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Welcome

The first question is, why study civics? As the classical authors teach us, living under laws is natural for human beings. After all, we can think in different ways than other creatures, and we can talk. Whatever we can think, we can say. That makes a natural closeness among us, and the political community is an expression of that closeness. For that reason alone, civics is one of those subjects that the educated person must know.

The second reason is that politics is important. Great harm is done by bad laws, and great good by good laws. We are citizens. We have an obligation to our fellow citizens and an interest for ourselves to make the laws as good as they can be.
The third reason is that the United States of America, our country, is a remarkable place. In 2026, we will reach the 250th anniversary of the founding of our nation. By any reckoning, this is a significant milestone. Our nation has grown from a few people huddled in a strange land along the eastern seaboard to a huge nation that spans the continent. Through the vast changes that have come upon the world and the United States in these centuries, the nation has been governed under a written Constitution, long the oldest surviving in human history. Under the principles of the Declaration of Independence, that Constitution provides for a government operating under the authority of the governed. This achievement is unprecedented.

The nation suffers deep divisions, divisions especially about the meaning and the goodness of that founding. Because that founding begins in the Declaration of Independence, which states that human equality is grounded in the nature of things, in the “laws of nature and of nature’s God,” a controversy about the founding is a controversy about our understanding of ourselves and nature and therefore of everything. This is a serious matter.

It is a happy thing that this controversy has so much to do with history. History is complete and cannot be changed. To the extent one can find out about it, he is finding a truth that will abide. Also, controversies about history, like controversies about everything, can only be resolved by looking at the facts. The historical facts are available for us to see.

The facts of the American Revolution are in some ways complex, although we assert that they are wonderful. Also, they are simple. The United States begins on a certain day, July 4, 1776, with a statement of the meaning of the nation and its purposes. One begins with that. And he proceeds in the same way, by studying the record of the American Revolution and later American history in order to see what it is.

This curriculum is a work of education. Education is important to each citizen and to the nation as a whole. The seeds from which a nation’s future grows are planted and nourished in the education and formation of its citizens. Our nation’s founders knew this and articulated it in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, which states: “Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall ever be encouraged.” The ordinance is unequivocal that without appropriate education the government cannot be good and the people cannot be happy. These two are intertwined with one another and stand upon a foundation of good education.

This curriculum is the work of teachers rather than officials or bureaucrats; it is informed by experience in the classroom as well as long and loving study of the history and principles of our country; and it seeks to cultivate in students the knowledge and virtue necessary to live good lives as citizens. It is an expression of the work of Hillsdale College since its founding in 1844, located in the very Northwest Territory established by the Northwest Ordinance. For the last 177 years, through civil war, depression, pandemic, and world war, Hillsdale College has remained committed to its founding principles. Admitting from its inception all students “irrespective of nation, race, and sex,” Hillsdale has studied and taught, and also fought, for the blessings of liberty championed in the American founding. This curriculum is an invitation to students, parents, and schools to join us in the work upon which the nation itself depends: to educate a people for liberty.

Dr. Larry P. Arnn
President, Hillsdale College
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Hillsdale College and K-12 Education

Located in rural southern Michigan, Hillsdale College was founded in 1844 with the purpose of providing its students “sound learning” of the kind necessary to preserve the “blessings of civil and religious liberty.” In the words of its modern mission statement, it “considers itself a trustee of our Western philosophical and theological inheritance tracing to Athens and Jerusalem, a heritage finding its clearest expression in the American experiment of self-government under law.”

Outreach efforts of the College include the Barney Charter School Initiative; the Allan P. Kirby, Jr. Center for Constitutional Studies and Citizenship in Washington, D.C.; the Center for Constructive Alternatives, one of the largest college lecture series in America; the Ludwig von Mises Lectures in free market economics; the Hoogland Center for Teacher Excellence; National Leadership Seminars in major cities nationwide; and Imprimis, a monthly speech digest with a circulation over 6.2 million.

The College’s educational mission rests upon two principles: academic excellence and institutional independence. The College is nationally known for its large and rigorous core curriculum, including a one-semester course on the U.S. Constitution, and for its principled refusal to accept federal or state taxpayer subsidies for any of its operations.

Hillsdale College K-12 Education

Hillsdale College has, since 1844, offered to its students an education in the liberal arts and sciences. But the College’s founders laid down a second purpose, one to which a liberal education naturally lends itself. They recognized that “civil and religious liberty” depended on “the diffusion of sound learning.” The College is committed to educating the country’s young people to be good, thoughtful human beings and responsible American citizens.

Hillsdale College K-12 Education brings the College’s founding mission to any K-12 American student. The College shares with students and teachers an education modeled on Hillsdale’s undergraduate course of study adapted appropriately for K-12 students. Hillsdale College K-12 Education promotes the founding of Hillsdale Classical Schools, and excellence in their teaching and operations, so that American students may be educated in the liberal arts and sciences and receive instruction in the principles of moral character and civic virtue.
The Hillsdale 1776 Curriculum

The Hillsdale 1776 Curriculum is a complete collection of lesson plans for teaching American history, civics, and government to K-12 students. Students who study using this curriculum learn about American history from the colonies through the Civil War at four different times during their K-12 years, each time increasing in depth. The curriculum also includes American history since the Civil War and American government and civics for both middle and high school students.

The curriculum is drawn from the actual evidence of the past, mostly documentary, which is our sole way of knowing what has gone before. It stays as close to that evidence as possible. As the student grows and learns, he is increasingly placed in direct contact with this evidence.

The curriculum provides teachers with guidance—not dictates—about how to plan and teach a given topic in American history or civics. This guidance includes Hillsdale College-vetted books, online courses, and other resource recommendations; lists of content topics, stories to tell, and questions to ask of students; “Keys to the Lesson” that clarify important points for teachers to keep in mind; student-ready primary sources; and sample assignments, activities, and assessments.

The introduction outlines how content was chosen, the pedagogical principles appropriate for teaching the curriculum, how teachers might use the curriculum when they plan lessons, what is necessary for the successful adoption of the curriculum and the restoration of American K-12 education, and the principles underlying the curriculum’s approach to history and civics education.

The curriculum is the product of Hillsdale College professors and some of the very best K-12 teachers, both past and present, derived from and created for real classrooms with real students taught by real teachers.
Engaging an Inheritance

In history and civics classes, American students should have one aim above all: to understand what they have received, i.e., their inheritance as Americans. To understand clearly, students and teacher alike must adopt a stance of humility. And this humility is fostered by the recognition on the part of the student that the world in which we live, with all its benefits and also its faults, is not of our own creation. This is the beginning of American history and civic education.

From this starting point, the field of discovery in history and civics is, if not endless, then impossible to explore completely in any number of lifetimes. Principles must therefore be discerned and applied to determine where to begin, on what to focus, and in which order. The need to choose and choose carefully is all the more pressing within the limits of thirteen years of formal education.

This curriculum rejects many fashionable ways to make decisions about what students should learn. Such trends include basing what students learn on political ideology and activism; corporate interests for preferred kinds of consumers and workers; the interests of higher education, standardized testing, and textbook corporations; and the color of one's skin. As to this final criterion, to base the content of a civics curriculum on such a standard is to resurrect and reinforce in students that they ought to judge, value, and treat people differently based on traits that a person does not control instead of on what he or she believes, says, or does. To teach students to so discriminate undermines the inherent dignity of each person and the equality found in each person’s equal possession of natural rights.

In defense of both the student and the historical figures she studies, this curriculum rejects all of these demands for deciding what students should encounter.
Instead, *The Hillsdale 1776 Curriculum* determines what students should learn in history and civics based on the answers to a single question: What ideas, words, and deeds have most significantly formed the world into which students were born? Studying the answers to this question provides students the fullest understanding of the world in which they will live their lives.

Of course, this question is not easy to answer. But this curriculum insists and does its utmost to abide by an honest commitment to the truth as it is, not as what some might want it to be. Rather than predetermining what we hope to find—and cherry-picking, obscuring, or even fabricating “facts” to fit our preconceived notions—this curriculum begins with searching for what actually happened and the contemporaneously stated reasons for why it happened.

So, what has most significantly shaped the world into which students were born? From where has their inheritance come?

First, the past. Much of what has immediately affected the student has happened since her birth: family, upbringing, and sometimes local current events. But students are already familiar with these influences, and it is not the place of the school to belittle the student by assuming her only interests or capacities for learning depend on what she already lives with on a daily basis. Nor is it the place of the school to draft the student into the civic work or outright political activism of adults. The world of the student was formed before she was born, and it is in history that she may search for understanding of his world.

Second, that which is most proximate. As a child’s life is shaped first by her parents, her home, her relatives, and her neighborhood, so has the student’s broader world been shaped most by figures within her own country’s past. This curriculum therefore brings students into encounters with American history and American civics, with due regard for the influences of figures from the world and particularly from the cradles of Western Civilization in the Middle East, Northern Africa, and Europe—figures who informed the very first Americans.

Third, individual persons. Ideas, words, and actions do not exist in a vacuum. They do not have a mind of their own. And history is not some fatalistic force compelling people to act a certain way, as Karl Marx claimed. The past, and therefore the present world of the student, is the creation of certain individual Americans who have had an outsized impact on the world the student has inherited. Moreover, these individual people are just like the student. They may look different or have come from a different background and have lived in a different time and place, but their desire to find what they thought was good in order to be happy, their high ideals, and their fallibility were all the same as those of the student. For all people at all times share the same human nature. This curriculum thus asks students to exercise the same imaginations that allow them to sympathize with talking animals and mythical demigods. These imaginations bring students into encounters with certain past American figures—not only on the basis of the extraordinary impact that these individuals have had on the student’s present world but also because in learning about them, students learn about themselves.

*The Hillsdale 1776 Curriculum* determines what students encounter based on what has shaped their world the most. As a result, students will have presented before their minds the following content, which may rightly be regarded as their birthright, their inheritance.

**Persons**

Because history and civics are composed of the actual thoughts, words, and actions of unique individuals, the study of individuals is of paramount importance in the curriculum. The curriculum is a person-driven encounter for students. Biographies lie at
the heart of the content, and students focus on individuals and individual actions rather than studying merely groups of people or social factors. Students study any given individual insofar as knowledge of him or her reveals the nature of human beings, helps students to understand circumstances that are foreign to them, or explains the cause of historical events and changes that were of extraordinary impact in forming the students’ world.

Primary Sources

What makes human beings human, distinct from animals, is our capacity for reason: to have thoughts and formulate ideas, and then to share those ideas through speech, both oral and written. The principal content of the curriculum, therefore, is primary sources, curated for the appropriate grade level. Primary sources capture the inner workings of past Americans, revealing their thoughts and desires, their virtues and vices. Although supplemental discoveries by historians and research are necessary and helpful, they often involve more conjecture than is warranted. It is the primary sources that are our chief evidence about the past and the origins of the student’s world. Within history and civics, documents, speeches, private correspondence, firsthand accounts, and the like reveal to students the interplay between human thoughts and events and lend insights into the ideas on which America was founded.

Geography and Places

Students learn about space. Each student has a physical existence. She occupies a certain part of physical space that no other person occupies. Students need to learn how to make sense of their places in the physical world. In American history, students must see how the fact that we are embodied beings living in a particular physical space has formed the thoughts and actions of historical figures and themselves.
Events and Dates

Knowledge of time includes gaining a general sense of temporal existence and of where their own lives and ages fit relative to the lives of those who have come before them. It also includes learning by heart certain dates of events or spans of time. Learning dates by heart should not be drudgery, but purposefully employed as guideposts for students in piecing together the chronological relationship between historical causes and their effects.

Terms and Topics

Typical curricula often require students to know the definitions of things. To reduce learning to the mere memorization of definitions and facts saps the wonder from history and civics and allows for easy manipulation of students. Instead, teachers should think in terms of topics—themes, events, and ideas ranging from the abstract to the particular; they should contemplate the full diversity of realities that had arisen in the lives of figures living and thinking and acting in a certain time and place. This curriculum does not reduce history and civics to memorizing definitions but instead drives students to engage terms and topics—and to question them. Above all, students seek to understand these terms and topics, their relations to the figures who also engaged with them in their own times, and to ask what they mean and what they show us about human beings and their country.

To Know by Heart

America’s founding and history is one of the best documented in the history of humankind. American students have before them an array of the truest of statements posited in beautiful words that have informed and inspired Americans for more than two centuries. In light of this unique opportunity, the curriculum nourishes the privileged capacity of childhood: the ready ability to learn and know things by heart. Students bring from this curriculum not only knowledge and skills, but also words and poetry and songs to carry in their hearts for the rest of their lives.

Stories for the American Heart

The word history means story, and in studying history, students learn from a thoughtful retelling of what happened. American history is full of more than four centuries of stories, some of which are the stuff of illustrative legend, while others are documented in detail. These stories—of individual Americans, events, heroic exploits, tragic turns of events, letters, firsthand accounts, etc.—capture the attention of the student, draw him into the historical scene, bring people of the past alive, and paint within the student’s moral imagination vivid images and examples of human conduct. Cumulatively, students gain a kind of seeing that can guide their understanding of history and their own conduct as human beings and American citizens.

“Lunch Atop a Skyscraper” | Public Domain
Questions for the American Mind

Beyond initial sensory perception and physical experience, a student’s understanding deepens when the mind grapples with reality, brings what is known to bear on what is new and unknown, and attempts to see how they fit together and how they do not. The chief means for fitting the intellect of the student to the reality of the world—to the truth—is through questions that challenge the student to reorient and apply herself to reality. But not all questions are the same. The first questions are matters of simple facts: the who, the what, the when, the where. These give the student knowledge. But true learning, real education, seeks something deeper, more full and complete and meaningful. To achieve understanding and practice in the virtue of wisdom, students must be asked the all-important question that has motivated all inquiry through all time: Why? This curriculum offers teachers a collection of possible questions that put the mind into action, pushing students into the more fertile territory of why something is the case and how they know something to be true. The asking of and grappling with thousands of such question for the student through this curriculum engenders in her a more complete understanding of her country and of herself.

Images

Like the stained-glass windows of great medieval buildings, images tell a story. With today’s technology, the student can encounter magnificent works of art, facsimiles, maps, and photographs daily in class. Each image may reinforce a historical figure or episode or become a jumping-off point for an entire lesson. Innumerable observations may be made and questions asked of the image, driving the class with the natural inquiry the student possesses, and providing a vivid lens into America through the decades.

This is what students who are taught this curriculum encounter. This is their inheritance.
Sharing a Love

What does a guest see upon entering a history and civics classroom?

The guest first notices walls alive with the past, with facsimiles, maps, portraits and paintings from American history. He sees the students with a pencil and paper and perhaps the text of a document or historical account upon their desks. And he sees their gaze moving from their desktops to a projected image or map, and finally and most consistently, to the teacher herself.

In a word, our guest sees harmony. It will look different based on grade level and school, on teacher and students. But sound history and civics classrooms will embrace an ordering and arranging of parts, just as the members of a symphony orchestra or athletic team move in complement to one another toward a common end, led by a director or captain or coach.

And what does our guest hear? He hears the teacher speaking, telling a story and asking questions about it.

First, with variations in voice and tone, with movement, with a hint of acting, she is telling a story. She uses descriptive words and her own careful study and imaginations of historical people and scenes to paint pictures in her students’ minds. She is conscious of her goal to transport students to the time and place they are studying, to bring the figures and scenes alive for her students. She sets the stage by describing the geography, landscape, and climate in which events will take place. She introduces individual figures by describing their backgrounds, sometimes including details and anecdotes from their childhoods, proceeding to physical descriptions and the telling qualities or shortcomings of their characters and temperaments, especially those that are relevant to the events to come. She introduces the hopes and thoughts of these characters, and she draws out the circumstances in which they
act. Quotations are read aloud, and images of scenes, maps, and the figures are projected for reference and student observation. The true story of history proceeds apace in the present tense, and the underlying drama that has lodged the historical moment in the enduring memory of a nation breaks through, arriving at a crescendo of action in an event and leading gloriously or malignantly to its consequences for subsequent events, for today, and for the student. This is the first kind of speech our guest hears.

The teacher’s second kind of speech repeatedly punctuates this kind of story and moves it along through questions to her students. Questions of who, what, when, and where, but more often and more importantly, questions of why and how: “Why does he do this? Why does she think that? Why does this happen? How did this come about? What will he, she, or they do, and why do you think that?” Question upon question, lending suspense and drawing students into the telling of the story with their answers and thoughts and wrestling with what really happened, and with the final questions of “Why?” and the all-important “What does this mean?” “What does this show us about America, about human beings, about ourselves?”

These questions are not rhetorical, and the class is therefore not a mere lecture. Instead, students seek to answer the questions throughout the class period, raising their hands, offering answers and reasons, engaging one another with respect. The result is a dynamic exchange of thoughts and reasoning, moving the class forward, and involving teacher, students, and historical figures all in the same story and conversation.

While civics class may have less of the story element, our guest will also observe in both history and civics the words of the past speaking directly to the students through primary sources. In history, students read or the teacher reads aloud portions of the foundational and most influential documents in American history, gleaning direct insights into the minds of American figures, and linking the episodes presented via story. In civics, the close and careful reading of the primary sources fills the minutes to their fullest. Students frequently learn to know by heart portions of these works. And in both history and civics, lively, civil conversations are held among all the students and the teacher as the class revolves around the text in search of what it is saying. And then, students attempt to answer the questions once more: “Is it true?” “Why?” and “What does it mean?”

And what is the goal of it all? What is the goal of each lesson and unit? Knowledge, surely, and understanding and images to furnish the moral imagination. And wise and virtuous citizens who will engage in and fulfill their civic responsibilities. But above all and as with all learning, the goal is the experience of encountering and discovering something that the student had not known before, something that has changed what he knows of reality, that pulls him to desire and dare to learn more, that pierces him with a fearful joy: wonder, the source of all learning and of wisdom itself.

For at the heart of history and civic education, as with any subject of study, is a sharing of love. The teacher loves both her content, which she deeply seeks to know, and her students. In loving each, she desires what is good for both content and students. For the sake of each, she brings content and students together through a moment of wonder, that students might know and then love what they study.

In the case of American history and civics, such a sharing of love in teaching offers students the wonder, opportunity, and capacity to honor and preserve what is good in their country, while condemning and correcting its flaws, for the good of America and their fellow Americans.

Such a knowledge and love is the very highest meaning of patriotism.
For the American Student

The Hillsdale 1776 Curriculum asks simply, in light of the vastness of reality and the limits of human existence, “What do American students in particular need and, most importantly, deserve to encounter and consider in their K-12 civic education?” The answer is first knowledge and understanding of American history and of the American republic as governed by the Constitution and morally grounded in the Declaration of Independence. The teachers who contributed to this curriculum are mindful of and experienced in the great and important changes in student development between grade levels, yet are also deferential to the circumstances and autonomy of local communities. This curriculum thus organizes the teaching of American history and civics into grade-level bands to provide the greatest usefulness as well as breadth for adjustment by states, districts, schools, teachers, and parents.
There are four grade level bands: Kindergarten through 2nd grade, 3rd through 5th grade, middle school, and high school. A school may use the units for any of the grades within a grade band. The curriculum has attempted to address the differences in student ability, but ultimately schools and teachers, given the students they have in their charge, must determine the appropriate adjustments for their situations.

This curriculum outlines simply what is most essential, and far more details of comparably less historical influence can and will be taught in relationship with these topics based on each teacher’s own study of the recommended resources.

Regarding integrating civics with other subjects, civics should play its role in history as well as in the other subjects, but it should not take over any given subject. Rather, civics topics should arise where naturally appropriate instead of reducing literature, science, mathematics, etc., to mere components of politics or, worse, political activism.

This curriculum respects the inherent dignity of both the student and historical figures. It does not whitewash or rewrite. It also does not ignore “warts,” if those “warts”—as with America’s noblest moments—are significant enough to fit the time restraints of K-12 schooling. It does not claim to be immune to conversation or disagreement, or to be “the last word.” But it does argue that this content is true, and that it is what American students should learn first.

Paying greater attention to injustices may in fact be warranted. But to force all of history through this myopic lens not only misses the whole picture but is no better than the histories such an approach claims to correct.

There is no reason to ignore the bad and emphasize the good, or vice versa: both deserve to be taught as they were and students deserve to know the entire truth.

Lastly, this curriculum only very carefully takes the stance of “consider the times,” for this phrase can easily give the impression that truth and morality (good and evil) are merely relative to one’s viewpoint or time period. “To consider the times” in which historical figures lived is not to excuse moral injustices or to justify relativism, but it requires us to understand the circumstances at the time and weigh them against principles that transcend time. It is recognizing the reality of history and honestly assessing how figures at the time acted within their circumstances in light of the truth.

The sequence is outlined on the following pages:
### Elementary School

**Kindergarten–2nd Grade**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3rd–5th Grade**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Middle School

**6th–8th Grade**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American Civics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### High School

**9th–12th Grade**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American Government and Politics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optional Civics Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fostering Civic Responsibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clarity and Simplicity

Great teachers often have a natural gift for teaching others, but The Hillsdale 1776 Curriculum supposes that any American who loves to learn, loves students, possesses a determined work ethic, and is open to improvement can become a high-quality teacher. Regardless of experience and abilities, every teacher deserves guidance that is clear, simple, and helpful, and such order and ease on the part of the teacher’s materials will translate into clear lessons for students.

The form of this curriculum, therefore, follows these principles of its intended function. It strives to demystify teaching from the cumbersome lingo, administrative complexities, and “bells-and-whistles” busyness associated with many curricula. We hope and trust that teachers will find this layout clear and refreshing.

Two facets to this structure are worthy of special note.

Keys to the Lesson

This curriculum does not tell the teacher exactly what he or she needs to teach or tell students. To dictate such content robs teachers of the joy of learning, robs students of the vibrancy of being taught by teachers who have genuinely studied their content, and disrespects the intellect and capacity of teachers to learn and teach according to their own pursuits of truth. What this curriculum offers instead are recommended resources and approaches that teachers may learn from but also engage with and question as they seek what is true.

The Keys to the Lesson include an initial recommendation on how to approach teaching the lesson in general, followed by a series of bullet-point suggestions on specific content areas, topics, and parts of the lesson. These suggestions usually highlight
points of emphasis, ways to approach certain texts or topics, and clarifications for accuracy of instruction. The order of these suggestions is generally the order in which the lesson may be best taught. As the name denotes, these statements are considered the keys to teaching the lesson with accuracy, effectiveness, and with a mind toward cultivating student engagement, class conversation, and meaningful, enduring understanding. They are meant to be guideposts for teachers to consider, not exclusive requirements to be followed blindly.

**Primary Sources**

Primary source handouts with applicable guiding reading questions (where a primary source is meant to be given as a preparatory assignment) accompany each unit. Each primary source includes information on its author, its date, and its location, and a very straightforward explanation of how it came to be. The goal of this information is to help bring the author and document alive for students by calling to mind the very real person who created it and the circumstances in which it was drafted. The text of each source has line numbers for ease of reference during in-class conversations, ample spacing between lines for annotations, and a wider right-hand margin for notetaking during reading or a seminar conversation. The number, length, and use of primary sources vary by grade level, but reading aloud short portions of primary sources is an important part of instruction in even the youngest grades. Teachers should adapt the scope of the primary sources to fit the abilities of their students and the actual content taught in class.

*Kidder copy of the Emancipation Proclamation | Source: Library of Congress*
The best and most sincere teachers understand teaching to be a vocation. Love for content and students draws them to such a challenging, demanding, and high-stakes career. Often this calling was first awakened when the teacher was herself a student. She experienced the wonder that her own teachers had cultivated through their instruction. The sense of great responsibility for the formation of a child called to her. It is not uncommon for a teacher to say that the reason she teaches is because of a teacher or professor she had as a student. How disappointing and tragic, then, that many teachers rarely get to focus on the art of teaching.

What are teachers doing instead? The list seems to grow by the school year: almost endless administrative paperwork, mostly tied to ever-evolving state and federal reporting requirements or test preparation; unnecessarily bureaucratic expectations for lesson plans; ever-changing and ever-increasing complexity in new technology, curricula, and pedagogical methods; student discipline policies that neither correct nor form student behavior and character, leaving teachers to manage a kind of chaos in some schools; and constant “box-checking” for teacher certification requirements and maintenance.

And when teachers are able, from time to time, to escape these burdens and actually arrive at teaching, they are handed what is little more than a script from which to read, dictating to them exactly what to say, how to say it, and what to do next by this kind of instruction manual. Some skill-based subjects may be well conducted in this manner, but history and civics are not.

While other efforts will be necessary to address many of the above infringements on actually teaching, The Hillsdale 1776 Curriculum attempts to restore and defend teachers’ freedom to teach in at least this final respect. Although it outlines content that students should probably encounter, vets resources, and offers some...
considerations for teachers, it defers entirely to the knowledge, creative ingenuity, and love of each teacher to plan out and present lessons. Sound, tried and true pedagogical principles—framed by genuine love of a subject—should shape lesson planning and teaching (see “Pedagogy: Sharing a Love”). This curriculum empowers the teacher to rediscover that original love of learning and that original sense of wonder and care for students that led her to become a teacher. Each lesson taught using this curriculum should be unique to the teacher and students of a particular classroom at a particular school.

The curriculum is designed to empower teachers with the freedom to teach. What we wish to offer, then, are a handful of suggestions on how teachers might consider using *The Hillsdale 1776 Curriculum*, whether their school has officially adopted the curriculum or they use it to supplement and enhance their existing lessons.

**Planning the Lesson**

1. **Teachers review the Teacher Preparation Resources, including Hillsdale-vetted texts and Online Courses lectures.**

2. **Teachers then write out their lesson notes.**

   **For History Classes**, teachers write and craft their lesson plans as much as possible as a narrative—a good story, and a true one. Taking on the mindset of a film director can be helpful in this process, asking, “What words must I use and in what order must I present things to bring the figures and scenes alive for my students?” Reflecting on the student and teacher resources, teachers may ask other questions, such as: What background information should I pull in? What should I dwell upon in detail, and what may I summarize? What will students want to know more about? What can I anticipate them asking? What do I want to know more about? What specific stories will I tell? Which questions will I ask? When? Where should I build suspense? At what actions or scenes or choices do I wish students to wonder? What images will I show and when? How might a specific class period conclude? After the teacher’s notes have been drafted, teachers may review the Core Content, Stories, Questions, and Keys to the Lesson sections of the curriculum lesson to see if anything has been missed. If so, they determine the best way and places to incorporate this content, these questions, and these considerations.

---

For Civics Classes, teachers review the Terms and Topic, Questions, and Keys to the Lesson outlined in the curriculum lesson. With these in mind, they read through the primary sources and craft a lesson plan that mainly uses the reading and discussion of primary sources to drive the lesson. Most lessons can be conducted as a full or partial seminar conversation.

3. Teachers determine what Preparatory and Post-Lesson Assignments and Activities may be warranted.

4. Teachers decide what images and stories to share with students.

Presenting the Lesson

1. Teachers begin with review.

2. Teachers become storytellers and/or let the primary source tell its story. Like a good movie, play, or book, teachers employ storytelling practices and variations in tone, voice, and pacing. They acquire the disposition of an actor or performer without reducing class to a reenactment. A certain gravitas, seriousness, and drama should come through. For teachers who have studied their content and care for it, such wonder and sincerity will naturally animate their presentation and they arrange for moments in which students may experience wonder. If class is composed mainly of a primary source, teachers read and discuss the text with the same principles in mind, seeking to understand the speaker on his or her own terms first.

3. Teachers ask an abundance of questions. They help students remain engaged, grow in understanding, and enter into the history or primary source by having students help tell the story through their answers to questions. Questions of fact will of course arise, but teachers focus especially on asking questions of “How,” “Why,” and “Why do you think that?” Class is not a lecture but rather a dynamic, teacher-led conversation among all the students, turning around the topic at hand in pursuit of truth.

Refining Understanding

1. Teachers assess students. Tests are a somewhat useful but imperfect tool to measure a certain kind of learning. But perhaps the more important and more overlooked use of quality tests is the opportunity they afford students to reflect, review, and more accurately understand what they have learned. The great value of tests in this curriculum, therefore, is how they can help students to reflect and understand by studying for the test. Each included study guide is based on a refined version of the lesson outline. Students should personally review their notes, along with reviewing as a class, to re-engage with what they have learned. In this sense, the study guide is a true guide to studying. It is meant to lead students back through what they learned through their notes. Students should grow in familiarity with the unit’s stories and ideas and how they are connected; they should be able to recount episodes and answer the deeper questions. This type of study and review is an excellent opportunity for students to synthesize the various parts of what they have learned, to see how it all fits together, and to adjust their understanding of reality accordingly. The test, then, is merely an opportunity for students to demonstrate this growth in knowledge and understanding.

2. Teachers allow students the time to reflect, think, and write. After a unit test, teachers use the writing assignments to provide students with the space and time to consider a question that strikes at the heart of the entire unit. Students may have some time in class to work on their response and
be instructed in good writing, but some writing may be completed independently, at least for older students. With the broad topic having been reviewed and tested, students should benefit from the freedom to engage one final time with the topic in a way that applies their intellect to form a deeper, long-lasting understanding.

Two Insights

First, teachers ought to make each lesson their own. The structure, recommendations, and resources provided in this curriculum are meant to be a trustworthy starting point and guide but should by no means be restrictive. They are meant to offer a sense of order within which teachers rediscover the freedom and joy of teaching.

Second, this curriculum eschews a number of relatively novel curriculum and pedagogical trends. We are well familiar with these practices, often theorized in academia and promulgated through preparation programs and bureaucratic agencies. Should a practice not appear in this curriculum, it is not necessarily ineffective or wrong (though we believe some are), and this curriculum can be taught with many different pedagogical approaches employed in modern classrooms but not listed here. We believe, however, that the methods recommended in this curriculum are the best and most consistent means of raising students in enduring knowledge and understanding while cultivating strong critical thinking skills. We have made these determinations over time, through careful thought and classroom experience, and have opted for what has been tried and true for decades, centuries, and even millennia: tried, because they have formed the civilization we have inherited, and true, because they accord with the way the world is, the way people are, and the way people come to know the world.
What Is Needed

It is common in education policy to release a new program, curriculum, or initiative, followed with directives on what needs to be done to make them succeed. Here we, too, outline what is necessary, but our recommendation is very different. It is not more money, more government action and control, or more hoops to jump through. Instead, what is needed for civic education to succeed in America is freedom and prudence.

Freedom

In education, the United States must restore the freedom to make decisions to those who are closest to the communities most directly affected by them.

Decision authority on what curriculum is used, how to teach, how to assess, and what schools to attend should be reclaimed from Washington, the Department of Education, state bureaucracies, and teaching colleges and departments. The power to make such choices should be repossessed by state legislators, local school districts, and school boards, all of whom are accountable to voters, and to the administration and teachers of each school, who are accountable to parents when they elect to enroll their students at the school.

The preparation of teachers should be reclaimed from costly and time-consuming university system and certification agencies. The process for forming high-quality teachers should be repossessed by local school districts and schools, where new hires can earn a living while being mentored and coached by the best veteran teachers, who are themselves compensated for their support. This is how teachers learn to be great teachers: by observing and being observed by the great teachers before them.
The creation of lesson plans should be reclaimed from corporate textbook publishers and state and federal mandates. This process should be repossessed by teachers, as this curriculum permits, in order to restore the freedom to teach with passion and ingenuity by empowered teachers.

State standards should be specific on the foundational content and skills students should share, particularly as content pertains to the principles and history of our common heritage, but state standards should otherwise allow flexibility for schools and teachers. National standards and civics funding tied to such standards, moreover, violate the principle of federalism and allow one position to crowd out the insights and sovereignty of local citizens, parents, and teachers. Federal policymakers and states operating under the guise of collaborative federalism should not force national civics standards and funding into states, districts, and local schools.

While it may be fitting to require high school students to pass the 2020 Civics Test used to naturalize immigrants as new U.S. citizens, accountability in history and civics does not require another standardized test. Instead, states should simply require that schools and school districts publish on their websites outlines of the specific lessons they teach students in history and civics. Parents can read for themselves if fundamental knowledge about America is being taught and if it is being taught accurately. And for recourse they can elect new school board members or else vote with their feet and move their students to a different school. Many of the assignments included in this curriculum are aimed at including parents in the education of their children, or at least making sure they are not barred from knowing what their children are being taught.

Just as federal standards and assessments are not the solution, federal money is not the solution for improving civics and history education. In fact, each of the above-mentioned restorations of freedom will save money, not increase expenses, for schools, teachers, and taxpaying citizens.

What is needed is greater freedom of time.

Teachers need time to learn more—not merely about how to teach but especially about what to teach, i.e., about their subject matter. Teachers need to drink deeply from great histories, from free online courses such as what Hillsdale College offers, and have time to plan dynamic lessons rather than be encumbered by administrative paperwork.

And students need time—time in the day to learn and engage with and think about history and civics. The most meaningful change that state policymakers and schools can make in this regard is to defend and even expand the amount of time allotted for American history and civics instruction each school day. But this instruction should be devoted to engagement with content, not merely time-filling activities or action civics in which students become the pawns of adults who push political ideology.

---

Prudence

For any of the above to happen, prudence must rule in the hearts and minds of those who are in positions of power to make them realities. This prudence requires a clear-sightedness for the principles of America and of civic education, and a humility to seek out their application to specific circumstances. It requires courage and discretion to shift control over education from powerful and centralized interests and back to local schools, individual teachers, and the voting citizens of a community. It requires a care for the well-being of students, a respect for their inherent dignity and rational yet impressionable hearts and minds, which deserve the often beautiful but sometimes ugly truth of American history. And it requires an American's love for his or her country, a love that can see and appreciate the good in America, recognize the bad, and strive always to preserve what is good and condemn what is not—all for the sake of the truths on which America was founded, in honor of those who sacrificed and died to defend them, and for the good of present and future generations of young Americans.
Real Teachers, Real Classrooms, Real Students

The Hillsdale 1776 Curriculum is a reflection of Hillsdale College’s K-12 Program Guide, which serves as the basis of instruction in Hillsdale-affiliated schools. The K-12 Program Guide itself reflects parts of the education of which college students partake on Hillsdale’s campus. The specific materials in this curriculum, however, are the creation of the very best K-12 teachers, at Hillsdale classical schools, both past and present.
Dear Teacher,

As you know, teaching is one of the most important professions in human history. As an institution whose purpose it is to teach, we at Hillsdale College are acutely aware of what it takes to teach and to teach well, especially today. We thank you for taking up this charge in general and this curriculum in particular. We hope and trust that it will serve you and your students in the ways that you and they most deserve.

The pursuit of truth is an unapologetic pursuit. For those who strive for honesty, it cannot be otherwise. As such, you the teacher should be aware of the truths which Hillsdale College holds to be accessible to human reason, proven through the ages, and true of all people and all times. This curriculum is based on these truths. They are as follows.

- That truth is objective, according to the first law of logic, the law of contradiction: that something cannot both be and not be at the same time in the same way. The first object of the human mind and the first end of education is this objective truth about the world.
- That the good is that at which all actions, however misguided or distorted, aim. The good shows us how we ought to act, which we call right moral conduct.
- That human nature is good but also limited, flawed, and prone to do what is wrong.
- That while an individual may conduct himself and form his character to align with what is good over his lifetime, human nature itself does not fundamentally change or progress.
- That because this is the nature of human beings, and human beings make up government, government will always be capable of tyranny and mismanagement.
- That individuals should be judged based on their specific actions tending toward a certain character instead of their label, group identity, sex, religion, or skin color.
- That civic knowledge, personal virtue, patriotism, respect for the rule of law, and civil free speech are absolutely necessary for young students to learn for a free and self-governing society to persevere.
- That the more important thing in American history is that which has endured rather than that which has passed, that is, America’s founding principles which have outlasted and extinguished from law various forms of evil, such as slavery, racism, and other violations of the equal protection of natural rights.
- That although the United States of America is by no means perfect, it is unprecedented in the annals of human history for the extraordinary degrees of freedom, peace, and prosperity available to its people and to those who immigrate to her shores.
- That these unprecedented benefits are the result of its founding ideas and of those who have bravely sacrificed to prove these principles true—the principles that all men are created equal in their human dignity and possession of certain natural rights, that government exists solely to protect these rights and to promote the public good, and that people ought to govern themselves and respect the rights of one another.
- That for these reasons, America is an exceptionally good country.

With these principles in mind, dive into your subject. Learn it, wonder at it, love it, and teach so your students will, too.

Dr. Kathleen O’Toole
Assistant Provost for K-12 Education
Hillsdale College
The Hillsdale 1776 Curriculum
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**Kindergarten-2nd Grade**

American History

4 units | 20-30-minute classes

**OVERVIEW**

Unit 1 | The British Colonies of North America

| LESSON 1 | The Lands, Waters, and Peoples of America |
| LESSON 2 | 1492–1630 Exploration and Settlement |
| LESSON 3 | 1630–1732 The Colonies in Profile |
| LESSON 4 | 1607–1763 Major Events in the Colonies |

Unit 2 | The American Founding

| LESSON 1 | 1763–1776 Self-Government or Tyranny |
| LESSON 2 | 1776 The Declaration of Independence |
| LESSON 3 | 1776–1783 The War of Independence |
| LESSON 4 | 1783–1789 The United States Constitution |
Unit 3 | The Early Republic
---

**Lesson 1**  1789–1801  The New Government

**Lesson 2**  1801–1815  Prospects, Uncertainties, and War

**Lesson 3**  1815–1829  The American Way

**Lesson 4**  1829–1848  Manifest Destiny

---

Unit 4 | The American Civil War
---

**Lesson 1**  1848–1854  The Expansion of Slavery

**Lesson 2**  1854–1861  Toward Civil War

**Lesson 3**  1861–1865  The Civil War

**Lesson 4**  1865–1877  Reconstruction
UNIT 1
The British Colonies of North America
1492–1763

UNIT PREVIEW

Structure

LESSON 1  The Lands, Waters, and Peoples of America  4–5 classes  p. 7
LESSON 2  1492–1630  Exploration and Settlement  9–10 classes  p. 11
LESSON 3  1630–1732  The Colonies in Profile  9–10 classes  p. 17
LESSON 4  1607–1763  Major Events in the Colonies  9–10 classes  p. 22
APPENDIX  Talk about History, Review Sheet, Test, Writing Assignment  p. 27

Why Teach the British Colonies of North America

Christopher Columbus’s discovery of what was then termed “The New World” is one of the most consequential events in all of recorded history. It was as if another half of Earth was being opened to the peoples of Europe, Africa, and Asia, and the changes that followed this momentous discovery were immense. Students should be especially aware of the profound effects of the initial contact of European explorers with the indigenous peoples of North America. They should understand the ways of life characteristic of Native American tribes, the exploits of European explorers and settlers, and the triumphs and tragedies that defined the relationships between settlers and natives. Students should also learn about the manner in which the British colonies of North America were established, since those first settlements would be the seedbed of our country. Our unique American heritage began here, on these coasts, among
scattered settlements of men and women pursuing economic independence or religious freedom, leaving behind their familiar lives to seek liberty and opportunity at what to them was the edge of the world. With the promise of freedom at these far reaches also came untold hardships and daily dangers. The American story begins with those few who braved these risks for the freedom to pursue what all human beings desire to attain: **happiness**.

### Enduring Ideas from This Unit

1. America’s varied and wondrous geography has played a crucial role in many of America’s successes.
2. The discovery, exploration, and settlement of the Western Hemisphere was one of the most consequential series of events in human history.
3. The contact between indigenous North American and European civilizations resulted in both benefits and afflictions for natives and colonists alike.
4. The British colonies of North America were unique, and their circumstances gradually shaped the character of the colonists into something unprecedented: **the American**.
5. The freedom afforded to the American colonists resulted in a degree of successful self-government unknown to the rest of the world in 1763.

### What Teachers Should Consider

Imagine two more continents, an eighth and a ninth, with different terrain, untouched resources, seemingly limitless lands, and complete openness to any sort of political regime. This is the vision teachers might consider adopting in preparing students to learn American history. In other words, one can adopt an outlook similar to that of the people who began the first chapter in the story of America. Such an outlook will help students to see the origins of America as something that was not at all inevitable.

In the same way the explorers, settlers, and indigenous Native Americans keenly fixed their attention on the contours of the North American landscape, so should students of American history at the outset of their studies. Learning about American geography sets the stage on which Americans of every generation would act out their lives.

Europeans’ exploration and settlement of the Western Hemisphere is an extraordinary era in terms of historical impact, but it also contains engaging stories of intrepid discoverers and of the conditions they found and helped to shape. It is important to find the proper balance in conveying the story of that era. Students ought to step into the lives of these explorers and settlers and understand not only their motivations for undertaking such hazardous trips and ways of living but also their experiences on the Atlantic and on the fringes of an unknown continent. They should also think carefully and honestly about the interactions between Native Americans, explorers, and settlers. They will encounter a mixed picture. At times, they will see cooperation, care, and mutual respect; at other times they will see all the duplicity and injustice that human nature is capable of. They will see these traits exhibited by all parties at various moments and in different circumstances.
Teachers should also focus on making clear the differences between England’s North American colonies and those of other emerging New World empires, such as Spain, France, and Portugal. They should bring out what was unique among the English settlers, from the form of their colonies’ settlements to the social and economic ventures of the colonists themselves, as well as their varied relationships to the mother country. Each English colony may be taught separately, each offering a distinct social and economic profile, while a final lesson may be devoted to studying the major events and movements in shared colonial American history. Together, students should come to see that an unplanned experiment was unfolding in the British colonies of North America: one that was shaping a unique society and citizenry, one that would be equipped for great accomplishments in the coming centuries.

How Teachers Can Learn More

TEXTS

Land of Hope, Wilfred McClay

ONLINE COURSES | Online.Hillsdale.edu

The Great American Story
American Heritage

Lesson Planning Resources

TEACHER RESOURCES

Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1, Wilfred McClay
The Geography of the United States, Core Knowledge
The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic, H.A. Guerber
Colonial Times, Anne Goudvis and Stephanie Harvey
The Landing of the Pilgrims, James Daugherty
The American Revolution and Constitution, Anne Goudvis and Stephanie Harvey

TRADE BOOKS

Maps and Globes, Jack Knowlton
Aboard the Santa Maria, Kate Mikoley
Exploration & Conquest, Betsy Maestro
James Towne, Marcia Sewall
Roanoke, Jane Yolen
Aboard the Mayflower, Theresa Emminizer
Sailing on the Mayflower, Caryn Jenner
The Thanksgiving Story, Alice Dalgliesh
The Pilgrims’ First Thanksgiving, Ann McGovern
The New Americans, Betsy Maestro
If You Lived in Colonial Times, Ann McGovern
If You Lived in Williamsburg in Colonial Days, Barbara Brenner
Three Young Pilgrims, Cheryl Harness
Meet George Washington, Joan Heilbroner
Ben Franklin of Old Philadelphia, Margaret Cousins
Heroes of the Revolution, David Adler
LESSON PLANS,
ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS,
AND QUIZZES
Lesson 1 — The Lands, Waters, and Peoples of America

Lesson Objective

Students learn about the geography of what would become the United States of America and its Native American and immigrant-descended inhabitants.

Teacher Preparation

Create a note outline based on the following:

Teacher Texts

Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1 Pages xiii-xv, 1-3
The Geography of the United States

Trade Books

Maps and Globes

Online.Hillsdale.edu

The Great American Story Lectures 1 and 2
American Heritage Lecture 1

Core Content in This Lesson

Topographic Geography

Atlantic Ocean Great Plains
Appalachian Mountains Rocky Mountains
Gulf of Mexico Pacific Ocean
Mississippi River Bering Strait
Great Lakes

Political Geography

Virginia South Carolina
Massachusetts New Jersey
New Hampshire New York
Maryland Pennsylvania
Connecticut Georgia
Rhode Island Washington, District of Columbia
Delaware
North Carolina
Terms and Topics
- glaciers
- land bridge
- natural resources
- climate
- Mayas
- Aztecs
- Inca
- cities
- towns
- countryside

Images
- Maps
- Famous or exemplar landscapes, landmarks, bodies of water in America
- Illustrations of indigenous peoples, civilizations, and life
- Photographs of Aztec, Maya, and Inca ruins

**STORY FOR THE AMERICAN HEART**
- Christopher Columbus’s crew on their voyage and sighting land

**QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND**
- What kinds of landforms and bodies of water can you find in America?
- Why is the American landscape a good place for people to live?
- Where did the indigenous peoples of North and South America come from? How did they get here?
- How did different groups of Native Americans live?
- What are some ways in which Native Americans and Europeans lived differently?

**KEYS TO THE LESSON**

Every story has a setting, and the true story of history is no different. To tell and to teach this story effectively requires first introducing students to the stage on which Americans would act. Thus, American history should begin with a study of American geography. The lesson should transport students to the different places of America, not through an online virtual map but through the use of their own imaginations. Geography instruction is an excellent way to awaken and exercise the imaginations of students, priming them for all the other journeys which studying history will ask their minds to undertake. Every history lesson will involve a similar setting of the stage in the students’ imaginations, and this lesson establishes that precedent. Of course, the lesson also gives students the “lay of the land” for the entire study of American history, beginning with an immersive trip through the country’s magnificent and diverse landscape. This geography lesson can be full of simple questions about what students observe, training them in the skill of careful discernment of detail. At the end of the lesson, the class may return to the virgin topography of the United States and place the various indigenous civilizations on it, learning the smattering of their history that has survived, and then return to the Atlantic and to the Spanish caravels and carracks just over the eastern horizon.
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Teachers might best plan and teach The Lands, Waters, and Peoples of America with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Introduce students to maps and globes, depending on the grade level and prior familiarity. Map skill topics may include teaching how to distinguish between a map and a globe; identifying and explaining a map of the classroom; distinguishing oceans, lakes, rivers, and mountains on a map; identifying cardinal directions on a map or globe; locating the North and South Poles; using different symbols on a map; and making references between locations on a map.

- Begin by telling a story that will encourage students to use their imaginations and set the precedent for the way class will normally be taught. The story of Christopher Columbus’s crew sighting land is an excellent example. The story may be picked up when Columbus’s three ships are already en route. Paint the scene. Provide descriptions of the ship. Help students get a sense of what sailing was like in those days, and the dangers it involved. Draw out the sounds and smells onboard the ships. Introduce the kind of men on board, the letters and instructions they had with them, and what they may have been thinking from moment to moment. Talk about their captain: his appearance, thoughts, and comportment. Share the story of how recently the crew had nearly mutinied against him, and how he quelled their fears. Describe the sudden appearance of a large flock of birds the previous day. Finally, bring students to the very early morning of October 12, 1492, after the view from the ship’s rail had not changed for weeks, when the call came from the masts, “La tierra!” Land!

- Introduce landmarks, bodies of water, and other physical characteristics, moving from east to west. The items listed under “Topographic Geography” follow in roughly this order. The goal is to make sure students are aware of these landmarks in order to develop an appreciation for the beauty and diversity of their country’s landscape.

- Call upon students’ imaginations by describing the settings of what you introduce with vivid language that engages all their senses. Place them in particular climates with the correct weather depending on the season and discuss the kinds of natural resources and economic activity to which each area is conducive. Record all this information with the class on a map projected on the board. As the class proceeds from coast to coast, label the map together using different symbols and drawings. Ask plenty of questions in the process. For review, project images of key areas discussed on the map and have students try to identify what is being projected.

- Emphasize with students the tremendous advantages America’s land offers to human flourishing. America had excellent and untouched soils for cultivation, temperature and rainfall averages were ideal, and timber was plentiful. Native plants and animals suitable for human consumption were abundant, while imported livestock thrived. The virgin forests provided all the fuel needed for fires, heating, and cooking, as well as for building. Waterways were plentiful and mostly navigable; their importance cannot be overstated, and students should appreciate that the colonial-era Atlantic world imagined the world primarily in terms of water flow, especially in North America. Most of the country had mild winters with long, warm growing seasons and few areas subject to drought. As for security from foreign powers, the United States would have two massive oceans separating it from most of the rest of the world.

- After covering topography, transition to a map of the colonies, proceeding in the order in which the first thirteen states were settled as colonies. The colonies and their major cities and features should be discussed, while details on the remaining states may be reserved for later grades. Review the topography, weather, climate, and seasons in the process.
Return to the topographical map and place the indigenous tribes onto the map of North America and into the environments in which the various tribes lived. The diversity of tribes is astounding, and highlighting several communities, particularly on the eastern seaboard, will put students in the right historical context and assist with teaching the events in subsequent lessons.

Explain how America is and always has been a land of immigrants. Even those who would be considered the indigenous or “native” peoples of both North and South America likely migrated from northeast Asia. Settlements and even great cities of Central and South America emerged in following years as migration resulted in people spreading over the land of the Western Hemisphere.

Show the range of different Western Hemisphere civilizations through the millennia prior to Christopher Columbus, including their ways of life, customs, and beliefs. In conjunction with state and local history, explore the history and traditions of historical Native Americans from the school’s locality or state.

Conclude this first lesson by reminding students that to Columbus, his crew, and the peoples of Europe, Africa, and Asia in 1492 (and for millennia before), none of this was known to them, and discovering the entirety of the New World would take hundreds of years, even after Columbus’s voyages.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

**Assignment 2:** Have students draw and color a landform of their choice in America. Have students present briefly in class what they drew and why they depicted it the way they did.

**Assignment 3:** Have students draw a map of their classroom or house. Have students present briefly in class what they drew and why they depicted it the way they did.
Lesson 2 — Exploration and Settlement

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the European exploration of North America and the first English settlement efforts at Roanoke, Jamestown, Plymouth, and Massachusetts Bay.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Teacher Texts
- *The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic* Pages 11–44, 56–57
- *Colonial Times*
- *The Landing of the Pilgrims*

Trade Books
- *Aboard the Santa Maria*
- *Exploration & Conquest*
- *Roanoke*
- *James Towne*
- *Aboard the Mayflower*
- *Sailing on the Mayflower*
- *The Thanksgiving Story*
- *The Pilgrims’ First Thanksgiving*
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- *The Great American Story* Lecture 2
- *American Heritage* Lecture 2

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places
- Genoa
- Spain
- San Salvador
- “The New World”
- La Florida
- St. Augustine
- England
- Virginia
- Roanoke
- Jamestown
- Plymouth
- Massachusetts Bay
- Boston
Persons
Leif Erikson
Ferdinand and Isabella
Christopher Columbus
John Smith
Pocahontas

John Rolfe
William Bradford
Massasoit
John Winthrop

Terms and Topics
Niña, Pinta, and Santa María
Taino
“Indians”
conquistadors
smallpox
Virginia Company
“Starving Time”
tobacco

Pilgrims
Mayflower
religious freedom
Mayflower Compact
government
rule of law
self-government
Wampanoag

Timeline
1492 Columbus lands on San Salvador Island
4th Thursday in November Thanksgiving Day

Images
Historical figures and events
Caravel and carrack
Maps of Columbus’s voyages and other exploration
Dress of Native Americans, explorers, and settlers
Illustrated map of Jamestown
Mayflower
Mayflower Compact facsimile
First Thanksgiving

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Christopher Columbus’s account of making landfall
- The Lost Colony of Roanoke
- The “Starving Time” at Jamestown
- Pocahontas, John Smith, and John Rolfe
- The voyage of the Mayflower
- Signing of the Mayflower Compact
- The first winter at Plymouth
- Accounts of the First Thanksgiving by Edward Winslow and William Bradford

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- Why did Europeans begin exploring the ocean in the 1400s?
- What did Christopher Columbus think would be the fastest way to get to Asia?
- Who were Queen Isabella and King Ferdinand? What did they agree to with Columbus?
- What was dangerous about sailing on the ocean?
- What were the *Niña*, the *Pinta*, and the *Santa Maria*?
- How did Christopher Columbus’s voyages change the world?
- Why did Christopher Columbus mistakenly name the indigenous people of North America?
- Was Christopher Columbus successful? Why or why not?
- Why did settlers want to establish Jamestown?
- What problems did Jamestown’s settlers face?
- What events helped Jamestown to succeed?
- What is “self-government”?
- Why did the Pilgrims want to establish Plymouth?
- What did the Mayflower Compact say?
- Why did the Pilgrims create the Mayflower Compact?
- How did the First Thanksgiving come about? Why?
- Why did John Winthrop say that the settlers at Massachusetts Bay were like “a city upon a hill”?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 73: The colonists came to America for many reasons. Name one.
  - Question 74: Who lived in America before the Europeans arrived?

**Keys to the Lesson**

Christopher Columbus’s discovery of the New World was one of the signal achievements of the age of exploration. Enterprising commoners who followed in his wake braved the seas and these wild lands for their own fortunes and opportunity. Nearly one hundred years would pass before the English would attempt a permanent settlement in North America and another two decades before they found any success. Yet while Jamestown was founded chiefly on economic motives, the next two decades would see the Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay colonies founded, at least in part, for religious and cultural ends. What was common to all these efforts was the desire for freedom to better their conditions—both the quality of earthly life and the preparation for eternal life. Put differently, they desired the freedom to seek happiness, made available to the common man in ways that had no parallel in the Old World.

Teachers might best plan and teach Exploration and Settlement with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Begin the teaching of American history by helping students gain historical perspective. Using the following reference points, ask them to compare today’s way of life with life in the centuries prior to the 1600s.
  - ability to believe and act on one’s beliefs without fear of arrest or worse
  - ability to speak one’s mind without fear of arrest or worse
  - acquisition of clothing, food, and shelter
  - communication by Internet, text, phones, mail
  - electricity, plumbing, heating, cooling
  - travel by plane, car, boat, horse and buggy, walking
- Offer students some background on the reasons why Europeans began exploring in the first place. Reasons include a newfound daringness in European thought and culture, trade interests in Asia, Muslim control of land routes, newly emerging and competing monarchs, and new maritime
technology. Riding these currents, many were inspired to turn to the seas in search of what was beyond, first along the African coast, and then across the Atlantic.

- Relay to students the background to Christopher Columbus. Of important note is the attention he gave to new theories of navigation and the size, but not the shape, of the world. It is a misconception that many people believed the Earth was flat during Columbus’ lifetime. Most educated people since the ancient Greeks believed the world was round. Columbus theorized the world was much smaller than others believed. This led him to surmise that it would be possible to travel to the East Indies by sailing west.

- Of Columbus’s first voyage, help students to imagine what he was doing and what his crew was undertaking as well. It was far from certain that they would find the route Columbus sought, or that they would survive trying. Even then, Columbus was confident of his theories and of his ability.

- Consider Columbus’s role in establishing the first enduring links between the Old and New Worlds, initiating European civilization’s influence on the Western Hemisphere. Additionally, his enterprising spirit has epitomized a quintessentially American trait to the American people.

- Explore with students the history of interactions between the indigenous peoples of North and South America and European explorers and settlers. Of paramount importance is that teachers do not paint with too broad of a brush. The relationships varied widely. Many interactions and relationships were mutually respectful and cooperative. Others were unjust. Often the relations between the same groups ebbed and flowed between friendship and conflict over time. Ask why misunderstandings, duplicity, and conflict between very different peoples and cultures—and between fallible individuals of all sorts—might arise.

- In addition to conflicts, discuss how the indigenous people’s lack of acquired immunity to diseases—notably smallpox, which most Europeans had been conditioned to survive—was a leading cause of the decline in the Native American population.

- Highlight the later years of Columbus’s life, including his removal as commander in Spanish-claimed territories, his shipwreck and stranding on Jamaica for a year, and Spain’s unwillingness to commission any further expeditions under his command. Columbus died as an abject failure in the eyes of the world and likely in his own eyes, as he never did find a passage to Asia yet also did not understand that what he had discovered was another half of planet Earth.

- Review other explorations between Columbus and the beginning of English settlement efforts in the late 1500s. Study Ponce de Leon’s discovery of Florida and the eventual settlement at St. Augustine, marking the first European presence in the future United States. Trace the paths of various explorers into the future states of America, particularly in Florida and the West. Recount the first English effort to establish a permanent settlement in North America in the colony of Roanoke, which famously disappeared with barely a trace after a brief four-year existence.

- Recount the founding of Jamestown as emblematic of one important motivation for the English to establish a colony: material opportunity for the lower classes. Land ownership by common folk was extremely rare in almost all of Europe, and economic mobility itself was a relatively new and rare phenomenon. The organizers and settlers of Jamestown embodied the enterprising spirit that would come to define emigrants from England to North America, and, for that matter, millions of immigrants throughout America’s history. This degree of opportunity for the ordinary person was unprecedented. It partly explains why so many European commoners left what was familiar and risked the greater likelihood of an earlier death to pursue it. The Jamestown settlers exemplified the idea of pursuing “the American dream.”
Tell stories about the several periods when Jamestown was on the verge of failing and the many deaths incurred despite its eventual success. Of particular note was Jamestown’s original experiment with a form of communism. This collectivism, plus rampant disease, helped produce a disastrous first year and a half for the fledgling settlement. John Smith’s requirement that settlers earn their bread by their work and his guarantee of private property ownership, along with some much-needed assistance from the local Native Americans, not only saved the settlement but also became quintessentially American traits, both in law and in the character of the people. But even this near disaster paled in comparison to what was known as the “Starving Time,” in which failure was averted only by a return to the rule of law under Lord De La Warr. The turning point for Jamestown was the successful cultivation of tobacco by John Rolfe. While not the gold many settlers had originally envisioned, the crop would both shore up Jamestown’s existence and spread the news among the English and other Europeans that opportunities were present and realizable in English Virginia.

Show how the founding of Plymouth was emblematic of the other important motivation for Englishmen to establish a colony: religion. In the wake of the Protestant Reformation, the Christian world was divided, with various forms of strife and severe restrictions on religious belief and practice. In England, these divisions were within Protestantism itself, with Puritans wishing to purify the Church of England of remaining Catholic trappings and Separatist Puritans (whom we call Pilgrims) seeking to establish a new, true Church of England. It was this latter group that sought not only the freedom to practice their form of Anglicanism but also to re-found the Church in the New World.

Spend some time with the Mayflower Compact, signed off the coast of Cape Cod before the settlers went ashore. Emphasize the English tradition of the rule of law and of forms of democratic expression traced back at least to the Magna Carta. Facing a lawless wilderness with families to protect and ex-convicts in their midst, the Pilgrims resorted to that English tradition of self-government under the rule of law—a social contract among themselves—with God as its ultimate judge. Both the Pilgrims at Plymouth in 1620 and the convening of the Virginia House of Burgesses down the coast at Jamestown in 1619, the first two successful English settlements, almost immediately practiced self-government. Self-government under law was therefore present at the very inception of America, a fact that makes America unique.

Note the terrible first winter the Pilgrims suffered at Plymouth, and how the Wampanoag Indians truly saved those who did survive. The next year, with the help of the Wampanoag, was a tremendous success, which Pilgrims and Native Americans together celebrated, and for which they gave thanks to God in what is considered America’s First Thanksgiving (notwithstanding a similar celebration in Spanish Florida in the previous century). Share accounts of this festive Thanksgiving from Edward Winslow and William Bradford.

Finally, discuss the founding of Massachusetts Bay Colony and the leadership of its first governor, John Winthrop. Like the Pilgrims, these Puritans were fierce critics of the Church of England. Unlike the Pilgrims, however, the Puritans at Massachusetts Bay sought not to separate from the Church of England but to establish a community that would help purify and correct the Church of England while remaining a part of it. As evident in Winthrop’s “A Modell of Christian Charity,” New England would convert Old England by its example. Together with Jamestown and Plymouth, the English had a beachhead in the New World, and the news spread far and wide across the Atlantic.
**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS**

**Activity:** Find pictures that represent five different scenes from this lesson. Print off enough images for each group of five students to have a set. Give each student in the group a different picture (all groups will have the same five pictures). Have the students arrange the pictures in the order that those events occurred. Once the students have figured out the correct order of events, have students line up in order and go over the order of events as a class. Conclude the activity by asking students how they knew what event the picture was portraying. Ask students how they remembered the order of events/what they did to figure out the correct order. If there are groups that did not figure out the correct order, ask those students questions in order to move them to the correct sequence.

**Assignment 1:** Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

**Assignment 2:** Have students draw and color a scene of their choice from a pre-Columbian Native American tribe. Have students present briefly in class what they drew, the story behind it, and why they depicted it the way they did.

**Assignment 3:** Have students draw and color a scene of their choice from Jamestown or Plymouth. Have students present briefly in class what they drew, the story behind it, and why they depicted it the way they did.

**FORMATIVE QUIZ 1**

Provide students with numbered papers. Using the “Review Sheets” in the Appendix, make statements and ask students if they are True or False. Have them draw ☑️ for “True” or ☐️ for “False” next to each number. Review as a class and talk through what makes each answer correct.
Lesson 3 — The Colonies in Profile

1630–1732

9–10 classes

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the thirteen colonies that would become the United States of America, including their foundings and ways of life for colonists.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
Selections

Teacher Texts
Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1
Pages 25–27

The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic
Pages 45–46, 48–51, 54–55

Colonial Times
Pages 35–54, 56–59, 103–127, 93–97

Trade Books
The New Americans
If You Lived in Colonial Times
If You Lived in Williamsburg in Colonial Days
Three Young Pilgrims

Online.Hillsdale.edu
The Great American Story Lecture 2
American Heritage Lecture 2

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places
New Hampshire
New York
Maryland
Pennsylvania
Connecticut
Philadelphia
Rhode Island
Georgia
Delaware
New England Colonies
North Carolina
Middle Colonies
South Carolina
Southern Colonies
New Jersey
Persons

Lord Baltimore
Roger Williams
William Penn
James Oglethorpe

Terms and Topics

education
religious freedom
self-government
colonial assemblies
Triangle Trade
indentured servitude
chattel slavery
slave ships
Middle Passage

Images

Historical figures and events
Landscape pictures of geographic places featured in this lesson
Depictions of indentured servants and then slaves in the colonies

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Roger Williams’s efforts to establish religious toleration in Rhode Island
- Descriptions of slavery and life on a slave ship
- Stories of African Americans who won their freedom in the colonies
- Accounts of life in the different colonies

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- How was lifestyle and work different between the three colonial regions?
- What is religious toleration?
- How did colonists look after themselves?
- What is self-government?
- What activities did the New England colonists rely on to make money?
- What was James Oglethorpe’s plan for Georgia?
- What was daily life like for colonists?
- What was the difference between an indentured servant and a person in slavery?
- In which ways did Native Americans and English colonists work together?
- In which ways did English colonists and Native Americans harm one another?
- What was daily life like for African colonists and African slaves?
- What are the origins of slavery in world history?
- How were Africans first enslaved, before being brought to the Western Hemisphere?
- What was it like to be an African on the Middle Passage and then a slave in the New World?
- Why were there more slaves in the Southern colonies than the Middle Atlantic and New England colonies?
- How would you describe the average colonist?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 73: The colonists came to America for many reasons. Name one.
  - Question 75: What group of people was taken and sold as slaves?
KEYS TO THE LESSON

Teaching the histories of each colony helps students to understand and appreciate the humble origins of the future United States. It is also very revealing. Students can see in the early histories of many colonies the beginnings of traits that would eventually be hallmarks of American society, law, and citizenry.

Teachers might best plan and teach The Colonies in Profile with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Try to teach the colonies in the order in which they were founded (i.e., as listed above in “Geography and Places”). A map may be projected and distributed to students for reference as the lesson proceeds from colony to colony.
- Note the more casual approach the English took to colonization, largely shaped by the monarch and parliamentary politics in England at the time of each colonial settlement. For one, colonization was decentralized, and most of the original colonies were established as private property ventures, often sanctioned by the crown but really in the possession of private individuals through joint-stock companies. These were then populated not with government officials or hired agents but with men of all ranks who were also seeking their own opportunity, freedom, and plot of land. Both of these features accounted for the lack of an overall master plan for colonizing North America and marked important departures from the approaches taken by Spain, Portugal, and France. This lack of a plan would become a problem later when England would seek to centralize the administration of the colonies, largely in an effort to raise revenue and enforce the sovereignty of Parliament.
- Help students to understand the importance of these traits. Not only did the English approach to colonization trend toward greater independence from the monarchy, it also attracted and encouraged individuals and families who were independent-minded and determined. What the settlers did not bring with them from Europe were the legal class distinctions that defined the aristocratic and monarchial nations they left behind. These individuals (except for their British governors) were common people who immigrated to America seeking their freedom and to better their station in life. The rugged individualism, practice of personal independence, work ethic, and ingenuity to succeed would become well-known American characteristics and in some cases would result in the formation of new colonies by separation from an existing colony, as was the case in New England.
- Spend time on what it meant to make a living and survive in the daunting wilderness and how such perseverance shaped the character and mind of the colonists. This would include looking at lifestyles and kinds of work done in the colonies and the type of self-reliance necessary for such lives.
- Consider how strongly matters of religious faith defined colonial culture, largely because so many came to America to escape the religious persecutions or limitations of the Old World. From the Pilgrims and the Puritans to Roman Catholics and Jews, a wide variety of faiths (most of them Christian and many of whom were intolerant of one another in the Old World) permeated colonial settlements, and their adherents increasingly came to respect one another as neighbors. Establishing this religious freedom in law, moreover, was widespread and exceptional compared to the rest of the world.
- Emphasize with students the degree of self-government that the colonists exercised. Include in this discussion the meaning of self-government. In brief, the colonists largely governed their own internal affairs (rule over local matters, including taxation, as opposed to international trade and
security) through local legislatures and governance structures chosen by the people. This was partly due to the English tradition of legislative authority and the rule of law, the loose and decentralized pattern of British colonial settlements and rule compared to other empires. Another factor at play here was the great distance between London and the American eastern seaboard, which led to long periods of “benign neglect” of the colonies and the further development of local institutions of self-government. While all of the colonies would eventually become official royal colonies with royal governors, colony-wide legislative bodies were prolific, as were local governments such as townships, counties, and cities. Unlike almost every place in the world at that time and in history, the people were to a large extent ruling themselves.

- Explain to students the several kinds of trade and vocational trades present in the various colonies. Farming was, of course, the main livelihood, but manufacturing, fishing, whaling, shipbuilding, and other trades (particularly in New England) rapidly emerged as key colonial contributions. Trade was principally with England, but the British colonies of North America developed robust trade among one another and with the colonies of other nations as well.

- Share with students the complex patterns of relationship between the colonists and Native Americans. The relationships ran the gamut from friendly to violent, varying widely depending on the tribe involved, with misunderstandings and clashes of cultures and languages. Disagreements abounded over the concepts of communal versus private property. Violent clashes occurred along the edges of the colonial frontier, and cross-frontier retaliations by both sides were not uncommon. Colonists could be caught in conflicts between various Native American tribes, and likewise, Native Americans were often caught in conflicts between European powers. Systematic displacement of Native Americans was usually limited to localities during this period (such as after King Philip’s War in southern New England and through the Indian slave trade on the South Carolina frontier). Displacement over time was primarily due to devastation from disease and gradual, individual settlement westward.

- Mention that a number of colonists criticized some of the ways that colonial governments dealt with Native Americans. These also condemned and sought to remove slavery from their colonies.

- Help students to understand why a full understanding of the human person, of equality, and of justice all make slavery an evil action and practice, violating the principle that all people are equal in their humanity and possession of natural rights. Therefore, no one person may automatically infringe on the humanity or rights of another unless some initial violation of another’s rights has occurred.

- Discuss the history of slavery in world history, from ancient times through the middle ages and in different places, leading up to the Transatlantic Slave Trade. Portugal first began using African slaves on their sugar plantations off the west African coast, manifesting the chattel and race-based aspects of slavery in European colonies. The slave trade gradually made its way to the various colonies established throughout the Western Hemisphere, particularly with the cultivation of sugar cane in the Caribbean.

- As mentioned in the previous lesson, the first Africans were brought to Jamestown by an English privateer who had captured a Portuguese slave ship en route from Africa, likely headed for Portugal’s South American colonies.

- Discuss the similarities and differences between slavery and indentured servitude. Indentured servitude was a common way for those who could not afford passage or to establish themselves in the New World to tie themselves to a sponsor for a number of years, offering free labor in exchange for passage across the Atlantic and shelter in the colonies. Oftentimes indentured
servitude was little different from slavery in its practice, as shown in transcripts from court cases of indentured servants claiming relief from a cruel master.

- Reflect with students on the unique American character that emerged among the free British colonists in North America. The harshness and risk of settling the New World gave them a certain grit and determination, along with an enterprising mind and innovative skill set. The universal demand for trade skills and farming in establishing a new civilization placed the vast majority of colonists within what we would call today the “working class.” In New England especially, colonists’ Protestantism made them widely literate for the sake of reading the Bible, skeptical of human sources of authority, and focused on individual improvement. At the same time, it made them highly idealistic, with many seeking to re-found Christendom. For many colonists, previous persecution granted them a deeper and more passionate sense of justice, of right and wrong. It also made them highly attuned to the politics on which freedom depended. A certain rugged, enterprising, and justice-loving individualism defined the colonists.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS**

**Activity:** Provide students with a copy of a map that can also be projected on the board. Review the geographical locations of the colonies. As a class, label each of thirteen colonies. Then color the colonies in three different colors to represent their geographical divisions–New England, Middle, and Southern colonies.

---

**Assignment 1:** Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

**Assignment 2:** Have students draw and color a scene involving a historical figure of their choice from colonial America. Have students present briefly in class what they drew, the story behind it, and why they depicted it the way they did.

**Assignment 3:** Have students draw and color a scene depicting economic activity in one of the colonial regions of their choice. Have students present briefly in class what they drew and why they depicted it the way they did.

**FORMATIVE QUIZ 2**

Provide students with numbered papers. Using the “Review Sheets” in the Appendix, make statements and ask students if they are True or False. Have them draw ☑ for “True” or ☐ for “False” next to each number. Review as a class and talk through what makes each answer correct.
Lesson 4 — Major Events in the Colonies

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the major events and movements in colonial America and further study the ideas and experiences that were shaping the colonists in the 1600s and 1700s.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Teacher Texts
- Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1
- The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic
- The American Revolution and Constitution

Trade Books
- Meet George Washington
- Ben Franklin of Old Philadelphia
- Heroes of the Revolution

Online.Hillsdale.edu
- The Great American Story
- American Heritage

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places
- England
- France
- Appalachian Mountains
- Ohio River Valley
- The Great Lakes
- Canada
- Mississippi River
- Quebec

Persons
- George III
- George Washington
- Benjamin Franklin

Terms and Topics
- King Philip’s War
- Magna Carta
- Glorious Revolution
- representation
- self-government
- The Great Awakening
- French and Indian War
- Iroquois Confederacy
- Albany Congress
- Treaty of Paris
To Know by Heart
Selections from George Washington’s “Rules of Civility & Decent Behavior in Company and Conversation,” such as:
- “Be not apt to relate news if you know not the truth thereof.”
- “Speak not evil of the absent for it is unjust.”

Timeline
1754–63 The French and Indian War

Images
Historical figures and events
Dress of colonists from different periods and places
Uniforms and munitions of soldiers in the various wars
Colonial assembly buildings

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART
- George Washington and the cherry tree (legend)
- George Washington’s first battles in the Virginia militia, including his survival and Braddock’s death
- Benjamin Franklin’s autobiography

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND
- What did colonists learn from the Glorious Revolution in England?
- Why was it good that England did not pay the colonists much attention?
- How did colonists take care of themselves without a lot of help from England?
- What was the Great Awakening like?
- How did the Great Awakening help colonists feel like they had more in common?
- Who fought in the French and Indian War? Why did they fight?
- What was George Washington’s childhood like?
- What was the role of George Washington in the French and Indian War?
- What was Benjamin Franklin’s childhood like?
- What was the Albany Plan of Union? What did it show about the unity of the colonies?
- Why did the British win the French and Indian War?
- What did the Treaty of Paris take from France and give to England?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 85: Benjamin Franklin is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 86: George Washington is famous for many things. Name one.

KEYS TO THE LESSON
Having learned about life in colonial America, students should then consider the major events that shaped colonial history. These include, of course, events that occurred within the colonies themselves, but also certain ideas and events in Europe that had significant influence on the colonists. Once the lesson enters the eighteenth century, special focus should be placed on the events that created in the colonists a sense of
independence from Great Britain and of greater dependence on one another, even as they themselves did not fully recognize or articulate these trends. In general, this lesson should help students see what the colonists and colonies had become before they learn about the American founding.

Teachers might best plan and teach Major Events in the Colonies with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Teach students about wars that occurred in the New World, either between settlers and Native Americans or with colonies of other countries. A lot of detail is not necessary, but students should appreciate that these wars were significant for those who were endangered by them and left largely to their own defenses.
- Offer a brief history of the English Civil War, which involved and influenced some of the main political thought of the colonists, as well as the Glorious Revolution a few decades later. These political developments informed the colonists and drew their careful attention to political considerations.
- Consider with students the view that the colonists enjoyed a relationship with the English government that was neglectful, but also beneficial. They were “neglected” in the sense that they were a month away by sea from England, which meant poor communication and the near impossibility of governing directly. The English also largely overlooked their colonies in North America, sometimes viewing the colonists merely as poor tradesmen, former criminals, religious radicals, and commoners of no noble birth. Compared to England’s Caribbean colonies, they were also far less profitable. England’s preoccupation with rivals Spain and France and her own civil war also left English kings and Parliament with relatively little thought to give the colonies. The mercantilist restrictions on trade, moreover, were seldom fully enforced or even capable of being completely enforced, and the colonies largely traded freely with the world.
- Help students understand why this relationship of neglect was not a disadvantage but actually healthy for the colonists. Overall, the colonists were still protected, especially on the seas, by the English. At the same time, however, they were not regulated or administratively directed beyond the general forms of governance; e.g., a royal governor and a local legislature. The colonists were largely free to take the enterprising, individualist spirit of common English settlers and, forced by necessity, to innovate and work hard to pursue livelihoods and security within their own spheres. Laws, moreover, could not wait for a two- or three-month lapse in communication. Colonists were both permitted and forced by circumstances to practice the elements of English law they had brought with them, including a recognition of certain rights and the limits of authority. The colonists had ample talent and opportunity to govern themselves. This tradition of self-government would allow for many generations of practice in self-rule as a feature of daily life. The colonists, therefore, were both used to and deeply practiced in locally governing themselves, replete with the ideas and habits that this process cultivated.
- Briefly spend time reviewing how the colonists governed themselves, including a discussion of what representation is. In general, representation by election determined the composition of the various colonial assemblies, beginning with the Virginia House of Burgesses. That representative self-government was the norm in the colonies was astonishing compared to the rest of the world and human history and the high degree of participation by the average colonist in local government was widespread.
- Clarify for students that each colony originally did not see itself as part of a shared English colonial political state. Although their own proprietary charters were eventually replaced with royal charters, each colony viewed itself as its own separate entity, only loosely bound to the others by a common mother country and overall shared culture. This view would persist up to the eve of the Revolution.

- Explore with students how the Great Awakening throughout the colonies provided the separate and distinct colonies with something they could hold in common. At the same time, it awakened a passion for right moral conduct and justice that could be attached to any cause.

- Teach students about the French and Indian War. Of special note here is the presence of a young George Washington and the Virginia militia fighting alongside the British regulars. This is a good opportunity to introduce Washington, including his boyhood biography and his exploits in the war, and especially his actions during the attack on General Braddock. The French and Indian War was also important for providing the colonists another shared experience, this time amidst the adversities of war, and for demonstrating increased cooperation and a sense of unity, as evidenced by the Albany Congress. This is also a good place to introduce the architect of the Albany congress and plan, Benjamin Franklin, including teaching about his biography up to this juncture. In addition to fostering advances toward and experiences in united action, the French and Indian War is also of great importance for understanding the circumstances that would lead to the American Revolution.

- Share with students maps showing the transfer of territory to the British Empire through the Treaty of Paris. Discuss with students what this meant for the relative power of Great Britain and France and the new challenges and opportunities inherent in such a sudden change of territory and power.

**Strengthening Understanding: Post-Lesson Activities and Assignments**

**Activity:** Have students conduct their own colonial assemblies by coming up with ideas on how to take care of themselves in light of the challenges of colonial North America and because England was so far away. Ask questions that help students understand how and why the colonists developed their own forms of self-government.

**Assignment 1:** Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

**Assignment 2:** Have students draw a picture of Benjamin Franklin or George Washington depicting an event or characteristic of his childhood or time up until the American Revolution. Have students present briefly in class what they drew, the story behind it, and why they depicted it the way they did.
**Assignment 3:** Have students illustrate one of George’s Washington’s *Rules of Civility* of their choosing. For students who are able to write, they should also write the rule that matches the picture. Have students present briefly in class what they drew and how it demonstrates the rule.
APPENDIX

Talk about History

Review Sheet

Test

Writing Assignment
TALK ABOUT HISTORY

Student Name: ___________________________ Due: ________________

Story/Lesson from History: __________________________________________

1. Who/what did you learn about in history class today?
   Student Answer: __________________________________________

2. Who were the most important characters in the story?
   Student Answer: __________________________________________

3. Tell me more about one of those characters.
   Student Answer: __________________________________________

4. Tell me about the most exciting/interesting part of the story today.
   Student Answer: __________________________________________

Parent Signature: ___________________________ Date: ________________

TALK ABOUT HISTORY

Student Name: ___________________________ Due: ________________

Story/Lesson from History: __________________________________________

1. Who/what did you learn about in history class today?
   Student Answer: __________________________________________

2. Who were the most important characters in the story?
   Student Answer: __________________________________________

3. Tell me more about one of those characters.
   Student Answer: __________________________________________

4. Tell me about the most exciting/interesting part of the story today.
   Student Answer: __________________________________________

Parent Signature: ___________________________ Date: ________________
History Assessment and Review in Grades K–2

**REVIEWING AND STUDYING**

One-page Review Sheets are included in the following materials. Teachers are encouraged to review items on these sheets with students in the days leading up to an assessment. Between reviewing at the beginning of each class period and this review based on the Review Sheets, students should not need to do any additional studying or review. Review Sheets may be sent home, however, if parents wish to review with their students at home.

**ASSESSMENT**

The method for assessing students on history in grades K-2 depends on the grade level and student ability.

For students who cannot yet read and write:

**Option 1:** Choose several items from the Review Sheet to ask each student orally. This may be done in private with the same questions while students complete another activity, or it may be administered aloud with the entire class, varying questions for each student.

**Option 2:** Create a test with images for matching or identifying terms and topics. Read aloud a description or explanation of a Person, Term, Topic, or Story to the whole class and have each student circle or place a number/letter next to the corresponding image on their test. For the Questions, read aloud a statement that would answer the question and ask students if it is True or False. Have them draw ☑️ for “True” or ☐ for “False” next to each statement.

For students who can read and write:

Teachers may administer the tests included in the following materials. It is recommended, especially early in a school year, to have each student complete the test individually, but with the class proceeding together from question to question, each being read aloud by the teacher.
### Unit 1 Test — Review Sheet

**Lesson 2 | Exploration and Settlement**  
**Lesson 3 | The Colonies in Profile**  
**Lesson 4 | Major Events in the Colonies**  
Test on ____________

**DATES:** When did/does ____________ occur?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1492</td>
<td>Columbus lands on San Salvador Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Thursday in November</td>
<td>Thanksgiving Day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PERSONS:** Tell me who ____________ was and what he/she did.

- Christopher Columbus  
- John Smith  
- Pocahontas  
- William Penn  
- George Washington  
- Benjamin Franklin

**TERMS AND TOPICS:** Tell me what ____________ is/are/was/were and why we learned about it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>land bridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smallpox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natural resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Starving Time”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niña, Pinta, and Santa María</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taíno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Passage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glorious Revolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayflower Compact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Great Awakening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French and Indian War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART:** Tell me the story of...

- Christopher Columbus’s voyage  
- Pocahontas, John Smith, and John Rolfe  
- Accounts of the First Thanksgiving  
- George Washington and the cherry tree

**QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND:** Tell me...

- Why is the American landscape a good place for people to live?  
- What was dangerous about sailing on the ocean?  
- What events helped Jamestown to succeed?  
- What did the Mayflower Compact say?  
- Why did the Pilgrims create the Mayflower Compact?  
- What is religious toleration?  
- How did colonists look after themselves?  
- What was daily life like for colonists?  
- In which ways did Native Americans and English colonists work together?  
- What was daily life like for African colonists and African slaves?  
- Why were there more slaves in the Southern colonies than the Middle Atlantic and New England colonies?  
- Why was it good that England did not pay the colonists much attention?  
- How did the Great Awakening help colonists feel like they had more in common?  
- What was the role of George Washington in the French and Indian War?  
- What did the Treaty of Paris take from France and give to England?
Unit 1 | Test — The British Colonies of North America

Lesson 2 | Exploration and Settlement
Lesson 3 | The Colonies in Profile
Lesson 4 | Major Events in the Colonies

DATES:

1. Circle the year Christopher Columbus came to the Americas.
   A. 1607  B. 1452  C. 1492

2. Circle the year the day that the Thanksgiving holiday takes place.
   A. July 4, 1776  B. 4th Thursday in November  C. Last Day in December

PERSONS: Match the person to who he/she was or what he/she did.

A. Pocahontas  B. William Penn  C. Benjamin Franklin

3. ________ Inventor and writer who tried to unite the colonies during the French and Indian War.

4. ________ Founded Pennsylvania for Quakers and for religious toleration.

5. ________ Convinced her fellow Native Americans to help the Jamestown settlers survive.

TERMS AND TOPICS: Match the term to the correct definition, description, or explanation.

A. Glorious Revolution  B. land bridge  C. smallpox  D. “Starving Time”  E. Taíno

6. ________How we believe Native Americans first came to the Americas from Asia.

7. ________The Native Americans whom Christopher Columbus first met.

8. ________A disease that hurt Native Americans but not European settlers.

9. ________When many Jamestown colonists died from lack of food and disease.

10. ________A change in government in England that taught the colonists about the sources of power.
**STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART:** *Tell me the story of the First Thanksgiving.*

---

---

---

---

**QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND**

11. Why is the American landscape a good place for people to live?

---

12. What did the Mayflower Compact say?

---

13. What was daily life like for African colonists and African slaves?

---

14. Why was it good that England did not pay the colonists much attention?

---

15. What was the role of George Washington in the French and Indian War?

---
Unit 1 | Writing Assignment — The British Colonies of North America

Due on ______________

What were some of the lessons we can learn from the stories of the American colonists?
UNIT 2
The American Founding
1763–1789

UNIT PREVIEW

Structure

LESSON 1  1763–1776  Self-Government or Tyranny  9-10 classes  p. 7
LESSON 2  1776  The Declaration of Independence  4-5 classes  p. 12
LESSON 3  1776–1783  The War of Independence  9-10 classes  p. 17
LESSON 4  1783–1789  The United States Constitution  9-10 classes  p. 22
APPENDIX A  Talk about History, Review Sheets, Tests, Writing Assignment  p. 31
APPENDIX B  Primary Sources  p. 47

Why Teach the American Founding

The beginning is the most important part of any endeavor, for a small change at the beginning will result in a very different end. How much truer this is of the most expansive of human endeavors: founding and sustaining a free country. The United States of America has achieved the greatest degree of freedom and prosperity for the greatest proportion of any country’s population in the history of humankind. How is it that the common American’s pursuit of happiness has resulted in such exceptional outcomes over time? This phenomenon compels mindful young Americans to seek to understand how their nation has achieved such results. And America’s youth could find no greater source of understanding than the history of their country’s founding, starting with their forefathers’ ideas, words, and deeds.
Enduring Ideas from this Unit

1. The United States is unprecedented in establishing its existence not on grounds of racial origin nor family privilege but on ideas asserted to be true of all people at all times: namely, on the equal human dignity of each person.
2. America was founded on the view that government should be controlled by the people themselves and limited to the purpose of protecting each person’s natural rights and fostering the common good.
3. Regular, ordinary Americans of everyday means sacrificed their security and very lives to defend these truths about human beings and civic life against a tyranny of the most powerful nation of its day.
4. The United States Constitution’s chief quality is that it allows the people to govern themselves with respect for the dignity of each person while both channeling and restraining the natural ambition of human beings to gain power and recognition.
5. The Constitution is a carefully wrought and considered document, and its original intent and structure should be honored both for the sake of our forebears, to whom we and the world owe our freedom and prosperity, and because the events of the last two hundred years have proven the Constitution’s remarkable achievements time and time again.

What Teachers Should Consider

The United States of America is unprecedented in many ways in the course of human history, but most significantly in the opportunity all its citizens have to pursue unmatched conditions of freedom, security, and prosperity. The country owes its unprecedented success to an unprecedented founding, a beginning forged and canonized in the Declaration of Independence, the War of Independence, and the U.S. Constitution.

And yet, never have so many Americans known so little about this founding. As for love of country, one cannot love (or even consider loving) what one does not know.

The teaching of the American founding is perhaps the most necessary series of lessons a teacher can share with his or her students if those students intend to enjoy the benefits of living in America for the duration of their lives.

With this in mind, a teacher ought to take special care to learn the history and ideas of the American founding. Ambiguity in the teacher’s own understanding, or assumptions derived from anywhere but careful scholarship and a deep reading of America’s founding documents, will leave him or her unprepared to help students understand this history accurately.

The teacher might best open the unit with lessons aimed at understanding why the colonists declared independence in the first place. It was not to avoid paying taxes or about wanting to preserve slavery. (These are misconceptions at best, distortions at worst.) It was to choose—between liberty under self-government and servitude under tyranny. Class may proceed at a brisk pace through the years 1763–1776, touching on the many acts of the British and respective colonial responses to those acts. Spend time on the conflicts and battles; students should chart the gradual shift in public sentiment toward independence.
The Declaration of Independence itself deserves careful study. Such lessons may begin with stories of the writing of the Declaration. Teachers can foster extensive conversations about what it says, what it means, and why it says it. The majority of the conversation should dwell on the ideas found in the first, second, and final paragraphs of the Declaration. Understanding what is meant by those words is pivotal to understanding American history, what makes America an exceptional nation, and the responsibilities every American citizen has.

The American War of Independence should be taught so as to fill the moral imaginations of students with images of the heroic characters and actions of its American participants. Strategy, battles, and the general arc of the war should be taught in detail, punctuated with accounts of the key moments and figures who contributed to America’s ultimate victory. The ideas for which the War of Independence was fought are matched in the American memory only by the stories of those who fought for them.

When teaching the aftermath of the War of Independence up to the Constitutional Convention, teachers should make clear that America’s foray into governing itself entirely independent of Great Britain initially trended toward abject failure. The Articles of Confederation ordered public affairs in a reactionary rather than prudent manner. Students should understand that the Constitutional Convention, in many respects, saved the country from another sort of tyranny: majority tyranny.

Finally, the Constitutional Convention and the Constitution itself should be studied in tandem. Students should consider carefully why the Framers constructed the Constitution as they did while also being introduced to laws and government in general. Students should understand that nothing in the Constitution was haphazardly decided. Given the unprecedented long-term success of the Constitution, students should appreciate that any changes to the Constitution warrant careful and complete understanding of why the Framers crafted it the way they did, as explained in their own words.

How Teachers Can Learn More

**TEXTS**

*Land of Hope*, Wilfred McClay  
*We Still Hold These Truths*, Matthew Spalding

**ONLINE COURSES** | Online.Hillsdale.edu

*The Great American Story*
Lesson Planning Resources

TEACHER RESOURCES

Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Wilfred McClay
The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic, H.A. Guerber
The American Revolution and Constitution, Anne Goudvis and Stephanie Harvey
The Declaration of Independence, Elizabeth Raum
The United States Constitution, Liz Sonneborn

TRADE BOOKS

Heroes of the Revolution, David Adler
The Boston Tea Party, Russell Freedman
Let It Begin Here!, Dennis Brindell Fradin
A Picture Book of Benjamin Franklin, David Adler
A Picture Book of Paul Revere, David Adler
A Picture Book of Thomas Jefferson, David Adler
The Fourth of July Story, Alice Dalgliesh
The Liberty Bell, Mary Firestone
Let’s Celebrate Independence Day, Barbara DeRubertis
George Washington, Ingrid and Edgar Parin d’Aulaire
A Picture Book of George Washington, David Adler
Sam the Minuteman, Nathaniel Benchley
Our Flag, Carl Memling
The Flag We Love, Pam Munoz Ryan
Blue Sky White Stars, Sarvinder Naberhaus
Uncle Sam and Old Glory, Delano and Jean West
We the People, Peter Spier
If You Were There When They Signed the Constitution, Elizabeth Levy
A Picture Book of Alexander Hamilton, David Adler

PRIMARY SOURCES

Declaration of Independence
The United States Constitution
The Bill of Rights
LESSON PLANS,
ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS,
AND FORMATIVE QUIZZES
Lesson 1 — Self-Government or Tyranny

1763–1776

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn how new British exertions of authority over the colonists led to the Declaration of Independence.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Teacher Texts

* Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition  
  Chapter 5
  * The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic  
  Pages 68–80
  * The American Revolution and Constitution  
  Pages 12–28, 34–50

Trade Books

* Heroes of the Revolution
* The Boston Tea Party
* Let It Begin Here!
* A Picture Book of Benjamin Franklin
* A Picture Book of Paul Revere

Online.Hillsdale.edu

* The Great American Story  
  Lecture 3

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places

* Thirteen Colonies
* Boston
* Philadelphia
* Independence Hall
* Lexington and Concord
* The Old North Church

Persons

* George III
* George Washington
* Crispus Attucks
* Paul Revere
* Samuel Adams
* Benjamin Franklin
* Thomas Jefferson
* Patrick Henry

Terms and Topics

* self–government
* representation
* consent
* tyranny
* Proclamation of 1763
* tax
Sons of Liberty
Boston Massacre
Boston Tea Party
Intolerable Acts
Minutemen
Redcoats
Battles of Lexington & Concord

Siege of Fort Ticonderoga
First Continental Congress
Second Continental Congress
Continental Army
Battle of Bunker Hill
Liberation of Boston

To Know by Heart
“Don’t Tread On Me”
“Paul Revere’s Ride,” Henry Wadsworth Longfellow
“One if by land, two if by sea.”
“The shot heard round the world.”
“No taxation without representation.”
“Give me Liberty or Give me Death” — Patrick Henry

Dates
July 4, 1776 Declaration of Independence signed

Images
Historical figures and events
Revolutionary era flags
Paul Revere’s Engraving of Boston Harbor under occupation
Paul Revere’s Engraving of the Boston Massacre
Independence Hall (exterior and interior)
Battle maps
Uniforms and arms of the Minutemen, the Continental Army soldiers, and the Redcoats

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Biographies and the roles of George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Samuel Adams, and Thomas Jefferson up through 1776
- Boston Massacre
- Boston Tea Party
- Paul Revere’s Ride
- Minutemen at the Battles of Lexington and Concord
- Ethan Allen, Henry Knox, and the Green Mountain Boys capturing the guns from Fort Ticonderoga
- John Adams’s nomination of George Washington to command the Continental Army
- Battle of Bunker Hill
- Liberation of Boston
- John Adams’s nomination of Thomas Jefferson to draft the Declaration of Independence
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- Why was it good that the colonists had been allowed so much freedom to govern themselves?
- Why did the British begin to limit what the colonists could do after the French and Indian War?
- What is self-government? How was the colonists' freedom to govern themselves limited by the British?
- What did the Proclamation Act of 1763 attempt to do? Why?
- What is a tax? What is it used for?
- What did the Sugar Act make the colonists do?
- What things did the Stamp Act tax?
- Why were the colonists upset about new taxes?
- What did the colonists have to do for British soldiers in the colonies?
- What were the two types of patriots? How did they resist the British differently?
- What happened in the Boston Massacre and why?
- What did John Adams do after the Boston Massacre?
- How did the Boston Massacre change the minds of many colonists?
- What happened at the Boston Tea Party and why?
- What were some of the things the British did in response to the Boston Tea Party through the Intolerable Acts?
- What was the First Continental Congress?
- What did the First Continental Congress do?
- How did Parliament and King George respond to colonists requests for agreement?
- Why did the Redcoats not surprise the Americans before Lexington and Concord?
- What happened at the Battle of Lexington and Concord?
- What happened at the Siege of Fort Ticonderoga?
- What happened at the Battle of Bunker Hill?
- What was George Washington like?
- What did Thomas Paine say in his pamphlet Common Sense? Did it change people’s minds?
- What did the Second Continental Congress do?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 77: Name one reason why the Americans declared independence from Britain.
  - Question 85: Benjamin Franklin is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 86: George Washington is famous for many things. Name one.

KEYS TO THE LESSON

For more than 150 years, the British colonists of North America rarely quarreled with their countrymen on the other side of the Atlantic. Then in 1763, the British began to claim new control over the colonists. What followed were thirteen years of increased tension and sometimes violent clashes leading to outright war in 1775 and, in 1776, the declaring of independence by the colonists and the formation of a new country separate from British power. This decade and a half gave birth to the nation each American citizen calls home. It is imperative that American students know the people, actions, and stories that led to the founding of their country. The chief aim of teaching these fourteen years, therefore, is to help students to understand the actions by both Great Britain and the colonists that compelled the Americans to such a separation and to found a new, unprecedented kind of country.
Teachers might best plan and teach Self-Government or Tyranny with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Have students consider a few problems the British in North America faced following the French and Indian War (in Europe, the Seven Years’ War), namely, the risk of further conflict (and associated costs) with Native Americans as colonists moved westward, and the money they owed after the late war.
- Show how Great Britain’s attempted solutions to these problems (prohibiting colonial expansion and the sudden enforcement of lax tax laws) marked the first shift in the relationship between Great Britain and the colonists and heralded the end of the period of “salutary neglect,” during which American colonists had grown accustomed to governing themselves.
- Help students see the pattern that this initial shift would grow into: attempts by the British (Parliament and, to a certain extent, King George III) to exert more control, alternating with American resistance to what they argued were infringements on their rights as Englishmen.
- Teach about some of the things the British tried to do through different acts, outlining what they did, why the colonists were upset, and how the colonists reacted.
- Consider with students that self-government, or representative self-government, was at the heart of the issue. Emphasize that this was not merely a nice-sounding phrase. Make clear that this was the question: not merely whether the colonists would have representation in Parliament (it was impractical) nor whether they had to pay taxes, but whether or not people must be controlled by the will of others in government without their free consent. In brief, must people be told what to do by others without having any say?
- Explain how the Americans organized themselves to engage with and resist the British, a capacity born of decades of practice in self-government and a trait of American citizens for subsequent generations. In due course, the Boston Massacre impressed on public opinion the British position’s semblance to tyranny.
- Highlight that it was the Boston Tea Party, however, that brought issues to a head, prompting the British to respond to various actions in Massachusetts with the Intolerable Acts. Help students to consider the ways that these acts were unjust to the colonists by considering what these would have meant for the students and their families.
- Spend time illustrating how specific Founding Fathers marshaled their talents and ideas, eventually leading to declaring independence and forming a new nation by summer 1776.
- Tell the stories of the open armed conflicts at Lexington and Concord, Fort Ticonderoga, and Bunker Hill. Students should learn how these battles bolstered the patriot cause and changed minds in these final two years of British rule. Included in this change is the role played by Thomas Paine’s *Common Sense*.
- Finally, emphasize how the news in the spring of 1776—that the British had hired German mercenary soldiers to deploy against British-Americans, and were now selectively encouraging slave rebellions in the colonies, while the Continental Congress recommended that the colonies begin forming their own governments—were key factors in moving a majority of the state delegates at the Second Continental Congress to commission a committee to draft a potential declaration of independence.
STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS

Activity 1: Find pictures that represent five different scenes from this lesson. Print off enough images for each group of five students to have a set. Give each student in the group a different picture (all groups will have the same five pictures). Have the students arrange the pictures in the order that those events occurred. Once the students have figured out the correct order of events, have students line up in order and go over the order of events as a class. Conclude the activity by asking students how they knew what event the picture was portraying. Ask students how they remembered the order of events/what they did to figure out the correct order. If there are groups that did not figure out the correct order, ask those students questions in order to move them to the correct sequence.

Activity 2: Conduct a round robin reading of the poem “Paul Revere’s Ride.” Then discuss it with students and begin to have them learn parts of the poem by heart. Plan two days for each student to recite their parts aloud.

Assignment 1: Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

Assignment 2: Have students draw and color a scene of their choice from the years between the French and Indian War through the Battle of Bunker Hill. Have students present briefly in class what they drew, the story behind it, and why they depicted it the way they did.

FORMATIVE QUIZ 1

Provide students with numbered papers. Using the “Review Sheets” in the Appendix, make statements and ask students if they are True or False. Have them draw ☑️ for “True” or ☐️ for “False” next to each number. Review as a class and talk through what makes each answer correct.
Lesson 2 — The Declaration of Independence

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the movement in favor of independence and about the drafting and signing of the Declaration of Independence. They also read the Declaration of Independence and have a conversation about its contents and ideas.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Teacher Texts
- The Declaration of Independence
- Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition
- The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic
- The American Revolution and Constitution

Trade Books
- Heroes of the Revolution
- A Picture Book of Thomas Jefferson
- The Fourth of July Story
- The Liberty Bell
- Let's Celebrate Independence Day

Online.Hillsdale.edu
- The Great American Story

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places
- Philadelphia
- Independence Hall

Persons
- Benjamin Franklin
- John Adams
- Thomas Jefferson
- John Hancock

Terms and Topics
- natural rights
- equality
- unalienable
- liberty
- pursuit of happiness
- consent of the governed
- Liberty Bell
Primary Sources
Declaration of Independence

To Know by Heart
“We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness.” — Declaration of Independence

“And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor.” — Final sentence of the Declaration of Independence

Dates
July 4, 1776 Declaration of Independence signed

Images
Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and John Adams
Independence Hall (exterior and interior)
Photos or facsimiles of original Declaration of Independence
National Archives Building and Rotunda
Jefferson Memorial
Statue of Thomas Jefferson (Hillsdale College campus)

Stories for the American Heart
- The first public reading of the Declaration of Independence at the State House Yard, the tolling of the Liberty Bell, and the removal of the royal coat of arms

Questions for the American Mind
- What is the Declaration of Independence about?
- Who was the main writer of the Declaration of Independence?
- To whom is the Declaration of Independence speaking?
- What does it mean that “all men are created equal”?
- What is a natural right?
- According to the Declaration of Independence, from where do natural rights come?
- What does “unalienable” mean?
- Is liberty the same thing as doing whatever you want? Why or why not?
- Why do people form government? What is it supposed to do?
- What happens without rules and laws?
- Who controls the government?
- What can people do if the government starts or threatens to hurt them?
- What kinds of things did the Declaration of Independence accuse King George of doing to them?
- Why is it special that America was created based on the words of the Declaration of Independence?
- America is a country that believes in certain ideas. What are these ideas?
- On what day do we celebrate our country’s independence, its “birthday”?

Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
- Question 8: Why is the Declaration of Independence important?
- Question 9: What founding document said the American colonies were free from Britain?
- Question 10: Name two important ideas from the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution.
- Question 11: The words “Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness” are in what founding document?
- Question 75: What group of people was taken and sold as slaves?
- Question 77: Name one reason why the Americans declared independence from Britain.
- Question 78: Who wrote the Declaration of Independence?
- Question 79: When was the Declaration of Independence adopted?
- Question 81: There were 13 original states. Name five.
- Question 85: Benjamin Franklin is famous for many things. Name one.
- Question 87: Thomas Jefferson is famous for many things. Name one.
- Question 125: What is Independence Day?
- Question 126: Name three national U.S. holidays.

**Keys to the Lesson**

The Declaration of Independence was not merely a renunciation of dependence on Great Britain. It was, in fact, generative. It created an entity—a nation—that stood on its own, had its own existence, and was independent of other nations. Even today, it offers guiding principles that continue to shape our arguments about the nature and limits of political authority. In brief, the Declaration of Independence created and still defines the United States of America.

Like an organizational mission statement, the Declaration is an indication of the Founders’ intention, a guiding star for our political life, and a benchmark for measuring our public institutions. Americans should consider all questions concerning the public sphere in light of the truths asserted in the Declaration. The Declaration of Independence should be both the beginning and end for students’ understanding of their country, their citizenship, and the benefits and responsibilities of being an American.

The lasting claim of the Declaration is that there are certain *truths* about *all men* having *unalienable* rights. Students should think about the Declaration of Independence as the foundation and even the heart of their country’s existence. While a more extensive study of the Declaration should occur in later grades, including consideration of the thinkers who influenced the Founders, the historical treatment of the American Revolution deserves some conversation on the ideas of the Declaration.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Declaration of Independence with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Help students to see that the Founders intended to speak to them, to posit truths for their consideration and ultimate judgment. “[A] decent respect to the opinions of mankind” means that the Declaration was not merely intended as an argument about
the unique situation of the colonists in 1776; the Founders submitted their claims to the judgment of all people in all times because they were asserting truths about all people in all times. This especially includes future Americans and, in this case, American students.

- Read aloud to students and talk about key phrases and words from the Declaration of Independence, especially the first and second paragraphs. Pause frequently to ask students questions about what the words mean.

- Help students to consider that the Founders are making assertions of the existence of objective truth by referencing “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God” and by describing the truths as “self-evident.” A “self-evident” truth is not merely a matter of perspective; it can be known and understood by anyone at any time.

- Ask students what the Declaration means by “all men are created equal.” For one thing, “men” means human being not males as opposed to females. Based on the totality of their writings available, the principal authors of the Declaration meant that men and women share equally in human dignity and in possession of natural rights or freedoms that are simply part of being human. A consistent application of equality would make slavery impossible—and the Second Continental Congress could scarcely have missed this point.

- Note that the mere articulation that all men are created equal was revolutionary. Compared to the degree and universality of equality we take for granted today, such a statement and contemporary limits on the principle in practice leave the Founders open to much potential criticism. For example, in general, women, men without land, and African Americans were not able to vote. But the mere fact that most men were able to vote was a significant departure from what was normal in the rest of the world. And even though civil equality was not universal, the statement about inherent and equal dignity of all people was unheard of at the time. Many Founders believed (and the centuries since have proven them correct) that this founding principle would allow for ever greater realizations of equality through history. In brief, were it not for the Founders’ assertion of human equality, albeit imperfectly put into practice, the kind of equality we are used to today likely would never have arisen, or certainly not from American shores.

- Ask students what the Declaration states to be the purpose of government. Students should understand the Declaration’s argument that government is created to secure the natural rights of each person.

- Ask students about the source of a government’s power. The Declaration explains that government power comes from the free consent of the people. Students should also consider the Declaration’s argument that people do not receive their rights from government, nor do they surrender their fundamental rights to it. Instead, the rights to “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness” are natural—they are inherent in being human—and government is delegated power by the sovereign people to secure their rights and pursue the common good. Rather than surrendering their rights to government, people create government to protect their rights. The Declaration describes these rights as “unalienable,” meaning that they cannot be relinquished or taken away, though they may be forfeited when a person violates the rights of another person, (e.g., the penalty for taking someone else’s life or liberty might be to lose your own life or liberty).

- Help students to understand what is meant by self-government: legitimate government exists to secure rights and derives its “just powers from the consent of the governed,” that is, from the citizen body. The fundamental purpose of government is clear and its powers are limited. As a result, and by design, the people have the liberty to govern themselves in most aspects of their daily lives.
- Read the list of grievances and ask students to connect some of the grievances to historical events they studied in the previous lesson. Then ask students to explain how those events violate the statements made in the first two paragraphs of the Declaration.
- Reserve conversations on the principled claims of the Declaration and the issue of slavery for Lesson 4 on the Constitution.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS**

**Activity 1:** Place students in groups of four. Give each student in the group a phrase from the first sentence in the second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence (all groups will have the same four phrases). Have the students arrange the phrases in the correct order. Once the students have figured out the correct order of phrases, have students practice saying the entire second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence within their groups. After some time for practice, recite the entire first sentence of the second paragraph as a class. Conclude the event by asking students the meaning of the following key terms topics: natural rights, equality, unalienable, liberty, and pursuit of happiness (provided in appendix).

**Assignment 1:** Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

**Assignment 2:** Have students draw and color a scene of their choice from the Second Continental Congress, the writing of the Declaration of Independence, or the reading of the Declaration and tolling of the Liberty Bell. Have students present briefly in class what they drew, the story behind it, and why they depicted it the way they did.
Lesson 3 — The War of Independence

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the major figures, common soldiers, strategy, and specific battles of the American War of Independence.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

**Teacher Texts**

*Land of Hope Young Reader's Edition*  
Chapter 6  
*Pages 83–102*

*The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic*  
*Pages 4, 33, 53–104, 112–121, 133–136*

*The American Revolution and Constitution*

**Trade Books**

*Heroes of the Revolution*

*George Washington*

*A Picture Book of George Washington*

*Sam the Minuteman*

*Our Flag*

*The Flag We Love*

*Blue Sky White Stars*

*Uncle Sam and Old Glory*

**Online.Hillsdale.edu**

*The Great American Story*  
Lecture 4

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

**Geography & Places**

Delaware River

Valley Forge

**Persons**

George Washington  
Benedict Arnold

Phillis Wheatley  
Alexander Hamilton

John Adams  
Marquis de Lafayette

Abigail Adams
Terms and Topics

Patriot/Revolutionary
Tory/Loyalist
Continental Army
volley
Battle of New York
mercenary
Hessians
Crossing of the Delaware

Battle of Trenton
Betsy Ross Flag
Yankee Doodle
Battle of Saratoga
French Treaty of Alliance
Battle of Yorktown
Newburgh Conspiracy
American Cincinnatus

To Know by Heart

“These are the times that try men’s souls.” — Thomas Paine, The Crisis
Yankee-Doodle, first stanza

Dates
1776–1783 War of Independence
July 4, 1776 Declaration of Independence signed
Christmas, 1776 Battle of Trenton

Images
Historical figures
Landscape pictures of geographic places featured in this lesson
Depictions of figures at various scenes and moments and in battle
“Washington Crossing the Delaware” painting
Betsy Ross Flag and other flags
Maps: overall strategies, specific battles
Relevant forts
Reenactment photos
Washington Monument
Statue of George Washington (Hillsdale College campus)

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- The fates of the signers of the Declaration of Independence
- David Bushnell’s submarine attack
- Washington’s Crossing of the Delaware
- The American farmers joining the Battle of Saratoga
- Washington encouraging his men at Valley Forge
- Stories of Margaret Corbin, Molly Pitcher, Abigail Adams, and Martha Washington during the war
- Washington on horseback at the Battle of Monmouth
- Washington’s dismissal of the Newburgh Conspiracy
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- How did the British respond to the Declaration of Independence?
- What things were helpful to the Americans in the War of Independence?
- What things were helpful to the British in the War of Independence?
- How did the Americans think they could win the war?
- How did the British think they could win the war?
- How did soldiers fight each other?
- What does it mean to love one’s country or to be patriotic?
- What things did George Washington do that helped the Americans?
- Why were the Americans in trouble in the winter of 1776?
- What happened at the crossing of the Delaware River and the Battle of Trenton?
- What happened at the Battle of Saratoga?
- Which country was so impressed by the Americans at the Battle of Saratoga that they decided to help the Americans fight against the British?
- Why were the Americans in trouble in the winter of 1777–78 when they were encamped at Valley Forge?
- How did George Washington inspire his soldiers at Valley Forge?
- Who was Baron von Steuben and how did he help the Continental Army?
- What happened at the Battle of Yorktown?
- Why did the Americans win the War of Independence?
- Why did soldiers want to overthrow the American government?
- How did George Washington convince the soldiers not to overthrow the American government?
- What did the British agree to do in the Treaty of Paris?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 76: What war did the Americans fight to win independence from Britain?
  - Question 80: The American Revolution had many important events. Name one.
  - Question 86: George Washington is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 89: Alexander Hamilton is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 121: Why does the flag have 13 stripes?
  - Question 122: Why does the flag have 50 stars?
  - Question 124: The Nation’s first motto was “E Pluribus Unum.” What does that mean?

KEYS TO THE LESSON

The American Revolution was truly a “David and Goliath” clash: a fledging strand of remote colonies loosely cooperating as one through a continental, mostly citizen army, fought and won independence from the greatest military power in the world. Students should appreciate this about the war of their forefathers. They should also know key stories of the heroic actions of the leaders and the many common folk in that struggle, understand the strategies employed in general and in specific battles, and consider the key moments and factors that led the Americans to victory.
Teachers might best plan and teach the War of Independence with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Ask students to identify and compare the various advantages and disadvantages of each side at the outset of the war and how these shifted over the years.
- Introduce students to the contemporary style of warfare by using images, maps, and artifacts. This approach will provide a foundation for their subsequent study of battles, help them to understand what happens in battle, and allow them to appreciate the bravery of soldiers fighting on both sides. Be mindful of being too graphic given the age level.
- Help students to empathize with the common Continental Army soldier and perceive the risk facing all the colonists, especially the leaders. Conditions were truly awful at many points in the war. The prospect of imminent defeat and the dire consequences for all involved weighed heavily upon the colonists throughout the war. The leaders—the men we now consider the American Founders—would most certainly have been killed if they were captured or the war was lost. In spite of the risks, they risked everything and sacrificed much for the cause of freedom and self-government. Students should appreciate the great debt we owe them.
- In telling the stories, explain in general each side’s strategy and the battle plans employed in some important battles.
- Focus on the drama of each battle through story. Students should understand how the battles came to be, the key stories and moments from the battles themselves, and the significance of their various outcomes on subsequent events. Employ battle maps as appropriate.
- As with any conflict, draw attention to the key contributions of both leaders and common soldiers in the war. George Washington should be especially considered, not so much in his battle tactics as in his overall strategy for the war and his stirring leadership of his soldiers.
**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS**

**Activity 1:** Find pictures that represent five different scenes from this lesson. Print off enough images for each group of five students to have a set. Give each student in the group a different picture (all groups will have the same five pictures). Have the students arrange the pictures in the order that those events occurred. Once the students have figured out the correct order of events, have students line up in order and go over the order of events as a class. Conclude the activity by asking students how they knew what event the picture was portraying. Ask students how they remembered the order of events/what they did to figure out the correct order. If there are groups that did not figure out the correct order, ask those students questions in order to move them to the correct sequence.

**Activity 2:** Provide students with copies of a map that can also be projected on the board. Review with students the events of the war and where certain battles take place. As a class, mark on the map on the board and have students do the same on their own maps. Make indications about who won each battle and review with students how the battle went and what its significance was.

**Activity 3:** Have students draw or color a picture of the original United States flag. Ask them what the colors, stars, and stripes each represent.

**Assignment 1:** Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

**Assignment 2:** Have students draw and color a scene of their choice from the War of Independence. Have students present briefly in class what they drew, the story behind it, and why they depicted it the way they did.

**FORMATIVE QUIZ 2**

Provide students with numbered papers. Using the “Review Sheets” in the Appendix, make statements and ask students if they are True or False. Have them draw ☑ for “True” or ☐ for “False” next to each number. Review as a class and talk through what makes each answer correct.
Lesson 4 — The United States Constitution

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the drafting of the Constitution, the debates within the Constitutional Convention and its ratification by the states, the political thought undergirding the Constitution, and the basic structure and powers of the federal government.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Teacher Texts
- Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition
- The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic
- The United States Constitution
- The American Revolution and Constitution

Trade Books
- We the People
- If You Were There When They Signed the Constitution
- A Picture Book of Alexander Hamilton
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- The Great American Story

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places
- Philadelphia
- Independence Hall

Persons
- James Madison
- George Washington
- Alexander Hamilton
- Publius

Terms and Topics
- government
- Shays’ Rebellion
- Constitutional Convention
- Father of the Constitution
- Constitution
- The Federalist
- consent of the governed
- self-government
- faction
- majority tyranny
representation  veto power
federalism  judicial powers
limited government  Supreme Court
separation of powers  Bill of Rights
legislative power  freedom of religion
Congress  freedom of speech
President  right to assembly
executive powers  right to keep and bear arms
Commander-in-Chief

Primary Sources
The United States Constitution
The Bill of Rights

To Know by Heart
Preamble to the U.S. Constitution
“A republic, if you can keep it.” — Benjamin Franklin
“If men were angels, no government would be necessary.” — Federalist 10

Dates
September 17, 1787 Constitutional Convention concludes (Constitution Day)

Images
Paintings of historical figures and events
Depictions of scenes from the Constitutional Convention
Photographs of Independence hall (exterior and interior)
Photos or facsimiles of the original Articles of Confederation, Constitution, Federalist, and Bill of Rights
The Signing of the American Constitution painting, Samuel Knecht
Statue of James Madison (Hillsdale College campus)
National Archives Building and the Rotunda for the Charters of Freedom
Paintings by Barry Faulkner in the Rotunda for the Charters of Freedom

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Benjamin Franklin’s story about the sun on George Washington’s chair being a sunrise for the country
- Benjamin Franklin’s reply to a woman’s question about what the Constitutional Convention had created: “A republic, if you can keep it,” and what this means

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What roles do rules and laws play in daily life? What are some examples?
- What is government and what is its purpose?
- Why were the Articles of Confederation not able to protect the rights of Americans?
- What was Shays’ Rebellion and why did it worry the founders?
- What is a constitution and what does it do?
- Who was the main thinker behind the Constitution, known as the “Father of the Constitution”?
- How are the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution connected?
- What was *The Federalist* and what did it try to do?
- Did the founders think the way people are changes over time or that it doesn’t change? (talking about people in general, not necessarily in each person’s own life)
- How did the founders think people tended to be: good, bad, smart, mistaken, a mixture of all of the above?
- Why were the founders worried about people who have power over others?
- Why did the founders believe it was so important to make sure people agreed to rules and laws that government made?
- Why were the founders so worried about people becoming angry with each other and dividing into groups or factions?
- What were the founders so worried that a big group of people would do to a smaller group of people if they disagreed (majority tyranny)?
- Why did the founders believe that having a big country with many different views would help make sure that one group would not makes laws to hurt another group?
- What were some things that the delegates at the Constitutional Convention disagreed about?
- What are ways for groups to make decisions? Which way did the Founders choose?
- How is America’s democratic republic distinct from the form of government in other nations?
- Why did the founders think it was important to make sure that power in the government, or control over others, was divided among different groups instead of all held by one person or group?
- What is federalism and how does it divide power?
- What is the separation of powers and how does it divide power?
- What does the legislative power allow Congress to do?
- What does the executive power allow the President to do?
- What does the judicial power allow the Supreme Court to do?
- How are members of Congress, the President, and the Supreme Court each chosen?
- How does a bill become a law?
- Why does the Constitution make it so hard for it to be changed?
- Did everyone think the Constitution was a good idea? Why not?
- What does the Bill of Rights do and why?
- What is freedom of religion and why is it important?
- What is freedom of speech and why is it important?
- What is the right to assembly and why is it important?
- What is the right to bear arms and why is it important?
- What is due process and why is it important?
- What does each elected or appointed person swear to do for the Constitution?
- Who controls the Constitution?
- How can you be a responsible citizen?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 1: What is the form of government of the United States?
  - Question 2: What is the supreme law of the land?
  - Question 3: Name one thing the U.S. Constitution does.
Question 4: The U.S. Constitution starts with the words “We the People.” What does “We the People” mean?

Question 6: What does the Bill of Rights protect?

Question 10: Name two important ideas from the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution.

Question 13: What is the rule of law?

Question 14: Many documents influenced the U.S. Constitution. Name one.

Question 82: What founding document was written in 1787?

Question 83: The Federalist Papers supported the passage of the U.S. Constitution. Name one of the writers.

Question 84: Why were the Federalist Papers important?

Question 86: George Washington is famous for many things. Name one.

Question 88: James Madison is famous for many things. Name one.

Question 89: Alexander Hamilton is famous for many things. Name one.

**KEYS TO THE LESSON**

“[I]t seems to have been reserved to the people of this country, by their conduct and example, to decide the important question, whether societies of men are really capable or not of establishing good government from reflection and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend for their political constitutions on accident and force.” Thus wrote Alexander Hamilton in the opening paragraph of Federalist 1 in support of the newly proposed United States Constitution. Indeed, it is the Constitution that gives institutional form to the principles of the Declaration of Independence. It is, as Abraham Lincoln would later express it, the “frame of silver” meant to adorn and, most importantly, to protect the “apple of gold” that is the Declaration of Independence and the truths it asserts. The Constitution is the vehicle for the American experiment in self-government.

Study of the Constitution and of the history of its creation shows students how and that human beings are able to govern themselves in freedom, securing the equal protection of rights and the dignity of each person through reflection, deliberation, and choice. This is a significant thing for students to grasp, even if in rudimentary form at the youngest grades, for if a constitution cannot achieve these ends, then force and violence are the only alternatives left to mankind.

Students should understand the main ideas and the very basic parts of the Constitution and the government it established, and know the stories from the Constitutional Convention and the ratification debates.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Constitution with emphasis on the following approaches. While the length of this advice is larger than advice for other lessons, it is owing to the ease with which so many features of the Constitution can be taught incorrectly, with important consequences. Therefore, this advice includes many corrections to common misconceptions that can be quickly addressed in class.

- Outline some problems America faced after the Revolution, such as cancelling debts, different currencies, trade barriers between states, not being able to kick the British out of the west, and Shays’ Rebellion.
- Lead students through the process of the Constitutional Convention. Help them see that the Convention was arranged to ensure that all the states were able to speak and be represented. Through stories of the various debates and compromises, explain the difficulty of establishing a government that would satisfy all parties.
- Describe the environment and people of the Constitutional Convention and of the ratification debates.
- Read and talk about certain key phrases from the Constitution with particular attention to the Preamble and the basic structure of government that the Constitution establishes.
- Clarify that the Constitution establishes a republic, not a democracy. In a pure democracy the people make all legislative decisions by direct majority vote; in a republic, the people elect certain individuals to represent their interests in deliberating and voting. The deliberations and voting record of representatives should usually reflect but should also be more refined than that of the entire people voting directly. Sometimes this distinction is described in terms of direct democracy vs. representative democracy. The key point is to highlight our ability to govern ourselves by choosing our neighbors to represent us.
- Explain the importance of the principles of separation of powers and federalism, and why these ideas are central to the Constitution’s safeguards against the corrupting tendency of power. In brief, they divide power so that everyone can hold each other accountable.
- Emphasize that the Framers of the Constitution were chiefly concerned with allowing the will of the majority to rule—thereby guaranteeing the consent of the governed—while still preserving the rights of the minority and thereby securing justice.
- Describe the American Founders’ understanding of human nature. They understood human nature to be fixed and unchanging, good but also flawed and tending toward corrupting power. In response to human nature, government must guard against the opposite dangers of lawlessness and tyranny, accounting for the realities of human nature and rejecting the possibility of utopia. In brief, the Constitution is constructed on a deep and accurate understanding of fixed human nature born of the Founders’ knowledge of history, their own experience, and their prudence.
- Ask about where government power comes from and what it’s used for. Review how the Declaration of Independence claims that government power comes from the free consent of the people. Help students to see how the Constitution tries to make sure the people are in control to protect their rights.
- Teach the very basic makeup and powers of each branch of government and explain why the Founders made them so. Students should understand what each branch is and what its main jobs are.
- If students are capable of handling the brutalities of slavery, the following considerations may be helpful in teaching about slavery during the founding decades:

  - Slavery was one of the few matters of disagreement among the colonial revolutionaries in their otherwise generally united challenge to England. Those who opposed slavery as well as those who favored it agreed about the growing threat of British tyranny.
  - Many of the American Founders, especially those from northern colonies, strongly opposed slavery but nevertheless accepted a temporary compromise on the issue, believing that an independent and united country would provide the best prospect for actually abolishing slavery. Without unity between northern and southern colonies, either the colonists would have lost the war, in which case slavery would simply be continued by
Great Britain, or the southern colonies would have formed their own separate country, in which case the North would have no power over the South to abolish slavery. The key for the American Founders, especially those who opposed slavery, would be to continue efforts against slavery as a united country—united around the principles of the Declaration of Independence.

The idea that a country can be founded on a principle—rather than merely on claims of territory, tribe, or military power—is uniquely American. America’s founding principle that “all men are created equal and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights” was unprecedented. Almost all recognized that the statement of the principles, despite a compromise that allowed for the pre-existing institution’s continuing existence, undermined the legitimacy of slavery.

Though the Constitution did not abolish slavery, it did place more limits on slavery on a national scale than had previously existed. Indeed, adopting the Constitution was one of the first significant moves to restrict slavery anywhere in the world at that time. Moreover, as Frederick Douglass and Abraham Lincoln would later acknowledge, the Constitution placed slavery on the path to extinction.

While it is rare that students in these grades are able to follow the logic of the Three-Fifths Clause, teachers should at least understand it well enough to dispel the commonplace belief that it made slaves only three-fifth human. The clause was not about the humanity of slaves; it was strictly about how much representation slave-owning states would receive in Congress and the Electoral College. The great hypocrisy of the slaveholders was that while they refused to call a slave a human being, they insisted that each slave be counted as a whole person for purposes of representation. In fact, it was the anti-slavery Founders who did not want slaves counted at all in the Constitution for the purposes of representation. The fact that slaves were only counted as three-fifths for the purposes of representation was a disappointment for southern states, as they had demanded they be counted as a whole person. It was a partial victory for northern opponents to slavery, as it would give the slaveholding states less influence in lawmaking than they wished. Additionally, students should understand that in the mind of those opposed to slavery, this compromise was the only politically viable route if they were to secure southern support for the Constitution, without which the country would become disunited, with the South able to perpetuate slavery indefinitely as their own country without northern abolitionists.

The international slave trade was unlimited in the states until the passage of the Constitution, which allowed for it to be outlawed in 1808 (which it was) and for Congress to discourage it by imposing tariffs on the slave trade in the meantime.

Consider with students the significance of the Constitution not using the word “slave” and instead using “person.” Refusing to use the word “slave” avoided giving legal legitimacy to slavery. Even Article IV, Section 2, Clause 3 emphasizes that slavery was legal based on certain state, not federal, laws. The use of the word “person” forced even slaveholders to recognize the humanity of the slave: that he or she was in fact a human person, not property. There would be no federally-recognized “property in man.”

Consider with students the sectional nature of views on slavery during the founding. The majority of northerners and northern founders (e.g., John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Benjamin Rush, Gouverneur Morris, and John Jay) spoke and wrote extensively on the immorality of slavery and its need to be abolished. Some northern founders, such as John
Jay, Alexander Hamilton, and Benjamin Franklin, founded or served in abolitionist societies.

Consider also that even among the southern founders who supported slavery or held slaves, several leading founders expressed regret and fear of divine retribution for slavery in America, such as Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and George Washington. Some freed their slaves as well, such as George Washington, who by the end of his life freed the slaves in his family estate. And many, like Thomas Jefferson, nevertheless maintained that slaves were men in full possession of the natural rights of all men. Making these observations does not diminish the inhumaneness of slavery or dismiss the wrong of racism by certain colonists or other individual Americans living in other generations.

Note the belief of many Founders, based on the evidence at the time, that slavery was naturally on the way to extinction. Public opinion had steadily grown against it; the principles of the Declaration of Independence and Revolution would continue to be a force toward realizing equality; and the Constitution had further restricted slavery, permitted further restrictions by holding the union together, and kept slavery on its path to extinction.

- Familiarize students with the Bill of Rights, especially the 1st and 2nd Amendments.
- Finally, tell students about the first elections, meetings of the Electoral College, and George Washington’s inauguration in 1789.
- Conclude the unit with some conversations along the following lines:
  - Many have understood the principle of equality as the enduring object or goal of American political life, with each generation seeking further to expand the conditions of political equality. This was the view of many Founders, as well as of Abraham Lincoln, abolitionists like Frederick Douglass, and civil rights leaders like Martin Luther King Jr., who called the Declaration a “promissory note to which every American was to fall heir” in his 1963 “I Have a Dream” speech.
  - The Declaration’s principle of equality—and the persistence and bravery of Americans of all origins to sacrifice and even die insisting that the nation should live up to the principle—has led to unprecedented achievements of human equality and the protection of equal rights.
STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS

Activity 1: Place students in groups of five. Provide each student with a sentence/phrase from either the Declaration of Independence or the U.S. Constitution. Have students determine which sentences/phrases come from the Declaration of Independence and which ones come from the Constitution. Review with students the key terms and topics mentioned in the sentences/phrases such as the following: equality, consent of the governed, self-government, etc. Ask plenty of questions about how the two documents are connected to each other.

Activity 2: Hold a brief mock election to parts of the government. Then pretend to try to pass a law. The key is not to spend a lot of time on the mechanics of the government, but rather to show students how no one person or group of people get to make all of the decisions, how they have to work together on things they agree about most, and how the voters still control what they do.

Assignment 1: Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

Assignment 2: Have students draw and color a picture of their choice that illustrates an example of one of the rights guaranteed in the Bill of Rights in practice. Have students present briefly in class what they drew, the story behind it, and why they depicted it the way they did.
APPENDIX A

Talk about History

Review Sheets

Tests

Writing Assignment
TALK ABOUT HISTORY

Student Name: ___________________________  Due: _______________
Story/Lesson from History: ____________________________________________________________

1. Who/what did you learn about in history class today?
   Student Answer: _____________________________________________________________

2. Who were the most important characters in the story?
   Student Answer: _____________________________________________________________

3. Tell me more about one of those characters.
   Student Answer: _____________________________________________________________

4. Tell me about the most exciting/interesting part of the story today.
   Student Answer: _____________________________________________________________

Parent Signature: _______________________________  Date: ______________

TALK ABOUT HISTORY

Student Name: ___________________________  Due: _______________
Story/Lesson from History: ____________________________________________________________

1. Who/what did you learn about in history class today?
   Student Answer: _____________________________________________________________

2. Who were the most important characters in the story?
   Student Answer: _____________________________________________________________

3. Tell me more about one of those characters.
   Student Answer: _____________________________________________________________

4. Tell me about the most exciting/interesting part of the story today.
   Student Answer: _____________________________________________________________

Parent Signature: _______________________________  Date: ______________
History Assessment and Review in Grades K–2

REVIEWING AND STUDYING

One-page Review Sheets are included in the following materials. Teachers are encouraged to review items on these sheets with students in the days leading up to an assessment. Between reviewing at the beginning of each class period and this review based on the Review Sheets, students should not need to do any additional studying or review. Review Sheets may be sent home, however, if parents wish to review with their students at home.

ASSESSMENT

The method for assessing students on history in grades K-2 depends on the grade level and student ability.

For students who cannot yet read and write:

Option 1: Choose several items from the Review Sheet to ask each student orally. This may be done in private with the same questions while students complete another activity, or it may be administered aloud with the entire class, varying questions for each student.

Option 2: Create a test with images for matching or identifying terms and topics. Read aloud a description or explanation of a Person, Term, Topic, or Story to the whole class and have each student circle or place a number/letter next to the corresponding image on their test. For the Questions, read aloud a statement that would answer the question and ask students if it is True or False. Have them draw 😊 for “True” or ☹ for “False” next to each statement.

For students who can read and write:

Teachers may administer the tests included in the following materials. It is recommended, especially early in a school year, to have each student complete the test individually, but with the class proceeding together from question to question, each being read aloud by the teacher.
Review Sheet — Unit 2, Test 1

Lesson 1 | Self-Government or Tyranny
Lesson 2 | The Declaration of Independence

DATES: When did ______________ occurred?

July 4, 1776 Declaration of Independence signed

PERSONS: Tell me who ______________ was and what he/she did.

George III  Patrick Henry  Benjamin Franklin  Thomas Jefferson
George Washington  Paul Revere  Thomas Paine

TERMS AND TOPICS: Tell me what ______________ is/are/was/were and why we learned about it.

self-government  Boston Tea Party  Continental Army  equality
representation  Intolerable Acts  Common Sense  pursuit of happiness
militia  Lexington & Concord  Bunker Hill  Patriot
Sons of Liberty  Concord  natural rights  Tory

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART: Tell me the story of...

- George Washington’s childhood
- The Boston Massacre
- The Boston Tea Party
- The Minutemen at the Battles of Lexington and Concord

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND: Tell me...

☐ Why the British began to limit what the colonists could do after the French and Indian War.
☐ What the Proclamation Act of 1763 attempted to do and why.
☐ What a tax is and what it is used for.
☐ Why the colonists were upset about new taxes.
☐ What John Adams did after the Boston Massacre.
☐ One of the things the British did in response to the Boston Tea Party through the Intolerable Acts.
☐ Why the Redcoats did not surprise the Americans before Lexington and Concord.
☐ What Thomas Paine said in his pamphlet Common Sense and how it changed people’s minds.
☐ What the Second Continental Congress decided to do.
☐ What the Declaration of Independence means when it says, “all men are created equal.”
☐ Where natural rights come from.
☐ If liberty is the same thing as doing whatever you want. Why or why not?
☐ What government is supposed to do.
☐ Who controls the government.
☐ Why it is special that America was created based on the words of the Declaration of Independence.
The American Founding — Test 1

Lesson 1 | Self-Government or Tyranny
Lesson 2 | The Declaration of Independence

DATES: Circle the day the Declaration of Independence was signed.

A. July 4, 1770  B. July 1, 1776  C. July 4, 1776

PERSONS: Match the person to who he/she was or what he/she did.

B. Thomas Jefferson  B. George III  C. Paul Revere

1. ________The King of England who ruled over the colonists.

2. ________Warned, “The British Are Coming!” before the Battles of Lexington and Concord.

3. ________Wrote the Declaration of Independence.

TERMS AND TOPICS: Match the term to the correct definition, description, or explanation.

A. Common Sense  C. equality  E. Patriot
B. Continental Army  D. natural rights  F. self-government

4. ________The people’s ability to choose those who make laws for them.

5. ________The colonial army led by General Washington.

6. ________Thomas Paine’s pamphlet that convinced many colonists to declare independence.

7. ________Freedoms to do something that people have because they are human beings.

8. ________That each person is of the same value and should be treated the same.

9. ________A colonist who fought for America’s independence.
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART: *Tell me the story of the Boston Tea Party.*

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

10. Tell me why the British began to limit what the colonists could do after the French and Indian War.

11. Tell me why the colonists were upset about new taxes.

12. Tell me one thing the British did in response to the Boston Tea Party through the Intolerable Acts.

13. Tell me what government is supposed to do, according to the Declaration of Independence.

14. Tell me who controls the government, according to the Declaration of Independence.
Review Sheet — Unit 2, Test 2

Lesson 3 | The War of Independence
Lesson 4 | The Constitution

Test on ____________

DATES: When did ______________ occur?

September 17, 1787  Constitutional Convention concludes (Constitution Day)

PERSONS: Tell me who _____________ was and what he/she did.

George Washington  Marquis de Lafayette  Benjamin Franklin
Benedict Arnold  James Madison  Alexander Hamilton

TERMS AND TOPICS: Tell me what ______________ is/are/was/were and why we learned about it.

Philadelphia  Yankee Doodle  Father of the  President
Patriot  Battle of Saratoga  Constitution  Supreme Court
Tory  Battle of Yorktown  majority tyranny  Bill of Rights
Continental Army  American Cincinnatus  federalism  freedom of religion
Battle of New York  Constitutional Convention  separation of powers  freedom of speech
Betsy Ross Flag  Convention  Congress

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART: Tell me the story of...

- Washington’s Crossing of the Delaware
- The American farmers joining the Battle of Saratoga
- Washington encouraging his men at Valley Forge
- Benjamin Franklin’s story about the sun on George Washington’s chair being a sunrise for the country

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND: Tell me...

☐ How soldiers fought each other in the War of Independence.
☐ The country that was so impressed by the Americans at the Battle of Saratoga that they decided to help the Americans fight against the British.
☐ How George Washington inspired his soldiers at Valley Forge.
☐ Why the Americans won the War of Independence.
☐ What a constitution is and what it does.
☐ What the founders worried a bigger group would do to a smaller group if they disagreed.
☐ Why the founders thought it was important to make sure that power in the government, or control over others, was divided among different groups instead of all held by one person or group.
☐ What the legislative power allows Congress to do.
☐ What freedom of speech is and why it is important.
**The American Founding — Test 2**

Lesson 3 | The War of Independence  
Lesson 4 | The Constitution

**DATES:** Circle the day the Constitutional Convention concluded, which we call Constitution Day.

A. September 17, 1787  
B. April 17, 1787  
C. July 4, 1776

**PERSONS:** Match the person to who he/she was or what he/she did.

A. Benedict Arnold  
B. James Madison  
C. Alexander Hamilton

1. ________Soldier and assistant to George Washington and proponent of the Constitution.

2. ________Drafted the ideas of the Constitution and is known as the Father of the Constitution.

3. ________Colonial general who abandoned America and joined the British instead.

**TERMS AND TOPICS:** Match the term to the correct definition, description, or explanation.

A. American Cincinnatus  
B. Battle of Yorktown  
C. Betsy Ross Flag  
D. Bill of Rights  
E. Constitutional Convention  
F. President

4. ________The first United States banner depicting thirteen stripes and thirteen stars in a circle.

5. ________The final battle of the War of Independence, where the British surrendered.

6. ________The nickname for the humble George Washington, who resigned his command.

7. ________The meeting of Founders to create a new government for the United States.

8. ________Makes sure people follow the laws passed by Congress; commands military in wartime.

9. ________A list of changes to the Constitution that clearly prevent certain government actions.
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART: Tell me the story of the Washington’s Crossing of the Delaware.

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

10. Tell me the country that was so impressed by the Americans at the Battle of Saratoga that they decided to help the Americans fight against the British.

11. Tell me how George Washington inspired his soldiers at Valley Forge.

12. Tell me what a constitution is and what it does.

13. Why the Founders thought it was important to make sure that power in the government, or control over others, was divided among different groups instead of all held by one person or group.

14. What freedom of speech is and why it is important.
Writing Assignment — The American Founding

Due on ____________

Why it is special that America was created based on the words of the Declaration of Independence, “all men are created equal”?
APPENDIX B

Primary Sources

The Second Continental Congress

The American People
The Thirteen United States of America

The Unanimous Declaration

A Declaration

July 4, 1776

Pennsylvania State House | Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Declaration of Independence

BACKGROUND

The delegates from each colony at the Second Continental Congress announced their votes to form a new country separate from Great Britain in this statement to mankind that expounds both the principles on which this new country would be founded and the reasons they judged themselves justified to separate.

ANNOTATIONS

When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

5

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.—That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,—That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to

NOTES & QUESTIONS

right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long
train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to
reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such
Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security.—Such has been the pa-
tient sufferance of these Colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to
alter their former Systems of Government. The history of the present King of Great Britain
is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establish-
ment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. To prove this, let Facts be submitted to a
candid world.

5
He has refused his Assent to Laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

He has forbidden his Governors to pass Laws of immediate and pressing importance, un-
less suspended in their operation till his Assent should be obtained; and when so sus-
pended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.

10
He has refused to pass other Laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless
those people would relinquish the right of Representation in the Legislature, a right inesti-
mable to them and formidable to tyrants only.

15
He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from
the depository of their public Records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compli-
ance with his measures.

20
He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly, for opposing with manly firmness his
invasions on the rights of the people.

25
He has refused for a long time, after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected;
whereby the Legislative powers, incapable of Annihilation, have returned to the People at
large for their exercise; the State remaining in the mean time exposed to all the dangers of
invasion from without, and convulsions within.
He has endeavored to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the Laws for Naturalization of Foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migrations hither, and raising the conditions of new Appropriations of Lands.

He has obstructed the Administration of Justice, by refusing his Assent to Laws for establishing Judiciary powers.

He has made Judges dependent on his Will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.

He has erected a multitude of New Offices, and sent hither swarms of Officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance.

He has kept among us, in times of peace, Standing Armies without the Consent of our legislatures.

He has affected to render the Military independent of and superior to the Civil power.

He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his Assent to their Acts of pretended Legislation:

For Quartering large bodies of armed troops among us:

For protecting them, by a mock Trial, from punishment for any Murders which they should commit on the Inhabitants of these States:

For cutting off our Trade with all parts of the world:

For imposing Taxes on us without our Consent:

For depriving us in many cases, of the benefits of Trial by Jury:
For transporting us beyond Seas to be tried for pretended offenses:

For abolishing the free System of English Laws in a neighboring Province, establishing therein an Arbitrary government, and enlarging its Boundaries so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these Colonies:

For taking away our Charters, abolishing our most valuable Laws, and altering fundamentally the Forms of our Governments:

For suspending our own Legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

He has abdicated Government here, by declaring us out of his Protection and waging War against us.

He has plundered our seas, ravaged our Coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people.

He is at this time transporting large Armies of foreign Mercenaries to complete the works of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of Cruelty and perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the Head of a civilized nation.

He has constrained our fellow Citizens taken Captive on the high Seas to bear Arms against their Country, to become the executioners of their friends and Brethren, or to fall themselves by their Hands.

He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavored to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian Savages, whose known rule of warfare, is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes and conditions.
In every stage of these Oppressions We have Petitioned for Redress in the most humble terms: Our repeated Petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A Prince whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a Tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.

Nor have We been wanting in attentions to our British brethren. We have warned them from time to time of attempts by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement here. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured them by the ties of our common kindred to disavow these usurpations, which, would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence. They too have been deaf to the voice of justice and of consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity, which denounces our Separation, and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind, Enemies in War, in Peace Friends.

We, therefore, the Representatives of the united States of America, in General Congress, Assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the Name, and by Authority of the good People of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, That these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be Free and Independent States; that they are Absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as Free and Independent States, they have full Power to levy War, conclude Peace, contract Alliances, establish Commerce, and to do all other Acts and Things which Independent States may of right do. And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor.

Georgia
Button Gwinnett, Lyman Hall, George Walton
North Carolina
William Hooper, Joseph Hewes, John Penn

South Carolina
Edward Rutledge, Thomas Heyward, Jr., Thomas Lynch, Jr., Arthur Middleton

Maryland
Samuel Chase, William Paca, Thomas Stone, Charles Carroll of Carrollton

Virginia
George Wythe, Richard Henry Lee, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Harrison, Thomas Nelson, Jr., Francis Lightfoot Lee, Carter Braxton

Pennsylvania
Robert Morris, Benjamin Rush, Benjamin Franklin, John Morton, George Clymer, James Smith, George Taylor, James Wilson, George Ross

Delaware
Caesar Rodney, George Read, Thomas McKean

New York
William Floyd, Philip Livingston, Francis Lewis, Lewis Morris

New Jersey
Richard Stockton, John Witherspoon, Francis Hopkinson, John Hart, Abraham Clark

New Hampshire
Josiah Bartlett, William Whipple, Matthew Thornton

Massachusetts
John Hancock, Samuel Adams, John Adams, Robert Treat Paine, Elbridge Gerry
Rhode Island
Stephen Hopkins, William Ellery

Connecticut
Roger Sherman, Samuel Huntington, William Williams, Oliver Wolcot
The Constitution

LAW

March 4, 1789
United States of America

BACKGROUND

Delegates to the Constitutional Convention drafted and the states ratified this Constitution, forming the second national government for the United States of America.

ANNOTATIONS

Preamble

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

Article I

Section 1. All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Section 2. The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States, and the Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature.

No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the Age of twenty five Years, and been seven Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons, including those bound to Service for a Term of Years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three fifths of all other Persons. The actual Enumeration shall be made within three Years after the first Meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent Term of ten Years, in such Manner as they shall by Law direct. The Number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every thirty Thousand, but each State shall have at Least one Representative; and until such enumeration shall be made, the State of New Hampshire shall be entitled to choose three, Massachusetts eight, Rhode-Island and Providence Plantations one, Connecticut five, New-York six, New Jersey four, Pennsylvania eight, Delaware one, Maryland six, Virginia ten, North Carolina five, South Carolina five, and Georgia three.

When vacancies happen in the Representation from any State, the Executive Authority thereof shall issue Writs of Election to fill such Vacancies.

The House of Representatives shall choose their Speaker and other Officers; and shall have the sole Power of Impeachment.

Section 3. The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the Legislature thereof, for six Years; and each Senator shall have one Vote.

Immediately after they shall be assembled in Consequence of the first Election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three Classes. The Seats of the Senators of the first Class shall be vacated at the Expiration of the second Year, of the second Class at the Expiration of the fourth Year, and of the third Class at the Expiration of the sixth Year, so that one third may be chosen every second Year; and if Vacancies happen by Resignation, or otherwise, during the Recess of the Legislature of any State, the Executive thereof may make temporary Appointments until the next Meeting of the Legislature, which shall then fill such Vacancies.
No Person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty Years, and been nine Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen.

The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no Vote, unless they be equally divided.

The Senate shall choose their other Officers, and also a President pro tempore, in the Absence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the Office of President of the United States.

The Senate shall have the sole Power to try all Impeachments. When sitting for that Purpose, they shall be on Oath or Affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside: And no Person shall be convicted without the Concurrence of two thirds of the Members present.

Judgment in Cases of Impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from Office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any Office of honor, Trust or Profit under the United States: but the Party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to Indictment, Trial, Judgment and Punishment, according to Law.

Section 4. The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of choosing Senators.

The Congress shall assemble at least once in every Year, and such Meeting shall be on the first Monday in December, unless they shall by Law appoint a different Day.

Section 5. Each House shall be the Judge of the Elections, Returns and Qualifications of its own Members, and a Majority of each shall constitute a Quorum to do Business; but a smaller Number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the Attendance of absent Members, in such Manner, and under such Penalties as each House may provide.
Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly
Behavior, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.

Each House shall keep a Journal of its Proceedings, and from time to time publish the same,
excepting such Parts as may in their Judgment require Secrecy; and the Yeas and Nays of
the Members of either House on any question shall, at the Desire of one fifth of those Pre-
sent, be entered on the Journal.

Neither House, during the Session of Congress, shall, without the Consent of the other,
adjourn for more than three days, nor to any other Place than that in which the two Houses
shall be sitting.

Section 6. The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Ser-
vices, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States. They
shall in all Cases, except Treason, Felony and Breach of the Peace, be privileged from Arrest
during their Attendance at the Session of their respective Houses, and in going to and re-
turning from the same; and for any Speech or Debate in either House, they shall not be
questioned in any other Place.

No Senator or Representative shall, during the Time for which he was elected, be appointed
to any civil Office under the Authority of the United States, which shall have been created,
or the Emoluments whereof shall have been encreased during such time; and no Person
holding any Office under the United States, shall be a Member of either House during his
Continuance in Office.

Section 7. All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but
the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills.

Every Bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, be-
fore it become a Law, be presented to the President of the United States; If he approve he
shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his Objections to that House in which it shall
have originated, who shall enter the Objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to
reconsider it. If after such Reconsideration two thirds of that House shall agree to pass the
Bill, it shall be sent, together with the Objections, to the other House, by which it shall
likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two thirds of that House, it shall become a Law. But in all such Cases the Votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and Nays, and the Names of the Persons voting for and against the Bill shall be entered on the Journal of each House respectively. If any Bill shall not be returned by the President within ten days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the Same shall be a Law, in like Manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress by their Adjournment prevent its Return in which Case it shall not be a Law.

Every Order, Resolution, or Vote to which the Concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of Adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the Same shall take Effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the Rules and Limitations prescribed in the Case of a Bill.

Section 8. The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow Money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and post Roads;
To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;—And

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.
Section 9. The Migration or Importation of such Persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the Year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a Tax or duty may be imposed on such Importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each Person.

The Privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it.

No Bill of Attainder or ex post facto Law shall be passed.

No Capitation, or other direct, Tax shall be laid, unless in Proportion to the Census or Enumeration herein before directed to be taken.

No Tax or Duty shall be laid on Articles exported from any State.

No Preference shall be given by any Regulation of Commerce or Revenue to the Ports of one State over those of another: nor shall Vessels bound to, or from, one State, be obliged to enter, clear, or pay Duties in another.

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.

Section 10. No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts; pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, or Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts, or grant any Title of Nobility.

No State shall, without the Consent of the Congress, lay any Imposts or Duties on Imports or Exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection Laws: and
the net Produce of all Duties and Imposts, laid by any State on Imports or Exports, shall be for the Use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such Laws shall be subject to the Revision and Control of the Congress.

No State shall, without the Consent of Congress, lay any duty of Tonnage, keep Troops, or Ships of War in time of Peace, enter into any Agreement or Compact with another State, or with a foreign Power, or engage in War, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent Danger as will not admit of delay.

Article II

Section 1. The executive Power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his Office during the Term of four Years, and, together with the Vice-President chosen for the same Term, be elected as follows:

Each State shall appoint, in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors, equal to the whole Number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress: but no Senator or Representative, or Person holding an Office of Trust or Profit under the United States, shall be appointed an Elector. The Electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by Ballot for two Persons, of whom one at least shall not be an Inhabitant of the same State with themselves. And they shall make a List of all the Persons voted for, and of the Number of Votes for each; which List they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the Seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall, in the Presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the Certificates, and the Votes shall then be counted. The Person having the greatest Number of Votes shall be the President, if such Number be a Majority of the whole Number of Electors appointed; and if there be more than one who have such Majority, and have an equal Number of Votes, then the House of Representatives shall immediately choose by Ballot one of them for President; and if no Person have a Majority, then from the five highest on the List the said House shall in like Manner choose the President. But in choosing the President, the Votes shall be taken by States, the Representation from each State having one Vote; a quorum for
this Purpose shall consist of a Member or Members from two thirds of the States, and a Majority of all the States shall be necessary to a Choice. In every Case, after the Choice of the President, the Person having the greatest Number of Votes of the Electors shall be the Vice President. But if there should remain two or more who have equal Votes, the Senate shall choose from them by Ballot the Vice President.

The Congress may determine the Time of choosing the Electors, and the Day on which they shall give their Votes; which Day shall be the same throughout the United States.

No Person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President; neither shall any Person be eligible to that Office who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty-five Years, and been fourteen Years a Resident within the United States.

In Case of the Removal of the President from Office, or of his Death, Resignation, or Inability to discharge the Powers and Duties of the said Office, the Same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by Law provide for the Case of Removal, Death, Resignation or Inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what Officer shall then act as President, and such Officer shall act accordingly, until the Disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

The President shall, at stated Times, receive for his Services, a Compensation, which shall neither be increased nor diminished during the Period for which he shall have been elected, and he shall not receive within that Period any other Emolument from the United States, or any of them.

Before he enter on the Execution of his Office, he shall take the following Oath or Affirmation:—"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States."

Section 2. The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States; he may require the Opinion, in writing, of the principal Officer in each of
The executive Departments, upon any subject relating to the Duties of their respective Offices, and he shall have Power to grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offenses against the United States, except in Cases of Impeachment.

He shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law: but the Congress may by Law vest the Appointment of such inferior Officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the Courts of Law, or in the Heads of Departments.

The President shall have Power to fill up all Vacancies that may happen during the Recess of the Senate, by granting Commissions which shall expire at the End of their next Session.

Section 3. He shall from time to time give to the Congress Information of the State of the Union, and recommend to their Consideration such Measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient; he may, on extraordinary Occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them, and in Case of Disagreement between them, with Respect to the Time of Adjournment, he may adjourn them to such Time as he shall think proper; he shall receive Ambassadors and other public Ministers; he shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed, and shall Commission all the Officers of the United States.

Section 4. The President, Vice President and all civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.

Article III

Section 1. The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good
Behavior, and shall, at stated Times, receive for their Services a Compensation, which shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office.

Section 2. The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority;—to all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls;—to all Cases of admiralty and maritime Jurisdiction; —to Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party;—to Controversies between two or more States;—between a State and Citizens of another State;—between Citizens of different States;—between Citizens of the same State claiming Lands under Grants of different States, and between a State, or the Citizens thereof, and foreign States, Citizens or Subjects.

In all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, and those in which a State shall be Party, the supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction. In all the other Cases before mentioned, the supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make.

The Trial of all Crimes, except in Cases of Impeachment, shall be by Jury; and such Trial shall be held in the State where the said Crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State, the Trial shall be at such Place or Places as the Congress may by Law have directed.

Section 3. Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying War against them, or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort. No Person shall be convicted of Treason unless on the Testimony of two Witnesses to the same overt Act, or on Confession in open Court.

The Congress shall have Power to declare the Punishment of Treason, but no Attainder of Treason shall work Corruption of Blood, or Forfeiture except during the Life of the Person attainted.
Article IV

Section 1. Full Faith and Credit shall be given in each State to the public Acts, Records, and judicial Proceedings of every other State. And the Congress may by general Laws prescribe the Manner in which such Acts, Records and Proceedings shall be proved, and the Effect thereof.

Section 2. The Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of Citizens in the several States.

A Person charged in any State with Treason, Felony, or other Crime, who shall flee from Justice, and be found in another State, shall on Demand of the executive Authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having Jurisdiction of the Crime.

No Person held to Service or Labor in one State, under the Laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in Consequence of any Law or Regulation therein, be discharged from such Service or Labor, but shall be delivered up on Claim of the Party to whom such Service or Labor may be due.

Section 3. New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the Junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the Consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

Section 4. The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic Violence.
Article V

The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

Article VI

All Debts contracted and Engagements entered into, before the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation.

This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States.
Article VII

The Ratification of the Conventions of nine States, shall be sufficient for the Establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the Same.

Done in Convention by the Unanimous Consent of the States present the Seventeenth Day of September in the Year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and Eighty seven and of the Independence of the United States of America the Twelfth In witness whereof We have hereunto subscribed our Names.

George Washington—
President and deputy from Virginia

Delaware
George Read, Gunning Bedford, Jr., John Dickinson, Richard Bassett, Jacob Broom

Maryland
James McHenry, Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer, Daniel Carroll

Virginia
John Blair, James Madison, Jr.

North Carolina
William Blount, Richard Dobbs Spaight, Hugh Williamson

South Carolina
John Rutledge, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, Charles Pinckney, Pierce Butler
Georgia

William Few, Abraham Baldwin

New Hampshire

John Langdon, Nicholas Gilman

Massachusetts

Nathaniel Gorham, Rufus King

Connecticut

William Samuel Johnson, Roger Sherman

New York

Alexander Hamilton

New Jersey

William Livingston, David Brearley, William Paterson, Jonathan Dayton

Pennsylvania

Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Mifflin, Robert Morris, George Clymer, Thomas FitzSimmons, Jared Ingersoll, James Wilson, Gouverneur Morris

Attest William Jackson Secretary
FIRST CONGRESS

Proposed Amendments to the Constitution

JOIN RESOLUTION EXCERPT

September 25, 1789
Federal Hall | City of New-York, New York

Bill of Rights

BACKGROUND

As part of a compromise to secure the ratification of the Constitution, Federalists introduced in the first Congress a Bill of Rights as twelve amendments to the new Constitution. Below are the ten amendments that were ultimately ratified.

ANNOTATIONS

Amendment I

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Amendment II

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms shall not be infringed.

Amendment III

No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

Amendment IV

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Amendment V

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Amendment VI

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.

Amendment VII

In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.
Amendment VIII

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

Amendment IX

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Amendment X

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.
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Why Teach the Early Republic

The United States of America is an “experiment in self-government.” None other than the Father of the Country, George Washington, said as much at his inauguration. The experiment had seemed to be on the verge of failure by 1787, but the Constitution gave it a second chance. This is the story of the beginning decades of that “second chance.” What is so remarkable about these decades is that the ideas and structures of the Constitution were put into action with real people, real challenges, and real opportunities. America’s first elected and appointed statesmen would set the precedents by which American representative democracy would operate. Indeed, much of American self-government still reflects the precedents established in those first decades. These acts were not performed in a vacuum, however. America’s leaders
had to face very real struggles, and the American people had to learn to trust the Constitution and one another. All the while, America also found before her opportunities rarely afforded to any nation. In navigating the challenges and seizing the opportunities, America matured into an increasingly, though still imperfect, democratic society.

**Enduring Ideas from This Unit**

1. The presidency of George Washington was indispensable in establishing precedents conducive to free self-government and in keeping America free of what would have been a disastrous war.  
2. The opportunities afforded to the United States were exceedingly rare in the history of nations. 
3. Amidst the great strides in the practice of self-government and in taking advantage of opportunities, America’s treatment of Native Americans and the entrenching of slavery in the Southern states reveal the imperfections of the American regime and the injustices that were permitted. 
4. American democracy expressed itself in a variety of unique ways and had a deep effect on the habits, thoughts, and character of Americans. 
5. The idea of America’s “manifest destiny” to expand from coast to coast and spread its democratic ideas was a mixture of noble and material motivations which led to the Mexican-American War and a renewed debate over the expansion of slavery.

**What Teachers Should Consider**

The start of this unit includes a familiar cast of characters. The first four presidents were all founding fathers, and many cabinet members, diplomats, and justices were either present in Philadelphia in 1776 and 1787, fought in the War of Independence, or both. It proved consequential to the early national stability of America that these figures should have been the first to govern under the Constitution, George Washington above all others. Students should come explore how much of the way American government functions and how many traditions of the American political order are owed to President Washington.

At the same time, students should understand the precarious situations into which the young country was drawn and learn how America’s first leaders managed these challenges. From maintaining a fragile unity to enduring buffets from Great Britain and Revolutionary France, these first four presidents had more than enough to handle, including the crisis of the War of 1812.

And yet, America also had an abundance of opportunities during the first half of the 1800s. These began with the Louisiana Purchase and proceeded to include the acquisition of Florida, the Monroe Doctrine’s assertion of American authority in the Western Hemisphere, the annexation of Texas, and the Mexican Cession following the Mexican-American War. All the while America’s economic fortunes grew steadily.

American representative democracy was thus put into action, and the experiment in self-government seemed to be succeeding. But how did democratic society affect its citizens? Considering this question offers an opportunity to look at life in a democratic republic. This includes the ways in which America’s founding principles were not upheld, with respect to slavery and the treatment of Native Americans.
The study of America’s “manifest destiny” is an opportunity for students to enter the minds of Americans at the time and attempt to understand the spirit of the democratic age. Based on the circumstances, it seemed almost inevitable that America would spread many of its unique ideas and accomplishments throughout all of North America. Yet this sentiment was sometimes in tension with America’s founding principles. The culmination of this spirit in the Mexican-American War would gain for America an astonishing amount of new land, resources, and opportunity, but also bring closer the prospect of civil war.

How Teachers Can Learn More

TEXT

*Land of Hope*, Wilfred McClay

ONLINE COURSES | Online.Hillsdale.edu

*The Great American Story*

Lesson Planning Resources

TEACHER RESOURCES

*Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition*, Volume 1, Wilfred McClay
*The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic*, H.A. Guerber
*Westward Expansion*, Anne Goudvis and Stephanie Harvey
*The Civil War and Reconstruction*, Anne Goudvis and Stephanie Harvey

TRADE BOOKS

*George Washington*, Ingri and Edgar Parin d’Aulaire
*A Picture Book of George Washington*, David Adler
*A Picture Book of Alexander Hamilton*, David Adler
*A Picture Book of Thomas Jefferson*, David Adler
*A Picture Book of Dolley and James Madison*, David Adler
*Aboard the USS Constitution*, Therese Shea
*Our Flag Was Still There*, Jessie Hartland
*The Star-Spangled Banner*, Peter Spier
*The Battle of New Orleans*, Freddi Evans
*If You Lived When There Was Slavery in America*, Anne Kamma
*Sequoyah*, James Rumford
*The Amazing Impossible Erie Canal*, Cheryl Harness
*Steam, Smoke, and Steel*, Patrick O’Brien
If You Traveled West in a Covered Wagon, Ellen Levine
Going West, Jean Van Leeuwen
Minnow and Rose, Judy Young
If You Traveled on the Underground Railroad, Ellen Levine

**PRIMARY SOURCES**

Thanksgiving Proclamation, George Washington
LESSON PLANS,
ASSIGNMENTS,
AND QUIZZES
Lesson 1 — The New Government

1789–1801

6–7 classes

**LESSON OBJECTIVE**

Students learn about the first decades of American self-government under the Constitution, including the major events and developments during the presidencies of George Washington and John Adams.

**TEACHER PREPARATION**

Create a note outline based on the following:

- **Teacher Texts**
  - *Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1* Pages 85–100
  - *The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic* Pages 109–119
  - *Westward Expansion* Pages 49–51
  - Primary Source See below.

- **Trade Books**
  - *George Washington*
  - *A Picture Book of George Washington*
  - *A Picture Book of Alexander Hamilton*

- **Online.Hillsdale.edu**
  - *The Great American Story* Lectures 5 and 6
  - *American Heritage* Lecture 5

**CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON**

- **Geography and Places**
  - New York City
  - Mount Vernon
  - Philadelphia
  - Washington, DC
  - Executive Mansion
  - Northwest Territory

- **Persons**
  - George Washington
  - John Adams
  - Thomas Jefferson
  - Alexander Hamilton

- **Terms and Topics**
  - Bill of Rights
  - Father of Our Country
  - cabinet
  - Whiskey Rebellion
  - cotton gin
  - Federalist Party
  - Democratic-Republican Party
  - Alien and Sedition Acts
  - nullify
Primary Sources
Thanksgiving Proclamation, George Washington

To Know by Heart
“Washington” —Nancy Byrd Turner

Timeline
1787  Constitutional Convention
1789  Elections held; First Congress convened;
      George Washington inaugurated

Images
Historical figures and events
Depictions of Federal Hall and Washington’s inauguration
Early maps and designs for Washington, DC, and the Executive Mansion

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Biographies and the roles of George Washington and John Adams
- George Washington’s travels to New York City for his inauguration
- The ebb and flow of the friendship between John Adams and Thomas Jefferson
- Thomas Jefferson walking to his inauguration and riding bareback around Washington, DC
- The death of George Washington

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- Why was George Washington’s presidency important?
- What presidential traditions did George Washington give us?
- What was Alexander Hamilton’s vision of the kind of country America should become?
- What was Thomas Jefferson’s vision of the kind of country America should become?
- What was the Whiskey Rebellion all about?
- Why was it hard for America not to get into the war between Great Britain and France?
- What did the cotton gin do?
- How did the cotton gin change the future of slavery?
- What did George Washington say about learning and doing the right thing?
- Why did John Adams have a hard time as president?
- What did the Alien and Sedition Acts do?
- Why was the election of 1800 called the “revolution of 1800” by Thomas Jefferson?
- Questions from the US Civics Test:
  - Question 37: The president of the United States can serve only two terms. Why?
  - Question 47: What does the president’s cabinet do?
  - Question 86: George Washington is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 89: Alexander Hamilton is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 119: What is the capital of the United States?
KEYS TO THE LESSON

With the Constitution ratified following robust debate, America embarked on the next phase of its experiment with self-government. Success was far from assured. The first statesmen to govern within this new system would play a decisive role in determining not only the immediate success of the fledgling republic but also its long-term well-being. Nearly every action would set a precedent, and there were very real threats to the country, both from without and from within. The statesmanship of George Washington and John Adams was indispensable for setting these precedents while steering the young nation through many trials, including deepening domestic division. With the peaceful national election in 1800, followed by a transfer of power in 1801, the United States could mark a successful passage through its first dozen years of self-government under the Constitution, setting the stage for the next two hundred years of American government and history.

Teachers might best plan and teach The New Government with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Spend time teaching about the importance of George Washington in these first years under the Constitution, including his character and his example. Of special note is Washington’s setting of precedents for the presidency, his unifying example, his balancing of different views, and his efforts to prevent the young country from being dragged into a war with the British or the French. Read aloud and discuss Washington’s Thanksgiving Proclamation with the class.
- Discuss briefly the different visions held by Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton about the kind of work and lifestyle America should be.
- Share with students the different sympathies that Americans had toward Great Britain or France, and how George Washington and John Adams both insisted on staying out of the conflict for the good of the country.
- Explore the invention of the cotton gin, which occurred in 1793, four years into the new government under the Constitution. Explain the ideal cotton-growing climate in the Southern states and yet the laborious and slow work of separating cotton seeds from the cotton. Then show how Whitney’s gin worked and how it revolutionized the cotton industry. Cotton plantations quickly began to expand and revitalized the demand for slave labor that had been in general decline through many of the founding years.
- Explain how the plan for surveying and settling the Northwest Territory went into effect through the Northwest Ordinance. Highlight how the distribution of public lands through the township system along with an allotment for a public school were both unique in world history.
- Emphasize for students the great growth in population and industry during this decade, including further settlement westward and changing relationships between Native Americans and settlers.
- Consider how voting privileges expanded with the removal of property requirements, what was then a monumental development in self-government unique to America.
- Conclude the treatment of George Washington’s presidency with a discussion of the main ideas in his Farewell Address, especially his emphasis on religion, education, and upright moral conduct as essential to the success of the United States. Implied throughout is the necessity of reverence for the rule of law.
- Discuss John Adams’s presidency, beginning with a review of his contributions during the Revolution. Note with students how Adams had a hard act to follow and little of the respect, admiration, or mystique that Washington had possessed. Help students to understand Adams’s major accomplishments, including building a navy and navigating a neutral position with respect
to the French wars of revolution, not to mention following the precedents set by Washington, thus lending them greater permanence.

- Based on previous conversation about the competing views for the country (as put forward by Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton), trace the development of political parties during the Washington and Adams administrations, culminating in the election of 1800, during which the American people were deeply divided. The threat of civil unrest was high, and Jefferson’s defeat of Adams posed a risk that such unrest would overflow during the first attempt to transfer power. That the transfer of power was, however, entirely peaceful after twelve years of rule by one regime seemed to confirm the sturdiness of the Constitution and the prudence of those who governed for that first decade. Such transfers of power were extraordinarily rare up to that point in history.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS**

**Activity 1:** Have students draw depictions of life in the two different visions of America as argued for by Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson. Then have them present on what they drew and why.

**Activity 2:** Have students draw or construct a monument to a historical figure of their choosing from this lesson, including symbols that represent their accomplishments or virtues. Then have them present on what they drew and why.

**Assignment 1:** Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

**Assignment 2:** Have students draw a map of Washington, DC, making comparisons between what it was like originally and what it like nowadays. Consider having students add the new buildings and monuments to their maps over the course of their study of American history.

**FORMATIVE QUIZ 1**

Provide students with numbered papers. Using the “Review Sheets” in the Appendix, make statements and ask students if they are True or False. Have them draw ☑️ for “True” or ☐️ for “False” next to each number. Review as a class and talk through what makes each answer correct.
Lesson 2 — Prospects, Uncertainties, and War

1801–1815

6–7 classes

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about events during the presidencies of Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, including Americans’ conflict with the British in the War of 1812.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Teacher Texts

- Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1 Pages 100–118
- The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic Pages 120–132
- Westward Expansion Pages 7–9, 34–48

Trade Books

- A Picture Book of Thomas Jefferson
- A Picture Book of Dolley and James Madison
- Aboard the USS Constitution
- Our Flag Was Still There
- The Star-Spangled Banner
- The Battle of New Orleans

Online.Hillsdale.edu

- The Great American Story Lecture 6
- American Heritage Lectures 5 and 7

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography and Places

- Monticello
- Barbary Coast
- Louisiana Territory
- Washington, DC

Persons

- Thomas Jefferson
- Meriwether Lewis
- William Clark
- Sacagawea
- James Madison
- Francis Scott Key
- Andrew Jackson
Terms and Topics
Louisiana Purchase
Corps of Discovery
Barbary Pirates
impressment
War of 1812

USS Constitution
“The Defense of Ft. McHenry”
Battle of New Orleans

To Know by Heart
“The Star-Spangled Banner”

Timeline
1812–15 War of 1812

Images
Historical figures and events
Landscape pictures of geographic places featured in this lesson
Statue of Thomas Jefferson (Hillsdale College campus)
Jefferson Memorial
Images and uniforms of British and American officers and soldiers
Depictions of figures at various scenes and moments in battle
USS Constitution in Boston Harbor
Depictions of the Executive Mansion on fire
Depictions of the defense of Fort McHenry
Scenes from the Battle of New Orleans
Statue of James Madison (Hillsdale College campus)

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Biographies and the roles of Thomas Jefferson and James Madison
- Entries from the diaries of Meriwether Lewis and William Clark
- Dolley Madison fleeing the British with the portrait of George Washington
- The burning of Washington, DC, including the Executive Mansion
- The defense of Fort McHenry and the writing of “The Star-Spangled Banner”
- The Battle of New Orleans and how it occurred after a peace treaty had been signed—unbeknownst to the battle participants

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What was the impact of the Louisiana Purchase on America’s future?
- What was it like to travel with the Corps of Discovery Expedition?
- How did Sacagawea help Lewis and Clark?
- Why did Thomas Jefferson send the Navy to attack the Barbary Pirates?
- What did Congress and Thomas Jefferson outlaw in 1808?
- What was James Madison’s presidency like?
- Why did America fight the British in the War of 1812?
- What happened in the Battle of Lake Erie?
- What happened to Washington, DC during the War of 1812?
- What happened in the Battle of New Orleans?
- What happened at the end of the War of 1812?
- Questions from the US Civics Test:
  - Question 87: Thomas Jefferson is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 88: James Madison is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 90: What territory did the United States buy from France in 1803?
  - Question 91: Name one war fought by the United States in the 1800s.
  - Question 123: What is the name of the national anthem?

**KEYS TO THE LESSON**

Changes in power had been historically tumultuous. How would the young United States handle its own change in who was in charge? And perhaps even more importantly, how would those making those changes behave? It turned out that Thomas Jefferson the president ended up being far less revolutionary than Thomas Jefferson the thinker and party leader. His policies were relatively moderate and even tended in the direction of Federalist positions. Yet challenges remained, particularly during the years of the Napoleonic Wars, culminating with the War of 1812 under James Madison. But even when the young nation made serious mistakes, somehow America seemed to emerge the better for it.

Teachers might best plan and teach Prospects, Uncertainties, and War with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Begin the lesson with a review of Thomas Jefferson’s childhood and biography. Like so many of his contemporary American Founders and statesmen, Jefferson had an exceptional mind with many interests and plenty of practical political skill. Of particular note is his storied career as a political thinker and statesman, his devotion to education, and the contradiction between his private efforts and statements against slavery and his continued ownership of slaves at Monticello.
- Explore with students how Thomas Jefferson used his power in more ways than many thought he would, including himself. The almost unilateral Louisiana Purchase and the military expedition against the Barbary pirates in the Mediterranean are two examples.
- Tell students the stories of the Corps of Discovery Expedition through the Louisiana Territory. Be sure to show plenty of drawings and maps from Meriwether Lewis and William Clark’s sketchbooks. Use this opportunity to review geography material as the Corps traveled westward.
- Discuss the continued menace of the Napoleonic Wars and Americans’ attempts to trade with both the French and the British. Illustrate clearly for students why impressment of American sailors was such an affront.
- Conclude the Jefferson administration by noting how Thomas Jefferson cemented the two-term limit tradition for presidents by following Washington’s example. In the last year of his presidency, Jefferson also signed into law in 1808 the abolition of the international slave trade, the earliest moment the Constitution allowed for it to be abolished.
- Introduce James Madison with a review of his biography and his role in the Constitutional Convention and ratification debates. From this background students should not be surprised that he had become president, just as many Americans at the time had likewise been unsurprised. The entirety of Madison’s presidency, however, would be absorbed with British aggression and an outright war.
Tell the stories of Tecumseh’s attempts to unite Native Americans east of the Mississippi River against American settlers and Tecumseh’s defeat at the Battle of Tippecanoe by forces under William Henry Harrison. The internal divisions over whether to defy a more powerful enemy or to capitulate were present within many Native American tribes in their responses to settlers and the United States government.

Teach the major battles of the War of 1812 with some detail, focusing on the story and its drama. These might include the frontier nature of fighting around the Great Lakes, the Americans’ actual attempt to conquer Canada, the American naval victories on inland lakes such as that of Commodore Oliver Perry in the Battle of Lake Erie, the British invasion of Washington, and the writing of “The Star-Spangled Banner.”

Note the great division between New England and the rest of the country in the War of 1812. In addition to secession talks, some New England states and New York actively supplied the British through trade for much of the war.

Conclude this lesson with the Battle of New Orleans, which technically occurred after peace had been agreed to. Note the diverse and ragtag army under Andrew Jackson’s command and their utter decimation of the regular British forces, including three generals. The Battle of New Orleans left Americans with a sense of triumph and pride from a war that had largely lacked such decisive victories, and which had included several embarrassing defeats and policy failures. The war would be the last major conflict with a foreign power that America would fight on its own soil.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS**

**Activity 1:** Find pictures that represent five different scenes from this lesson. Print off enough images for each group of five students to have a set. Give each student in the group a different picture (all groups will have the same five pictures). Have the students arrange the pictures in the order that those events occurred. Once the students have figured out the correct order of events, have students line up in order and go over the order of events as a class. Conclude the activity by asking students how they knew what event the picture was portraying. Ask students how they remembered the order of events/what they did to figure out the correct order. If there are groups that did not figure out the correct order, ask those students questions in order to move them to the correct sequence.

**Activity 2:** Have students make their own sketches of photographs of animals that the Corps of Discovery had documented. Make reference to the journal sketches of Meriwether Lewis and William Clark to imitate style and layout. Encourage students to be accurate and pay close attention to details, color, and proportion.

**Activity 3:** Have students draw or construct a monument to a historical figure of their choosing from the War of 1812, including symbols that represent their accomplishments or virtues. Then have them present on what they drew and why.
Assignment 1: Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

Assignment 2: Have students learn by heart and recite the first stanza to the poem “The Defense of Fort McHenry.”
Lesson 3 — The American Way

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the Era of Good Feelings under James Monroe, the rivalry between John Quincy Adams and Andrew Jackson, and continued American expansion.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Teacher Texts
- The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic, Pages 133–138
- Westward Expansion

Trade Books & Novels
- If You Lived When There Was Slavery in America
- Sequoyah
- The Amazing Impossible Erie Canal
- Steam, Smoke, and Steel
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- The Great American Story, Lectures 7 and 8
- American Heritage, Lecture 5

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography and Places
- Mexico
- Texas
- Deep South
- Missouri

Persons
- James Monroe
- John Quincy Adams
- Stephen F. Austin
- Andrew Jackson
- William Lloyd Garrison
Terms and Topics

“Era of Good Feelings”  
immigration  
Erie Canal  
railroad  
steamship  
Second Great Awakening  
slave trade  
cotton gin  
Missouri Compromise  
Monroe Doctrine

Timeline

1820  
Missouri Compromise

Images

Historical figures and events  
Landscape pictures of geographic places featured in this lesson  
First versions of inventions from this time period, such as steamboats and railroad  
The Erie Canal  
Photos of cotton plantations today  
Depictions of life as a slave  
Depictions of the Second Great Awakening gatherings and revival scenes  
Maps of Mexico and Texas

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Biographies and the roles of John Quincy Adams and Andrew Jackson  
- The deaths of Thomas Jefferson and John Adams on July 4, 1826  
- Andrew Jackson’s many duels, rivalries, feats, and accomplishments, before he became president  
- Margaret Bayard Smith’s account of the inauguration of Andrew Jackson

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- From where did many immigrants come during the 1820s and 1830s?  
- What happened in the Second Great Awakening?  
- What was society and life like in the South?  
- What was life like for slaves during the early nineteenth century?  
- Why did the cotton gin increase the demand for slaves?  
- What did the Missouri Compromise do?  
- How were parts of Texas first settled by Americans?  
- What did the Monroe Doctrine say?  
- What were Adams-Jackson campaigns like?  
- Why did Andrew Jackson promote the common man?  
- Question from the US Civics Test:  
  - Question 118: Name one example of an American innovation.

KEYS TO THE LESSON

The “Era of Good Feelings” that followed the War of 1812—complete with prosperity at home and peace abroad—permitted America to develop further its unique potential. As America “grew up” its version of
democracy became clearer. Perhaps no individual channeled or seemed to embody this democratic spirit of the time and the stake of the common man more fully than Andrew Jackson.

Teachers might best plan and teach The American Way with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Teach students about the background and biography of James Monroe, whose accomplishments prior to his becoming president were already storied and remarkable, and the impressive streak of Virginian presidents—sometimes called the “Virginia Dynasty.”
- Note the beginning of one of the first great immigration waves of the nineteenth century. With Europe in shambles following the Napoleonic Wars, European immigrants found new security, personal ownership of land, and opportunity in America, with half settling in New York and Philadelphia, while the other half settled in what is now the Midwest.
- Explore with students the great changes in technology and transportation during the 1820s and 1830s, including canals, the railroad, the steamboat, and advances in agriculture, including how these changes actually worked and what their effects were.
- Review the effects of the cotton gin on the practice of slavery in slaveholding states, and the economic value of slavery and the domestic slave trade. Greater percentages of slaves were also shifted decisively into manual field work. Even as the free-state/slave-state balance was maintained, the country was gradually losing the argument of many antislavery Founders, in whose view slavery was to be kept on the path to extinction as a temporary evil destined for its own ruin.
- Provide students with insights into Southern culture and society. Give an overview of Southern socioeconomic demography. Be sure to address the planter class—including the variety of estate sizes within the planter class—the free subsistence farmers, enslaved African Americans, etc. Spend some time on the life of slaves and the culture that emerged among slaves; include reading specific slave narratives. *Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition*, Volume 1’s treatment of these themes on pages 151–158 is an excellent aid in these discussions.
- Present the question over Missouri’s admission as a state as the first major reemergence of the slavery issue after the founding and a mark of the growing divide in America in the post–cotton gin era. It was clear from this fierce debate, which involved talks of secession, that the hopes of many Founders that slavery would resolve itself organically were no longer tenable with the invention of the cotton gin, and that the deepest of America’s divisions could not be ignored forever. As the elderly Thomas Jefferson noted at the time, the crisis over Missouri could be the death knell of the Union. Even though conflict would be postponed forty years, the temporary peace acquired by the Missouri Compromise would leave the problem of slavery to haunt America for those four decades.
- Discuss the settlement of Texas by Stephen Austin and other Americans during the 1820s, for the emergence of this American outpost within New Spain and then in Mexico would be consequential for events of subsequent decades.
- Talk briefly about the Monroe Doctrine, including how unrealistic and yet still successful it was.
- Review with students Andrew Jackson’s childhood and biography prior to becoming president.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS**

**Activity 1:** Have students choose a mode of transportation pioneered during this era, draw a scene of it in use, and present what they depicted to the class.
**Activity 2:** Have students draw scenes of daily life in the South, including those of small farmers, slaves, and plantation owners.

**Assignment 1:** Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

**Formative Quiz 2**

Provide students with numbered papers. Using the “Review Sheets” in the Appendix, make statements and ask students if they are True or False. Have them draw 😊 for “True” or ☹️ for “False” next to each number. Review as a class and talk through what makes each answer correct.
Lesson 4 — Manifest Destiny

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the presidency of Andrew Jackson, the Mexican-American War, and expansion to the Pacific Ocean under the banner of “manifest destiny.”

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Teacher Texts

*Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1*
Pages 127–131, 138–150, 158–168

*The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic*
Pages 138–151

*Westward Expansion*
Pages 15–19, 23–26, 54–62, 66–109, 114–123

Trade Books

*If You Traveled West in a Covered Wagon*

*Going West*

*Minnow and Rose*

*If You Traveled on the Underground Railroad*
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*The Great American Story*
Lectures 7, 8, and 9

*American Heritage*
Lectures 5, 6, and 7

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography and Places

- Republic of Texas
- Oregon Country

Persons

- Sam Houston
- Antonio López de Santa Anna
- Davy Crockett
- Frederick Douglass
- Harriet Tubman
- Abraham Lincoln
Terms and Topics
- Nat Turner Rebellion
- Nullification Crisis
- Trail of Tears
- The Alamo
- abolitionism
- Underground Railroad
- manifest destiny
- Mexican-American War

To Know by Heart
“Knowledge makes a man unfit to be a slave.” —Frederick Douglass
“Frederick Douglass” —Robert Hayden

Timeline
- 1846–48 Mexican-American War

Images
- Historical figures and events
- First flags of Texas
- Uniforms and munitions of soldiers in the Mexican-American War
- Relevant forts

Stories for the American Heart
- Frederick Douglass’s stories of his time as a slave and his escape
- The Battle of the Alamo
- Accounts of traveling the Oregon Trail
- John Quincy Adams suffering a stroke at his desk in the House of Representatives, and subsequent death in the Speaker’s Room

Questions for the American Mind
- What happened on the Trail of Tears?
- How did the Texas Revolution come about?
- What happened at the Alamo?
- Why did the Texans want to become part of the United States?
- In which ways did abolitionists work to abolish slavery?
- How did the Underground Railroad work?
- What was the idea of “manifest destiny”?
- Why did people want to go west to the Oregon Country?
- How did the Mexican-American War begin?
- Why did the Americans win the Mexican-American War?
- What did America get by winning the Mexican-American War?
- Questions from the US Civics Test:
  - Question 91: Name one war fought by the United States in the 1800s.
  - Question 117: Name one American Indian tribe in the United States.
KEYS TO THE LESSON

In the 1830s and 1840s, a spirit of optimistic expansion imbued American politics, eventually termed America’s “manifest destiny” to settle from coast to coast. Confidence in the benefits of American freedom and self-government, coupled with other motivations and seemingly endless opportunities for expansion, fueled this spirit. Expansion, however, often involved displacing Native Americans in ways that lacked honor or justice. At America’s then-southwestern border, Americans who had settled in Texas were fighting their own revolution against Mexico. The resulting Republic of Texas and its potential admission to the Union stalked the next decade of American politics, as the slavery question lurked over all other debates. The Texas question came to a head with the Mexican-American War, the consequences of which would re-ignite the slavery debate and drive the nation toward civil strife.

Teachers might best plan and teach Manifest Destiny with emphasis on the following approaches:

- When teaching about Andrew Jackson and his presidency, consider with students the theme of his democratic appeal, namely in favor of the common man. At its heart, this meant a faith in the rightness of the views of the common man and the defense of his station in life against larger commercial interests. In short, the Jeffersonian view of America began to push back against the Hamiltonian view.
- Teach about Nat Turner’s revolt and the hardening of the slaveholding position during the 1830s and 1840s.
- Talk about the growing North-South divide, over both slavery and economics, such as the 1833 Nullification Crisis over the tariff.
- Tell the story of the treaties made after the passage of the Indian Removal Act and the removal of Native Americans who disagreed with the treaties, especially their treatment and suffering on the Trail of Tears. Land of Hope’s treatment of this topic on pages 115–117 is very good. The general treatment of Native Americans is a bitter and sad part of America’s history, and unfortunately one that may have been better if the view of the human person laid out in the Declaration of Independence had been more consistently referenced in relationships with the indigenous population. Additionally, spend time teaching about efforts to maintain Native American heritage, such as how Sequoyah and the Cherokee sought to preserve their culture.
- Share the stories of the Texas Revolution, including the Alamo, Texas’s subsequent efforts to join the United States, and the effects of the Texas question on American political issues, such as slavery.
- Discuss the immigration waves from Ireland and Germany during the 1840s, where most of the people settled first in New York and New England. Also discuss the growing reform efforts in the areas of temperance, women’s political participation, and especially abolitionism.
- Introduce and discuss the idea of “manifest destiny” with students. Land of Hope’s treatment of this topic on pages 154–155 is especially helpful. In brief, manifest destiny involved many different dimensions, some of which were noble; others less so. Even then, the meaning of this expression in the minds of different people varied greatly. The common point is that many Americans believed—based on the situation at the time—that America was destined to reach from coast to coast across a comparably sparsely populated wilderness, and to do great things for freedom, human flourishing, and individuals in the process. This was the sentiment that influenced many decisions during the 1830s and 1840s.
Present the less-than-honorable origins and intentions behind the Mexican-American War within the contexts of the annexation of Texas, manifest destiny, the consequences of expansion for the slave-state/free-state balance of power, and the resistance to the war by figures such as Abraham Lincoln and Henry David Thoreau.

Teach the Mexican-American War with a pace that captures the swiftness with which it was fought and concluded. As with any conflict, draw attention to the key contributions of both leaders and common soldiers in the war. Of special interest in teaching this war is foreshadowing the many soldiers who would rise to famous generalships during the Civil War a dozen years later. Finally, conclude with how the war’s outcome effected American territory.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS**

**Activity 1:** Have students draw a depiction of pioneers heading to the Oregon Country. Then have them present and answer questions about what they drew.

**Assignment 1:** Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).
APPENDIX A

Talk about History

Review Sheets

Tests

Writing Assignment
TALK ABOUT HISTORY

Student Name: __________________________ Due: ______________
Story/Lesson from History: ____________________________________________________________

1. Who/what did you learn about in history class today?
   Student Answer: ____________________________________________________________

2. Who were the most important characters in the story?
   Student Answer: ____________________________________________________________

3. Tell me more about one of those characters.
   Student Answer: ____________________________________________________________

4. Tell me about the most exciting/interesting part of the story today.
   Student Answer: ____________________________________________________________

Parent Signature: __________________________ Date: ______________

TALK ABOUT HISTORY

Student Name: __________________________ Due: ______________
Story/Lesson from History: ____________________________________________________________

1. Who/what did you learn about in history class today?
   Student Answer: ____________________________________________________________

2. Who were the most important characters in the story?
   Student Answer: ____________________________________________________________

3. Tell me more about one of those characters.
   Student Answer: ____________________________________________________________

4. Tell me about the most exciting/interesting part of the story today.
   Student Answer: ____________________________________________________________

Parent Signature: __________________________ Date: ______________
History Assessment and Review in Grades K–2

REVIEWING AND STUDYING

One-page Review Sheets are included in the following materials. Teachers are encouraged to review items on these sheets with students in the days leading up to an assessment. Between reviewing at the beginning of each class period and this review based on the Review Sheets, students should not need to do any additional studying or review. Review Sheets may be sent home, however, if parents wish to review with their students at home.

ASSESSMENT

The method for assessing students on history in grades K-2 depends on the grade level and student ability.

For students who cannot yet read and write:

Option 1: Choose several items from the Review Sheet to ask each student orally. This may be done in private with the same questions while students complete another activity, or it may be administered aloud with the entire class, varying questions for each student.

Option 2: Create a test with images for matching or identifying terms and topics. Read aloud a description or explanation of a Person, Term, Topic, or Story to the whole class and have each student circle or place a number/letter next to the corresponding image on their test. For the Questions, read aloud a statement that would answer the question and ask students if it is True or False. Have them draw ☑ for “True” or ☐ for “False” next to each statement.

For students who can read and write:

Teachers may administer the tests included in the following materials. It is recommended, especially early in a school year, to have each student complete the test individually, but with the class proceeding together from question to question, each being read aloud by the teacher.
Unit 3 | Test 1 — Review Sheet

Lesson 1 | The New Government
Lesson 2 | Prospects, Uncertainties, and War

Test on ____________

DATES: When did ______________ occur?

1812–1815 War of 1812

PERSONS: Tell me who ______________ was and what he/she did.

George Washington  Thomas Jefferson  James Madison
John Adams  Alexander Hamilton  Francis Scott Key

TERMS AND TOPICS: Tell me what ______________ is/are/was/were and why we learned about it.

Mount Vernon  cotton gin  USS Constitution
Executive Mansion  Louisiana Purchase  Battle of New Orleans
Northwest Territory  Corps of Discovery
Bill of Rights  Barbary Pirates
Father of Our Country  impressment

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART: Tell me the story of...

 George Washington's travels to New York City for his inauguration
 The ebb and flow of the friendship between John Adams and Thomas Jefferson
 Dolley Madison fleeing the British with the portrait of George Washington
 The burning of Washington, DC, including the Executive Mansion

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND: Tell me...

☐ What Alexander Hamilton’s vision was of the kind of country America should become.
☐ What Thomas Jefferson’s vision was of the kind of country America should become.
☐ Why it was hard for America not to get into the war between Great Britain and France.
☐ What the cotton gin did.
☐ What George Washington said about learning and doing the right thing.
☐ Why John Adams had a hard time as president.
☐ Why as the election of 1800 was called the “revolution of 1800.”
☐ What it was like to travel with the Corps of Discovery Expedition.
☐ How Sacagawea helped Lewis and Clark.
☐ Why Thomas Jefferson sent the Navy to attack the Barbary Pirates.
☐ Why America fought the British in the War of 1812.
☐ What happened in the Battle of Lake Erie.
☐ What happened in the Battle of New Orleans.
Unit 3 | Test 1 — The Early Republic

Lesson 1 | The New Government
Lesson 2 | Prospects, Uncertainties, and War

DATES: Circle the dates of the War of 1812.

A. 1800–1812  B. 1812–1815  C. 1812–1820

PERSONS: Match the person to who he/she was or what he/she did.

A. Francis Scott Key  B. George Washington  C. Thomas Jefferson

1. ________ America’s first president who kept the country united and out of war.

2. ________ President who purchased the Louisiana Territory from France.

3. ________ Wrote “The Defense of Fort McHenry,” also called “The Star-Spangled Banner.”

TERMS AND TOPICS: Match the term to the correct definition, description, or explanation.

A. Battle of New Orleans  B. Bill of Rights  C. Corps of Discovery  D. impressment  E. Monticello  F. Washington, DC

4. ________ America’s third and final capital city, named after “The Father of Our Country.”

5. ________ The list of protected freedoms (like religion and speech) added to the Constitution.

6. ________ The country home of President Thomas Jefferson.

7. ________ The group of explorers and scientists who explored the Louisiana Territory.

8. ________ When the British forced American sailors to serve in their navy, causing the War of 1812.

9. ________ A victory over the British which established America’s power in North America.
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART: Tell me the story of the friendship between John Adams and Thomas Jefferson.

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

10. Tell me what Thomas Jefferson’s vision was of the kind of country America should become.

11. Tell me what George Washington said about learning and doing the right thing.

12. Tell me why John Adams had a hard time as president.

13. Tell me what it was like to travel with the Corps of Discovery Expedition.

14. Tell me why Thomas Jefferson sent the Navy to attack the Barbary Pirates.
Unit 3 | Test 2 — Review Sheet

Lesson 3 | The American Way
Lesson 4 | Manifest Destiny

DATES: When did ________________ occur?

1846–48  Mexican-American War

PERSONS: Tell me who ________________ was and what he/she did.

James Monroe  Stephen F. Austin  Frederick Douglass
Andrew Jackson  Davy Crockett  Harriet Tubman

TERMS AND TOPICS: Tell me what ________________ is/are/was/were and why we learned about it.

Mexico  cotton gin  Nat Turner Rebellion  Underground Railroad
Texas  Missouri Compromise  Trail of Tears  manifest destiny
Deep South  Monroe Doctrine  The Alamo  Mexican-American War
steamship  Oregon Country  abolitionism

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART: Tell me the story of...

▪ The biography and presidency of Andrew Jackson
▪ Accounts of the inauguration of Andrew Jackson
▪ Frederick Douglass’s stories of his time as a slave and his escape
▪ The Battle of the Alamo

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND: Tell me...

☐ Where many immigrants came from during the 1820s and 1830s.
☐ What society and life was like in the South.
☐ What life was like for slaves.
☐ Why the cotton gin increased demand for slave labor.
☐ What the Missouri Compromise said.
☐ Why Andrew Jackson wanted to help the common man.
☐ What happened on the Trail of Tears.
☐ Why Texans wanted to become part of the United States.
☐ How the Underground Railroad worked.
☐ Why people wanted to go west to the Oregon Country.
☐ How the Mexican-American War began.
Unit 3 | Test 2 — The Early Republic

Lesson 3 | The American Way
Lesson 4 | Manifest Destiny

DATES: Circle the dates of the Mexican-American War.

PERSONS: Match the person to who he/she was or what he/she did.
A. Davy Crockett  B. Harriet Tubman  C. Frederick Douglass
1. ________An explorer, Congressman, and Texas pioneer who was killed at the Alamo.
2. ________An escaped slave who became a leading abolitionist and speaker.
3. ________An escaped slave who helped other slaves flee to freedom on the Underground Railroad.

TERMS AND TOPICS: Match the term to the correct definition, description, or explanation.
A. abolitionism  C. Missouri Compromise  E. steamship
B. Deep South  D. Nat Turner Rebellion  F. The Alamo
4. ________The part of the United States that had many cotton plantations.
5. ________This invention allowed people and goods to travel by water without wind, sails, or oars.
6. ________An agreement that tried to solve peacefully America’s division over slavery.
7. ________An armed uprising of slaves against their owners and others in Virginia.
8. ________Where the Mexican army defeated and killed Texan soldiers who refused to surrender.
9. ________Efforts made by Americans in the North to end slavery.
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART: Tell me the story of Andrew Jackson.

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

10. Tell me what society and life was like in the South.

11. Tell me why Andrew Jackson wanted to help the common man.

12. Tell me how the Underground Railroad worked.

13. Tell me why people wanted to go west to the Oregon Country.

14. Tell me how the Mexican-American War began.
Writing Assignment — The Early Republic

Unit 3

Due on _____________

Why did some people want slavery to continue?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

How did some people work to stop slavery?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX B

Primary Source

George Washington
PRESIDENT GEORGE WASHINGTON

A Proclamation

PROCLAMATION

October 3, 1789

Federal Hall | New York City, New York

Thanksgiving Proclamation

BACKGROUND

In response to a joint resolution of Congress, President George Washington issued this proclamation.

ANNOTATIONS

By the President of the United States of America, a Proclamation.

Whereas it is the duty of all Nations to acknowledge the providence of Almighty God, to obey his will, to be grateful for his benefits, and humbly to implore his protection and favor—and whereas both Houses of Congress have by their joint Committee requested me “to recommend to the People of the United States a day of public thanksgiving and prayer to be observed by acknowledging with grateful hearts the many signal favors of Almighty God especially by affording them an opportunity peaceably to establish a form of government for their safety and happiness.”

Now therefore I do recommend and assign Thursday the 26th day of November next to be devoted by the People of these States to the service of that great and glorious Being, who is the beneficent Author of all the good that was, that is, or that will be—That we may then all unite in rendering unto him our sincere and humble thanks—for his kind care and protection of the People of this Country previous to their becoming a Nation—for the signal and manifold mercies, and the favorable interpositions of his Providence which we experienced in the course and conclusion of the late war—for the great degree of tranquility,

---

union, and plenty, which we have since enjoyed—for the peaceable and rational manner, in which we have been enabled to establish constitutions of government for our safety and happiness, and particularly the national One now lately instituted—for the civil and religious liberty with which we are blessed; and the means we have of acquiring and diffusing useful knowledge; and in general for all the great and various favors which he hath been pleased to confer upon us.

And also that we may then unite in most humbly offering our prayers and supplications to the great Lord and Ruler of Nations and beseech him to pardon our national and other transgressions—to enable us all, whether in public or private stations, to perform our several and relative duties properly and punctually—to render our national government a blessing to all the people, by constantly being a Government of wise, just, and constitutional laws, discreetly and faithfully executed and obeyed—to protect and guide all Sovereigns and Nations (especially such as have shewn kindness unto us) and to bless them with good government, peace, and concord—To promote the knowledge and practice of true religion and virtue, and the increase of science among them and us—and generally to grant unto all Mankind such a degree of temporal prosperity as he alone knows to be best.

Given under my hand at the City of New-York the third day of October in the year of our Lord 1789.

George Washington
UNIT 4
The American Civil War
1848–1877

UNIT PREVIEW

Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LESSON 1</th>
<th>1848–1854</th>
<th>The Expansion of Slavery</th>
<th>9–10 classes</th>
<th>p. 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LESSON 2</td>
<td>1854–1861</td>
<td>Toward Civil War</td>
<td>7–8 classes</td>
<td>p. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESSON 3</td>
<td>1861–1865</td>
<td>The Civil War</td>
<td>9–10 classes</td>
<td>p. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESSON 4</td>
<td>1865–1877</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>4–5 classes</td>
<td>p. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX A</td>
<td>Talk about History, Review Sheets, Tests, Writing Assignment</td>
<td>p. 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX B</td>
<td>Primary Source</td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why Teach the American Civil War

“Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent, a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure.”

These famous opening lines from President Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg express why the Civil War was fought. Whether America, founded in liberty and equality, could long endure depended on whether the nation’s original contradiction, slavery, could be abolished while still preserving the country’s existence as a union. American students must know how the ideas at the heart of their country were undermined by slavery; but they must also learn how heroic Americans committed to America’s founding ideas made...
great sacrifices and sometimes gave their lives, so that these ideas of liberty and equality might prevail over
the dehumanizing tyranny of slavery. And students must learn that, like those in Lincoln's audience, it is
up to each American to oppose tyranny and dehumanization to ensure that “government of the people, by
the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.”

Enduring Ideas from this Unit

1. That slavery was the original contradiction in America, and that slavery is immoral, unjust,
dehumanizing, and in violation of the inherent dignity and equal possession of natural rights of each
person, as are any ways in which one person or group of people is favored over another due to the
color of their skin.
2. That at its heart, the Civil War was fought over the issue of slavery: first, whether slavery would
expand in America; next, whether it would be permitted at all; and last, whether the half of the
country that opposed slavery would let the country be divided and the
injustice to continue elsewhere, instead of fighting to preserve a union that would guarantee liberty
and abolish slavery.
3. That President Abraham Lincoln exemplified American statesmanship as he piloted the nation
toward fulfillment of its founding ideas, ended the barbarous and tyrannical institution of slavery, and
nevertheless abided by the rule of law in doing so.
4. That the period of Reconstruction following the Civil War witnessed a realization of civil rights for
freedmen, producing greater degrees of justice and equality that would nevertheless be challenged
both during Reconstruction and in following decades.

What Teachers Should Consider

The American Civil War is one of the most important events in American history if only for its attempt to
prove, with the blood of hundreds of thousands of Americans, that a people may freely govern themselves
and organize themselves to preserve the liberty and equal natural rights of all.

Many students may not know that America was founded on these ideas. Fewer, perhaps, know that America
even succeeded in proving these ideas true, striving to live up to them for twenty years, before such progress
was eclipsed after Reconstruction. Although subsequent decades would manifest different kinds of failures
to guarantee the equal protection of natural rights in certain parts of the country, the Civil War
demonstrated that some statesmen and a considerable portion of Americans were committed to carrying
out America’s founding promise to the point of bloodshed.

Teachers will greatly benefit from studying not only the war itself but also the thoughts, words, and deeds
of the statesman who conducted the war for the Union: President Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln’s ideas and
speeches, and his political actions, should constitute for students a model of prudence, both in the public
arena and in their own lives. His understanding of the issue of slavery, not merely in the abstract but as it
existed in America, can teach students much about their country and its history.
This unit should begin, therefore, with an understanding of slavery as it was found in America in 1848. The teacher should especially emphasize the changes in the status and practice of slavery since the founding in 1776. The teacher should also emphasize changes in legal and public opinion toward the institution since the Constitution went into effect in 1789. In brief, both had entrenched slavery instead of keeping it on the gradual path to extinction, where the founding generation had arguably placed it.

Abraham Lincoln saw these legal and public opinion shifts most clearly, and he saw that such changes struck directly at the ideas on which America was founded. In brief, his entire public career as well as the founding of the Republican Party were devoted to checking this change, to returning slavery to the path of extinction, and to fulfilling the founding ideas of constitutional self-government. Lincoln’s arguments to these ends dominate the crescendo leading to war in spring of 1861. At its heart, this is what the Civil War was about.

The teacher will be able to enrich his or her students by cultivating their imaginations with the events, battles, and images of the Civil War, the bloodiest conflict in which Americans have ever been involved. Strategy, battles, and the general history of the war should be taught in detail. The teacher should learn and share accounts and images of the important moments and figures who contributed to Union victory in 1865. Meanwhile, Lincoln’s careful yet effective maneuverings—both to preserve the Union and to seize the constitutional opportunity afforded him to emancipate the slaves—should be followed in detail.

The unit best concludes with a study of the period known as Reconstruction. Perhaps never in history was so much hoped for, achieved, and mismanaged in so short a period of time with respect to liberty and equality under the law. Students should learn to appreciate both the sacrifices of the Civil War and its immediate achievements during Reconstruction. Nevertheless, students should also learn about the emergence of different kinds of injustice, especially for African Americans living in the former rebel states: injustices that would be perpetuated for a century.

How Teachers Can Learn More

TEXTS

*Land of Hope*, Wilfred McClay
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*The Great American Story*
Lesson Planning Resources

TEACHER RESOURCES

*Land of Hope Young Reader's Edition*, Wilfred McClay
*The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic*, H.A. Guerber
*The Civil War and Reconstruction*, Anne Goudvis and Stephanie Harvey
*Fields of Fury*, James McPherson

TRADE BOOKS

*The Listeners*, Gloria Whelan
*Follow the Drinking Gourd*, Jeanette Winter
*A Picture Book of Harriet Tubman*, David Adler
*A Picture Book of Frederick Douglass*, David Adler
*The Last Brother*, Trinka Hakes Noble
*Abraham Lincoln*, Ingri and Edgar Parin d'Aulaire
*A Picture Book of Abraham Lincoln*, David Adler
*The Gettysburg Address*, Michael McCurdy
*The Lincoln Memorial*, Mary Firestone

PRIMARY SOURCES

Gettysburg Address, Abraham Lincoln
LESSON PLANS,
ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS,
AND FORMATIVE QUIZZES
Lesson 1 — The Expansion of Slavery

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn how the defenders of slavery began to assert that slavery was a “positive good” that ought to be expanded throughout the country instead of an existing evil that should be contained and kept on the path to extinction, and about the efforts of abolitionists to resist slavery.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Teacher Texts
- *Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition* Chapters 19 and 20
- *The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic* Pages 150–159

Trade Books
- *The Listeners*
- *Follow the Drinking Gourd*
- *A Picture Book of Harriet Tubman*
- *A Picture Book of Frederick Douglass*
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- *The Great American Story* Lecture 9
- *Civil Rights in American History* Lecture 3

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places

- California
- Kansas-Nebraska Territory

Persons

- Frederick Douglass
- Harriet Beecher Stowe
- Harriet Tubman
- Abraham Lincoln
- Stephen Douglas
Terms and Topics

King Cotton
antebellum
Gold Rush
secession
abolitionism
Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass
Uncle Tom’s Cabin
Underground Railroad
popular sovereignty

To Know by Heart

“Knowledge makes a man unfit to be a slave.” — Frederick Douglass
“Frederick Douglass” — Robert Hayden
“So you’re the little woman who wrote the book that started this great war.” — Abraham Lincoln to Harriet Beecher Stowe upon their meeting

Dates
1849 California Gold Rush

Images
Historical figures and events
Grade-level appropriate depictions of the life of slaves and the horrors of slavery
Maps of the free versus slave-state breakdown when changes occur
Pictures of first-edition copies of Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass and Uncle Tom’s Cabin
Statue of Frederick Douglass (on the Hillsdale College campus)

Stories for the American Heart

- Biographies and the roles of Frederick Douglass, Harriet Tubman, and Abraham Lincoln prior to the Civil War
- Childhood biography of Abraham Lincoln
- Grade-level appropriate scenes from Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass and Uncle Tom’s Cabin
- Actions of Harriet Tubman and the Underground Railroad

Questions for the American Mind

- Even though many wanted to abolish slavery, why did many leading Founders think that permitting slavery and keeping the Americans united would be the only way eventually to get rid of slavery?
- How did the Founders restrict slavery at the founding more than it had ever been before?
- How can we judge the actions of some Founders who expressed their belief that slavery was wrong but did not free their slaves in their lifetimes?
- Why did the Founders expect that slavery would eventually die out on its own?
- What invention after the Founding made cotton more valuable and actually increased slavery, which ruined the Founders’ guess that slavery would end on its own?
- What was life like for slaves in the Southern states?
- Who was Frederick Douglass and what did he do?
How did Frederick Douglass show that slavery was evil?
Who were the abolitionists? What kinds of things did they do to try to end slavery?
Who was Harriet Tubman and what did she do?
Who was Harriet Beecher Stowe and what did her book, Uncle Tom’s Cabin, do?
How did the Underground Railroad work?
What did Northerners and Southerners argue about whenever a new state was going to be made?
Why did slave states want to expand the number of slave states in the western territories?
Was Abraham Lincoln for or against slavery? Why?
What was the idea of “popular sovereignty”?
Why did Abraham Lincoln believe “popular sovereignty” was wrong?

Question from the U.S. Civics Test:
- Question 75: What group of people was taken and sold as slaves?

Keys to the Lesson

The status of slavery in 1848 was markedly different than it was when the Founders crafted the Constitution in 1787. The gradual decline in the profitability of slavery, evident during the founding, was forecast to continue—but this trend reversed direction upon the invention of the cotton gin in 1793. From then on, the demand for slave labor in the Southern states rapidly compounded. But the free population in the South was vastly outstripped by the burgeoning population of the North. If nothing changed, demographics and geography would eventually give Americans living in the North the power to limit slavery through law and perhaps even abolish it entirely through a constitutional amendment. Slaveholders in the South needed to change this trajectory by expanding slavery westward into the territories. Students need to understand that to justify such expansion, slavery advocates in the South had to change the opinion of Northerners: either to believe slavery to be morally good or, at the very least, to view slavery as merely a matter of the will of the majority, what Stephen Douglas called “popular sovereignty.” Moral relativism, the idea that there is no “right” or “wrong” besides what the majority of people want, and a belief in unfettered democracy through the vote of the majority were the slaveholders’ pillars in arguing to preserve slavery. Students should understand that Abraham Lincoln favored government “of the people, by the people, and for the people” but also saw how just letting a vote of the majority decide whether slavery was good or evil violated equality, freedom, and human dignity. Lincoln went about waging an oratorical war in defense of objective standards of truth and justice, of good and evil. Students should also learn how abolitionists, of both African and European descent, continued to publicize the horrors of slavery for Americans in Northern states far removed from witnessing slavery firsthand. Abolitionists also shepherded escaped slaves to freedom in the Northern states and Canada.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Expansion of Slavery with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Review with students the status of slavery over the initial decades of the country’s history. At the founding, slavery was generally either openly condemned by those in the North or defended by those in the South. Its toleration by northern delegates and others who were opposed to slavery at the time of the founding was for the sake of a unity that even many abolitionists believed was the only eventual path toward abolition. The Declaration of Independence established the country on principles of equality that could and would be cited to demand the end of slavery, the Northwest Ordinance had prohibited the expansion of slavery, the Constitution refused to give legal standing to the institution, and many states had restricted or abolished slavery outright. Lastly, many
leading Founders, including those who held slaves, believed that the profitability of slavery was gradually but decisively waning and that slavery would die out on its own in a relatively short period of time. The invention of the cotton gin in 1793 by Eli Whitney, however, greatly increased the profitability of slavery and reignited slaveholders' interest in perpetuating and expanding slavery.

- Help students to imagine and understand the dehumanizing and brutal tyranny of slavery, emphasizing that the sheer fact that some people owned other human beings is and always will be morally reprehensible. Moreover, as Frederick Douglass argued, slavery actually dehumanized the master as well as the slave. Treat of this subject mindful of the degree of detail appropriate for the grade level.

- Demonstrate for students how the growth in population in the North compared to the South would eventually allow Northern states to restrict slavery further and perhaps even abolish it with a constitutional amendment. Slaveholders recognized that they had to expand the number of slave states if they were to prohibit such actions by Northerners.

- Show students how slavery actually weakened the South as a whole while supporting the lifestyle of the elite few. For all other Southerners, slavery lowered the value and wages of labor by non-slaves, limited innovation, and thwarted economic development in the South. The Civil War would reveal the weakness of the position in which Southerners’ insistence on slavery had placed them. A simple comparison of the Northern to the Southern economy, development, and society before and during the Civil War illustrates the case.

- Teach students how the slavery issue nearly resulted in civil war over the question of expanding slavery into the territories acquired from Mexico after the Mexican-American War, brought to a head when California, after a population surge during the California Gold Rush, applied to become a state without slavery. California’s lone admission as a free state would have increased Northern power in Congress and the Electoral College against Southern states on the issue of slavery.

- Explain how the Compromise of 1850 may have avoided war in the short term, but it only deepened and delayed the divisions tearing at the country over the next ten years. Focus especially on the effects of the Fugitive Slave Law, which compelled Northerners to assist in capturing escaped slaves and encouraged the practice of abducting free African Americans living in the North and forcing them into slavery.

- Teach students about the various parts of the abolitionist movement and its major figures. Students should learn that there was great diversity among abolitionists, especially in their underlying views about America’s governing principles and the best way to abolish slavery. For instance, William Lloyd Garrison actually agreed with the slaveholder reading of the Constitution while Frederick Douglass moved from this view to that of Abraham Lincoln that the Constitution was pro-freedom. One might read aloud with students some portions of Douglass’s Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass and discuss Harriet Beecher Stowe’s Uncle Tom’s Cabin, important works in making Northerners, most of whom had never seen slavery in practice, aware of its moral evil. Other abolitionists, such as Harriet Tubman and those running the Underground Railroad, heroically worked to lead escaped slaves to freedom. In general, most abolitionists appealed to the principles of equality stated in the Declaration of Independence in justifying their cause.

- Tell students the childhood and political biography of Abraham Lincoln, to show how he rose from poverty and obscurity to become arguably America’s greatest president.
• Help students understand the idea of popular sovereignty, that right and wrong amount to the mere will of the majority opinion, and how the Kansas-Nebraska Act and Stephen Douglas embraced this solution to the slavery question.

• Explain why Abraham Lincoln believed just letting the majority decide on slavery was dangerous. Students should understand that Lincoln saw slavery to be, above all, a moral question of right and wrong, of good and evil, that every American should care about. Lincoln also believed that leaving slavery to the vote of the majority was opposed to the ideas of the Declaration of Independence. In brief, students should understand that Lincoln believed America in the 1850s was allowing slavery to expand while the founding had tried to make sure slavery was on the path to being ended, and that the ideas of America were against slavery.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS**

**Activity 1:** Assign each student a state from the time period. Work through the history, adding states accordingly. Show how the balance of power was trending in the north’s favor and why the south found it politically necessary to expand slavery in order to protect slavery.

**Activity 2:** Have a mock election on an issue as simple as whether students in three rows should get extra recess time at the expense of the students in two rows. Of course, the result will be majority tyranny. Have students consider whether the majority is always right or if the majority should be able to do whatever it wants just because it is the majority. Help students understand that this was what popular sovereignty was arguing about slavery, except that slavery was one of the worst forms of majority tyranny.

**_assignment:** Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

**Assignment 2:** Have students draw and color a scene of their choice from the biographies of Frederick Douglass, Harriet Tubman, or Abraham Lincoln. Have students present briefly what they drew, the story behind it, and why they depicted it the way they did.

**FORMATIVE QUIZ 1**

Provide students with numbered papers. Using the “Review Sheets” in the Appendix, make statements and ask students if they are True or False. Have them draw ☑️ for “True” or ☐️ for “False” next to each number. Review as a class and talk through what makes each answer correct.
Lesson 2 — Toward Civil War

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn how Abraham Lincoln and the new Republican Party’s opposition to the expansion of slavery led Southern states to secede from the Union, resulting in civil war.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Teacher Texts

- Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition
- The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic
- The Civil War and Reconstruction

Trade Book

- Abraham Lincoln
- A Picture Book of Abraham Lincoln
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- The Great American Story
- Civil Rights in American History

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places

- Kansas-Nebraska Territory
- Fort Sumter

Persons

- Abraham Lincoln
- Frederick Douglass
- Stephen Douglas
- John Brown

Terms and Topics

- Bleeding Kansas
- “a house divided”
- popular sovereignty
- Democratic Party
- Republican Party
- Lincoln-Douglas Debates
- “don’t care”
- majority tyranny

To Know by Heart

“A house divided against itself cannot stand.” — Abraham Lincoln, paraphrasing from the words of Jesus of Nazareth in the Bible
Dates
April 12, 1861 Attack on Fort Sumter

Images
Historical figures and events
Depictions of the Lincoln-Douglas Debates
Campaign materials
Fort Sumter

Stories for the American Heart
- What the Lincoln-Douglas Debates were like
- The young girl who suggested to Abraham Lincoln that he grow a beard
- The first shots fired on Fort Sumter

Questions for the American Mind
- What was Bleeding Kansas like and why did it happen?
- What kind of person was Abraham Lincoln?
- What was Abraham Lincoln’s childhood like?
- How did Abraham Lincoln learn?
- Why did people create the Republican Party?
- Why did Abraham Lincoln worry that the Dred Scott v. Sandford decision would allow slavery anywhere in the country?
- Did Abraham Lincoln believe the founders created a country to protect slavery or to end slavery? Why did he think this?
- Why did Abraham Lincoln believe it was necessary to say that slavery was evil?
- Why did Abraham Lincoln say it was wrong to “not care” about whether people vote for slavery or not?
- What did Abraham Lincoln mean when he said that “a house divided against itself cannot stand?”
- How did Abraham Lincoln end up winning the 1860 election?
- What did Southern states do after Abraham Lincoln was elected?
- What did Abraham Lincoln mean when he wrote that the Declaration of Independence was like a golden apple and that the Constitution was a picture frame of silver?
- What did Abraham Lincoln do after he was elected but before Fort Sumter was attacked?
- What happened at Fort Sumter and how did Abraham Lincoln respond?
- What was the reason, at first, why the North fought the Civil War?
- How was slavery the real reason the Civil War was fought?
- Question from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 94: Abraham Lincoln is famous for many things. Name one.
The passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act in 1854 sparked the little-known Abraham Lincoln to redouble his efforts to engage in the growing national debate over slavery in America. He saw a tremendous threat in the argument put forward by the bill’s sponsor, Stephen Douglas, that slavery was not a moral question but rather one that should simply be decided by the will of the majority. From 1854 to the outbreak of the Civil War in 1861, Lincoln would combat the idea that the morality of slavery was to be determined merely by majority opinion. Students should come to see this arc to Lincoln’s words and deeds. They should understand how he took up and articulated the heart of the matter regarding the morality of slavery and that slavery struck at America’s founding idea that all men are created equal. Roger Taney’s majority opinion in *Dred Scott v. Sandford* interpreted the Constitution to legitimize slavery, and Lincoln argued against both popular sovereignty and Taney’s position throughout his debates with Douglas. The moral question regarding slavery, manifesting itself in the practical questions of the expansion of slavery, is what a civil war would be fought over. After all, the formal move to secession—a constitutionally debatable claim also at issue in the approach to war—and the war itself was triggered in response to Lincoln being elected president on the position that slavery was wrong and should not be expanded.

Teachers might best plan and teach Toward Civil War with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Emphasize the breakdown in civil dialogue in the several violent episodes related to slavery preceding the Civil War: Bleeding Kansas, Preston Brooks’s attack on Charles Sumner, and John Brown’s raid on the federal armory at Harpers Ferry. Go into some detail to bring these events alive for students.
- Clarify the party alignment that was emerging in 1854. The Democratic Party was dividing between those who favored the principle of “popular sovereignty,” in which a state or territory could vote to allow slavery or not, and those who explicitly favored slavery. Meanwhile, the Republican Party was founded in 1854 in opposition to laws encouraging the spread of slavery. The split of the Democratic Party and the consolidation of the Republican Party in 1860 assured the election of Lincoln and significantly contributed to the coming of the Civil War.
- Explain how Lincoln believed the Supreme Court was rejecting the Founders’ view on slavery and would lead, together with Stephen Douglas’s popular sovereignty, to the spread of slavery throughout the country.
- Help students think through Lincoln’s understanding of the evil of slavery and its relationship to the founding ideas of America: that all men are created equal, have unalienable rights, and that legitimate government is based on the consent of the governed. Students should see that the whole question of slavery depended on whether Americans believed slavery was good or evil.
- Tell students the stories of the Lincoln-Douglas Debates, presenting the settings and atmosphere as imaginatively as possible.
- Help students to understand the various pressures that were mounting on the Southern states during the 1850s, from increased abolitionist activities to the sheer industrial might of the Northern states to a burgeoning plantation debt as other countries produced more cotton and the price of cotton fell as a result.
- Tell students the stories of Lincoln’s speeches and his reception during these years, including the founding of the Republican Party and the various conventions in 1856 and especially 1860. Students should sense the drama of the times.
• Share with students the apple and frame metaphor that Lincoln used to describe the relationship between the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. Help students understand the arguments with respect to the American founding and slavery.
• Provide a clear overview of events between Lincoln’s election and South Carolina’s attack on Fort Sumter in Charleston Harbor. Students should learn both Lincoln and the South’s accounts of what happened.
• There were, of course, other factors and dimensions that impelled each side to fight the Civil War. Students should be familiar with these, as well as the view of most Southerners that the war was about defending what they saw as the rights of their states. This view and Lincoln’s counterview and incumbent duty to preserve the Union and Constitution may have been the occasion for the Civil War, but students should understand that the war was, at its heart, fought over whether slavery would be permitted to spread and so remain indefinitely, or be restricted and returned to the path to extinction on which the founding generation had left it. This question was, in turn, based on the morality of slavery, which Abraham Lincoln would later maintain in his Gettysburg Address was a question about the rejection or fulfillment of the ideas on which America was founded.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS**

**Activity 1:** Find pictures that represent five different scenes from this lesson. Print off enough images for each group of five students to have a set. Give each student in the group a different picture (all groups will have the same five pictures). Have the students arrange the pictures in the order that those events occurred. Once the students have figured out the correct order of events, have students line up in order and go over the order of events as a class. Conclude the activity by asking students how they knew what event the picture was portraying. Ask students how they remembered the order of events/what they did to figure out the correct order. If there are groups that did not figure out the correct order, ask those students questions in order to move them to the correct sequence.

**Activity 2:** Assign students to act out how the 1860 election unfolded and then how southern states proceeded to secede after Abraham Lincoln’s election. Have some students make Lincoln’s arguments to keep the states from seceding. Students should appreciate the delicate and frustrating situation in which Lincoln found himself.

**Assignment 1:** Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

**Assignment 2:** Have students draw and color a scene of their choice from the Lincoln-Douglas debates, the Republican nominating convention of 1860 in which Abraham Lincoln was nominated for president, or the attack on Fort Sumter. Have students present briefly what they drew, the story behind it, and why they depicted it the way they did.
Lesson 3 — The Civil War

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the major figures, common soldiers, strategy, and specific battles of the American Civil War, including a close study of the statesmanship of President Abraham Lincoln.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Teacher Texts

Land of Hope Young Reader's Edition
Chapters 21 and 22

The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic
Pages 170–195

The Civil War and Reconstruction
Pages 79–237, 252–273

Trade Book

The Last Brother

Abraham Lincoln

A Picture Book of Abraham Lincoln

The Gettysburg Address

The Lincoln Memorial
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The Great American Story
Lecture 10

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places

Fort Sumter
Union
Yankees
Confederacy
Rebels
Border States
Appomattox Court House
Ford’s Theatre

Persons

Abraham Lincoln
Jefferson Davis
Robert E. Lee
Thomas “Stonewall” Jackson
Clara Barton

Ulysses S. Grant
William Tecumseh Sherman
Martin Delany
Robert Gould Shaw
John Wilkes Booth
Terms and Topics
- secession
- Confederate States of America
- Army of the Potomac
- Army of Northern Virginia
- American Red Cross
- ironclads
- USS Monitor*
- CSS Virginia
- Battle of Antietam
- abolition
- Battle of Gettysburg
- Pickett’s Charge
- 54th Massachusetts Regiment
- Sherman’s “March to the Sea”

Primary Sources
- Gettysburg Address, Abraham Lincoln

To Know by Heart
- “Battle Hymn of the Republic,” first stanza — Julia Ward Howe
- Gettysburg Address — Abraham Lincoln
- "So Atlanta is ours, and fairly won." — William Tecumseh Sherman telegram announcing the fall of Atlanta to Abraham Lincoln
- “Lincoln,” Nancy Byrd Turner

Dates
- 1861–65 Civil War

Images
- Historical figures and events
- Landscape pictures of geographic places featured in this lesson
- Soldier uniforms, weaponry, flags
- Grade-level appropriate depictions and photographs of figures at various scenes and moments and in battle
- Maps: overall strategies
- Relevant forts
- Reenactment photos
- Pictures of the Emancipation Proclamation, Gettysburg Address, etc.
- Robert Gould Shaw and the 54th Massachusetts Regiment Memorial
- Lincoln Memorial
- Statue of Abraham Lincoln (Hillsdale College campus)

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART
- Biographies and roles of Abraham Lincoln, Robert E. Lee, Ulysses S. Grant, and William Tecumseh Sherman in the Civil War
- Robert E. Lee’s denial of Abraham Lincoln’s offer to command the Union forces
- How Stonewall Jackson got his nickname
- Battle of the ironclads
- Fighting at Little Round Top and Pickett’s Charge

* A previous version referred to the USS Merrimack instead of the USS Monitor.
- The writing and delivery of the Gettysburg Address
- Robert E. Lee’s surrender to Ulysses S. Grant at Appomattox Court House
- Assassination of Abraham Lincoln at Ford’s Theatre
- Abraham Lincoln’s funeral train

**QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND**

- Why did the Southern states think the Constitution allowed them to leave the United States?
- Why did Abraham Lincoln think that the Southern states cannot leave the country?
- Why was Abraham Lincoln’s first goal for fighting the Civil War to preserve the Union?
- Why was Abraham Lincoln’s second goal for fighting the Civil War to stop the spread of slavery?
- How did Abraham Lincoln keep the Border States in the Union?
- What things were helpful to the Union in the Civil War?
- What things were helpful to the Confederacy in the Civil War?
- How did the Union think they could win the war?
- How did the Confederacy think they could win the war?
- How did soldiers fight each other?
- What was it like to be a soldier in the Civil War?
- What did Clara Barton do during the Civil War?
- What was Robert E. Lee like? Why was he a good general?
- What happened at the Battle of Antietam?
- What was the problem with most of the Union generals early in the war?
- What happened in the battle of the ironclads?
- What was the Emancipation Proclamation and what did it do?
- Why did Abraham Lincoln believe he could free the slaves in the Confederacy?
- How did the Emancipation Proclamation change Lincoln’s goals for the war?
- What happened at the Battle of Gettysburg?
- What was Pickett’s Charge?
- What did Abraham Lincoln say in the Gettysburg Address?
- What was Ulysses S. Grant like? Why was he a good general?
- What happened during the March to the Sea?
- Why were many people not happy with Abraham Lincoln before the 1864 election?
- Why did Robert E. Lee eventually surrender?
- What happened at Appomattox Court House?
- Why did the Union win the Civil War?
- What happened to Abraham Lincoln just a few days after the end of the Civil War?
- Why did John Wilkes Booth shoot Abraham Lincoln? What did he do afterwards?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 92: Name the U.S. war between the North and the South.
  - Question 93: The Civil War had many important events. Name one.
  - Question 94: Abraham Lincoln is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 95: What did the Emancipation Proclamation do?
  - Question 96: What U.S. war ended slavery?
KEYS TO THE LESSON

The American Civil War may be the defining event in American history. The outcome of the Civil War determined whether the nation would live according to the principles of liberty, equality under law, and self-government, or reject those truths in favor of slavery, inequality, and tyrannical rule. Students should appreciate this about the bloodiest conflict in their nation’s history. They should also know the stories of the heroic actions both leaders and of ordinary citizens in that war, understand the strategies employed in general and in specific battles, and consider the key moments and factors that led the Union to ultimate victory. Additionally, students have an unmatched opportunity to understand statesmanship through the careful study of Abraham Lincoln’s thoughts, speeches, and actions as he led the nation through the Civil War.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Civil War with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Have students consider the arguments by the South and by Abraham Lincoln regarding the idea of “states’ rights” and the constitutionality of secession. Students should understand that there is no such thing as a “state right,” since rights belong only to persons. States possess powers (not rights) which the states are to use to protect the rights of their citizens (including from encroachment by the federal government by appealing to the Constitution). Lincoln believed secession was unconstitutional and that he, having taken an oath in his office as president, could and must preserve the Constitution and Union.
- Help students to see how the decision by Southern states to secede was largely determined by a small elite or even merely by governors. In Virginia, for example, the governor himself made the decision to secede without consulting the legislature. Moreover, insofar as slavery was the chief interest the South wanted to preserve, only a minority of Southerners owned slaves and even a smaller minority owned a large number of slaves on plantations. The majority of Southerners were not slaveholders and while fighting for their states would preserve slavery, many common Southerners fought for the argument of states’ rights rather than to preserve the institution of slavery.
- Teach students about the delicacy with which Abraham Lincoln had to approach the border states (slave states that remained in the Union) and why this delicacy was needed. Lincoln was mindful of this necessity when he wrote his first inaugural address.
- Explain that although Lincoln as a person was against slavery and wanted it abolished, his first constitutional obligation as president was to preserve the Union. By preserving the Union Lincoln believed, like the Founders and Frederick Douglass, that slavery had the best chance of being abolished.
- Have students think through and compare the various advantages and disadvantages each side had at the outset of the war and how these shifted during the war.
- Build students’ familiarity with the style of warfare in the mid-19th century, and show them plenty of images to do so, being mindful of grade-level appropriateness. Students need this foundation for their subsequent study of battles. This helps them to imagine and understand what happens in battle and to appreciate the bravery of soldiers fighting on both sides.
- Present to students explanations of each side’s strategy at various stages of the war and the tactics and battle plans employed in specific battles.
- As with any conflict, dwell on the key contributions of both leaders and common soldiers in the war, especially Robert E. Lee and Ulysses S. Grant.
• Share with students the unity found within the Union ranks in the cause of the United States and eventually the abolition of slavery. 1.3 million Union men of European ancestry fought in the Civil War and 180,000 African American men volunteered for the Union forces, making up nearly 10 percent of the Union army. Of all Union soldiers, 600,000 were wounded and approximately 360,000 Union men were killed.

• Teach the war, especially the major battles and military campaigns, in some detail. Students should understand how the battles came to be, the key stories, factors, and moments from the battle itself, and the significance of their various outcomes on subsequent events. Employ battle maps often.

• Help students to note the major themes running through the early years of the war, namely how Confederate commanders carried the day repeatedly despite the North’s growing advantages, and how they exhibited military leadership and decisiveness. Students should also appreciate how unpopular Abraham Lincoln was in the North during much of the war.

• Have students come to know Abraham Lincoln, in his personal life, interior thoughts and troubles, and his great love for his country. Students should also think about the thinking and decision-making that makes Lincoln perhaps the greatest statesman in American history.

• Teach students about the Emancipation Proclamation and the technicalities Abraham Lincoln navigated in thinking of it, drawing it up, and timing its promulgation. He had to retain the border states, abide by the Constitution, achieve victory, and earn the support of public opinion in order for slaves to be effectively freed—and he did it all. Students should understand that Lincoln’s justification for freeing the slaves involved exercising his executive powers as commander-in-chief of the armed forces during an armed rebellion. This is why Lincoln only had the authority to apply the Emancipation Proclamation to those states in actual rebellion, why it could not be applied to slave-holding border states not in rebellion, and why he knew that after the war, an amendment to the Constitution would be necessary to bring emancipation to all the states and make it permanent.

• Read aloud with students and discuss the Gettysburg Address. It is a magnificent work of oratory, but it also gets at the heart of the American founding and the ideas that maintain the United States. It also shows the importance of defending and advancing those ideas, both in the Civil War and in our own day, as is incumbent on every American citizen.

• Note the importance of Abraham Lincoln’s choice of Ulysses S. Grant as General-in-Chief of the entire Union Army. Grant’s decisiveness combined with William Tecumseh Sherman’s boldness proved essential in prosecuting the war from late 1863 onward.

• Recap the war by considering major statistics, including the number of causalities and deaths on each side. Ask what stance Americans today should have towards those who fought in the Civil War, distinguishing between Northern soldiers and Southern soldiers. When considering Southern soldiers, be sure to note the tragic death of so many Americans, even if they were fighting for a confederate government dedicated to preserving slavery. As noted previously, most of those doing the actual fighting for the South did not own slaves and believed that they were fighting for their country as well.

• Share some of the main ideas in Abraham Lincoln’s second inaugural address. Lincoln addresses many topics within the speech, both reflecting on the war and outlining a plan for after the war. In some respects, this speech is “part two” of what Lincoln began to assert in the Gettysburg Address. One of the main ideas Lincoln suggests, however, is that the Civil War was a punishment for the whole nation. This punishment was not necessarily for the mere existence of slavery but
because, unlike the founding generation, the nation had in the time since the founding not
continued to work for the abolition of the evil of slavery. While no country will ever be perfect, a
people should work to make sure its laws do not promote the perpetuation of a practice that
violates the equal natural rights of its fellow citizens.

- To set up the following unit, outline for students Abraham Lincoln’s preliminary plans for
reconstruction, and impress upon students the immense historical consequences of Lincoln’s
assassination.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS**

**Activity 1:** Find pictures that represent five different scenes from this lesson. Print off enough
images for each group of five students to have a set. Give each student in the group a different
picture (all groups will have the same five pictures). Have the students arrange the pictures in the
order that those events occurred. Once the students have figured out the correct order of events,
have students line up in order and go over the order of events as a class. Conclude the activity by
asking students how they knew what event the picture was portraying. Ask students how they
remembered the order of events/what they did to figure out the correct order. If there are groups
that did not figure out the correct order, ask those students questions in order to move them to
the correct sequence.

**Activity 2:** Provide students with copies of a map that can also be projected on the board. Review
with students the events of the war and where certain battles took place. As a class, mark on the
map on the board and have students do the same on their own maps. Make indications about who
won each battle and review with students how the battle went and what its significance was.

**Activity 3:** Conduct a round robin reading of the Gettysburg Address. Then discuss it with
students and begin to have them learn parts of the speech by heart. Plan two days for each student
to recite their parts aloud.

**Assignment 1:** Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which
parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson.
Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

**Assignment 2:** Have students draw and color a scene of their choice from the Civil War. Have
students present briefly in class what they drew, the story behind it, and why they depicted it the
way they did.

**FORMATIVE QUIZ 2**

Provide students with numbered papers. Using the “Review Sheets” in the Appendix, make
statements and ask students if they are True or False. Have them draw ☑ for “True” or ☐ for
“False” next to each number. Review as a class and talk through what makes each answer correct.
Lesson 4 — Reconstruction

1865–1877

4-5 classes

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the remarkable fulfillment of civil rights for freedmen during Reconstruction despite the objections of some and then the reversal of many of those realizations in Southern states during Reconstruction and after its end in 1877.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Teacher Texts

*Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition* Chapters 23 and 24
*The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic* Pages 196–202
*The Civil War and Reconstruction* Pages 274–317

Trade Book

*If You Lived at the Time of the Civil War*

Online.Hillsdale.edu

*The Great American Story* Lecture 11
*Civil Rights in American History* Lectures 4 and 5

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places

Former Confederacy

Persons

Andrew Johnson Ulysses S. Grant
Hiram Revels Rutherford B. Hayes

Terms and Topics

Reconstruction sharecropping
Radical Republicans black codes
freedmen scalawags and carpetbaggers
13th, 14th, 15th Amendments Transcontinental Railroad
military districts Compromise of 1877

To Know by Heart

“Lift Every Voice and Sing” — James Weldon Johnson
Dates
1865–77  Reconstruction

Images
Historical figures and events
Photographs of African Americans in the south, both in freedom and with the heavy restrictions placed on their freedom

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART
- The swearing in of Hiram Revels to the U.S. Senate
- Completion of the Transcontinental Railroad at Promontory Point, Utah

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND
- What does reconstruction mean?
- What was the North like after the Civil War?
- What was the South like after the Civil War?
- How did Northerners and Southerners feel about each other after the Civil War?
- What plans did Abraham Lincoln have for Reconstruction?
- What plans did the Radical Republicans have for Reconstruction?
- Why did Andrew Johnson and the Republicans not get along?
- What did a Confederate state have to do in order to rejoin the Union?
- What changes did Republicans make to the Constitution?
- What did the 13th Amendment do?
- How did life improve for African Americans in the South during Reconstruction?
- How did some people and governments in the Southern states continue to try to hurt African Americans during Reconstruction?
- How did Republicans in the North attempt to defend and protect African Americans in the South during Reconstruction?
- How were African Americans in the South forced to fend for themselves?
- What was Ulysses S. Grant’s presidency like?
- What happened in the election of 1876 and the Compromise of 1877?
- How did some people and governments in the Southern states continue to try to hurt African Americans in the South after Reconstruction?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 63: There are four amendments to the U.S. Constitution about who can vote. Describe one of them.
  - Question 97: What amendment gives citizenship to all persons born in the United States?
  - Question 98: When did all men get the right to vote?
  - Question 126: Name three national U.S. holidays.
  - Question 127: What is Memorial Day?
KEYS TO THE LESSON

Even before the battlefield fighting was over, a new kind of struggle would emerge to determine the status of former slaves now made free. In decisive ways, Abraham Lincoln’s assassination was devastating for the prospects of healing the nation while effectively securing the equal rights of freedmen. Not only was the desire for vengeance that Lincoln attempted to abate unleashed against the South, but the Republicans controlling Congress themselves fought bitterly with President Andrew Johnson over the purpose and method of Reconstruction. While some remarkable gains were made for African Americans in the South, particularly in fulfilling in law the core ideas enunciated in the American founding and fought for by the Union, objections to such fulfillments remained, new injustices were established, and the management of Reconstruction was in disarray. The Compromise of 1877 ended the period of Reconstruction, leaving the protections African Americans had gained without federal protection, resulting in decades of restrictions on their rights and liberties.

Teachers might best plan and teach Reconstruction with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Have students consider the effect of Abraham Lincoln’s assassination on Reconstruction and the future of America, especially as regards civil rights for African Americans. Lincoln’s focus was healing the nation while simultaneously providing for the effective and long-term establishment of equal rights for African Americans. Vice President Andrew Johnson succeeded Lincoln after his assassination.
- The transformation of a society away from decades of slavery was no small task. Depict Reconstruction as being tragically undermined and strained by the conflicts between congressional Republicans (who strongly opposed slavery), President Andrew Johnson (a pro-Union Democrat with little sympathy for former slaves), and lawmakers in the Southern states (who mostly wished to restrict the rights of the new freedmen), all of whom operated out of distrust following a painful and bloody Civil War.
- Teach students about each of the Reconstruction Amendments to the Constitution. It is important to note the major and meaningful efforts Northerners made to guarantee the rights of African Americans.
- Teach students about both the important gains and protections Republicans won for African Americans during Reconstruction as well as the ways in which these were undermined by actions in the former confederate states and Johnson himself. Students should gain an appreciation of the remarkable speed and degrees to which former slaves were incorporated into the civil body early in Reconstruction, including the thousands of African Americans who would hold office at the local, state, and even federal level. But they should also understand the ways that Johnson resisted equal treatment of African Americans and in doing so encouraged and allowed certain bad policies (such as “black codes” passed by state legislatures) in the former Confederacy. In fact, many of the reversals of reconstruction began during the presidential reconstruction of Johnson, who was decidedly against secession but by no means opposed to slavery. Congress repeatedly had to override his vetoes and enact Constitutional amendments to prevent his defense of inequalities.
- Have students learn about the ways in which many civil rights achievements were thwarted or undone both during and after Reconstruction. For instance, spend time discussing how as Southerners were refranchised, African American officials were voted out of office and how “black codes” would eventually become Jim Crow laws. Discuss how “black codes” limited...
freedmen’s civil rights and imposed economic restrictions, including making being unemployed illegal, prohibiting landownership, prohibiting assemblies of freedmen only, prohibiting teaching freedmen to read or write, segregating public facilities, prohibiting freedmen from serving on juries, and carrying out corporal punishments for violators, among other restrictions and injustices. Note also the use of poll taxes and literacy tests to prohibit African Americans from voting.

- Explain how sharecropping made it nearly impossible for freedmen to accumulate enough savings to purchase their own land or set-off on a different pursuit. Moreover, students should be aware of the struggle facing freedmen who were still in a society prejudiced against them, without many possessions or even the ability to read.

- Explain the emergence of efforts to intimidate African Americans and Republicans and their effect on diminishing the political participation of freedmen.

- Teach students how President Ulysses S. Grant tried to prohibit intimidation of freedmen exercising their civil rights. Nonetheless, such measures were usually sloppily enforced.

- At the same time, note the improvements during Reconstruction in building hospitals, creating a public school system, securing civil rights in principle, and fostering community within the freedmen community, especially in marital and family stability and through vibrant churches.

- Explain that Reconstruction effectively ended with the Compromise of 1877 that settled the disputed election of 1876. Congress (now controlled by the Democratic Party) would allow Republican Rutherford B. Hayes to be declared president in exchange for his withdrawing federal troops in former confederate states. Point out that in the backdrop was both continuing Southern resistance and a gradual decrease in Northern zeal for (and political interest in) reform within the South.

- Ask students to consider the tragic nature of Reconstruction: a time of so much hoped for and achieved in applying the principle of equal natural rights was repeatedly undermined and mismanaged, then suddenly ended for political expediency, enabling new forms of injustice in certain areas of the country, after a war to end injustice had consumed the lives of hundreds of thousands of Americans.

- Nevertheless, make sure students do not lose sight of the momentous achievements in liberty, equality, and self-government fulfilled because of the Civil War. Students should appreciate the very significant achievements of Lincoln and the Civil War while looking forward to future generations of Americans who would seek to live up to the fundamental principles of America in their own times.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS**

**Activity 1:** Find pictures that represent five different scenes from this lesson. Print off enough images for each group of five students to have a set. Give each student in the group a different picture (all groups will have the same five pictures). Have the students arrange the pictures in the order that those events occurred. Once the students have figured out the correct order of events, have students line up in order and go over the order of events as a class. Conclude the activity by asking students how they knew what event the picture was portraying. Ask students how they remembered the order of events/what they did to figure out the correct order. If there are groups
that did not figure out the correct order, ask those students questions in order to move them to
the correct sequence.

____________

**Assignment 1:** Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which
parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson.
Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

**Assignment 2:** Have students draw and color a scene or figure from this lesson. Have students
present briefly what or whom they drew, the story behind it, and why they depicted the scene or
person the way they did.
APPENDIX A

Talk about History

Review Sheets

Tests

Writing Assignment
TALK ABOUT HISTORY

Student Name: ___________________________ Due: ________________

Story/Lesson from History: ____________________________________________________________

1. Who/what did you learn about in history class today?
   Student Answer: ________________________________________________________________

2. Who were the most important characters in the story?
   Student Answer: ________________________________________________________________

3. Tell me more about one of those characters.
   Student Answer: ________________________________________________________________

4. Tell me about the most exciting/interesting part of the story today.
   Student Answer: ________________________________________________________________

Parent Signature: ___________________________ Date: ________________

TALK ABOUT HISTORY

Student Name: ___________________________ Due: ________________

Story/Lesson from History: ____________________________________________________________

1. Who/what did you learn about in history class today?
   Student Answer: ________________________________________________________________

2. Who were the most important characters in the story?
   Student Answer: ________________________________________________________________

3. Tell me more about one of those characters.
   Student Answer: ________________________________________________________________

4. Tell me about the most exciting/interesting part of the story today.
   Student Answer: ________________________________________________________________

Parent Signature: ___________________________ Date: ________________
History Assessment and Review in Grades K–2

REVIEWING AND STUDYING

One-page Review Sheets are included in the following materials. Teachers are encouraged to review items on these sheets with students in the days leading up to an assessment. Between reviewing at the beginning of each class period and this review based on the Review Sheets, students should not need to do any additional studying or review. Review Sheets may be sent home, however, if parents wish to review with their students at home.

ASSESSMENT

The method for assessing students on history in grades K-2 depends on the grade level and student ability.

For students who **cannot** yet read and write:

**Option 1:** Choose several items from the Review Sheet to ask each student orally. This may be done in private with the same questions while students complete another activity, or it may be administered aloud with the entire class, varying questions for each student.

**Option 2:** Create a test with images for matching or identifying terms and topics. Read aloud a description or explanation of a Person, Term, Topic, or Story to the whole class and have each student circle or place a number/letter next to the corresponding image on their test. For the Questions, read aloud a statement that would answer the question and ask students if it is True or False. Have them draw ☑ for “True” or ☐ for “False” next to each statement.

For students who **can** read and write:

Teachers may administer the tests included in the following materials. It is recommended, especially early in a school year, to have each student complete the test individually, but with the class proceeding together from question to question, each being read aloud by the teacher.
Review Sheet — Unit 4, Test 1

Lesson 1 | The Expansion of Slavery
Lesson 2 | Toward Civil War

Test on ____________

DATES: When did _________________ occur?

1861 Civil War begins

PERSONS: Tell me who _________________ was and what he/she did.

Abraham Lincoln
Frederick Douglass
Harriet Beecher Stowe
Harriet Tubman
Stephen Douglas

TERMS AND TOPICS: Tell me what _________________ is/are/was/were and why we learned about it.

cotton gin
secession
abolitionism
Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass
Uncle Tom’s Cabin
Underground Railroad
Bleeding Kansas
a house divided
Lincoln-Douglas Debates

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART: Tell me the story of...

- Biography of Frederick Douglass
- Biography of Abraham Lincoln
- Actions of Harriet Tubman and the Underground Railroad
- The first shots fired on Fort Sumter

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND: Tell me...

☐ Why many Founders who were against slavery thought that allowing slavery and keeping the Americans united would be the only way eventually to get rid of slavery.
☐ Why the Founders expected that slavery would eventually die out on its own.
☐ The name of the invention after the founding that made cotton more valuable and actually increased slavery, which ruined the Founders’ guess that slavery would end on its own.
☐ What life was like for slaves in the Southern states.
☐ Who the abolitionists were and what kinds of things they did to try to end slavery.
☐ Who Harriet Beecher Stowe was and what her book, Uncle Tom’s Cabin, did.
☐ If Abraham Lincoln was for or against slavery and why.
☐ What Abraham Lincoln’s childhood was like.
☐ Why Abraham Lincoln said it was wrong to “not care” about whether people vote for slavery or not.
☐ What Abraham Lincoln meant when he said that “a house divided against itself cannot stand.”
☐ What Southern states did after Abraham Lincoln was elected.
☐ How slavery was the real reason the Civil War was fought.
The American Civil War — Test 1

Lesson 1 | The Expansion of Slavery
Lesson 2 | Toward Civil War

DATES: Circle the year the Civil War began.

A. 1877  B. 1776  C. 1861

PERSONS: Match the person to who he/she was or what he/she did.

A. Frederick Douglass  B. Harriet Beecher Stowe  C. Stephen Douglas

1. ________Argued that people should vote whether or not to have slavery.

2. ________An escaped slave who wrote about the horrors of slavery and worked to end slavery.

3. ________A little lady whose book *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* let northerners know how bad slavery was.

TERMS AND TOPICS: Match the term to the correct definition, description, or explanation.

A. a house divided  C. Bleeding Kansas  E. Lincoln-Douglas Debates
B. abolitionism  D. cotton gin  F. secession

4. ________An invention that made Southerners want more slaves to work.

5. ________When people worked to end slavery.

6. ________Disagreements over whether people should be able to vote for slavery or not.

7. ________Fighting about slavery in a western territory.

8. ________Abraham Lincoln’s worry about America’s divisions hurting the country.

9. ________When a state tries to leave a country.
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART: Tell me about Harriet Tubman and the Underground Railroad.

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

10. Tell me why many Founders who were against slavery thought that allowing slavery and keeping the Americans united would be the only way eventually to get rid of slavery.

11. Tell me what life was like for slaves in the Southern states.

12. Tell me who the abolitionists were and what kinds of things they did to try to end slavery.

13. Tell me what Abraham Lincoln’s childhood was like.

14. Tell me how slavery was the real reason the Civil War was fought.
Review Sheet — Unit 1, Test 2

Lesson 3 | The Civil War
Lesson 4 | Reconstruction

Test on ________________

DATES: When did ________________ occur?

1865 Civil War ends

PERSONS: Tell me who ________________ was and what he/she did.

Abraham Lincoln
Jefferson Davis
Robert E. Lee
Clara Barton
Ulysses S. Grant
William Tecumseh Sherman

John Wilkes Booth
Hiram Revels

TERMS AND TOPICS: Tell me what ________________ is/are/was/were and why we learned about it.

Confederate States of America
ironclads
Emancipation Proclamation
Battle of Gettysburg
Pickett’s Charge

54th Massachusetts
March to the Sea
Reconstruction
13th Amendment
freedmen

black codes
scalawags and carpetbaggers
Transcontinental Railroad
Compromise of 1877

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART: Tell me the story of...

- The writing and delivery of the Gettysburg Address
- Robert E. Lee’s surrender to Ulysses S. Grant at Appomattox Court House

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND: Tell me...

☐ Why Abraham Lincoln thought that the Southern states could not leave the country.
☐ How soldiers fought each other in the Civil War.
☐ What the problem was with most of the Union generals early in the war.
☐ What Robert E. Lee was like and why he was a good general.
☐ What the Emancipation Proclamation did.
☐ What Ulysses S. Grant was like and why he was a good general.
☐ Why the Union won the Civil War.
☐ What Reconstruction was.
☐ Why Andrew Johnson and the Republicans did not get along.
☐ How life improved for African Americans in the South during Reconstruction.
☐ How some people and governments in the Southern states tried to hurt African Americans during and after Reconstruction.
The American Civil War — Test 2

Lesson 3 | The Civil War
Lesson 4 | Reconstruction

**DATES:** Circle the year the Civil War ended.

A. 1877  B. 1865  C. 1860

**PERSONS:** Match the person to who he/she was or what he/she did.

A. Abraham Lincoln  B. Robert E. Lee  C. Ulysses S. Grant

1. ________Led the Confederate Army of Northern Virginia through the entire Civil War.

2. ________Led Union army to victory later in the Civil War.

3. ________Was President of the United States during the Civil War.

**TERMS AND TOPICS:** Match the term to the correct definition, description, or explanation.

A. Confederate States of America  B. Emancipation Proclamation  C. Battle of Gettysburg
   D. Reconstruction  E. 13th Amendment  F. Compromise of 1877

4. ________What the Southern states called themselves during the Civil War.

5. ________Abraham Lincoln’s order freeing the slaves in the South.

6. ________A very bloody conflict where the Union army stopped the invasion of the Southern army.

7. ________The time after the Civil War.

8. ________Changed the Constitution to make slavery illegal everywhere in America.

9. ________Ended Reconstruction and many protections for former slaves in the South.
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART: *Tell me the story of Robert E. Lee’s surrender to Ulysses S. Grant at Appomattox Court House.*


QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

10. Tell me how soldiers fought each other in the Civil War.

11. Tell me what Robert E. Lee was like and why he was a good general.

12. Tell me what Ulysses S. Grant was like and why he was a good general.

13. Tell me why the Union won the Civil War.

14. Tell me why Andrew Johnson and the Republicans did not get along.
Why did Americans fight a civil war? What did northerners and President Lincoln do by winning the Civil War?
APPENDIX B

Primary Source

Abraham Lincoln
**PRESIDENT ABRAHAM LINCOLN (R)**

On the Consecration of the Soldiers’ National Cemetery

**SPEECH**

November 19, 1863

Soldiers’ National Cemetery | Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

Gettysburg Address

**BACKGROUND**

Abraham Lincoln delivered these remarks at the dedication of the Union cemetery for those soldiers killed in the Battle of Gettysburg in the summer of 1863.

**ANNOTATIONS**

Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth, on this continent, a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived, and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battle-field of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting-place for those who here gave their lives, that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But, in a larger sense, we can not dedicate—we can not consecrate—we can not hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly

---

advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they here gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.
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American History

OVERVIEW

Unit 1 | The British Colonies of North America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LESSON 1</td>
<td>The Lands, Waters, and Peoples of America</td>
<td>37-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESSON 2</td>
<td>1492–1630 Exploration and Settlement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESSON 3</td>
<td>1630–1732 The Colonies in Profile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESSON 4</td>
<td>1607–1763 Major Events in the Colonies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit 2 | The American Founding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LESSON 1</td>
<td>1763–1776 Self-Government or Tyranny</td>
<td>35-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESSON 2</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>The Declaration of Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESSON 3</td>
<td>1776–1783 The War of Independence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESSON 4</td>
<td>1783–1789 The United States Constitution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Unit 3 | The Early Republic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 1</td>
<td>1789–1801</td>
<td>The New Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 2</td>
<td>1801–1815</td>
<td>Prospects, Uncertainties, and War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 3</td>
<td>1815–1829</td>
<td>The American Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 4</td>
<td>1829–1848</td>
<td>Manifest Destiny</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unit 4 | The American Civil War

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 1</td>
<td>1848–1854</td>
<td>The Expansion of Slavery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 2</td>
<td>1854–1861</td>
<td>Toward Civil War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 3</td>
<td>1861–1865</td>
<td>The Civil War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 4</td>
<td>1865–1877</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNIT 1
The British Colonies of
North America
1492–1763
30-40-minute classes | 35-39 classes

UNIT PREVIEW

Structure

LESSON 1 The Lands, Waters, and Peoples of America 6–7 classes p. 7
LESSON 2 1492–1630 Exploration and Settlement 9–10 classes p. 11
LESSON 3 1630–1732 The Colonies in Profile 9–10 classes p. 20
LESSON 4 1607–1763 Major Events in the Colonies 9–10 classes p. 28
APPENDIX A Study Guide, Test, and Writing Assignment p. 35
APPENDIX B Primary Source p. 45

Why Teach the British Colonies of North America

Christopher Columbus’s discovery of what was then termed “The New World” is one of the most consequential events in all of recorded history. It was as if another half of Earth was being opened to the peoples of Europe, Africa, and Asia, and the changes that followed this momentous discovery were immense. Students should be especially aware of the profound effects of the initial contact of European explorers with the indigenous peoples of North America. They should understand the ways of life characteristic of Native American tribes, the exploits of European explorers and settlers, and the triumphs
and tragedies that defined the relationships between settlers and natives. Students should also study closely the manner in which the British colonies of North America were established, since those first settlements would be the seedbed of our country. Our unique American heritage began here, on these coasts, among scattered settlements of men and women pursuing economic independence or religious freedom, leaving behind their familiar lives to seek liberty and opportunity at what to them was the edge of the world. With the promise of freedom at these far reaches also came untold hardships and daily dangers. The American story begins with those few who braved these risks for the freedom to pursue what all human beings desire to attain: happiness.

Enduring Ideas from This Unit

1. America’s varied and wondrous geography has played a crucial role in many of America’s successes.
2. The discovery, exploration, and settlement of the Western Hemisphere was one of the most consequential series of events in human history.
3. The contact between indigenous North American and European civilizations resulted in both benefits and afflictions for natives and colonists alike.
4. The British colonies of North America were unique, and their circumstances gradually shaped the character of the colonists into something unprecedented: the American.
5. The freedom afforded to the American colonists resulted in a degree of successful self-government unknown to the rest of the world in 1763.

What Teachers Should Consider

Imagine two more continents, an eighth and a ninth, with different terrain, untouched resources, seemingly limitless lands, and complete openness to any sort of political regime. This is the vision teachers might consider adopting in preparing students to learn American history. In other words, one can adopt an outlook similar to that of the people who began the first chapter in the story of America. Such an outlook will help students to see the origins of America as something that was fluid and not at all inevitable.

In the same way the explorers, settlers, and indigenous Native Americans keenly fixed their attention on the contours of the North American landscape, so should students of American history at the outset of their studies. A close study of American geography sets the stage on which Americans of every generation would act out their lives.

Europeans’ exploration and settlement of the Western Hemisphere is an extraordinary era in terms of historical impact, but it also contains engaging stories of intrepid discoverers and of the conditions they found and helped to shape. It is important to find the proper balance in conveying the story of that era. Students ought to step into the lives of these explorers and settlers and understand not only their motivations for undertaking such hazardous trips and ways of living but also their experiences on the Atlantic and on the fringes of an unknown continent. They should also think carefully and honestly about the interactions between Native Americans, explorers, and settlers. They will encounter a mixed picture. At times, they will see cooperation, care, and mutual respect; at other times they will see all the duplicity and
injustice that human nature is capable of. They will see these traits exhibited by all parties at various moments and in different circumstances.

Teachers should also focus on making clear the differences between England’s North American colonies and those of other emerging New World empires, such as Spain, France, and Portugal. They should bring out what was unique among the English settlers, from the form of their colonies’ settlements to the social and economic ventures of the colonists themselves, as well as their varied relationships to the mother country. Each English colony may be taught separately, each offering a distinct social and economic profile, while a final lesson may be devoted to studying the major events and movements in shared colonial American history. Together, students should come to see that an unplanned experiment was unfolding in the British colonies of North America: one that was shaping a unique society and citizenry, one that would be equipped for great accomplishments in the coming centuries.

How Teachers Can Learn More

TEXTS

*Land of Hope*, Wilfred McClay
*The Formative Years, 1607–1763*, Clarence Ver Steeg
*Freedom Just Around the Corner*, Walter McDougall

ONLINE COURSES | Online.Hillsdale.edu

*The Great American Story*
*American Heritage*

Lesson Planning Resources

TEACHER RESOURCES

*Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition*, Volume 1, Wilfred McClay
*The Geography of the United States*, Core Knowledge
*The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic*, H.A. Guerber
*Colonial Times*, Anne Goudvis and Stephanie Harvey
*The American Revolution and Constitution*, Anne Goudvis and Stephanie Harvey
*The Age of Exploration*, Core Knowledge
*A Jamestown Time Capsule*, Jessica Freeburg
*Pilgrims: Magic Tree House Fact Tracker*, Mary Pope Osborne
*Science on the Mayflower*, Tammy Enz
**STUDENT RESOURCES**

- *The Landing of the Pilgrims*, James Daugherty
- *Meet George Washington*, Joan Heilbroner
- *Ben Franklin of Old Philadelphia*, Margaret Cousins

**TRADE BOOKS**

- *Exploration & Conquest*, Betsy Maestro
- *Discovery of the Americas*, Betsy Maestro
- *Aboard the Santa Maria*, Kate Mikoley
- *James Towne*, Marcia Sewall
- *If You Sailed On the Mayflower*, Ann McGovern
- *Aboard the Mayflower*, Theresa Emminizer
- *If You Lived With the Iroquois*, Ellen Levine
- *The New Americans*, Betsy Maestro
- *If You Lived in Colonial Times*, Ann McGovern
- *If You Lived in Williamsburg in Colonial Days*, Barbara Brenner
- *Three Young Pilgrims*, Cheryl Harness
- *The Courage of Sarah Noble*, Alice Dalgliesh
- *Struggle for a Continent*, Betsy Maestro

**PRIMARY SOURCE**

- The Mayflower Compact
LESSON PLANS, ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS, AND QUIZZES
Lesson 1 — The Lands, Waters, and Peoples of America

6–7 classes

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the geography of what would become the United States of America, including its physical contours, climate, advantages for civilization, and its Native American inhabitants.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Teacher Texts

Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1  Pages xiii-xv, 1-3
The Geography of the United States

Online.Hillsdale.edu

The Great American Story  Lectures 1 and 2
American Heritage  Lecture 1

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Topographic Geography

Atlantic Ocean  Lake Superior
San Salvador  Great Lakes
Appalachian Mountains  Great Plains
Lake Ontario  Rocky Mountains
Niagara Falls  Grand Canyon
Lake Erie  Death Valley
Chesapeake Bay  Mojave Desert
Gulf of Mexico  Pacific Ocean
Mississippi River  Bering Strait
Lake Huron  Hawaiian Islands
Lake Michigan

Political Geography

Virginia  Maryland
Richmond  Annapolis
Jamestown  Baltimore
Massachusetts  Connecticut, Hartford
Boston  Rhode Island, Providence
Plymouth  Delaware, Dover
New Hampshire, Concord  North Carolina, Raleigh
South Carolina
  Columbia
  Charleston
New Jersey, Trenton
New York
  Albany
  New York City

Pennsylvania
  Harrisburg
  Philadelphia
Georgia, Atlanta
Washington, District of Columbia

Terms and Topics
  glaciers
  land bridge
  terrain
  natural resources
  climate
  Mayas
  Aztecs

Incas
  Hopewell
  cities
  towns
  countryside

Images
  Maps
  Famous or exemplar landscapes, landmarks, bodies of water in America
  Illustrations of indigenous peoples, civilizations, and life
  Photographs of Aztec, Maya, Inca, Hopewell, and Ancestral Pueblo ruins

STORY FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Christopher Columbus’s crew on their voyage and sighting land

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What are some of the different kinds of terrain in the American landscape?
- Why is the American landscape a good place for people to live?
- How is the terrain different between different regions?
- Where did the indigenous peoples of North and South America come from? How do we believe they came?
- How did different groups of Native Americans live?
- What are some ways in which Native Americans and Europeans lived differently?

KEYS TO THE LESSON

Every story has a setting, and the true story of history is no different. To tell and to teach this story effectively requires first introducing students to the stage on which Americans would act. Thus, American history should begin with a study of American geography. The lesson should transport students to the different places of America, not through an online virtual map but through the use of their own imaginations. Geography instruction is an excellent way to awaken and exercise the imaginations of students, priming them for all the other journeys which studying history will ask their minds to undertake. Every history lesson will involve a similar setting of the stage in the students’ imaginations, and this lesson establishes that
precedent. Of course, the lesson also gives students the “lay of the land” for the entire study of American history, beginning with an immersive trip through the country’s magnificent and diverse landscape. This geography lesson can be full of simple questions about what students observe, training them in the skill of careful discernment of detail. At the end of the lesson, the class may return to the virgin topography of the United States and place the various indigenous civilizations on it, learning the smattering of their history that has survived, and then return to the Atlantic and to the Spanish caravels and carracks just over the eastern horizon.

Teachers might best plan and teach The Lands, Waters, and Peoples of America with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Begin by telling a story that will encourage students to use their imaginations and set the precedent for the way class will normally be taught. The story of Christopher Columbus’s crew sighting land is an excellent example. The story may be picked up when Columbus’s three ships are already en route. Paint the scene. Provide descriptions of the ship. Help students get a sense of what sailing was like in those days, and the dangers it involved. Draw out the sounds and smells onboard the ships. Introduce the kind of men on board, the letters and instructions they had with them, and what they may have been thinking from moment to moment. Talk about their captain: his appearance, thoughts, and comportment. Share the story of how recently the crew had nearly mutinied against him, and how he quelled their fears. Describe the sudden appearance of a large flock of birds the previous day. Finally, bring students to the very early morning of October 12, 1492, after the view from the ship’s rail had not changed for weeks, when the call came from the masts, “La tierra!” Land!

- Introduce landmarks, bodies of water, and other physical characteristics, moving from east to west. The items listed under “Topographic Geography” follow in roughly this order. The goal is to make sure students are aware of these landmarks in order to develop an appreciation for the beauty and diversity of their country’s landscape.

- Call upon students’ imaginations by describing the settings of what you introduce with vivid language that engages all their senses. Place them in particular climates with the correct weather depending on the season and discuss the kinds of natural resources and economic activity to which each area is conducive. Record all this information with the class on a physical map handed out to them and on its projection on the board. As the class proceeds from coast to coast, label the map together. Ask plenty of questions in the process. For review, project images of key areas discussed on the map and have students try to identify what is being projected.

- Emphasize with students the tremendous advantages America’s land offers to human flourishing. America had excellent and untouched soils for cultivation, temperature and rainfall averages were ideal, and timber was plentiful. Native plants and animals suitable for human consumption were abundant, while imported livestock thrived. The virgin forests provided all the fuel needed for fires, heating, and cooking, as well as for building. Waterways were plentiful and mostly navigable; their importance cannot be overstated, and students should appreciate that the colonial-era Atlantic world imagined the world primarily in terms of water flow, especially in North America. Most of the country had mild winters with long, warm growing seasons and few areas subject to drought. As for security from foreign powers, the United States would have two massive oceans separating it from most of the rest of the world.

- After covering topography, transition to the modern political map with a new projected map and a corresponding political map handout. In teaching the political map, proceed in the order in
which the first thirteen states were settled as colonies, and then in the order in which the remaining thirty-seven became states in the Union. The colonies and their major cities and features should be discussed in detail, while details on the remaining states may be reserved for later grades. Review the topography, weather, climate, and seasons in the process. Discuss how population is distributed across the country, and then group the states into different regions.

- After covering the modern political United States, return to the topographical map and place the indigenous tribes onto the map of North America and into the environments in which the various tribes lived. The diversity of tribes is astounding, and highlighting several communities, particularly on the eastern seaboard, will put students in the right historical context and assist with teaching the events in subsequent lessons.
- Explain how America is and always has been a land of immigrants. Even those who would be considered the indigenous or “native” peoples of both North and South America likely migrated from northeast Asia. Settlements and even great cities of Central and South America emerged in following years as migration resulted in people spreading over the land of the Western Hemisphere.
- Show the range of different Western Hemisphere civilizations through the millennia prior to Christopher Columbus. In conjunction with state and local history, explore the history and traditions of historical Native Americans from the school’s locality or state.
- Conclude this first lesson by reminding students that to Columbus, his crew, and the peoples of Europe, Africa, and Asia in 1492 (and for millennia before), none of this was known to them, and discovering the entirety of the New World would take hundreds of years, even after Columbus’s voyages.

**Strengthening Understanding: Post-Lesson Activities and Assignments**

**Activity 1:** Complete a physical map of the United States together as a class and study it for a future map assessment (teacher created).

**Activity 2:** Complete a political map of the United States together as a class (teacher created).

**Activity 3:** Map major historical indigenous tribes onto a physical map together as a class (teacher created).

**Assignment 1:** Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

**Assignment 2:** What natural resources made North America a good place to live? (2–4 sentences)

**Assignment 3:** Choose two indigenous tribes in North America and describe how the environment in which they lived shaped their lifestyle. (2–4 sentences)
Lesson 2 — Exploration and Settlement

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the European exploration of North America and the first English settlement efforts at Roanoke, Jamestown, Plymouth, and Massachusetts Bay.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Text
- Selections from *The Landing of the Pilgrims* and *Colonial Times*
- Primary Source: See below.

Teacher Texts
- *The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic* Pages 11–44, 56–57
- *The Age of Exploration*
- *The Landing of the Pilgrims*
- *A Jamestown Time Capsule*
- *Pilgrims: Magic Tree House Fact Tracker*
- *Science on the Mayflower*

Trade Books
- *Exploration & Conquest*
- *Discovery of the Americas*
- *Aboard the Santa Maria*
- *James Towne*
- *If You Sailed On the Mayflower*
- *Aboard the Mayflower*

Online.Hillsdale.edu
- *The Great American Story* Lecture 2
- *American Heritage* Lecture 2

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students look at images of Spanish or Portuguese caravels and describe some challenges explorers may have faced while crossing the Atlantic Ocean.
Assignment 2: Students look at a world map prior to Christopher Columbus and describe why his theories of navigation may have seemed unbelievable according to many Europeans.

Assignment 3: Students pre–read selections from The Landing of the Pilgrims (based on grade level reading ability).

Assignment 4: Students pre–read the Mayflower Compact (based on grade level reading ability).

Assignment 5: Students look at “The first Thanksgiving 1621” painting by Jean Leon Gerome Ferris and discuss the goodwill of the Native Americans and its reciprocation by the Pilgrims.

Assignment 6: Students pre–read selections from Colonial Times (based on grade level reading ability).

Core Content in This Lesson

Geography & Places
- Genoa  
- San Salvador/Watling Island  
- “The New World”  
- La Florida  
- St. Augustine  
- Virginia  
- Roanoke  
- Chesapeake Bay  
- Jamestown  
- Plymouth  
- Massachusetts Bay  
- Boston

Persons
- Leif Erikson  
- Ferdinand and Isabella  
- Christopher Columbus  
- John Smith  
- Pocahontas  
- Lord De La Warr  
- John Rolfe  
- William Bradford  
- Massasoit  
- John Winthrop

Terms and Topics
- caravel  
- merchants  
- nation-states  
- Niña, Pinta, and Santa María  
- Taíno  
- “Indians”  
- conquistadors  
- Columbian Exchange  
- smallpox  
- Virginia Company  
- indentured servants  
- Powhatan  
- “Starving Time”  
- tobacco  
- House of Burgesses  
- Pilgrims  
- Mayflower  
- religious freedom  
- self-government  
- Wampanoag  
- Puritans
Primary Source

The Mayflower Compact

To Know by Heart

“We must consider that we shall be as a city upon a hill. The eyes of all people are upon us.” —John Winthrop

Timeline

1492  Columbus lands on San Salvador Island
1607  Jamestown settled
1620  Pilgrims settle Plymouth

4th Thursday in November  Thanksgiving Day

Images

Historical figures and events
World map prior to Columbus
Caravel and carrack
Maps of Columbus’s voyages and other exploration
Dress of Native Americans, explorers, and settlers
Illustrated map of Jamestown
Mayflower
Mayflower Compact facsimile
First Thanksgiving

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Christopher Columbus’s account of making landfall
- The Lost Colony of Roanoke
- John Smith’s account of the founding of Jamestown
- The “Starving Time” at Jamestown
- Pocahontas, John Smith, and John Rolfe
- The voyage of the Mayflower
- Signing of the Mayflower Compact
- William Bradford’s account of going ashore at Plymouth
- The first winter at Plymouth
- Accounts of the First Thanksgiving by Edward Winslow and William Bradford

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- Why did Europeans begin exploring the ocean in the 1400s?
- What was Christopher Columbus’s theory about the fastest route to Asia?
- Why was exploration, especially by sailing west, so dangerous?
- How did Christopher Columbus’s voyages change the world?
- Was Christopher Columbus successful? Why or why not?
- How did England settle the New World? How was it different from other countries?
- Why did settlers want to establish Jamestown?
- What problems did Jamestown’s settlers face?
- What events helped Jamestown to succeed?
- What two things both happened in Jamestown in 1619?
- What is “self-government”?
- Why did the Pilgrims want to establish Plymouth?
- Why did the Pilgrims create the Mayflower Compact?
- How did the First Thanksgiving come about? Why?
- Why did John Winthrop say that the settlers at Massachusetts Bay were like “a city upon a hill”?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 73: The colonists came to America for many reasons. Name one.
  - Question 74: Who lived in America before the Europeans arrived?
  - Question 75: What group of people was taken and sold as slaves?

**Keys to the Lesson**

Christopher Columbus’s discovery of the New World was one of the signal achievements of the age of exploration. Enterprising commoners who followed in his wake braved the seas and these wild lands for their own fortunes and opportunity. Nearly one hundred years would pass before the English would attempt a permanent settlement in North America and another two decades before they found any success. Yet while Jamestown was founded chiefly on economic motives, the next two decades would see the Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay colonies founded, at least in part for religious and cultural ends. What was common to all these efforts was the desire for freedom to better their conditions—both the quality of earthly life and the preparation for eternal life. Put differently, they desired the freedom to seek happiness, made available to the common man in ways that had no parallel in the Old World.

Teachers might best plan and teach Exploration and Settlement with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Begin the teaching of American history by helping students gain historical perspective. Using the following reference points, ask them to compare today’s way of life with life in the centuries prior to the 1600s.
  - ability to believe and act on one’s beliefs without fear of arrest or worse
  - ability to speak one’s mind without fear of arrest or worse
  - acquisition of clothing, food, and shelter
  - communication by internet, text, phones, mail
  - electricity, plumbing, heating, cooling
  - travel by plane, car, boat, horse and buggy, walking
- Offer students some background on the reasons why Europeans began exploring in the first place. Reasons include a newfound daringness in European thought and culture, trade interests in Asia, Muslim control of land routes, newly emerging and competing monarchs, growing prosperity among an expanding middle class, and new maritime technology. Riding these currents, many were inspired to turn to the seas in search of what was beyond, first along the African coast, and
then across the Atlantic. A short review of explorers who predated Christopher Columbus may be helpful.

- Relay to students the background to Christopher Columbus. Of important note is the attention he gave to new theories of navigation and the size, but not the shape, of the world. It is a misconception that many people believed the Earth was flat during Columbus’ lifetime. Most educated people since the ancient Greeks believed the world was round. Columbus theorized the world was much smaller than others believed. This led him to surmise that it would be possible to travel to the East Indies by sailing west.

- Of Columbus’s first voyage, help students to imagine what he was doing and what his crew was undertaking as well. It was far from certain that they would find the route Columbus sought, or that they would survive trying. Even then, Columbus was confident of his theories and of his ability.

- Share the stories of each of Columbus’s four voyages, marking the gradual decline in success, based on the stated goals of each trip.

- Consider Columbus’s role in establishing the first enduring links between the Old and New Worlds, initiating European civilization’s influence on the Western Hemisphere. Additionally, his enterprising spirit has epitomized a quintessentially American trait to the American people.

- Use this opportunity to address with students the history of interactions between the indigenous peoples of North and South America and European explorers and settlers. Of paramount importance is that students not paint with too broad of a brush. The relationships varied widely. Many interactions and relationships were mutually respectful and cooperative. Others were brutal and unjust. Often the relations between the same groups ebbed and flowed between friendship and conflict over time. Ask why misunderstandings, duplicity, and conflict between very different peoples and cultures—and between fallible individuals of all sorts—might arise.

- In addition to conflicts, discuss how the indigenous people’s lack of acquired immunity to diseases—notably smallpox, which most Europeans had been conditioned to survive—was a leading cause of the decline in the Native American population.

- Highlight the later years of Columbus’s life, including his removal as commander in Spanish-claimed territories, his shipwreck and stranding on Jamaica for a year, and Spain’s unwillingness to commission any further expeditions under his command. Columbus died as an abject failure in the eyes of the world and likely in his own eyes, as he never did find a passage to Asia yet also did not understand that what he had discovered was another half of planet Earth. Note how his sailings along the isthmus of Panama left him, unknowingly, just a few dozen miles from the vast Pacific Ocean, the existence of which he knew nothing.

- Review other explorations between Columbus and the beginning of English settlement efforts in the late 1500s. Study Ponce de Leon’s discovery of Florida and the eventual settlement at St. Augustine, marking the first European presence in the future United States. Students need not study all of these events in detail, but they should grasp the overall strategy that Spain, Portugal, and even France adopted toward exploring and settling the New World, namely, a top-down, economically motivated approach under the direct centralized control of their respective monarchies. It will be important to contrast this approach with that of the English in the next lesson.

- Trace the paths of various explorers into the future states of America, particularly in Florida and the West. The presence of Catholic missionaries is of special note, highlighting one motivation for exploration.
• Recount the first English effort to establish a permanent settlement in North America in the colony of Roanoke, which famously disappeared with barely a trace after a brief four-year existence.

• Recount the founding of Jamestown as emblematic of one important motivation for the English to establish a colony: material opportunity for the lower classes. Land ownership by common folk was extremely rare in almost all of Europe, and economic mobility itself was a relatively new and rare phenomenon. The organizers and settlers of Jamestown embodied the enterprising spirit that would come to define emigrants from England to North America, and, for that matter, millions of immigrants throughout America’s history. This degree of opportunity for the ordinary person was unprecedented. It partly explains why so many European commoners left what was familiar and risked the greater likelihood of an earlier death to pursue it. The Jamestown settlers exemplified the idea of pursuing “the American dream.”

• Help students to appreciate the several periods when Jamestown was on the verge of failing and the many deaths incurred despite its eventual success. Of particular note was Jamestown’s original experiment with a form of communism. This collectivism, plus rampant disease, helped produce a disastrous first year and a half for the fledgling settlement. John Smith’s requirement that settlers earn their bread by their work and his guarantee of private property ownership, along with some much-needed assistance from the local Native Americans, not only saved the settlement but also became quintessentially American traits, both in law and in the character of the people. But even this near disaster paled in comparison to what was known as the “Starving Time,” in which failure was averted only by a return to the rule of law under Lord De La Warr. The turning point for Jamestown was the successful cultivation of tobacco by John Rolfe. While not the gold many settlers had originally envisioned, the crop would both shore up Jamestown’s existence and spread the news among the English and other Europeans that opportunities were present and realizable in English Virginia.

• Consider how the year 1619 at Jamestown offers a profound insight into colonial America:
  - On the one hand, it was in 1619 that the first enslaved Africans, having been taken from a Portuguese slave ship en route to Mexico by an English privateer, landed at Jamestown.
  - On the other hand, it was also in 1619 at Jamestown that the Virginia House of Burgesses first convened, marking the beginning of representative self-government in the colonies. This self-government would flourish for more than 150 years as the British colonists of North America largely governed themselves and developed the thoughts, practices, and habits of a self-governing people. Be sure to discuss what is meant by “self-government.”

• Show how the founding of Plymouth was emblematic of the other important motivation for Englishmen to establish a colony: religion. In the wake of the Protestant Reformation, the Christian world was divided, with various forms of strife and severe restrictions on religious belief and practice. In England, these divisions were within Protestantism itself, with Puritans wishing to purify the Church of England of remaining Catholic trappings and Separatist Puritans (whom we call Pilgrims) seeking to establish a new, true Church of England. It was this latter group that sought not only the freedom to practice their form of Anglicanism but also to re-found the Church in the New World.

• Spend some time with the Mayflower Compact, signed off the coast of Cape Cod before the settlers went ashore. Emphasize the English tradition of the rule of law and of forms of democratic expression traced back at least to the Magna Carta. Facing a lawless wilderness with families to protect and ex-convicts in their midst, the Pilgrims resorted to that English tradition of self-government under the rule of law—a social contract among themselves—with God as its
ultimate judge. Both the Pilgrims at Plymouth in 1620 and the convening of the Virginia House of Burgesses down the coast at Jamestown in 1619, the first two successful English settlements, almost immediately practiced self-government. Self-government under law was therefore present at the very inception of America, a fact that makes America unique.

- Note the terrible first winter the Pilgrims suffered at Plymouth, and how the Wampanoag Indians truly saved those who did survive. The next year, with the help of the Wampanoag, was a tremendous success, which Pilgrims and Native Americans together celebrated, and for which they gave thanks to God in what is considered America’s First Thanksgiving (notwithstanding a similar celebration in Spanish Florida in the previous century). Share accounts of this festive Thanksgiving from Edward Winslow and William Bradford.

- Finally, discuss the founding of Massachusetts Bay Colony and the leadership of its first governor, John Winthrop. Like the Pilgrims, these Puritans were fierce critics of the Church of England. Unlike the Pilgrims, however, the Puritans at Massachusetts Bay sought not to separate from the Church of England but to establish a community that would help purify and correct the Church of England while remaining a part of it. As evident in Winthrop’s “A Modell of Christian Charity,” New England would convert Old England by its example. Together with Jamestown and Plymouth, the English had a beachhead in the New World, and the news spread far and wide across the Atlantic.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS**

**Activity 1:** Assign each student a different event to draw from the years between Columbus’ landing in San Salvador through the First Thanksgiving. Then have students arrange themselves in the correct order of events in class and have each present briefly what they drew, the story behind it, its relationship to other scenes, and why they depicted it the way they did.

**Activity 2:** Using a printed map, have students draw the Columbian Exchange and list or draw several products that would be traded from the Americas to the Old Word and vice versa.

**Assignment 1:** Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

**Assignment 2:** What were the primary motivations of the Jamestown settlers? What were the primary motivations of the Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay settlers? What were the similarities and differences between these two groups’ motivations? (2–4 sentences)

**Assignment 3:** What are some of the reasons Jamestown nearly failed in its early years? What strategies did men like John Smith and Lord De La Warr use to save the young colony? (2–4 sentences)
Assignment 4: Retell the story of the First Thanksgiving and Algonquian’s role in saving the Pilgrims who survived the harsh winter (2–4 sentences).
Unit 1 | Formative Quiz 1

Covering Lesson 2
10-15 minutes

MATCHING: Write the letter of each definition to the correct word it defines.

____ Virginia Company
A. a cash crop exported from Virginia to Europe

____ “starving time”
B. a document in which the Pilgrims organized themselves under the rule of law

____ Mayflower Compact
C. a period in which many of Jamestown colonists died

____ tobacco
D. Englishmen who combined their resources to finance travels to England’s first successful colony

____ House of Burgesses
E. first convened in 1619 and marked the beginning of representative self-government in the colonies

SHORT ANSWER: Answer the following in complete sentences.

1. Why did Europeans begin exploring the ocean in the 1400s?
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

2. Was Christopher Columbus successful? Why or why not?
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

3. What events helped Jamestown to succeed?
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

4. Why did the Pilgrims want to establish Plymouth?
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

5. Why did John Winthrop say that the settlers at Massachusetts Bay were like “a city upon a hill”?
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
Lesson 3 — The Colonies in Profile

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the thirteen colonies that would become the United States of America, including their foundings and ways of life for colonists.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
Selections from Colonial Times

Teacher Texts
Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1  Pages 25–27
The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic  Pages 45–46, 48–51, 54–55
Colonial Times  Pages 35–54, 56–59, 103–127, 93–97

Trade Books
If You Lived With the Iroquois
The New Americans
If You Lived in Colonial Times
If You Lived in Williamsburg in Colonial Days
Three Young Pilgrims

Online.Hillsdale.edu
The Great American Story Lecture 2
American Heritage Lecture 2

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students pre–read selections from Colonial Times (based on grade level reading ability).

Assignment 2: Students look at images displaying the geography of the New England, Middle, and Southern colonies and list the advantages and disadvantages presented by the natural features of each region.
**CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON**

**Geography & Places**
- New Hampshire
- Maryland
- Connecticut
- Rhode Island
- Delaware
- North Carolina
- South Carolina
- New Jersey
- New York
- Pennsylvania
- Philadelphia
- Georgia
- New England Colonies
- Middle Colonies
- Southern Colonies

**Persons**
- Lord Baltimore
- Roger Williams
- Peter Stuyvesant
- William Penn
- James Oglethorpe

**Terms and Topics**
- public education
- indentured servitude
- religious freedom
- chattel slavery
- township
- slave ships
- Quakers
- Middle Passage
- self-government
- individualism
- colonial assemblies
- aristocracy
- colonial governors
- militia
- Triangle Trade

**Images**
- Historical figures and events
- Landscape pictures of geographic places featured in this lesson
- Map of the Triangle Trade
- Depictions of indentured servants and then slaves in the colonies

**STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART**

- Roger Williams’s efforts to establish religious toleration in Rhode Island
- Stories of Peter Stuyvesant’s governance in New York
- Accounts from the Salem Witch Trials
- Descriptions of slavery and life on a slave ship
- Stories of African Americans who won their freedom in the colonies
- Accounts of life in the different colonies
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- How did the English settle the New World differently than other countries?
- How did many European settlers see the New World as a place of opportunity?
- What is religious freedom or toleration? Why was this special in the colonies compared to other parts of the world?
- Why was it important that colonial children learned to read and think? Why was this special in the colonies compared to children in other parts of the world?
- What was unique about who was able to own property and vote in the colonies compared to other places in the world?
- How did the kind of work colonists vary from region to region?
- What was indentured servitude? How is it similar to and different from slavery?
- What are the origins of slavery in world history?
- How were Africans first enslaved, before being brought to the Western Hemisphere?
- What was it like to be an African on the Middle Passage and then a slave in the New World?
- How were African slaves distributed in the New World? What proportions of Africans were taken to which parts?
- How did slavery gradually expand and become accepted by laws?
- Describe the main characteristics of the “American” colonist? Where did these traits come from?
- How were the colonies’ leading citizens distinct from the leaders in European societies?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 73: The colonists came to America for many reasons. Name one.
  - Question 75: What group of people was taken and sold as slaves?

KEYS TO THE LESSON

Teaching the histories of each colony helps students to understand and appreciate the humble origins of the future United States. It is also very revealing. Students can see in the early histories of many colonies the beginnings of traits that would eventually be hallmarks of American society, law, and citizenry.

Teachers might best plan and teach The Colonies in Profile with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Try to teach the colonies in the order in which they were founded (i.e., as listed above in “Geography and Places”). A map may be projected and distributed to students for reference as the lesson proceeds from colony to colony.
- Compare with students the basic economic differences between French, Spanish, and English colonies; i.e., the native fur trade (France), tributary native labor and precious metals (Spain), and settlement agriculture (England).
- Note the seemingly haphazard approach the English took to colonization, largely shaped by the monarch and parliamentary politics in England at the time of each colonial settlement. For one, colonization was decentralized, and most of the original colonies were established as private property ventures, often sanctioned by the crown but really in the possession of private individuals through joint-stock companies. These were then populated not with government officials or hired agents but with men of all ranks who were also seeking their own opportunity, freedom, and plot of land. Both of these features accounted for the lack of an overall master plan for colonizing North America and marked important departures from the approaches taken by
Spain, Portugal, and France. This lack of a plan would become a problem later when England would seek to centralize the administration of the colonies, largely in an effort to raise revenue and enforce the sovereignty of Parliament.

- Help students to understand the importance of these traits. Not only did the English approach to colonization trend toward greater independence from the monarchy, it also attracted and encouraged individuals and families who were independent-minded and determined. What the settlers did not bring with them from Europe were the legal class distinctions that defined the aristocratic and monarchical nations they left behind. These individuals (except for their British governors) were common people who immigrated to America seeking their freedom and to better their station in life. The rugged individualism, practice of personal independence, work ethic, and ingenuity to succeed would become well-known American characteristics and in some cases would result in the formation of new colonies by separation from an existing colony, as was the case in New England.

- Spend time on what it meant to make a living and survive in the daunting wilderness and how such perseverance shaped the character and mind of the colonists. This would include looking at lifestyles and kinds of work done in the colonies, the type of self-reliance necessary for such lives, and the ways in which Christian religious beliefs contributed to how communities functioned.

- Consider how strongly matters of religious faith defined colonial culture, largely because so many came to America to escape the religious persecutions or limitations of the Old World. From the Pilgrims and the Puritans to Roman Catholics and Jews, a wide variety of faiths (most of them Christian and many of whom were intolerant of one another in the Old World) permeated colonial settlements, and their adherents increasingly came to respect one another as neighbors. Establishing this religious freedom in law, moreover, was widespread and exceptional compared to the rest of the world, even while events such as the persecution of the Quakers in Massachusetts still occurred.

- Note also for the students that the diversity of religious belief was accompanied by the diversity of immigrants. New York and Rhode Island, for example, were well known for the number of people who had migrated there from many countries other than the British Isles.

- Help students appreciate that colonial America was highly literate and that the leading members of colonial society and government were educated in classical thought, ancient and contemporary history, and philosophy and politics (including thinkers of the moderate Enlightenment). Such high levels of literacy and learning were unheard of anywhere else in the world. Important factors that contributed to this high degree of literacy among the people was the insistence on being able to read the Bible, broad support for education, and collegiate preparation.

- Emphasize with students the degree of self-government that the colonists exercised. Include in this discussion the meaning of self-government. In brief, the colonists largely governed their own internal affairs (rule over local matters, including taxation, as opposed to international trade and security) through local legislatures and governance structures chosen by the people. This was partly due to the English tradition of legislative authority and the rule of law, the loose and decentralized pattern of British colonial settlements and rule compared to other empires. Another factor at play here was the great distance between London and the American eastern seaboard, which led to long periods of “benign neglect” of the colonies and the further development of local institutions of self-government. While all of the colonies would eventually become official royal colonies with royal governors, colony-wide legislative bodies were prolific, as were local governments such as townships, counties, and cities. Unlike almost every place in the world at that time and in history, the people were to a large extent ruling themselves.
Discuss how private property opportunities and protections enabled commoners to earn their livelihood in freedom and contributed to the characteristics of Americans as industrious and independent.

Explain to students the several kinds of trade and vocational trades present in the various colonies. Farming was, of course, the main livelihood, but manufacturing, fishing, whaling, shipbuilding, and other trades (particularly in New England) rapidly emerged as key colonial contributions. Trade was principally with England, but the British colonies of North America developed robust trade among one another and with the colonies of other nations as well.

Share with students the complex patterns of relationship between the colonists and Native Americans. The relationships ran the gamut from friendly to violent, varying widely depending on the tribe involved, with misunderstandings and clashes of cultures and languages. Disagreements abounded over the concepts of communal versus private property. Violent clashes occurred along the edges of the colonial frontier, and cross-frontier retaliations by both sides were not uncommon. Colonists could be caught in conflicts between various Native American tribes, and likewise, Native Americans were often caught in conflicts between European powers. Systematic displacement of Native Americans was usually limited to localities during this period (such as after King Philip’s War in southern New England and through the Indian slave trade on the South Carolina frontier). Displacement over time was primarily due to devastation from disease and gradual, individual settlement westward.

Mention that a number of colonists criticized some of the ways that colonial governments dealt with Native Americans. These also condemned and sought to remove slavery from their colonies. Arguments for justice toward Native Americans and Africans often cited Christian religious beliefs and moral philosophy.

Review with students the emergence of chattel slavery during the Renaissance in Europe and through colonization, then address slavery in what would become the future United States. When teaching students about the history of slavery in the British colonies of North America, be mindful of the following:

- Help students to understand why a full understanding of the human person, of equality, and of justice all make slavery an evil action and practice, violating the principle that all people are equal in their humanity and possession of natural rights. Therefore, no one person may automatically infringe on the humanity or rights of another unless some initial violation of another’s rights has occurred.

- Discuss the history of slavery in world history, from ancient times through the middle ages and in different places, leading up to the transatlantic slave trade. Portugal first began using African slaves on their sugar plantations off the west African coast, manifesting the chattel and race-based aspects of slavery in European colonies. The slave trade gradually made its way to the various colonies established throughout the Western Hemisphere, particularly with the cultivation of sugar cane in the Caribbean.

- Ask students to imagine the Middle Passage and the barbarities of slavery and the slave trade. Overall, of the nearly 11 million Africans who survived being brought to the Western Hemisphere, around 3 percent, or about 350,000, were brought to the North American continent, with the rest of all Africans taken to other colonies in the Caribbean and South America.

- As mentioned in the previous lesson, the first Africans were brought to Jamestown by an English privateer who had captured a Portuguese slave ship en route from Africa, likely headed for Portugal’s South American colonies.
Discuss the similarities and differences between slavery and indentured servitude. Indentured servitude was a common way for those who could not afford passage or to establish themselves in the New World to tie themselves to a sponsor for a number of years, offering free labor in exchange for passage across the Atlantic and shelter in the colonies. Oftentimes indentured servitude was little different from slavery in its practice, as shown in transcripts from court cases of indentured servants claiming relief from a cruel master.

It would be several decades before a law emerged in the southern colonies that concerned African colonists in particular or the practice of slavery. In 1662, forty-three years after the arrival of the first Africans at Jamestown, Virginia’s commanding general determined that a child born to an enslaved woman would also be a “servant for life,” and in 1668, corporal punishment for slaves was permitted in law. These appear to be the first laws regarding slavery in colonial America.

The transatlantic slave trade grew with the sugar cane plantations of the Caribbean as far back as the early 1500s—plantations which also happened to become England’s most valuable colonies. At the same time, the source of labor shifted away from indigenous peoples, European convicts, and indentured servants to slaves. Although slavery was more widespread in the southern colonies (to grow tobacco and rice) and almost universal in England’s Caribbean sugar plantations, few laws explicitly prohibited the practice in most colonies, at least at certain times in their histories. Consider also the early abolitionist efforts of some colonists, the Quakers, for example.

Reflect with students on the unique American character that emerged among the free British colonists in North America. The harshness and risk of settling the New World gave them a certain grit and determination, along with an enterprising mind and innovative skill set. The universal demand for trade skills and farming in establishing a new civilization placed the vast majority of colonists within what we would call today the “working class.” In New England especially, colonists’ Protestantism made them widely literate for the sake of reading the Bible, skeptical of human sources of authority, and focused on individual improvement. At the same time, it made them highly idealistic, with many seeking to re-found Christendom. For many colonists, previous persecution granted them a deeper and more passionate sense of justice, of right and wrong. It also made them highly attuned to the politics on which freedom depended. A certain rugged, enterprising, and justice-loving individualism defined the colonists.

Explain how a sort of unofficial aristocracy emerged throughout the colonies, but an aristocracy open to promotion by the meritorious; that is, based on merit, talent, and virtue instead of mere heredity. This unofficial class of leading citizens was also modeled more on the English gentleman rather than on the courts of continental Europe. Their stations in life ranged from planters in the south, where the aristocratic element was most prevalent, to clergy, merchants, professors, and manufacturers in the north. And in general, all of them were highly learned.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS**

**Activity 1:** Assign each student a different colony and have them describe its founding. Then have students arrange themselves in the correct order based on when the colonies were founded. Have each student present briefly who founded the colony and his or their primary motivation for founding that colony.
Activity 2: Using a printed map, have students label each of the colonies and color the colonies using three different colors for each of the different regions: New England, Middle, and Southern colonies.

Assignment 1: Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

Assignment 2: What was religious toleration and why was it important in the colonies? (2–4 sentences)

Assignment 3: What was chattel slavery, where did it come from, and how was it promoted and resisted in the colonies? (2-4 sentences)

Assignment 4: What kind of unofficial aristocracy emerged throughout the colonies, and how did this differ from the aristocracy in Europe? (2-4 sentences)
Unit 1 | Formative Quiz 2

Covering Lesson 3
10-15 minutes

MATCHING: Write the letter of each definition to the correct word it defines.

____ indentured servitude  
A. an exchange of free labor for passage across the Atlantic and shelter in the colonies

____ self-government  
B. England’s loose control over the American colonies

____ James Oglethorpe  
C. politically deciding one’s internal affairs

____ The Middle Passage  
D. the route by which Africans were taken to the Americas from Africa

____ salutary neglect  
E. tried to set up a debtor’s haven in Georgia

SHORT ANSWER: Answer the following in complete sentences.

1. How did many European settlers see the New World as a place of opportunity?

_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

2. Why was it important that colonial children learned to read and think?

_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

3. What was unique about who was able to own property and vote in the colonies compared to other places in the world?

_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

4. What are the origins of slavery in world history?

_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

5. How did slavery gradually expand and become accepted by laws?

_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
Lesson 4—Major Events in the Colonies

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the major events and movements in colonial America and further study the ideas and experiences that were shaping the colonists in the 1600s and 1700s.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts

Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1 Pages 12–14, 28–36
Meet George Washington Pages 1–24
Ben Franklin of Old Philadelphia Pages 3–98

Teacher Texts

Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1 Pages 12–14, 28–36
The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic Pages 47, 59–67
The American Revolution and Constitution Pages 5–11

Trade Books

Struggle for a Continent
The Courage of Sarah Noble

Online.Hillsdale.edu

The Great American Story Lectures 2 and 3
American Heritage Lectures 2 and 3

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students pre-read selections from The American Revolution and Constitution (based on grade level reading ability).

Assignment 2: Students draw, label, and color on a map the approximate extents of Spanish, French, and English claims in North America up until 1754.

Assignment 3: Students pre-read selections from Meet George Washington (based on grade level reading ability).

Assignment 4: Students pre-read selections from Ben Franklin of Old Philadelphia (based on grade level reading ability).
Core Content in This Lesson

Geography & Places
- Appalachian Mountains
- Allegheny Mountains
- Ohio River Valley
- The Great Lakes
- Canada
- Mississippi River
- Quebec
- Montreal
- Duquesne

Persons
- Jonathan Edwards
- George III
- George Washington
- Benjamin Franklin

Terms and Topics
- King Philip’s War
- English Civil War
- Bacon’s Rebellion
- Glorious Revolution
- English Bill of Rights
- “salutary neglect”
- representation
- self-government
- The Great Awakening
- French and Indian War
- Iroquois Confederacy
- Battle of Jumonville Glen
- Albany Congress
- Fort Duquesne
- Treaty of Paris

To Know by Heart

Selections from George Washington’s “Rules of Civility & Decent Behavior in Company and Conversation,” such as:
- “Be not apt to relate news if you know not the truth thereof.”
- “Speak not evil of the absent for it is unjust.”
- “Use no Reproachfull Language against any one neither Curse nor Revile.”
- And a rule of each student’s choice regarding eating.

Timeline
- 1688: Glorious Revolution; English Bill of Rights
- 1754–63: The French and Indian War

Images
- Historical figures and events
- Dress of colonists from different periods and places
- Uniforms and munitions of soldiers in the various wars
- Depictions of battles and battlefields
- Colonial assembly buildings
- Depictions of Great Awakening gatherings and revival scenes
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- A sermon by Jonathan Edwards
- George Washington and the cherry tree (legend)
- George Washington’s time as a surveyor
- George Washington’s first battles in the Virginia militia, including his survival and Braddock’s death
- Benjamin Franklin’s autobiography

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What was it like to wage war in colonial North America?
- What did the colonists learn from the English Civil War?
- Which ideas from Europe about government influenced the colonists?
- What is “salutary neglect”? Why was it good that England did not pay the colonists much attention?
- What did self-government look like in the colonies?
- How did the Great Awakening help colonists feel like they had more in common than they thought?
- Who fought in the French and Indian War? Why did they fight?
- What was the role of George Washington in the French and Indian War?
- What were the major battles and moments in the French and Indian War?
- What was the Albany Plan of Union? What did it show about the unity of the colonies?
- Why did the British win the French and Indian War?
- How did the Treaty of Paris reshape North America?
- What was good and bad about the territory that the British gained from France?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 85: Benjamin Franklin is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 86: George Washington is famous for many things. Name one.

KEYS TO THE LESSON

Having learned about the establishment and characteristics of each colony, students should consider the major influences and events that shaped colonial history. These include, of course, events that occurred within the colonies themselves, but also certain ideas and events in Europe that had significant influence on the colonists, too. Treatment of some general Enlightenment ideas and of the English Civil War does not need to be extensive in an American history class, but students should understand how these events affected and informed the colonists. Once the lesson enters the eighteenth century, special focus should be placed on the events that created in the colonists a sense of independence from Great Britain and of greater dependence on one another, even as they themselves did not fully recognize or articulate these trends. In general, this lesson should help students see what the colonists and colonies had become before they learn about the American founding.

Teachers might best plan and teach Major Events in the Colonies with emphasis on the following approaches:
Review with students the relationships between Native Americans and the settlers. Note the variety of relationships and circumstances over time, helping students to recognize how much time colonial history spans. Disease was the main factor that tragically sent the Native Americans into decline. When significant conflict did occur, it often involved an entangling of rivalries among Native American tribes and those of European powers and their colonies. The American colonists in particular were well versed in defending themselves with their own arms and in locally assembled citizen militias.

Teach students about wars that occurred in the New World, either between settlers and Native Americans or with colonies of other countries. A lot of detail is not necessary, but students should appreciate that these wars were significant for those who were endangered by them and left largely to their own defenses. Students should also be introduced to the style, strategy, and tactics of seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century warfare, particularly as waged in North America.

Offer a brief history of the English Civil War, which involved and influenced some of the main political thought of the colonists, as well as the Glorious Revolution a few decades later. These political developments informed the colonists and drew their careful attention to political considerations.

Discuss with students the Magna Carta and the English Bill of Rights to show that there is a long history of understanding that a “fundamental law” exists.

Review or discuss the historical ideas that influenced the colonial leaders. In addition to a Judeo-Christian faith tradition and Greco-Roman philosophy and law, Enlightenment ideas also influenced leading colonists, especially those regarding the sources of power and the purpose of government.

Consider with students the English statesman Edmund Burke’s idea that the colonists in British North America enjoyed a relationship of “salutary neglect” with respect to the English government. They were “neglected” in the sense that they were a month away by sea from England, which meant poor communication and the near impossibility of governing directly. The English also largely overlooked their colonies in North America, sometimes viewing the colonists merely as poor tradesmen, former criminals, religious radicals, and commoners of no noble birth. Compared to England’s Caribbean colonies, they were also far less profitable. England’s preoccupation with rivals Spain and France and her own civil war also left English kings and Parliament with relatively little thought to give the colonies. The mercantilist restrictions on trade, moreover, were seldom fully enforced or even capable of being completely enforced, and the colonies largely traded freely with the world.

Help students understand why this relationship of neglect was not, in Burke’s view, a disadvantage but actually healthy for the colonists. Overall, the colonists were still protected, especially on the seas, by the English. At the same time, however, they were not regulated or administratively directed beyond the general forms of governance; e.g., a royal governor and a local legislature. The colonists were largely free to take the enterprising, individualist spirit of common English settlers and, forced by necessity, to innovate and work hard to pursue livelihoods and security within their own spheres. Laws, moreover, could not wait for a two- or three-month lapse in communication. Colonists were both permitted and forced by circumstances to practice the elements of English law they had brought with them, including a recognition of certain rights and the limits of authority. The colonists had ample talent and opportunity to govern themselves: they had education and a group of leading colonists who were learned in classical thought; they had the English rule of law tradition; and they had general
Enlightenment ideas. This tradition of self-government would allow for many generations of practice in self-rule as a feature of daily life. The colonists, therefore, were both used to and deeply practiced in locally governing themselves, replete with the ideas and habits that this process cultivated.

- Briefly spend time reviewing how the colonists governed themselves, including a discussion of what representation is. In general, representation by election determined the composition of the various colonial assemblies, beginning with the Virginia House of Burgesses in 1619. That representative self-government was the norm in the colonies was astonishing compared to the rest of the world and human history and the high degree of participation by the average colonist in local government was widespread.

- Clarify for students that each colony originally did not see itself as part of a shared English colonial political state. Although their own proprietary charters were eventually replaced with royal charters, each colony viewed itself as its own separate entity, only loosely bound to the others by a common mother country and overall shared culture. This view would persist up to the eve of the Revolution.

- Explore with students how the Great Awakening throughout the colonies provided the separate and distinct colonies with something they could hold in common. At the same time, it awakened a passion for right moral conduct and justice that could be attached to any cause.

- Teach students about the various conflicts in which the British colonists of North America found themselves. Spend some time in particular with the French and Indian War. Of special note here is the presence of a young George Washington and the Virginia militia fighting alongside the British regulars. This is a good opportunity to introduce Washington, including his boyhood biography and his exploits in the war, and especially his actions during the attack on General Braddock. The French and Indian War was also important for providing the colonists another shared experience, this time amidst the adversities of war, and for demonstrating increased cooperation and a sense of unity, as evidenced by the Albany Congress. This is also a good place to introduce the architect of the Albany congress and plan, Benjamin Franklin, including teaching about his biography up to this juncture. In addition to fostering advances toward and experiences in united action, the French and Indian War is also of great importance for understanding the circumstances that would lead to the American Revolution.

- Share with students maps showing the transfer of territory to the British Empire through the Treaty of Paris. Discuss with students what this meant for the relative power of Great Britain and France and the new challenges and opportunities inherent in such a sudden change of territory and power.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS**

**Activity 1:** Assign each student a different event to draw from the years between The Glorious Revolution and the French and Indian War. Then have students arrange themselves in the correct order of events in class and have each present briefly what they drew, the story behind it, its relationship to other scenes, and why they depicted it the way they did.

**Activity 2:** Each student chooses one of George Washington’s suggestions from “Rules of Civility & Decent Behavior in Company and Conversation,” recite it by heart, and describe what it means.
Activity 3: Students draw, label, and color on a map the approximate extents of Spanish, French, and English claims in North America after the Treaty of Paris in 1763 and compare the changes to the map they made prior to the French and Indian War.

---

Assignment 1: Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

Assignment 2: What is “salutary neglect,” and how did it turn out to be a good thing for the colonists? (2–4 sentences)

Assignment 3: Retell the story of the French and Indian War and its effects (2–4 sentences).
APPENDIX A

Talk about History

Study Guide

Test

Writing Assignment
TALK ABOUT HISTORY

Student Name: ___________________________  Due: ________________
Story/Lesson from History: ______________________________________

1. Who/what did you learn about in history class today?
   Student Answer: ______________________________________

2. Who were the most important characters in the story?
   Student Answer: ______________________________________

3. Tell me more about one of those characters.
   Student Answer: ______________________________________

4. Tell me about the most exciting/interesting part of the story today.
   Student Answer: ______________________________________

Parent Signature: ___________________________  Date: ________________

TALK ABOUT HISTORY

Student Name: ___________________________  Due: ________________
Story/Lesson from History: ______________________________________

1. Who/what did you learn about in history class today?
   Student Answer: ______________________________________

2. Who were the most important characters in the story?
   Student Answer: ______________________________________

3. Tell me more about one of those characters.
   Student Answer: ______________________________________

4. Tell me about the most exciting/interesting part of the story today.
   Student Answer: ______________________________________

Parent Signature: ___________________________  Date: ________________
Unit 1 Test — Study Guide

Lesson 2 | Exploration and Settlement
Lesson 3 | The Colonies in Profile
Lesson 4 | Major Events in the Colonies

TIMELINE

When given dates in order, match events from a list to the years or dates that they happened.

1492  Christopher Columbus land on San Salvador Island
1607  Jamestown founded
1620  Pilgrims land at Plymouth

PERSONS

Identify each, provide biographical details, and explain what he or she thought or did in specific periods or events.

Christopher Columbus  William Bradford  William Penn
John Smith  Massasoit  James Oglethorpe
Pocahontas  John Winthrop  Jonathan Edwards
Lord De La Warr  Roger Williams  George Washington
John Rolfe  Lord Baltimore  Benjamin Franklin

TERMS AND TOPICS

Identify each and explain its significance to the period of history studied.

Niña, Pinta, and Santa María  Mayflower  Glorious Revolution
Religious freedom  English Bill of Rights
Self-government  “salutary neglect”
Quakers  representation
Militia  The Great Awakening
Triangle Trade  French and Indian War
Chattel slavery  Iroquois Confederacy
Slave ships  Albany Congress
Middle Passage  Treaty of Paris
King Philip’s War  English Civil War
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STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

Be familiar with each of the following stories.

- Christopher Columbus’s crew on their voyage and sighting of land
- The “Starving Time” at Jamestown
- The voyage of the Mayflower
- The First Thanksgiving
- What it was like on a slave ship on the Middle Passage and what it was like to farm tobacco
- George Washington’s first battles in the Virginia militia, including his survival and Braddock’s death
- Benjamin Franklin’s biography

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Based on notes from lessons and conversations, answer each of the following.

☐ Why did Europeans begin exploring the ocean in the 1400s?
☐ How did Christopher Columbus’s voyages change the world?
☐ Why did settlers want to establish Jamestown?
☐ What events helped Jamestown to succeed?
☐ Why did the Pilgrims create the Mayflower Compact?
☐ How did the English settle the New World differently than other countries?
☐ How did many European settlers see the New World as a place of opportunity?
☐ What is religious freedom or toleration? Why was this special in the colonies compared to other parts of the world?
☐ Why was it important that colonial children learned to read and think? Why was this special in the colonies compared to children in other parts of the world?
☐ What was indentured servitude? How is it similar to and different from slavery?
☐ How were Africans first enslaved, before being brought to the Western Hemisphere?
☐ What was it like to be an African on the Middle Passage and then a slave in the New World?
☐ What is “salutary neglect”? Why was it good that England did not pay the colonists much attention?
☐ What did self-government look like in the colonies?
☐ How did the Great Awakening help colonists feel like they had more in common than they thought?
☐ Who fought in the French and Indian War? Why did they fight?
☐ Why did the British win the French and Indian War?
☐ How did the Treaty of Paris reshape North America?
Unit 1 | Test — The British Colonies of North America

TIMELINE: Write the letter of each event next to the date or years it took place.

1492  ______  A. Jamestown founded
1607  ______  B. Pilgrims land at Plymouth
1620  ______  C. Christopher Columbus land on San Salvador Island

MATCHING: Write the letter of each definition to the correct word it defines.

____ Columbian Exchange  A. a body of armed citizens prepared for military service at any time
____ smallpox  B. a deadly disease that was brought to the Americas by Europeans and killed many indigenous peoples
____ Virginia Company  C. an English ship that transported the first Pilgrims from England to the New World
____ tobacco  D. an English trading company charted by King James I that founded Jamestown
____ Mayflower  E. cash crop grown in Virginia that ultimately made it successful
____ religious freedom  F. conflict back in their home country that influenced the colonists’ view of government and freedom
____ self-government  G. people have a say in the laws that they have to live under
____ militia  H. the belief held by many colonists that people should be allowed to freely hold religious beliefs and practice religious customs
____ Middle Passage  I. the route by which Africans were taken to the Americas in slavery
____ English Civil War  J. the transfer of diseases, ideas, goods, and peoples between the New World and the Old World following the voyage of Christopher Columbus
MULTIPLE CHOICE: Circle the option that best answers each question.

1. Who required the Jamestown colonists to work for their bread and guaranteed private property ownership?
   a. Ponce de Leon
   b. John Smith
   c. William Bradford
   d. John Winthrop

2. What was the name of the trade pattern between Europe, Africa, and the Americas?
   a. Triangle Trade
   b. Middle Passage
   c. Great Awakening
   d. Glorious Revolution

3. These were made up of elected representatives and allowed the colonies to govern themselves?
   a. joint-stock companies
   b. townships
   c. colonial assemblies
   d. royal charters

4. Who founded the Province of Maryland as a haven for Catholics?
   a. Thomas Hooker
   b. Roger Williams
   c. James Oglethorpe
   d. Lord Baltimore

5. Who wrote the Albany Plan of Union?
   a. Benjamin Franklin
   b. George Washington
   c. Roger Williams
   d. George III

6. What formally ended the French and Indian Wars?
   a. Bacon’s Rebellion
   b. The Glorious Revolution
   c. The Treaty of Paris
   d. The English Bill of Rights
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART: Tell me about the George Washington’s first battles in the Virginia militia.

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND: Answer the following in complete sentences.

1. How did Christopher Columbus’s voyages change the world?

2. Why did the Pilgrims create the Mayflower Compact?

3. Why was it important that colonial children learned to read and think? Why was this special in the colonies compared to children in other parts of the world?

4. What is “salutary neglect”? Why was it good that England did not pay the colonists much attention?

5. How did the Great Awakening help colonists feel like they had more in common than they thought?
Unit 1 | Writing Assignment — The British Colonies of North America

Due on _____________

DIRECTIONS

In one paragraph, retell the story of how the British colonized North America. Be sure to explain the motivations of colonists and how this influenced how they governed themselves.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX B

Primary Source

The Pilgrims
THE UNDERSIGNED SUBJECTS OF KING JAMES

Agreement Between
the Settlers of New Plymouth

LAW

November 11, 1620

Mayflower | Off the Coast of Cape Cod, Colony of Virginia

The Mayflower Compact

BACKGROUND

The settlers who traveled to the British possession of Virginia on the Mayflower drafted and signed this agreement pertaining to their governance before disembarking in the New World.

ANNOTATIONS

IN THE NAME OF GOD, AMEN. We, whose names are underwritten, the Loyal Subjects of our dread Sovereign Lord King James, by the Grace of God, of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, King, Defender of the Faith, &c. Having undertaken for the Glory of God, and Advancement of the Christian Faith, and the Honour of our King and Country, a Voyage to plant the first Colony in the northern Parts of Virginia; Do by these Presents, solemnly and mutually, in the Presence of God and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil Body Politick, for our better Ordering and Preservation, and Furtherance of the Ends aforesaid: And by Virtue hereof do enact, constitute, and frame, such just and equal Laws, Ordinances, Acts, Constitutions, and Officers, from time to time, as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the general Good of the Colony; unto which we promise all due Submission and Obedience.

IN WITNESS whereof we have hereunto subscribed our names at Cape-Cod the eleventh of November, in the Reign of our Sovereign Lord King James, of England, France, and Ireland, the eighteenth, and of Scotland the fifty-fourth, Anno Domini; 1620.

UNIT 2

The American Founding

1763–1789

UNIT PREVIEW

Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>1763–1776</th>
<th>Self-Government or Tyranny</th>
<th>9-10 classes</th>
<th>p. 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 2</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>The Declaration of Independence</td>
<td>4-5 classes</td>
<td>p. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 3</td>
<td>1776–1783</td>
<td>The War of Independence</td>
<td>9-10 classes</td>
<td>p. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 4</td>
<td>1783–1789</td>
<td>The United States Constitution</td>
<td>9-10 classes</td>
<td>p. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A</td>
<td>Talk about History, Study Guides, Tests, and Writing Assignment</td>
<td>p. 37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B</td>
<td>Primary Sources</td>
<td>p. 55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why Teach the American Founding

The beginning is the most important part of any endeavor, for a small change at the beginning will result in a very different end. How much truer this is of the most expansive of human endeavors: founding and sustaining a free country. The United States of America has achieved the greatest degree of freedom and prosperity for the greatest proportion of any country's population in the history of humankind. How is it that the common American's pursuit of happiness has resulted in such exceptional outcomes over time? This phenomenon compels mindful young Americans to seek to understand how their nation has achieved such results. And America's youth could find no greater source of understanding than the history of their country's founding, starting with their forefathers' ideas, words, and deeds.
Enduring Ideas from this Unit

1. The United States is unprecedented in establishing its existence not on grounds of racial origin nor family privilege but on ideas asserted to be true of all people at all times: namely, on the equal human dignity of each person.

2. America was founded on the view that government should be controlled by the people themselves and limited to the purpose of protecting each person’s natural rights and fostering the common good.

3. Regular, ordinary Americans of everyday means sacrificed their security and very lives to defend these truths about human beings and civic life against a tyranny of the most powerful nation of its day.

4. The United States Constitution’s chief quality is that it allows the people to govern themselves with respect for the dignity of each person while both channeling and restraining the natural ambition of human beings to gain power and recognition.

5. The Constitution is a carefully wrought and considered document, and its original intent and structure should be honored both for the sake of our forebears, to whom we and the world owe our freedom and prosperity, and because the events of the last two hundred years have proven the Constitution’s remarkable achievements time and time again.

What Teachers Should Consider

The United States of America is unprecedented in many ways in the course of human history, but most significantly in the opportunity all its citizens have to pursue unmatched conditions of freedom, security, and prosperity. The country owes its unprecedented success to an unprecedented founding, a beginning forged and canonized in the Declaration of Independence, the War of Independence, and the U.S. Constitution.

And yet, never have so many Americans known so little about this founding. As for love of country, one cannot love (or even consider loving) what one does not know.

The teaching of the American founding is perhaps the most necessary series of lessons a teacher can share with his or her students if those students intend to enjoy the benefits of living in America for the duration of their lives.

With this in mind, a teacher ought to take special care to learn the history and ideas of the American founding. Ambiguity in the teacher’s own understanding, or assumptions derived from anywhere but careful scholarship and a deep reading of America’s founding documents, will leave him or her unprepared to help students understand this history accurately.

The teacher might best open the unit with lessons aimed at understanding why the colonists declared independence in the first place. It was not to avoid paying taxes or about wanting to preserve slavery. (These are misconceptions at best, distortions at worst.) It was to choose—between liberty under self-government and servitude under tyranny. Class may proceed at a brisk pace through the years 1763–1776, touching on the many acts of the British and respective colonial responses to those acts. Spend time on the conflicts and battles; students should chart the gradual shift in public sentiment toward independence.
The Declaration of Independence itself deserves careful study. Such lessons may begin with stories of the writing of the Declaration. Students should read parts of the document aloud together in class, and teachers can foster extensive conversations about what it says, what it means, and why it says it. The majority of the conversation should dwell on the first, second, and final paragraphs of the Declaration. Understanding what is meant by those words is pivotal to understanding American history, what makes America an exceptional nation, and the responsibilities every American citizen has. The list of grievances should be discussed in light of the previous history that led to the Declaration.

The American War of Independence should be taught so as to fill the moral imaginations of students with images of the heroic characters and actions of its American participants. Strategy, battles, and the general arc of the war should be taught in detail, punctuated with accounts of the key moments and figures who contributed to America’s ultimate victory. The ideas for which the War of Independence was fought are matched in the American memory only by the stories of those who fought for them.

When teaching the aftermath of the War of Independence up to the Constitutional Convention, teachers should make clear that America’s foray into governing itself entirely independent of Great Britain initially trended toward abject failure. The Articles of Confederation ordered public affairs in a reactionary rather than prudent manner. Students should understand that the Constitutional Convention, in many respects, saved the country from another sort of tyranny: majority tyranny.

Finally, the Constitutional Convention and the Constitution itself should be studied in tandem and in detail. Students should consider carefully the Framers’ intentions in how they constructed the Constitution. Students should understand that nothing in the Constitution was haphazardly decided. Given the unprecedented long-term success of the Constitution, students should appreciate that any changes to the Constitution warrant careful and complete understanding of why the Framers crafted it the way they did, as explained in their own words.

How Teachers Can Learn More

**TEXTS**

- *Land of Hope*, Wilfred McClay
- *A Short History of the American Revolution*, James Stokesbury
- *The Glorious Cause*, Robert Middlekauff
- *We Still Hold These Truths*, Matthew Spalding

**ONLINE COURSES** | Online.Hillsdale.edu

- *The Great American Story*
- *Civil Rights in American History*
- *Introduction to the Constitution*
- *Constitution 101*
Lesson Planning Resources

**TEACHER RESOURCES**

*Land of Hope Young Reader's Edition,* Wilfred McClay  
*The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic,* H.A. Guerber  
*The American Revolution and Constitution,* Anne Goudvis and Stephanie Harvey

**STUDENT RESOURCES**

*Liberty!,* Lucille Recht Penner  
*Meet George Washington,* Joan Heilbroner  
*The Declaration of Independence,* Elizabeth Raum  
*Meet Thomas Jefferson,* Marvin Barrett  
*The American Revolution,* Bruce Bliven, Jr.  
*The United States Constitution,* Liz Sonneborn

**TRADE BOOKS AND NOVELS**

*Liberty or Death,* Betsy Maestro  
*Give Me Liberty!,* Russell Freedman  
*Guns for General Washington,* Seymour Reit  
*Johnny Tremain,* Esther Hoskins Forbes  
*A New Nation,* Betsy Maestro  
*A More Perfect Union,* Betsy Maestro  
*We The People,* Lynne Cheney

**PRIMARY SOURCES**

“Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death!,” Patrick Henry  
*Common Sense,* Thomas Paine  
Declaration of Independence  
Resignation Speech, George Washington  
“Liberty and Peace,” Phillis Wheatley  
The United States Constitution  
The Bill of Rights
LESSON PLANS,
ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS,
AND FORMATIVE QUIZZES
Lesson 1 — Self-Government or Tyranny

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn how new British exertions of authority over the colonists led to the Declaration of Independence.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
- Liberty!
- Meet George Washington
- Primary Sources

Teacher Texts
- Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition
- The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic
- The American Revolution and Constitution

Trade Books
- Liberty or Death
- Give Me Liberty!

Online.Hillsdale.edu
- The Great American Story

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students look at the painting Spirit of ’76 and describe what the “spirit of 1776” was in a few sentences.

Assignment 2: Students pre-read Liberty!, pages 6–17, 26–31, and 35 (based on grade level reading ability).

Assignment 3: Students pre-read Meet George Washington, pages 1–35 (based on grade level reading ability).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places
Boston  Lexington and Concord
Philadelphia  Ticonderoga
Independence Hall

Persons
George III  Patrick Henry
George Washington  John Adams
Crispus Attucks  Abigail Adams
Paul Revere  Ethan Allen
Samuel Adams  Thomas Paine
Benjamin Franklin  Thomas Jefferson

Terms and Topics
self–government  Intolerable Acts
representation  First Continental Congress
consent  Minutemen
French and Indian War  Battles of Lexington & Concord
Proclamation of 1763  Siege of Fort Ticonderoga
Sons of Liberty  Second Continental Congress
Declaratory Act  Continental Army
Boston Massacre  Battle of Bunker Hill
Boston Tea Party  Liberation of Boston

Primary Sources
“Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death!,” Patrick Henry
Common Sense, Thomas Paine

To Know by Heart
“Appeal to Heaven”
“Don’t Tread On Me”
“Give me liberty or give me death!” — Patrick Henry
“I am no more a Virginian, but an American!” — Patrick Henry
“Paul Revere’s Ride,” Henry Wadsworth Longfellow
“One if by land, two if by sea.”
“The shot heard round the world.”
“Concord Hymn” — Ralph Waldo Emerson
“Don’t fire till you see the whites of their eyes!” — Israel Putnam, William Prescott, or legend

Timeline
1754–1763  French and Indian War
1770  Boston Massacre
1773  Boston Tea Party
1775  Lexington and Concord
July 4, 1776  Declaration of Independence signed
Images

- Historical figures and events
- Revolutionary era flags
- Paul Revere’s Engraving of Boston Harbor under occupation
- Paul Revere’s Engraving of the Boston Massacre
- Independence Hall (exterior and interior)
- Battle maps and battle scene depictions
- Uniforms and arms of the Minutemen, the Continental Army soldiers, and the Redcoats
- Medical equipment
- *Spirit of ’76* painting by Archibald Willard

Stories for the American Heart

- Biographies and the roles of George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Samuel Adams, Patrick Henry, Thomas Paine, and Thomas Jefferson up through 1776
- Boston Massacre
- John Adams’s heroic defense of the redcoats
- Boston Tea Party
- Patrick Henry’s “Give me liberty or give me death!” speech
- Paul Revere’s Ride
- Minutemen at the Battles of Lexington and Concord
- Ethan Allen, Henry Knox, and the Green Mountain Boys capturing the guns from Fort Ticonderoga
- Letters of John and Abigail Adams
- John Adams’s nomination of George Washington to command the Continental Army
- Battle of Bunker Hill
- Liberation of Boston
- John Adams’s nomination of Thomas Jefferson to draft the Declaration of Independence

Questions for the American Mind

- Why was it good that the colonists had been allowed so much freedom to govern themselves?
- What is self–government? How was the colonists’ freedom to govern themselves limited by the British?
- What was the Proclamation Line of 1763? Why were the colonists upset about it?
- What is a tax? What is it used for?
- Why were the colonists upset about new taxes?
- What were the two types of patriots? How did they resist the British differently?
- How was a boycott used by the Sons of Liberty to repeal the Stamp Act?
- How did the British try to trick the colonists into buying tea with the Tea Act?
- What did the colonists have to do for British soldiers in the colonies?
- What happened in the Boston Massacre and why?
- Why was John Adams’s defense of the redcoats after the Boston Massacre heroic?
- What happened at the Boston Tea Party and why?
- What were the Intolerable Acts and why were they called such by the colonists?
• How did the First Continental Congress unify the colonies?
• How did the Sons of Liberty alert the colonists that the British were coming before Lexington and Concord?
• What happened at the Battle of Lexington and Concord?
• What was the ‘shot heard round the world’ and why is it called that?
• What happened at the Siege of Fort Ticonderoga?
• Even though the Patriots lost the Battle of Bunker Hill, why did it strengthen their spirit to fight?
• What happened at the Battle of Bunker Hill?
• What was George Washington like?
• What did Thomas Paine say in his pamphlet Common Sense? Did it change people’s minds?
• What did the Second Continental Congress do?
• Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 77: Name one reason why the Americans declared independence from Britain.
  - Question 85: Benjamin Franklin is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 86: George Washington is famous for many things. Name one.

**Keys to the Lesson**

For more than 150 years, the British colonists of North America rarely quarreled with their countrymen on the other side of the Atlantic. Then in 1763, the British began to claim new control over the colonists. What followed were thirteen years of increased tension and sometimes violent clashes leading to outright war in 1775 and, in 1776, the declaring of independence by the colonists and the formation of a new country separate from British power. This decade and a half gave birth to the nation each American citizen calls home. It is imperative that American students know the people, actions, and stories that led to the founding of their country. The chief aim of teaching these fourteen years, therefore, is to help students to understand the actions by both Great Britain and the colonists that compelled the Americans to such a separation and to found a new, unprecedented kind of country.

Teachers might best plan and teach Self-Government or Tyranny with emphasis on the following approaches:

• Read aloud together with students in class the book *Liberty!* asking questions throughout.
• By way of background, discuss with students the significance of rights and freedoms to the colonists, appealing to students’ innate sense of justice and fairness. A long English tradition of possessing certain rights or freedoms to act in certain ways had been carried over to the colonies from England. In addition to these traditional guarantees by British government, the colonists had had ample time and space in which to exercise these freedoms, including by actively governing themselves. This was owing in large part to the haphazard way in which the colonies were established and the great distance between them and Great Britain. Setting up these considerations now with students will make the subsequent infringements on the colonists’ rights all the more clear.
• Have students consider the issues the British in North America faced following the French and Indian War (in Europe, the Seven Years’ War), namely, the risk of further conflict (and associated costs) with Native Americans as colonists moved westward, and the massive debt that Great Britain had accumulated in the late war.
• Show how Great Britain’s attempted solutions to these problems (prohibiting colonial expansion and the sudden enforcement of lax tax laws) marked the first shift in the relationship between Great Britain and the colonists and heralded the end of the period of “salutary neglect,” during which American colonists had grown accustomed to practicing self-government.

• Help students see the pattern that this initial shift would grow into: attempts by the British (Parliament and, to a certain extent, King George III) to exert more control, alternating with American resistance to what they argued were infringements on their rights as Englishmen.

• Teach about the various British acts: what they were, why they were passed, how the colonists resisted, and what happened next as a consequence.

• Consider with students that self-government, or representative self-government, was at the heart of the issue. Emphasize that this was not merely a nice-sounding phrase. Instead, the colonists gradually came to recognize the following as a question of liberty or tyranny: whether they were self-governed through their elected representatives or were dictated to and controlled by a distant government in which they had no consent. Make clear that this was the question: not merely whether the colonists would have representation in Parliament (it was impractical) nor whether they had to pay taxes, but whether or not people must be controlled by the will of others in government without their free consent.

• Explain how the Americans organized themselves to engage with and resist the British, a capacity born of decades of practice in self-government and a trait of American citizens for subsequent generations. In due course, the Boston Massacre impressed on public opinion the British position’s semblance to tyranny.

• Emphasize for students how there were often two competing approaches to responding to British actions: one that attempted deliberation and petition, and another that resorted to destruction of property and even tarring and feathering. In the end, the former approach prevailed, resorting to arms only as necessary to defend their assertion of rights, self-government, and liberty.

• Highlight that it was the Boston Tea Party, however, that brought issues to a head, prompting the British to respond to various actions in Massachusetts with the Intolerable Acts. Help students to consider that in five separate, odious ways, these acts show how preventing a people from governing themselves in even something as simple as a tax on paper and tea can lead to tyranny if not effectively recognized and resisted.

• Spend time illustrating how it was really across 1774–75, in response to the execution of the Intolerable Acts, that specific Founding Fathers marshaled their talents and ideas, eventually leading to declaring independence and forming a new nation by summer 1776.

• Teach in some detail the open armed conflicts at Lexington and Concord, Fort Ticonderoga, and Bunker Hill. Students should learn how these battles bolstered the patriot cause and transformed public opinion in these final two years of British rule.

• Show how and why Thomas Paine’s pamphlet Common Sense proved decisive in shifting public opinion at the start of 1776.

• Finally, emphasize how the news in the spring of 1776—that the British had hired German mercenary soldiers to deploy against British-Americans, and were now selectively encouraging slave rebellions in the colonies, while the Continental Congress recommended that the colonies begin forming their own governments—were key factors in moving a majority of the state delegates at the Second Continental Congress to commission a committee to draft a potential declaration of independence.
STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS

**Activity 1:** Assign each student a different event to draw from the years between the French and Indian War through the Battle of Bunker Hill. Then have students arrange themselves in the correct order of events in class and have each present briefly what they drew, the story behind it, its relationship to other scenes, and why they depicted it the way they did.

**Activity 2:** Have students draw maps of Boston and the surrounding area. Have students trace the battles of Lexington, Concord, and Bunker Hill as well as the route taken by Paul Revere. Ask plenty of questions in the process.

---

**Assignment 1:** Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

**Assignment 2:** How did the British change their treatment of the colonists after the French and Indian War? Why did they do so? (2–4 sentences)

**Assignment 3:** Why did the colonists argue it was unjust for Parliament to levy taxes against the colonists who had no representation in Parliament? (2–4 sentences)

**Assignment 4:** Retell the story of the Boston Massacre and John Adams’s role in the trial that followed (2–4 sentences).
Formative Quiz 1

Covering Lesson 1
10-15 minutes

MATCHING: Write the letter of each definition to the correct word it defines.

____ militia  
A. a formal written request signed by several people

____ massacre  
B. a group that made laws for the colonies

____ petition  
C. a violent unjust killing of innocent people

____ Minutemen  
D. an armed body of citizens prepared for military service

____ Congress  
E. colonists ready to fight at a minute’s notice

SHORT ANSWER: Answer the following in complete sentences.

1. What was being stored in Concord that the British were seeking?

_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

2. Explain the meaning of the colonists crying out “no taxation without representation.”

_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

3. Why did John Adams defend the British soldiers in the trial after the Boston Massacre?

_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

4. Why is the shot fired on the North Bridge in Concord, which killed the first British soldier, referred to as the “shot heard ‘round the world”?

_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

5. Who said this quote: “The distinctions between Virginias, Pennsylvanians, New Yorkers, and New Englanders are no more. I am not a Virginian but an American”? What does it mean?

_________________________________________________________________________________
Lesson 2 — The Declaration of Independence

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the movement in favor of independence and about the drafting and signing of the Declaration of Independence. They also read the Declaration of Independence and engage in a seminar conversation about its contents and ideas.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
- The Declaration of Independence
  Chapter 5
- Meet Thomas Jefferson
  Pages 1–28
- Primary Sources
  See below.

Teacher Texts
- Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition
- The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic
  Pages 81–82
- The American Revolution and Constitution
  Pages 155–160, 178–181

Trade Books
- Give Me Liberty!
- Liberty or Death

Online.Hillsdale.edu
- The Great American Story
  Lecture 3
- Introduction to the Constitution
  Lectures 1, 2, 3
- Constitution 101
  Lecture 2
- Civil Rights in American History
  Lectures 1, 2, 3

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students pre–read The Declaration of Independence (based on grade level reading ability).

Assignment 2: Students pre–read Meet Thomas Jefferson, pages 1–28 (based on grade level reading ability).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places
Philadelphia
Independence Hall
Persons
Benjamin Franklin
John Adams

Thomas Jefferson

Terms and Topics
Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God
self–evident
natural rights
equality
unalienable
liberty

pursuit of happiness
consent of the governed
list of grievances
slavery
self–government
representation
Liberty Bell

Primary Sources
Declaration of Independence

To Know by Heart
“When in the Course of human Events, it becomes necessary for one People to dissolve the Political Bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the Powers of the Earth, the separate and equal Station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God entitle them, a decent Respect to the Opinions of Mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the Separation.

“We hold these Truths to be self–evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness—–That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the Consent of the Governed, that whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these Ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its Foundation on such Principles, and organizing its Powers in such Form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.” — First two sentences of the Declaration of Independence

“And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor.” — Final sentence of the Declaration of Independence

“We must all hang together or else we shall assuredly all hang separately.” — Benjamin Franklin

Timeline
July 2, 1776  Second Continental Congress votes for independence
July 4, 1776  Declaration of Independence signed
Images
Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and John Adams
Independence Hall (exterior and interior)
Photos or facsimiles of original Declaration of Independence
National Archives Building and Rotunda
Jefferson Memorial
Statue of Thomas Jefferson (Hillsdale College campus)

Stories for the American Heart

- The first public reading of the Declaration of Independence at the State House Yard, the tolling of the Liberty Bell, and the removal of the royal coat of arms
- The quiet in Independence Hall when the signers realized they had committed treason in the eyes of the Crown and had started down a road that was to end in death or independence or both.

Questions for the American Mind

- What is the Declaration of Independence about?
- Who was the main writer of the Declaration of Independence?
- What did the Declaration of Independence do beyond stating America’s independence from Britain?
- What were the consequences for signing the Declaration and why were the men so willing to sign it?
- Why did the colonists argue they were justified in breaking away from Great Britain? What wrong had Britain done to them?
- What is a “self-evident” truth?
- What does it mean that “all men are created equal”?
- What is a natural right?
- What does “unalienable” mean?
- What is liberty (or freedom) according to the founders?
- Is liberty the same thing as doing whatever you want? Why or why not?
- Why do people create government? What is it supposed to do?
- Where does the government’s power come from?
- What are the people free to do if the government fails or violates its purpose?
- Why is it special that America was created based on the words of the Declaration of Independence?
- America is a country that believes in certain ideas. What are these ideas?
- On what day do we celebrate our country’s independence, its “birthday”?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 8: Why is the Declaration of Independence important?
  - Question 9: What founding document said the American colonies were free from Britain?
  - Question 10: Name two important ideas from the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution.
  - Question 11: The words “Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness” are in what founding document?
Question 75: What group of people was taken and sold as slaves?

Question 77: Name one reason why the Americans declared independence from Britain.

Question 78: Who wrote the Declaration of Independence?

Question 79: When was the Declaration of Independence adopted?

Question 81: There were 13 original states. Name five.

Question 85: Benjamin Franklin is famous for many things. Name one.

Question 87: Thomas Jefferson is famous for many things. Name one.

Question 125: What is Independence Day?

Question 126: Name three national U.S. holidays.

**Keys to the Lesson**

The Declaration of Independence was not merely a renunciation of dependence on Great Britain. It was, in fact, generative. It created an entity—a nation—that stood on its own, had its own existence, and was independent of other nations. Even today, it offers guiding principles that continue to shape our arguments about the nature and limits of political authority. In brief, the Declaration of Independence created and still defines the United States of America.

Like an organizational mission statement, the Declaration is an indication of the Founders’ intention, a guiding star for our political life, and a benchmark for measuring our public institutions. Americans should consider all questions concerning the public sphere in light of the truths asserted in the Declaration. The Declaration of Independence should be both the beginning and end for students’ understanding of their country, their citizenship, and the benefits and responsibilities of being an American.

Referring questions of our common life to the Declaration of Independence does not mean that Americans should be forced or manipulated to believe the ideas of the Declaration to be true. But this unit asks students at least to consider whether the Declaration’s claims are true. Indeed, Thomas Jefferson and the delegates at the Second Continental Congress addressed the Declaration of Independence not only to Americans in 1776 but also to the critical judgment of American students in the 21st Century, for, as they stated, “a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation” [emphasis added]. The lasting claim of the Declaration is that there are certain truths about all men having unalienable rights. As a historical matter, as well, students should think about how the American founding—and the continuation of the American experiment—has succeeded or failed against its stated objectives.

Students should think about the Declaration of Independence as the foundation and even the heart of their country’s existence. While a more extensive study of the Declaration should occur in later grades, including consideration of the thinkers who influenced the Founders, the historical treatment of the American Revolution deserves some conversation on the ideas of the Declaration.
Teachers might best plan and teach the Declaration of Independence with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Read aloud together with students in class the book *The Declaration of Independence*, asking questions throughout.
- Help students to see that the Founders intended to speak to them, to posit truths for their consideration and ultimate judgment. “[A] decent respect to the opinions of mankind” means that the Declaration was not merely intended as an argument about the unique situation of the colonists in 1776; the Founders submitted their claims to the judgment of all people in all times because they were asserting truths about all people in all times. This especially includes future Americans and, in this case, American students.
- Lead students through key phrases from the Declaration of Independence, especially the first and second paragraphs. Pause frequently to ask students questions.
- Help students to consider that the Founders are making assertions of the existence of objective truth by referencing “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God” and by describing the truths as “self-evident.” This abides by the first law of logic, that of contradiction, which is the basis of all reasoning and of our capacity to make sense of reality: i.e., that something cannot both be and not be at the same time in the same way. The use of the words “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God” ties truth to an external reality (nature) with fixed and reliable features (laws). “Self-evident” ties truth to fixed definitions—a “self-evident” claim is one that is true by definition of the idea in question, like the claim that a triangle has three sides. A “self-evident” truth is not merely a matter of perspective; it can be known and understood by anyone at any time.
- Ask students what the Declaration means by “all men are created equal.” For one thing, “men” means human being not males as opposed to females. Based on the totality of their writings available, the principal authors of the Declaration meant that men and women share equally in human dignity and in possession of natural rights or freedoms that are simply part of being human. A consistent application of equality would make slavery impossible—and the Second Continental Congress could scarcely have missed this point. This meaning of equality did not suggest equality in talent, property, or other accidentals to one’s humanity, qualities that are unique to a particular person and circumstance.
- Note that the mere articulation that all men are created equal was revolutionary. Compared to the degree and universality of equality we take for granted today, such a statement and contemporary limits on the principle in practice leave the Founders open to much potential criticism. For example, in general, women, men without land, and African Americans were not able to vote. But the mere fact that most men *were able* to vote was a significant departure from what was normal in the rest of the world. And even though civil equality was not universal, the statement about inherent and equal dignity of all people was unheard of at the time. Many Founders believed (and the centuries since have proven them correct) that this founding principle would allow for ever greater realizations of equality through history. In brief, were it not for the Founders’ assertion of human equality, albeit imperfectly put into practice, the kind of equality we are used to today likely would never have arisen, or certainly not from American shores.
- Ask students what the Declaration states to be the purpose of government. Students should understand the Declaration’s argument that government is created to secure the natural rights of each person.
Ask students about the source of a government’s power. The Declaration explains that government power comes from the free consent of the people. Students should also consider the Declaration’s argument that people do not receive their rights from government, nor do they surrender their fundamental rights to it. Instead, the rights to “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness” are natural—they are inherent in being human—and government is delegated power by the sovereign people to secure their rights and pursue the common good. Rather than surrendering their rights to government, people create government to protect their rights. The Declaration describes these rights as “unalienable,” meaning that they cannot be relinquished or taken away, though they may be forfeited when a person violates the rights of another person, (e.g., the penalty for taking someone else’s life or liberty might be to lose your own life or liberty).

Help students to understand what is meant by self-government: legitimate government exists to secure rights and derives its “just powers from the consent of the governed,” that is, from the citizen body. The fundamental purpose of government is clear and its powers are limited. As a result, and by design, the people have the liberty to govern themselves in most aspects of their daily lives.

Read the list of grievances and ask students to connect some of the grievances to historical events they studied in the previous lesson. Then ask students to explain how those events violate the statements made in the first two paragraphs of the Declaration.

Introduce the contradiction between the words of the Declaration of Independence and slavery. Talk with students about what a contradiction is and ways in which they have felt or acted in a contradictory way at home or school. The contradiction is genuine and students should rightly grapple with it. In the Constitution lesson, there will be opportunities to see how slaveholding Founders grappled with this contradiction. Here students should see how contradiction, doing both good and bad, runs through the heart of each person.

When discussing compromises between the principled claims of the Declaration and the brutal matter of slavery, be mindful of the following:

- Slavery was one of the few matters of disagreement among the colonial revolutionaries in their otherwise generally united challenge to England. Those who opposed slavery as well as those who favored it agreed about the growing threat of British tyranny.
- Many of the American Founders, especially those from northern colonies, strongly opposed slavery but nevertheless accepted a temporary compromise on the issue, believing that an independent and united country would provide the best prospect for actually abolishing slavery. Without unity between northern and southern colonies, either the colonists would have lost the war, in which case slavery would simply be continued by Great Britain, or the southern colonies would have formed their own separate country, in which case the North would have no power over the South to abolish slavery. The key for the American Founders, especially those who opposed slavery, would be to continue efforts against slavery as a united country—united around the principles of the Declaration of Independence.
- The idea that a country can be founded on a principle—rather than merely on claims of territory, tribe, or military power—is uniquely American. America’s founding principle that “all men are created equal and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights” was unprecedented. Almost all recognized that the statement of the principles, despite a compromise that allowed for the pre-existing institution’s continuing existence, undermined the legitimacy of slavery.
Many northern Founders and even some slaveholding Founders recognized the hypocrisy of claiming the principle of equality in spite of the continuing institution of slavery. Nevertheless, some southern Founders did not believe this phrase to be true for slaves and therefore did not believe it was hypocritical.

Many have understood the principle of equality as the enduring object or goal of American political life, with each generation seeking further to expand the conditions of political equality. This was the view of many Founders, as well as of Abraham Lincoln, abolitionists like Frederick Douglass, and civil rights leaders like Martin Luther King Jr., who called the Declaration a “promissory note to which every American was to fall heir” in his 1963 “I Have a Dream” speech.

Slavery and the subsequent inequality and violations of the rights of the descendants of slaves, as well as of women and certain immigrants, are glaring ways in which the country has fallen short of its founding idea.

The Declaration’s principle of equality—and the persistence and bravery of Americans of all origins to sacrifice and even die insisting that the nation should live up to the principle—has led to unprecedented achievements of human equality and the protection of equal rights.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS**

**Activity 1:** Reenact with students the votes to declare independence and the signing of the Declaration of Independence. Divide students into thirteen groups representing the thirteen colonies. Have a roll call vote by colony and then invite each student to sign a replica Declaration of Independence. The purpose of this exercise is to help students understand the very real and very personal commitment the delegates made. Over the entire proceeding, remind students of the consequences that each of them would face if the revolution failed, and reinforce with them that it probably would fail and that these things probably would happen to them.

**Assignment 1:** Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

**Assignment 2:** Using the first lines of the Declaration of Independence, highlight with a highlighter certain key phrases and terms and then write explanations of what these phrases mean, why they were important for the colonists’ situation, and why they are important for all people at all times (4–6 sentences).

**Assignment 3:** Have students learn by heart and recite the first paragraph of the Declaration of Independence. Some grade levels can learn by heart and recite the second or final paragraph as well.
Lesson 3 — The War of Independence

1776–1783

9-10 classes

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the major figures, common soldiers, strategy, and specific battles of the American War of Independence.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts

*The American Revolution*  
Pages 63–77, 86–104, 131–147

Primary Sources  
See below.

Teacher Texts

*Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition*  
Chapter 6

*The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic*  
Pages 83–102

*The American Revolution and Constitution*  
Pages 4, 33, 53–104, 112–121, 133–136

Trade Books & Novels

*Liberty or Death*

*Guns for General Washington*

*Johnny Tremain*
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*The Great American Story*  
Lecture 4

STUDENT PREPARATION

**Assignment 1:** Students pre-read *The American Revolution*, pages 63–77, 86–104, 131–147 (based on grade level reading ability).

**Assignment 2:** Students pre-read *Meet George Washington*, pages 40–54 (based on grade level reading ability).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places

Delaware River  
Yorktown

Valley Forge

Persons
George Washington  Marquis de Lafayette
Phillis Wheatley  Baron von Steuben
John Adams  Benedict Arnold
Abigail Adams  John Burgoyne
Ethan Allen  Alexander Hamilton
Henry Knox

Terms and Topics
Patriot/Revolutionary  Betsy Ross Flag
Tory/Loyalist  Yankee Doodle
Continental Army  Battle of Saratoga
guerrilla warfare
privateer
Brown Bess Musket  ally
volley
Battle of New York  French Treaty of Alliance
mercenary
Battle of Yorktown
Hessians  Newburgh Conspiracy
American Cincinnatus
Crossing of the Delaware  Treaty of Paris
Battle of Trenton

Primary Sources
Resignation Speech, George Washington
“Liberty and Peace,” Phillis Wheatley

To Know by Heart
“These are the times that try men’s souls.” — Thomas Paine, The Crisis
Yankee–Doodle, first stanza
“George Washington,” Rosemary and Stephen Vincent Benet
“I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country.” — Nathan Hale

Timeline
(1775) 1776–1783  War of Independence
July 4, 1776  Declaration of Independence signed
Christmas, 1776  Battle of Trenton
1777–78  Winter Quarters at Valley Forge
1781 (Fall)  Battle of Yorktown; Cornwallis Surrenders
1783  Treaty of Paris

Images
Historical figures
Images and uniforms of British and American officers and soldiers
Landscape pictures of geographic places featured in this lesson
Depictions of figures at various scenes and moments and in battle
“Washington Crossing the Delaware” painting
Betsy Ross Flag and other flags
Maps: overall strategies, specific battles
Relevant forts
Medical equipment
Reenactment photos
Washington Monument
Statue of George Washington (Hillsdale College campus)

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

▪ The fates of the signers of the Declaration of Independence
▪ David Bushnell’s submarine attack
▪ Washington’s Crossing of the Delaware
▪ The American farmers joining the Battle of Saratoga
▪ Washington encouraging his men at Valley Forge
▪ Stories of Margaret Corbin, Molly Pitcher, Abigail Adams, and Martha Washington during the war
▪ Washington’s camp acting out the Cato play by Joseph Addison
▪ Washington on horseback at the Battle of Monmouth
▪ Washington’s dismissal of the Newburgh Conspiracy
▪ Story of Emily Geiger and Deborah Sampson

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

▪ Who was favored to win the War of Independence?
▪ What things were helpful to the Americans in the War of Independence?
▪ What things were helpful to the British in the War of Independence?
▪ How did the Americans think they could win the war?
▪ How did the British think they could win the war?
▪ How did soldiers fight each other?
▪ What things does an army need to be successful?
▪ Why were the Americans in trouble in the winter of 1776?
▪ How did Washington’s military strategy build confidence in the Americans?
▪ What happened at the crossing of the Delaware River and the Battle of Trenton?
▪ How did the victory at Saratoga invite other countries to take America seriously?
▪ Why did the French form an alliance with the United States?
▪ How did the army suffer in the winter of 1777–78 and how did they regain new hope?
▪ What important contribution did Baron von Steuben make to the Continental Army?
▪ What is the legacy of Benedict Arnold in light of his actions at West Point?
▪ How did the Americans defeat the British at Yorktown?
▪ Why did the Americans win the War of Independence?
▪ What were the terms of the Treaty of Paris?
▪ Why were soldiers on the verge of mutiny in 1783? How did George Washington resolve the crisis?
▪ Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  ▪ Question 76: What war did the Americans fight to win independence from Britain?
  ▪ Question 80: The American Revolution had many important events. Name one.
  ▪ Question 86: George Washington is famous for many things. Name one.
Question 89: Alexander Hamilton is famous for many things. Name one.
Question 121: Why does the flag have 13 stripes?
Question 122: Why does the flag have 50 stars?
Question 124: The Nation’s first motto was “E Pluribus Unum.” What does that mean?

**Keys to the Lesson**

The American Revolution was truly a “David and Goliath” clash: a fledgling strand of remote colonies loosely cooperating as one through a continental, mostly citizen army, fought and won independence from the greatest military power in the world. Students should appreciate this about the war of their forefathers. They should also know key stories of the heroic actions of the leaders and the many common folk in that struggle, understand the strategies employed in general and in specific battles, and consider the key moments and factors that led the Americans to victory.

Teachers might best plan and teach the War of Independence with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Read aloud together with students in class the corresponding pages from *The American Revolution*, asking questions throughout.
- Read selections from *Guns for General Washington* and *Johnny Tremain* aloud to students in class.
- Discuss how the new states organized themselves in the Articles of Confederation. Students should understand generally how it worked and some of its problems.
- Emphasis with students how declaring independence, while no easy task in the first place, was comparatively the easy part. Fighting to prove that the new country could defend its claims to independence was a whole other matter, and one that was very much in doubt.
- Ask students to identify and compare the various advantages and disadvantages of each side at the outset of the war and how these shifted over the years. Having students take simple notes as a “T-Chart” can be effective for this part of the lesson.
- Introduce students to the contemporary style of warfare by using images, maps, and artifacts. This approach will provide a foundation for their subsequent study of battles, help them to understand what happens in battle, and allow them to appreciate the bravery of soldiers fighting on both sides.
- Help students to empathize with the common Continental Army soldier and perceive the risk facing all the colonists, especially the leaders. Conditions were truly awful at many points in the war. The prospect of imminent defeat and the dire consequences for all involved weighed heavily upon the colonists throughout the war. The leaders—the men we now consider the American Founders—would most certainly have been killed if they were captured or the war was lost. In spite of the risks, they risked everything and sacrificed much for the cause of freedom and self-government. Students should appreciate the great debt we owe them.
- Explain in general each side’s strategy at various stages of the war and the tactics and battle plans employed in some important battles.
- Teach major battles with some detail, focusing on the story and its drama. Students should understand how the battles came to be, the key stories, factors, and moments from the
battles themselves, and the significance of their various outcomes on subsequent events. Employ battle maps as appropriate.

- As with any conflict, draw attention to the key contributions of both leaders and common soldiers in the war. George Washington should be especially considered, not so much in his battle tactics as in his overall strategy for the war and his stirring leadership of his soldiers. Read aloud Washington’s resignation speech, presenting it as vividly as possible and helping students appreciate the significance of Washington’s character and example.

- Explain how the principles of the Declaration of Independence were already effecting change among the Americans even prior to the resolution of the war. By the end of the war, every northern state except for New York and New Jersey had explicitly outlawed slavery, and some New England colonies had allowed African Americans to vote. Students should also learn of the outsized contributions of African American soldiers in the war, with five thousand serving in the Continental Army over the course of the war and, by some accounts, African Americans composing nearly a quarter of the American forces at Yorktown.

- Read aloud Phyllis Wheatley’s “Liberty and Peace.” Consider Wheatley’s perspective on the revolution, bearing in mind her status as a former slave.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS**

**Activity 1:** Assign each student a different event to draw from the War of Independence. Then have students arrange themselves in the correct order of events in class and have each present briefly what they drew, the story behind it, its relationship to other scenes, and why they depicted it the way they did.

**Activity 2:** Have students draw a map of the thirteen colonies and then draw and label strategy and battle sites of the War of Independence (this assignment can be assigned at the end of the lesson or be an ongoing assignment as battles are taught).

**Assignment 1:** Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

**Assignment 2:** Make a T-chart. On one side, list the leadership virtues George Washington exhibited during the war. On the other side, give examples from the war in which that virtue was on display.

**Assignment 3:** Choose a battle from the War of Independence and retell the story of what happened in the battle (1 paragraph).

**Assignment 4:** Give three reasons why the Americans won the War of Independence and explain each reason (2–4 sentences).
Formative Quiz 2

MULTIPLE CHOICE: Circle the option that best answers each question.

1. What is an alliance?
   a. an agreement between two countries to stop fighting
   b. a nation neighboring a country at war
   c. a nation that has promised to help another nation in wartime
   d. a non-professional soldier

2. What is guerrilla warfare?
   a. a type of irregular hit-and-run military activity
   b. training animals to fight with your army
   c. a children’s game based on real warfare
   d. attacking an enemy army from the side

3. Who physically wrote or penned the Declaration of Independence?
   a. Thomas Jefferson
   b. George Washington
   c. Paul Revere
   d. John Adams

4. What river did Washington and his men cross to fight in the Battle of Trenton?
   a. Potomac River
   b. Delaware River
   c. Charles River
   d. York River

5. Who was the main ally to the Americans during the war?
   a. The French
   b. The Dutch
   c. The Germans
   d. The British
SHORT ANSWER: Answer the following in complete sentences.

6. How did the Americans think they could win the War of Independence?
   ____________________________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________________________

7. Why did the French form an alliance with the United States?
   ____________________________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________________________

8. Who was Benedict Arnold and why is he well known?
   ____________________________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________________________

9. The colonial army suffered greatly at Valley Forge, but regained their hope at the end of the winter. Name one specific hardship the army faced and one way they regained hope.
   ____________________________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________________________

10. What important contribution did Baron von Steuben make to the Continental Army?
    ____________________________________________________________________________________
    ____________________________________________________________________________________
    ____________________________________________________________________________________
Lesson 4 — The United States Constitution

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the drafting of the Constitution, the debates within the Constitutional Convention and its ratification by the states, the political thought undergirding the Constitution, and the basic structure and powers of the federal government.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
- The United States Constitution
- Primary Sources

Teacher Texts
- Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition
- The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic
- The American Revolution and Constitution

Trade Books
- A New Nation
- A More Perfect Union
- We The People
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- The Great American Story
- Constitution 101
- Civil Rights in American History

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment: Students pre-read The United States Constitution (based on grade level reading ability).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places
- Philadelphia
- Independence Hall
Persons
James Madison  George Washington
Gouvernour Morris  Alexander Hamilton
James Wilson  Publius

Terms and Topics
Articles of Confederation  bicameralism
Shays’ Rebellion  House of Representatives
Constitutional Convention  Senate
Father of the Constitution  impeachment
Constitution  executive powers
natural rights  Electoral College
equality  Commander–in–Chief
consent of the governed  veto power
self–government  judicial powers
faction  judicial review
majority tyranny  amendment
representation  The Federalist
republicanism  Anti–Federalists
federalism  Bill of Rights
limited government  freedom of religion
enumerated powers  free exercise
separation of powers  establishment clause
checks and balances  freedom of speech
Great Compromise  freedom of the press
Three-Fifths Clause  right to assembly
legislative power  right to keep and bear arms
Congress

Primary Sources
The United States Constitution
The Bill of Rights

To Know by Heart
Preamble to the U.S. Constitution
“A republic, if you can keep it.” — Benjamin Franklin
“If men were angels, no government would be necessary.” — Federalist 10
First Amendment

Timeline
September 17, 1787  Constitutional Convention concludes (Constitution Day)
1789  Constitution takes effect; George Washington elected president
Images
Paintings of historical figures and events
Depictions of scenes from the Constitutional Convention
Photographs of Independence Hall (exterior and interior)
Photos or facsimiles of the original Articles of Confederation, Constitution, *Federalist*, and Bill of Rights
*The Signing of the American Constitution* painting, Samuel Knecht
Statue of James Madison (Hillsdale College campus)
National Archives Building and the Rotunda for the Charters of Freedom
Paintings by Barry Faulkner in the Rotunda for the Charters of Freedom

Stories for the American Heart
- Benjamin Franklin’s story about the sun on George Washington’s chair being a sunrise for the country
- Benjamin Franklin’s reply to a woman’s question about what the Constitutional Convention had created: “A republic, if you can keep it,” and what this means

Questions for the American Mind
- What is government and what is its purpose?
- Why were the Articles of Confederation not able to protect the rights of Americans?
- What was Shays’ Rebellion and why did it worry the founders?
- What is a constitution and what does it do?
- Who was the main thinker behind the Constitution, known as the “Father of the Constitution”?
- How are the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution connected?
- What was *The Federalist*, what was its purpose, and why do we still read it?
- Did the founders think the way people are changes over time or that it doesn’t change? (talking about people in general, not necessarily in each person’s own life)
- How did the founders think people tended to be: good, bad, smart, mistaken, a mixture of all of the above?
- Why were the founders worried about people who have power over others?
- Why did the founders believe it was so important to make sure people agreed to rules and laws that government made?
- Why were the founders so worried about people becoming angry with each other and dividing into groups or factions?
- What were the founders so worried that a group of most people would do to a group of few people (majority tyranny)?
- Why did the founders believe that having a big country with many different views would help make sure that one group would not makes laws to hurt another group?
- What were some things that the delegates at the Constitutional Convention disagreed about?
- Why did the founders think it was important to make sure that power in the government, or control over others, was divided among different groups instead of all held by one person or group?
- What is a representative democracy (or a democratic republic, or constitutional republic)?
- What is federalism and how does it divide power?
• What are the levels of government? How is each organized?
• What is the separation of powers and how does it divide power?
• What does the legislative power allow Congress to do?
• What does the executive power allow the President to do?
• What does the judicial power allow the Supreme Court to do?
• How are members of Congress, the President, and the Supreme Court each chosen?
• How does a bill become a law?
• Why does the Constitution make it so hard for it to be changed?
• Did everyone think the Constitution was a good idea? Why not?
• What does the Bill of Rights do and why?
• What is freedom of religion and why is it important?
• What is freedom of speech and why is it important?
• What is the right to assembly and why is it important?
• What is the right to bear arms and why is it important?
• What is due process and why is it important?
• What does each elected or appointed person swear to do for the Constitution?
• Who controls the Constitution?
• What are the various responsibilities of U.S. citizens?
• Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 1: What is the form of government of the United States?
  - Question 2: What is the supreme law of the land?
  - Question 3: Name one thing the U.S. Constitution does.
  - Question 4: The U.S. Constitution starts with the words “We the People.” What does “We the People” mean?
  - Question 6: What does the Bill of Rights protect?
  - Question 10: Name two important ideas from the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution.
  - Question 13: What is the rule of law?
  - Question 14: Many documents influenced the U.S. Constitution. Name one.
  - Question 82: What founding document was written in 1787?
  - Question 83: The Federalist Papers supported the passage of the U.S. Constitution. Name one of the writers.
  - Question 84: Why were the Federalist Papers important?
  - Question 86: George Washington is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 88: James Madison is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 89: Alexander Hamilton is famous for many things. Name one.

**Keys to the Lesson**

“[I]t seems to have been reserved to the people of this country, by their conduct and example, to decide the important question, whether societies of men are really capable or not of establishing good government from reflection and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend for their political constitutions on accident and force.” Thus wrote Alexander Hamilton in the opening paragraph of *Federalist 1* in support of the newly proposed United States Constitution. Indeed, it is the Constitution that gives institutional form to the principles of the Declaration of Independence. It is, as Abraham Lincoln would
later express it, the “frame of silver” meant to adorn and, most importantly, to protect the “apple of gold” that is the Declaration of Independence and the truths it asserts. The Constitution is the vehicle for the American experiment in self-government.

Study of the Constitution and of the history of its creation shows students how and that human beings are able to govern themselves in freedom, securing the equal protection of rights and the dignity of each person through reflection, deliberation, and choice. This is a significant thing for students to grasp, for if a constitution cannot achieve these ends, then force and violence are the only alternatives left to mankind.

Students should understand the main ideas and the basic structure of the Constitution and the government it established, and know the stories from the Constitutional Convention and the ratification debates.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Constitution with emphasis on the following approaches. While the length of this advice is larger than advice for other lessons, it is owing to the ease with which so many features of the Constitution can be taught incorrectly, with significant consequences. Therefore, this advice includes many corrections to common misconceptions that can be quickly addressed in class.

- Read aloud together with students in class the book *The United States Constitution*, asking questions throughout.
- Review briefly the structure of the Articles of Confederation and the issues that emerged under such a structure during the War of Independence, especially the debt cancellation laws by states (a clear example of majority tyranny), varieties of currencies, interstate trade barriers, separate agreements between states and foreign powers, the inability to enforce the Treaty of Paris against the British with respect to western territories, and Shays’ Rebellion.
- Lead students through the process of the Constitutional Convention. Help them see that the Convention was arranged to ensure that all the states were able to speak and be represented. Through stories of the various debates and compromises, explain the difficulty of establishing a government that would satisfy all parties.
- Describe the environment and people of the Constitutional Convention, as well as the history and tone of the ratification debate that followed.
- Read and talk about certain key phrases from the Constitution with particular attention to the Preamble and the structure of government that the Constitution establishes.
- Clarify that the Constitution establishes a republic, not a democracy. In a pure democracy the people make all legislative decisions by direct majority vote; in a republic, the people elect certain individuals to represent their interests in deliberating and voting. The deliberations and voting record of representatives should usually reflect but should also be more refined than that of the entire people voting directly. Sometimes this distinction is described in terms of direct democracy vs. representative democracy.
- Explain the importance of the principles of separation of powers and federalism, and why these ideas are central to the Constitution’s safeguards against the corrupting tendency of power.
- Consider how the Constitution repeatedly structures federal institutions to refine and enlarge the will of the people.
- Explain how the House of Representatives is meant to be a more dynamic and immediate expression of the people’s will, while the Senate is meant to be more deliberative and circumspect.
- Emphasize that the Framers of the Constitution were chiefly concerned with allowing the will of the majority to rule—thereby guaranteeing the consent of the governed—while still preserving the rights of the minority and thereby securing justice.

- Describe the American Founders’ understanding of human nature. They understood human nature to be fixed and unchanging, good but also flawed and tending toward corrupting power. In response to human nature, government must guard against the opposite dangers of lawlessness and tyranny, accounting for the realities of human nature and rejecting the possibility of utopia.

- Show how the Constitution does not deny, demonize, or elevate human nature, but rather seeks to channel the powers of human beings into constructive institutions while mitigating man’s baser tendencies. In brief, the Constitution is constructed on a deep and accurate understanding of fixed human nature born of the Founders’ knowledge of history, their own experience, and their prudence.

- Ask about the source and purpose of a government’s power. Review how the Declaration of Independence claims that government power comes from the free consent of the people, and ask students to identify whether and how the Constitution accomplishes that goal.

- Teach in general terms the structure, makeup, and powers of each branch of government and explain why the Founders made them so. Students should understand the basics of how each branch works, how they work together, and how the branches check and balance one another.

- Take the time to discuss the ways in which slavery was addressed in the Constitution, including the extents to which the Constitution both left slavery in place and also placed new national limits on it. As Frederick Douglass and Abraham Lincoln would later acknowledge, the Declaration’s principle of equality and the Constitution’s arrangements gave the Founders the belief that they had placed slavery on the path to eventual extinction. This of course does not excuse the fact that many of these founders still held African Americans in slavery during their lifetimes.

- Clarify for students the arguments of northerners and southerners concerning the Three-Fifths Clause. The clause was not about the humanity of slaves; it was strictly about how much representation slave-owning states would receive in Congress and the Electoral College. The great hypocrisy of the slaveholders was that while they refused to call a slave a human being, they insisted that each slave be counted as a whole person for purposes of representation. In fact, it was the anti-slavery Founders who did not want slaves counted at all in the Constitution for the purposes of representation. The fact that slaves were only counted as three-fifths for the purposes of representation was a disappointment for southern states, as they had demanded they be counted as a whole person. It was a partial victory for northern opponents to slavery, as it would give the slaveholding states less influence in lawmaking than they wished. Additionally, students should understand that in the mind of those opposed to slavery, this compromise was the only politically viable route if they were to secure southern support for the Constitution, without which the country would become disunited, with the South able to perpetuate slavery indefinitely as their own country without northern abolitionists. Students need not agree with the tenets of the compromise, but they must understand it as the founders themselves understood it.

- Remind students that the slave trade was not formally limited in the states (the Continental Congress had temporarily banned the practice in 1774) until the passage of the Constitution, which allowed for it to be outlawed nationwide in 1808 (which it was) and for Congress to discourage it by imposing tariffs on the slave trade in the meantime. Students should understand that without the compromise that allowed this twenty-year delay, the power to abolish the slave trade would not have been granted by the slaveholding interest in the first place.
• Consider with students the significance of the Constitution not using the word “slave” and instead using “person.” Refusing to use the word “slave” avoided giving legal legitimacy to slavery. Even Article IV, Section 2, Clause 3 emphasizes that slavery was legal based on certain state, not federal, laws. The use of the word “person” forced even slaveholders to recognize the humanity of the slave: that he or she was in fact a human person, not property. There would be no federally-recognized “property in man.”

• Consider with students the sectional nature of views on slavery during the founding. The majority of northerners and northern founders (e.g., John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Benjamin Rush, Gouverneur Morris, and John Jay) spoke and wrote extensively on the immorality of slavery and its need to be abolished. Some northern founders, such as John Jay, Alexander Hamilton, and Benjamin Franklin, founded or served in abolitionist societies.

• Consider also that even among the southern founders who supported slavery or held slaves, several leading founders expressed regret and fear of divine retribution for slavery in America, such as Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and George Washington. Some freed their slaves as well, such as George Washington, who by the end of his life freed the slaves in his family estate. And many, like Thomas Jefferson, nevertheless maintained that slaves were men in full possession of the natural rights of all men. Making these observations does not diminish the inhumaneness of slavery or dismiss the wrong of racism by certain colonists or other individual Americans living in other generations.

• Note the belief of many Founders, based on the evidence at the time, that slavery was naturally on the way to extinction. Public opinion had steadily grown against it; the principles of the Declaration of Independence and Revolution would continue to be a force toward realizing equality; and the Constitution had further restricted slavery, permitted further restrictions by holding the union together, and kept slavery on its path to extinction.

• Teach students about the Anti-Federalists’ concerns with the Constitution, the arguments for and against a Bill of Rights, and how the Federalists ultimately convinced states to ratify the Constitution (provided that a Bill of Rights was included).

• Help students understand why each of the rights found in the Bill of Rights corresponds to the preservation of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and how these rights answer some of the grievances in the Declaration of Independence as well as the problems under the Articles of Confederation. Especially consider the 1st, 2nd, 5th, and 10th Amendments.

• Finally, tell about the first elections, meetings of the Electoral College, and George Washington’s inauguration in 1789.

**Strengthening Understanding: Post-Lesson Activities and Assignments**

**Activity 1:** Divide students into a large group (the people), a medium–sized group (the House of Representatives), and a small group (the Senate). Have the people come up with a policy idea and propose it to the House of Representatives and the Senate. Then have each group discuss their idea one group at a time while everyone else listens. Students should understand how the size and talents of the students in each group changes the nature of the discussions. Students should see how representation in general allows for a more refined and broader consensus on ideas while the Senate provides the greatest opportunity for reflection and careful conversation. These are the virtues of representation and the democratic republican form of government the Constitution establishes.
Assignment 1: Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

Assignment 2: Explain to someone who argues that the government should be more active and powerful what the founders would have said in response and why (2–4 sentences).

Assignment 3: The writers of the Constitution wanted all American citizens to be self-governed. What does it mean to self-govern yourself? (2–4 sentences)

Assignment 4: Have students learn by heart and recite the Preamble to the Constitution.

Assignment 5: Explain why each of the five rights outlined in the First Amendment are important (5–6 sentences).
APPENDIX A

Talk about History

Study Guides

Tests

Writing Assignment
TALK ABOUT HISTORY

Student Name: ___________________________ Due: _____________
Story/Lesson from History: _________________________________________________________

1. Who/what did you learn about in history class today?
   Student Answer: _________________________________________________________________

2. Who were the most important characters in the story?
   Student Answer: _________________________________________________________________

3. Tell me more about one of those characters.
   Student Answer: _________________________________________________________________

4. Tell me about the most exciting/interesting part of the story today.
   Student Answer: _________________________________________________________________

Parent Signature: ___________________________ Date: _________________

TALK ABOUT HISTORY

Student Name: ___________________________ Due: _____________
Story/Lesson from History: _________________________________________________________

1. Who/what did you learn about in history class today?
   Student Answer: _________________________________________________________________

2. Who were the most important characters in the story?
   Student Answer: _________________________________________________________________

3. Tell me more about one of those characters.
   Student Answer: _________________________________________________________________

4. Tell me about the most exciting/interesting part of the story today.
   Student Answer: _________________________________________________________________

Parent Signature: ___________________________ Date: _________________
Study Guide — Unit 2, Test 1

Lesson 1 | Self-Government or Tyranny
Lesson 2 | The Declaration of Independence

Test on ______________

TIMELINE

When given dates in order, match events from a list to the years or dates that they happened.

1770  Boston Massacre
1773  Boston Tea Party
July 4, 1776  Declaration of Independence signed

PERSONS

Identify each, provide biographical details, and explain what he or she thought or did in specific periods or events.

George III  Paul Revere  Thomas Paine
George Washington  Benjamin Franklin  Thomas Jefferson
Patrick Henry  John Adams
Crispus Attucks  Abigail Adams

TERMS AND TOPICS

Identify each and explain its significance to the period of history studied.

self–government  Sons of Liberty  Common Sense
representation  Boston Tea Party  Bunker Hill
petition  Intolerable Acts  self–evident
militia  Committee of  natural rights
mercenary  Correspondence  equality
boycott  Continental Army  unalienable
treason  Minutemen  pursuit of happiness
Proclamation Line  Redcoats  Patriot/Revolutionary
Stamp Act  Lexington & Concord  Tory/Loyalist
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

Be familiar with each of the following stories.

- Biographies and the roles of George Washington, John Adams, and Thomas Jefferson up through 1776
- Boston Massacre
- Boston Tea Party
- Minutemen at the Battles of Lexington and Concord
- Battle of Bunker Hill

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Based on notes from lessons and conversations, answer each of the following.

- Why was it good that the colonists had been allowed so much freedom to govern themselves?
- Why were the colonists upset about new taxes?
- What were the two types of patriots? How did they resist the British differently?
- Why was John Adams’s defense of the redcoats after the Boston Massacre heroic?
- What were the Intolerable Acts and why were they called such by the colonists?
- How did the Sons of Liberty alert the colonists that the British were coming before Lexington and Concord?
- What was the ‘shot heard round the world’ and why is it called that?
- Even though the Patriots lost the Battle of Bunker Hill, why did it strengthen their spirit to fight?
- What did the Second Continental Congress do?
- What is the Declaration of Independence about?
- Who was the main writer of the Declaration of Independence?
- What were the consequences for signing the Declaration and why were the men so willing to sign it?
- What is a “self–evident” truth?
- What does it mean that “all men are created equal”?
- What is a natural right?
- Why do people create government? What is it supposed to do?
The American Founding — Test 1

Lesson 1 | Self-Government or Tyranny
Lesson 2 | The Declaration of Independence

**TIMELINE:** Write the letter of each event next to the date or years it took place.

1770 ______ A. Boston Massacre
1773 ______ B. Boston Tea Party
July 4, 1776 ______ C. Declaration of Independence signed

**MATCHING:** Write the letter of each definition to the correct word it defines.

___ Proclamation Line
A. a body of armed citizens prepared for military service at any time

___ representation
B. a group of colonists who used protest and sometimes violence to resist the British

___ Sons of Liberty
C. a soldier from another country you can hire to fight

___ boycott
D. an attempt by the British to prevent colonial settlement beyond the Appalachian Mountains to avoid conflict with Native Americans

___ Boston Tea Party
E. an organized campaign in which people refuse to have any dealings with a particular group or country in order to force a change of policy

___ militia
F. the ability for people to choose those who make laws for them

___ Common Sense
G. the group of colonial representatives who voted to declare independence from Great Britain

___ Second Continental Congress
H. Thomas Paine’s influential pamphlet that convinced more Americans to declare independence

___ mercenary
I. when colonists destroyed British tea in response to British restrictions and monopolies
MULTIPLE CHOICE: Circle the option that best answers each question.

1. What did colonists call the shooting of civilians in Boston by British soldiers after the Redcoats were attacked by the mob?
   a. The Boston Tea Party
   b. The Battle of Bunker Hill
   c. The Olive Branch Petition
   d. The Boston Massacre

2. On the night of Paul Revere’s ride, what were the British soldiers sent to do?
   a. surrender to the colonists
   b. arrest John Hancock and Samuel Adams and take the Minutemen’s supplies
   c. bomb Boston Harbor
   d. attack the French

3. Who stated, “I am no longer a Virginian but an American”?
   a. Benedict Arnold
   b. General Cornwallis
   c. George Washington
   d. Patrick Henry

4. What was the name of the battle outside Boston in which the colonists only retreated because they ran out of ammunition, inflicting heavy losses on the British in the process?
   a. Bunker Hill
   b. Lexington
   c. Concord
   d. Fort Ticonderoga

5. Who was chosen as Commander in Chief of the Continental Army?
   a. John Adams
   b. Benjamin Franklin
   c. Sam Adams
   d. George Washington

6. Who physically wrote or penned the Declaration of Independence?
   a. Thomas Jefferson
   b. George Washington
   c. Paul Revere
   d. John Adams
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART: Tell me about the battles of Lexington and Concord.

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND: Answer the following in complete sentences.

7. Why were the colonists upset about new taxes?

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

8. What were the Intolerable Acts and why were they called such by the colonists?

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

9. What is the Declaration of Independence about?

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

10. What does it mean that “all men are created equal”?

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

11. Why do people create government? What is it supposed to do?

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________
Study Guide — Unit 2, Test 2

Lesson 3 | The War of Independence
Lesson 4 | The Constitution

Test on __________

TIMELINE

When given chronological dates, match events from a list to the years or dates that they happened.

1775–1783  War of Independence
1776 (Christmas)  Crossing the Delaware/Battle of Trenton
September 17, 1787  Constitutional Convention concludes (Constitution Day)

PERSONS

Identify each, provide biographical details, and explain what he or she thought or did in specific periods or events.

George III  Baron von Steuben  James Madison
George Washington  Benedict Arnold  Publius
Ethan Allen  Charles Cornwallis
Henry Knox  Alexander Hamilton

TERMS AND TOPICS

Identify each and explain its significance to the period of history studied.

ally  Shays’ Rebellion  executive powers
guerrilla warfare  delegate  President
volley  Constitutional Convention  judicial powers
Hessians  Father of the Constitution  Supreme Court
Betsy Ross Flag  Constitution  amendment
Yankee Doodle  majority tyranny  Three-Fifths Compromise
Trenton  republicanism  The Federalist Papers
Saratoga  limited government  Bill of Rights
France  separation of powers  freedom of religion
Yorktown  checks and balances  freedom of speech
Newburgh Conspiracy  compromise  right to bear arms
American Cincinnatus  legislative power
Northwest Ordinance  Congress

Copyright © 2022 Hillsdale College. All Rights Reserved
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

Be familiar with each of the following stories.

- Washington’s Crossing of the Delaware
- The American farmers joining the Battle of Saratoga
- Washington encouraging his men at Valley Forge
- Washington’s dismissal of the Newburgh Conspiracy
- Benjamin Franklin’s reply to a woman’s question about what the Constitutional Convention had created: “A republic, if you can keep it,” and what this means

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Based on notes from lessons and conversations, answer each of the following.

□ How did soldiers fight each other in the War of Independence?
□ How did Washington’s military strategy build confidence in the Americans?
□ What happened at the crossing of the Delaware River and the Battle of Trenton?
□ Why did the French form an alliance with the United States?
□ How did the army suffer in the winter of 1777–78 and how did they regain new hope?
□ What important contribution did Baron von Steuben make to the Continental Army?
□ How did the Americans defeat the British at Yorktown?
□ Why did the Americans win the War of Independence?
□ What is a constitution and what does it do?
□ Why did the founders think it was important to make sure that power in the government, or control over others, was divided among different groups instead of all held by one person or group?
□ What is federalism and how does it divide power?
□ What is the separation of powers and how does it divide power?
□ What does the legislative power allow Congress to do?
□ What does the executive power allow the President to do?
□ What does the judicial power allow the Supreme Court to do?
□ What does the Bill of Rights do and why?
□ What is freedom of speech and why is it important?
□ What is the right to bear arms and why is it important?
□ What is due process and why is it important?
The American Founding — Test 2

Lesson 3 | The War of Independence
Lesson 4 | The Constitution

TIMELINE: Write the letter of each event next to the date or years it took place.

1775–1783  _______  A. Constitutional Convention concludes

1776 (Christmas)  _______  (Constitution Day)

Sept. 17, 1787  _______  B. Crossing the Delaware/Battle of Trenton

C. War of Independence

MATCHING: Write the letter of each definition to the correct word it defines.

____ guerrilla warfare  A. a law that outlawed slavery in the west and established public schools

____ Newburgh Conspiracy  B. a plan to overthrow the new Congress and make George Washington King of America

____ Northwest Ordinance  C. a series of newspaper articles in favor of the Constitution and which explains it

____ Constitutional Convention  D. an agreement in the Constitution where northerners did not allow slaves to count fully for representation in southern states because southerners wouldn’t treat them as people

____ majority tyranny  E. fighting by hiding from the enemy and surprising them with an attack when they are unprepared

____ 3/5 Compromise  F. how the Bill of Rights makes sure government does not stop people from defending themselves

____ The Federalist Papers  G. the meeting of colonial leaders to draft a new plan for government

____ right to bear arms  H. when a larger group of people violates the freedom of a smaller group of people
MULTIPLE CHOICE: Circle the option that best answers each question.

1. Which country was so impressed by the American victory in the Battle of Saratoga that they formed an alliance to help the Americans against the British?
   a. Russia
   b. Germany
   c. Italy
   d. France

2. What was the final battle of the war in which General Cornwallis surrendered to the Americans?
   a. Yorktown
   b. Bunker Hill
   c. Cowpens
   d. Saratoga

3. Who is known as the “American Cincinnatus” for not using his power to take over America?
   a. Thomas Jefferson
   b. John Jay
   c. George Washington
   d. John Adams

4. Who is known as the “Father of the Constitution”?
   a. George Washington
   b. James Madison
   c. Benjamin Franklin
   d. Alexander Hamilton

BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT: Fill in the boxes below with the name of the correct branch of government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Branch</th>
<th>Name of Office/Institution</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Enforces Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congress</td>
<td>Makes Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supreme Court</td>
<td>Settles Disputes Over Laws</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART: Tell me about the Winter at Valley Forge.

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND: Answer the following in complete sentences.

5. What happened at the crossing of the Delaware River and the Battle of Trenton?

6. What is a constitution and what does it do?

7. Why did the founders think it was important to make sure that power in the government, or control over others, was divided among different groups instead of all held by one person or group?

8. What is federalism and how does it divide power?

9. What does the Bill of Rights do and why?
Writing Assignment — The American Founding

**DIRECTIONS**

In one paragraph, retell the story of what happened in the American War of Independence. Be sure to explain the key moments that led to American victory.
APPENDIX B

Primary Sources
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Thomas Paine

The Second Continental Congress

George Washington

Phillis Wheatley

The American People
Patrick Henry, Delegate to the Second Virginia Convention

On the Resolution for a State of Defense

Speech Excerpts

March 23, 1775
St. John’s Episcopal Church | Richmond, Virginia

Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death

BACKGROUND

Just weeks before the battles of Lexington and Concord in Massachusetts, Patrick Henry delivered this speech in support of raising a company of cavalry or infantry in every Virginian county.

ANNOTATIONS

Mr. President:

No man thinks more highly than I do of the patriotism, as well as abilities, of the very worthy gentlemen who have just addressed the House. But different men often see the same subject in different lights; and, therefore, I hope it will not be thought disrespectful to those gentlemen if, entertaining as I do opinions of a character very opposite to theirs, I shall speak forth my sentiments freely and without reserve. This is no time for ceremony.

The question before the House is one of awful moment to this country. For my own part, I consider it as nothing less than a question of freedom or slavery; and in proportion to the magnitude of the subject ought to be the freedom of the debate. It is only in this way that we can hope to arrive at truth, and fulfill the great responsibility which we hold to God and our country. Should I keep back my opinions at such a time, through fear of giving offense, I should consider myself as guilty of treason towards my country, and of an act of disloyalty toward the Majesty of Heaven, which I revere above all earthly kings....

Sir, we have done everything that could be done to avert the storm which is now coming

on. We have petitioned; we have remonstrated; we have supplicated; we have prostrated ourselves before the throne, and have implored its interposition to arrest the tyrannical hands of the ministry and Parliament. Our petitions have been slighted; our remonstrances have produced additional violence and insult; our supplications have been disregarded; and we have been spurned, with contempt, from the foot of the throne!

In vain, after these things, may we indulge the fond hope of peace and reconciliation. There is no longer any room for hope. If we wish to be free—if we mean to preserve inviolate those inestimable privileges for which we have been so long contending—if we mean not basely to abandon the noble struggle in which we have been so long engaged, and which we have pledged ourselves never to abandon until the glorious object of our contest shall be obtained—we must fight! I repeat it, sir, we must fight! An appeal to arms and to the God of hosts is all that is left us!...

Sir, we are not weak if we make a proper use of those means which the God of nature hath placed in our power. Three millions of people, armed in the holy cause of liberty, and in such a country as that which we possess, are invincible by any force which our enemy can send against us.

Besides, sir, we shall not fight our battles alone. There is a just God who presides over the destinies of nations, and who will raise up friends to fight our battles for us. The battle, sir, is not to the strong alone; it is to the vigilant, the active, the brave. Besides, sir, we have no election. If we were base enough to desire it, it is now too late to retire from the contest. There is no retreat but in submission and slavery! Our chains are forged! Their clanking may be heard on the plains of Boston! The war is inevitable—and let it come! I repeat it, sir, let it come.

It is in vain, sir, to extenuate the matter. Gentlemen may cry, peace, peace—but there is no peace. The war is actually begun! The next gale that sweeps from the north will bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms! Our brethren are already in the field! Why stand we here idle? What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?
Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!
THOMAS PAINE

Common Sense

PAMPHLET EXCERPT

January 10, 1776
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

BACKGROUND

After outright conflict the previous year at Lexington and Concord and Bunker Hill, and with Boston occupied by the British army and navy, Thomas Paine wrote this pamphlet on the relationship between the British and the American colonists.

ANNOTATIONS

Introduction

5 PERHAPS the sentiments contained in the following pages are not yet sufficiently fashionable to procure them general favor. A long habit of not thinking a thing wrong gives it a superficial appearance of being right, and raises at first a formidable outcry in defense of custom. But tumult soon subsides. Time makes more converts than reason.

As a long and violent abuse of power is generally the means of calling the right of it in question (and in matters too which might never have been thought of, had not the sufferers been aggravated into the inquiry), and as the King of England hath undertaken in his own Right to support the Parliament in what he calls Theirs, and as the good people of this country are grievously oppressed by the combination, they have an undoubted privilege to inquire into the pretensions of both, and equally to reject the usurpation of either. . . .

15 The cause of America is in a great measure the cause of all mankind. Many circumstances hath and will arise which are not local, but universal, and through which the principles of

all Lovers of Mankind are affected, and in the event of which their Affections are interested. The laying a Country desolate with Fire and Sword, declaring War against the natural rights of all Mankind, and extirpating the Defenders thereof from the Face of the Earth, is the Concern of every Man to whom Nature hath given the Power of feeling; of which Class, regardless of Party Censure, is the AUTHOR.

**Thoughts on the Present State of American Affairs.**

In the following pages I offer nothing more than simple facts, plain arguments, and common sense: and have no other preliminaries to settle with the reader, than that he will divest himself of prejudice and prepossession, and suffer his reason and his feelings to determine for themselves: that he will put on, or rather that he will not put off, the true character of a man, and generously enlarge his views beyond the present day….

It is the good fortune of many to live distant from the scene of present sorrow; the evil is not sufficiently brought to their doors to make them feel the precariousness with which all American property is possessed. But let our imaginations transport us a few moments to Boston; that seat of wretchedness will teach us wisdom, and instruct us for ever to renounce a power in whom we can have no trust. The inhabitants of that unfortunate city who but a few months ago were in ease and affluence, have now no other alternative than to stay and Starve, or turn out to Beg. Endangered by the fire of their friends if they continue within the city, and plundered by the soldiery if they leave it, in their present situation they are prisoners without the hope of redemption, and in a general attack for their relief they would be exposed to the fury of both armies…

No man was a warmer wisher for a reconciliation than myself, before the fatal nineteenth of April, 1775, but the moment the event of that day was made known, I rejected the hardened, sullen-tempered Pharaoh of England for ever; and disdain the wretch, that with the pretended title of FATHER OF HIS PEOPLE can unfeelingly hear of their slaughter, and composedly sleep with their blood upon his soul.
But admitting that matters were now made up, what would be the event? I answer, the ruin of the Continent. And that for several reasons.

First. The powers of governing still remaining in the hands of the King, he will have a negative over the whole legislation of this Continent. And as he hath shown himself such an inveterate enemy to liberty, and discovered such a thirst for arbitrary power, is he, or is he not, a proper person to say to these colonies, *You shall make no laws but what I please!* And is there any inhabitant of America so ignorant as not to know, that according to what is called the *present constitution*, this Continent can make no laws but what the king gives leave to; and is there any man so unwise as not to see, that (considering what has happened) he will suffer no law to be made here but such as suits *his* purpose? We may be as effectually enslaved by the want of laws in America, as by submitting to laws made for us in England….

Secondly. That as even the best terms which we can expect to obtain can amount to no more than a temporary expedient, or a kind of government by guardianship, which can last no longer than till the Colonies come of age, so the general face and state of things in the interim will be unsettled and unpromising. Emigrants of property will not choose to come to a country whose form of government hangs but by a thread, and who is every day tottering on the brink of commotion and disturbance; and numbers of the present inhabitants would lay hold of the interval to dispose of their effects, and quit the Continent.

But the most powerful of all arguments is, that nothing but independance, *i. e.* a Continental form of government, can keep the peace of the Continent and preserve it inviolate from civil wars. I dread the event of a reconciliation with Britain now, as it is more than probable that it will be followed by a revolt some where or other, the consequences of which may be far more fatal than all the malice of Britain….

A government of our own is our natural right: and when a man seriously reflects on the precariousness of human affairs, he will become convinced, that it is infinitely wiser and safer, to form a constitution of our own in a cool deliberate manner, while we have it in our power, than to trust such an interesting event to time and chance….
O! ye that love mankind! Ye that dare oppose not only the tyranny but the tyrant, stand forth! Every spot of the old world is overrun with oppression. Freedom hath been hunted round the Globe. Asia and Africa have long expelled her. Europe regards her like a stranger, and England hath given her warning to depart. O! receive the fugitive, and prepare in time an asylum for mankind.
THE THIRTEEN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Unanimous Declaration

A DECLARATION

July 4, 1776
Pennsylvania State House | Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

BACKGROUND

The delegates from each colony at the Second Continental Congress announced their votes to form a new country separate from Great Britain in this statement to mankind that expounds both the principles on which this new country would be founded and the reasons they judged themselves justified to separate.

ANNOTATIONS

When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.—That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,—That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to

right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long
train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to
reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such
Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security.—Such has been the pa-
tient sufferance of these Colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to
alter their former Systems of Government. The history of the present King of Great Britain
is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establish-
ment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. To prove this, let Facts be submitted to a
candid world.

He has refused his Assent to Laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

He has forbidden his Governors to pass Laws of immediate and pressing importance, un-
less suspended in their operation till his Assent should be obtained; and when so sus-
pended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.

He has refused to pass other Laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless
those people would relinquish the right of Representation in the Legislature, a right inesti-
mable to them and formidable to tyrants only.

He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from
the depository of their public Records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compli-
ance with his measures.

He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly, for opposing with manly firmness his
invasions on the rights of the people.

He has refused for a long time, after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected;
whereby the Legislative powers, incapable of Annihilation, have returned to the People at
large for their exercise; the State remaining in the mean time exposed to all the dangers of
invasion from without, and convulsions within.
He has endeavored to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the Laws for Naturalization of Foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migrations hither, and raising the conditions of new Appropriations of Lands.

He has obstructed the Administration of Justice, by refusing his Assent to Laws for establishing Judiciary powers.

He has made Judges dependent on his Will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.

He has erected a multitude of New Offices, and sent hither swarms of Officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance.

He has kept among us, in times of peace, Standing Armies without the Consent of our legislatures.

He has affected to render the Military independent of and superior to the Civil power.

He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his Assent to their Acts of pretended Legislation:

For Quartering large bodies of armed troops among us:

For protecting them, by a mock Trial, from punishment for any Murders which they should commit on the Inhabitants of these States:

For cutting off our Trade with all parts of the world:

For imposing Taxes on us without our Consent:

For depriving us in many cases, of the benefits of Trial by Jury:
For transporting us beyond Seas to be tried for pretended offenses:

For abolishing the free System of English Laws in a neighboring Province, establishing therein an Arbitrary government, and enlarging its Boundaries so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these Colonies:

For taking away our Charters, abolishing our most valuable Laws, and altering fundamentally the Forms of our Governments:

For suspending our own Legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

He has abdicated Government here, by declaring us out of his Protection and waging War against us.

He has plundered our seas, ravaged our Coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people.

He is at this time transporting large Armies of foreign Mercenaries to complete the works of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of Cruelty and perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the Head of a civilized nation.

He has constrained our fellow Citizens taken Captive on the high Seas to bear Arms against their Country, to become the executioners of their friends and Brethren, or to fall themselves by their Hands.

He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavored to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian Savages, whose known rule of warfare, is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes and conditions.
In every stage of these Oppressions We have Petitioned for Redress in the most humble terms: Our repeated Petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A Prince whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a Tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.

Nor have We been wanting in attentions to our British brethren. We have warned them from time to time of attempts by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement here. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured them by the ties of our common kindred to disavow these usurpations, which, would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence. They too have been deaf to the voice of justice and of consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity, which denounces our Separation, and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind, Enemies in War, in Peace Friends.

We, therefore, the Representatives of the united States of America, in General Congress, Assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the Name, and by Authority of the good People of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, That these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be Free and Independent States; that they are Absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as Free and Independent States, they have full Power to levy War, conclude Peace, contract Alliances, establish Commerce, and to do all other Acts and Things which Independent States may of right do. And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor.

Georgia
Button Gwinnett, Lyman Hall, George Walton
North Carolina
William Hooper, Joseph Hewes, John Penn

South Carolina
5 Edward Rutledge, Thomas Heyward, Jr., Thomas Lynch, Jr., Arthur Middleton

Maryland
Samuel Chase, William Paca, Thomas Stone, Charles Carroll of Carrollton

Virginia

Pennsylvania
15 Robert Morris, Benjamin Rush, Benjamin Franklin, John Morton, George Clymer, James Smith, George Taylor, James Wilson, George Ross

Delaware
Caesar Rodney, George Read, Thomas McKean

New York
20 William Floyd, Philip Livingston, Francis Lewis, Lewis Morris

New Jersey
25 Richard Stockton, John Witherspoon, Francis Hopkinson, John Hart, Abraham Clark

New Hampshire
Josiah Bartlett, William Whipple, Matthew Thornton

Massachusetts
30 John Hancock, Samuel Adams, John Adams, Robert Treat Paine, Elbridge Gerry
Rhode Island
Stephen Hopkins, William Ellery

Connecticut
5 Roger Sherman, Samuel Huntington, William Williams, Oliver Wolcot
GENERAL GEORGE WASHINGTON, COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF OF THE CONTINENTAL ARMY

Address to Congress

SPEECH

December 23, 1783
Old Senate Chamber of the Maryland State House | Annapolis, Maryland

BACKGROUND

George Washington delivered this message to Congress to resign his commission as Commander-in-Chief of the Continental Army.

ANNOTATIONS

The great events on which my resignation depended having at length taken place; I have now the honor of offering my sincere Congratulations to Congress and of presenting myself before them to surrender into their hands the trust committed to me, and to claim the indulgence of retiring from the Service of my Country.

Happy in the confirmation of our Independence and Sovereignty, and pleased with the opportunity afforded the United States of becoming a respectable Nation, I resign with satisfaction the Appointment I accepted with diffidence. A diffidence in my abilities to accomplish so arduous a task, which however was superseded by a confidence in the rectitude of our Cause, the support of the Supreme Power of the Union, and the patronage of Heaven.

The Successful termination of the War has verified the most sanguine expectations, and my gratitude for the interposition of Providence, and the assistance I have received from my Countrymen, encreases with every review of the momentous Contest.

While I repeat my obligations to the Army in general, I should do injustice to my own feelings not to acknowledge in this place the peculiar Services and distinguished merits of
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the Gentlemen who have been attached to my person during the War. It was impossible the choice of confidential Officers to compose my family should have been more fortunate. Permit me Sir, to recommend in particular those, who have continued in Service to the present moment, as worthy of the favorable notice and patronage of Congress.

I consider it an indispensable duty to close this last solemn act of my Official life, by recommending the Interests of our dearest Country to the protection of Almighty God, and those who have the superintendence of them, to his holy keeping.

Having now finished the work assigned me, I retire from the great theatre of Action; and bidding an Affectionate farewell to this August body under whose orders I have so long acted, I here offer my Commission, and take my leave of all the employments of public life.
PHYLIS WHEATLEY
“Liberty and Peace”
POEM

BACKGROUND
Phyllis Wheatley composed this poem after the signing of the Treaty of Paris officially ending the War of Independence.

ANNOTATIONS

LO! Freedom comes. Th’ prescient Muse foretold,
All Eyes th’ accomplish’d Prophecy behold:

Her Port describ’d, "She moves divinely fair,
"Olive and Laurel bind her golden Hair."
She, the bright Progeny of Heaven, descends,
And every Grace her sovereign Step attends;
For now kind Heaven, indulgent to our Prayer,
In smiling Peace resolves the Din of War.
Fix’d in Columbia her illustrious Line,
And bids in thee her future Councils shine.
To every Realm her Portals open’d wide,
Receives from each the full commercial Tide.

Each Art and Science now with rising Charms
Th’ expanding Heart with Emulation warms.
E’en great Britannia sees with dread Surprize,
And from the dazzling Splendor turns her Eyes!
Britain, whose Navies swept th’ Atlantic o’er,
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And Thunder sent to every distant Shore;
E'en thou, in Manners cruel as thou art,
The Sword resign'd, resume the friendly Part!
For Galia's Power espous'd Columbia's Cause,
And new-born Rome shall give Britannia Law,
Nor unremember'd in the grateful Strain,
Shall princely Louis' friendly Deeds remain;
The generous Prince th' impending Vengeance eye's,
Sees the fierce Wrong, and to the rescue flies.

Perish that Thirst of boundless Power, that drew
On Albion's Head the Curse to Tyrants due.
But thou appeas'd submit to Heaven's decree,
That bids this Realm of Freedom rival thee!
Now sheathe the Sword that bade the Brave attone
With guiltless Blood for Madness not their own.
Sent from th' Enjoyment of their native Shore
Ill-fated – never to behold her more!
From every Kingdom on Europa's Coast
Throng'd various Troops, their Glory, Strength and Boast.

With heart-felt pity fair Hibernia saw
Columbia menac'd by the Tyrant's Law:
On hostile Fields fraternal Arms engage,
And mutual Deaths, all dealt with mutual Rage:
The Muse's Ear hears mother Earth deplore
Her ample Surface smoak with kindred Gore:
The hostile Field destroys the social Ties,
And every-lasting Slumber seals their Eyes.
Columbia mourns, the haughty Foes deride,
Her Treasures plunder'd, and her Towns destroy'd:
Witness how Charlestown's curling Smoaks arise,
In sable Columns to the clouded Skies!
The ample Dome, high-wrought with curious Toil,
In one sad Hour the savage Troops despoil.
Descending Peace and Power of War confounds;
From every Tongue celestial Peace resounds:
As for the East th’ illustrious King of Day,
With rising Radiance drives the Shades away,
So Freedom comes array’d with Charms divine,
And in her Train Commerce and Plenty shine.
Britannia owns her Independent Reign,
Hibernia, Scotia, and the Realms of Spain;
And great Germania’s ample Coast admires
The generous Spirit that Columbia fires.
Auspicious Heaven shall fill with fav’ring Gales,
Where e’er Columbia spreads her swelling Sails:
To every Realm shall Peace her Charms display,
And Heavenly Freedom spread her golden Ray.

THE END
THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Constitution

March 4, 1789
United States of America

BACKGROUND

Delegates to the Constitutional Convention drafted and the states ratified this Constitution, forming the second national government for the United States of America.

ANNOTATIONS

Preamble

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

Article I

Section 1. All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Section 2. The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States, and the Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature.

No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the Age of twenty five Years, and been seven Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons, including those bound to Service for a Term of Years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three fifths of all other Persons. The actual Enumeration shall be made within three Years after the first Meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent Term of ten Years, in such Manner as they shall by Law direct. The Number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every thirty Thousand, but each State shall have at Least one Representative; and until such enumeration shall be made, the State of New Hampshire shall be entitled to choose three, Massachusetts eight, Rhode-Island and Providence Plantations one, Connecticut five, New-York six, New Jersey four, Pennsylvania eight, Delaware one, Maryland six, Virginia ten, North Carolina five, South Carolina five, and Georgia three.

When vacancies happen in the Representation from any State, the Executive Authority thereof shall issue Writs of Election to fill such Vacancies.

The House of Representatives shall choose their Speaker and other Officers; and shall have the sole Power of Impeachment.

Section 3. The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the Legislature thereof, for six Years; and each Senator shall have one Vote.

Immediately after they shall be assembled in Consequence of the first Election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three Classes. The Seats of the Senators of the first Class shall be vacated at the Expiration of the second Year, of the second Class at the Expiration of the fourth Year, and of the third Class at the Expiration of the sixth Year, so that one third may be chosen every second Year; and if Vacancies happen by Resignation, or otherwise, during the Recess of the Legislature of any State, the Executive thereof may make temporary Appointments until the next Meeting of the Legislature, which shall then fill such Vacancies.
No Person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty Years, and
been nine Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an In-
habitant of that State for which he shall be chosen.

The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no
Vote, unless they be equally divided.

The Senate shall choose their other Officers, and also a President pro tempore, in the Abs-
ence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the Office of President of the United
States.

The Senate shall have the sole Power to try all Impeachments. When sitting for that Pur-
pose, they shall be on Oath or Affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried,
the Chief Justice shall preside: And no Person shall be convicted without the Concurrence
of two thirds of the Members present.

Judgment in Cases of Impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from Office,
and disqualification to hold and enjoy any Office of honor, Trust or Profit under the United
States: but the Party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to Indictment, Trial,
Judgment and Punishment, according to Law.

Section 4. The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Represent-
atives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at
any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of choosing Sena-
tors.

The Congress shall assemble at least once in every Year, and such Meeting shall be on the
first Monday in December, unless they shall by Law appoint a different Day.

Section 5. Each House shall be the Judge of the Elections, Returns and Qualifications of its
own Members, and a Majority of each shall constitute a Quorum to do Business; but a
smaller Number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the At-
tendance of absent Members, in such Manner, and under such Penalties as each House may
provide.
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Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behavior, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.

Each House shall keep a Journal of its Proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such Parts as may in their Judgment require Secrecy; and the Yeas and Nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the Desire of one fifth of those Present, be entered on the Journal.

Neither House, during the Session of Congress, shall, without the Consent of the other, adjourn for more than three days, nor to any other Place than that in which the two Houses shall be sitting.

Section 6. The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States. They shall in all Cases, except Treason, Felony and Breach of the Peace, be privileged from Arrest during their Attendance at the Session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any Speech or Debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other Place.

No Senator or Representative shall, during the Time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil Office under the Authority of the United States, which shall have been created, or the Emoluments whereof shall have been encreased during such time; and no Person holding any Office under the United States, shall be a Member of either House during his Continuance in Office.

Section 7. All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills.

Every Bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a Law, be presented to the President of the United States; If he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his Objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the Objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If after such Reconsideration two thirds of that House shall agree to pass the Bill, it shall be sent, together with the Objections, to the other House, by which it shall
likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two thirds of that House, it shall become a
Law. But in all such Cases the Votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and Nays,
and the Names of the Persons voting for and against the Bill shall be entered on the Journal
of each House respectively. If any Bill shall not be returned by the President within ten days
(Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the Same shall be a Law, in
like Manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress by their Adjournment prevent its
Return in which Case it shall not be a Law.

Every Order, Resolution, or Vote to which the Concurrence of the Senate and House of
Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of Adjournment) shall be pre-
10 sented to the President of the United States; and before the Same shall take Effect, shall be
approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two thirds of the Senate
and House of Representatives, according to the Rules and Limitations prescribed in the
Case of a Bill.

Section 8. The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and
15 Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the
United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United
States;

To borrow Money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the
20 Indian Tribes;

To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bank-
ruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of
Weights and Measures;

25 To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the
United States;

To establish Post Offices and post Roads;
To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;—And

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.
Section 9. The Migration or Importation of such Persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the Year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a Tax or duty may be imposed on such Importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each Person.

5 The Privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it.

No Bill of Attainder or ex post facto Law shall be passed.

No Capitation, or other direct, Tax shall be laid, unless in Proportion to the Census or Enumeration herein before directed to be taken.

10 No Tax or Duty shall be laid on Articles exported from any State.

No Preference shall be given by any Regulation of Commerce or Revenue to the Ports of one State over those of another: nor shall Vessels bound to, or from, one State, be obliged to enter, clear, or pay Duties in another.

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.

Section 10. No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts; pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, or Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts, or grant any Title of Nobility.

25 No State shall, without the Consent of the Congress, lay any Imposts or Duties on Imports or Exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection Laws: and
the net Produce of all Duties and Imposts, laid by any State on Imports or Exports, shall be for the Use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such Laws shall be subject to the Revision and Control of the Congress.

No State shall, without the Consent of Congress, lay any duty of Tonnage, keep Troops, or Ships of War in time of Peace, enter into any Agreement or Compact with another State, or with a foreign Power, or engage in War, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent Danger as will not admit of delay.

Article II

Section 1. The executive Power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his Office during the Term of four Years, and, together with the Vice-President chosen for the same Term, be elected as follows:

Each State shall appoint, in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors, equal to the whole Number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress: but no Senator or Representative, or Person holding an Office of Trust or Profit under the United States, shall be appointed an Elector.

The Electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by Ballot for two Persons, of whom one at least shall not be an Inhabitant of the same State with themselves. And they shall make a List of all the Persons voted for, and of the Number of Votes for each; which List they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the Seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall, in the Presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the Certificates, and the Votes shall then be counted. The Person having the greatest Number of Votes shall be the President, if such Number be a Majority of the whole Number of Electors appointed; and if there be more than one who have such Majority, and have an equal Number of Votes, then the House of Representatives shall immediately choose by Ballot one of them for President; and if no Person have a Majority, then from the five highest on the List the said House shall in like Manner choose the President. But in choosing the President, the Votes shall be taken by States, the Representation from each State having one Vote; a quorum for
this Purpose shall consist of a Member or Members from two thirds of the States, and a
Majority of all the States shall be necessary to a Choice. In every Case, after the Choice of
the President, the Person having the greatest Number of Votes of the Electors shall be the
Vice President. But if there should remain two or more who have equal Votes, the Senate
shall choose from them by Ballot the Vice President.

The Congress may determine the Time of choosing the Electors, and the Day on which
they shall give their Votes; which Day shall be the same throughout the United States.

No Person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of
the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President; neither shall
any Person be eligible to that Office who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty-five
Years, and been fourteen Years a Resident within the United States.

In Case of the Removal of the President from Office, or of his Death, Resignation, or Ina-
bility to discharge the Powers and Duties of the said Office, the Same shall devolve on the
Vice President, and the Congress may by Law provide for the Case of Removal, Death,
Resignation or Inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what Officer
shall then act as President, and such Officer shall act accordingly, until the Disability be
removed, or a President shall be elected.

The President shall, at stated Times, receive for his Services, a Compensation, which shall
neither be increased nor diminished during the Period for which he shall have been elected,
and he shall not receive within that Period any other Emolument from the United States,
or any of them.

Before he enter on the Execution of his Office, he shall take the following Oath or Affirma-
tion:—"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President
of the United States, and will to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and defend the
Constitution of the United States."

Section 2. The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United
States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the
United States; he may require the Opinion, in writing, of the principal Officer in each of
the executive Departments, upon any subject relating to the Duties of their respective Offices, and he shall have Power to grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offenses against the United States, except in Cases of Impeachment.

He shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law: but the Congress may by Law vest the Appointment of such inferior Officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the Courts of Law, or in the Heads of Departments.

The President shall have Power to fill up all Vacancies that may happen during the Recess of the Senate, by granting Commissions which shall expire at the End of their next Session.

Section 3. He shall from time to time give to the Congress Information of the State of the Union, and recommend to their Consideration such Measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient; he may, on extraordinary Occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them, and in Case of Disagreement between them, with Respect to the Time of Adjournment, he may adjourn them to such Time as he shall think proper; he shall receive Ambassadors and other public Ministers; he shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed, and shall Commission all the Officers of the United States.

Section 4. The President, Vice President and all civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.

**Article III**

Section 1. The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good
Behavior, and shall, at stated Times, receive for their Services a Compensation, which shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office.

Section 2. The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority;—to all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls;—to all Cases of admiralty and maritime Jurisdiction; —to Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party;—to Controversies between two or more States;—between a State and Citizens of another State;—between Citizens of different States;—between Citizens of the same State claiming Lands under Grants of different States, and between a State, or the Citizens thereof, and foreign States, Citizens or Subjects.

In all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, and those in which a State shall be Party, the supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction. In all the other Cases before mentioned, the supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make.

The Trial of all Crimes, except in Cases of Impeachment, shall be by Jury; and such Trial shall be held in the State where the said Crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State, the Trial shall be at such Place or Places as the Congress may by Law have directed.

Section 3. Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying War against them, or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort. No Person shall be convicted of Treason unless on the Testimony of two Witnesses to the same overt Act, or on Confession in open Court.

The Congress shall have Power to declare the Punishment of Treason, but no Attainder of Treason shall work Corruption of Blood, or Forfeiture except during the Life of the Person attained.
Article IV

Section 1. Full Faith and Credit shall be given in each State to the public Acts, Records, and judicial Proceedings of every other State. And the Congress may by general Laws prescribe the Manner in which such Acts, Records and Proceedings shall be proved, and the Effect thereof.

Section 2. The Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of Citizens in the several States.

A Person charged in any State with Treason, Felony, or other Crime, who shall flee from Justice, and be found in another State, shall on Demand of the executive Authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having Jurisdiction of the Crime.

No Person held to Service or Labor in one State, under the Laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in Consequence of any Law or Regulation therein, be discharged from such Service or Labor, but shall be delivered up on Claim of the Party to whom such Service or Labor may be due.

Section 3. New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the Junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the Consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

Section 4. The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic Violence.
Article V

The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

Article VI

All Debts contracted and Engagements entered into, before the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation.

This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States.
Article VII

The Ratification of the Conventions of nine States, shall be sufficient for the Establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the Same.

Done in Convention by the Unanimous Consent of the States present the Seventeenth Day of September in the Year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and Eighty seven and of the Independence of the United States of America the Twelfth In witness whereof We have hereunto subscribed our Names.

George Washington—
President and deputy from Virginia

Delaware

George Read, Gunning Bedford, Jr., John Dickinson, Richard Bassett, Jacob Broom

Maryland

James McHenry, Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer, Daniel Carroll

Virginia

John Blair, James Madison, Jr.

North Carolina

William Blount, Richard Dobbs Spaight, Hugh Williamson

South Carolina

John Rutledge, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, Charles Pinckney, Pierce Butler
Georgia

William Few, Abraham Baldwin

New Hampshire

John Langdon, Nicholas Gilman

Massachusetts

Nathaniel Gorham, Rufus King

Connecticut

William Samuel Johnson, Roger Sherman

New York

Alexander Hamilton

New Jersey

William Livingston, David Brearley, William Paterson, Jonathan Dayton

Pennsylvania

Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Mifflin, Robert Morris, George Clymer, Thomas FitzSimons, Jared Ingersoll, James Wilson, Gouverneur Morris

Attest William Jackson Secretary
FIRST CONGRESS

Proposed Amendments to the Constitution

JOIN RESOLUTION EXCERPT

September 25, 1789

Federal Hall | City of New-York, New York

BACKGROUND

As part of a compromise to secure the ratification of the Constitution, Federalists introduced in the first Congress a Bill of Rights as twelve amendments to the new Constitution. Below are the ten amendments that were ultimately ratified.

ANNOTATIONS

Amendment I

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Amendment II

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms shall not be infringed.

Amendment III

No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

NOTES & QUESTIONS

Amendment IV

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Amendment V

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Amendment VI

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.

Amendment VII

In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.
Amendment VIII

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

Amendment IX

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Amendment X

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.
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Why Teach the Early Republic

The United States of America is an “experiment in self-government.” None other than the Father of the Country, George Washington, said as much at his inauguration. The experiment had seemed to be on the verge of failure by 1787, but the Constitution gave it a second chance. This is the story of the beginning decades of that “second chance.” What is so remarkable about these decades is that the ideas and structures of the Constitution were put into action with real people, real challenges, and real opportunities. America’s first elected and appointed statesmen would set the precedents by which American representative democracy would operate. Indeed, much of American self-government still reflects the precedents established in those first decades. These acts were not performed in a vacuum, however. America’s leaders
had to face very real struggles, and the American people had to learn to trust the Constitution and one another. All the while, America also found before her opportunities rarely afforded to any nation. In navigating the challenges and seizing the opportunities, America matured into an increasingly, though still imperfect, democratic society.

Enduring Ideas from This Unit

1. The presidency of George Washington was indispensable in establishing precedents conducive to free self-government and in keeping America free of what would have been a disastrous war.
2. The opportunities afforded to the United States were exceedingly rare in the history of nations.
3. Amidst the great strides in the practice of self-government and in taking advantage of opportunities, America’s treatment of Native Americans and the entrenching of slavery in the Southern states reveal the imperfections of the American regime and the injustices that were permitted.
4. American democracy expressed itself in a variety of unique ways and had a deep effect on the habits, thoughts, and character of Americans.
5. The idea of America’s “manifest destiny” to expand from coast to coast and spread its democratic ideas was a mixture of noble and material motivations which led to the Mexican-American War and a renewed debate over the expansion of slavery.

What Teachers Should Consider

The start of this unit includes a familiar cast of characters. The first four presidents were all founding fathers, and many cabinet members, diplomats, and justices were either present in Philadelphia in 1776 and 1787, fought in the War of Independence, or both. It proved consequential to the early national stability of America that these figures should have been the first to govern under the Constitution, George Washington above all others. Students should come explore how much of the way American government functions and how many traditions of the American political order are owed to President Washington.

At the same time, students should understand the precarious situations into which the young country was drawn and learn how America’s first leaders managed these challenges. From maintaining a fragile unity to enduring buffets from Great Britain and Revolutionary France, these first four presidents had more than enough to handle, including the crisis of the War of 1812.

And yet, America also had an abundance of opportunities during the first half of the 1800s. These began with the Louisiana Purchase and proceeded to include the acquisition of Florida, the Monroe Doctrine’s assertion of American authority in the Western Hemisphere, the annexation of Texas, and the Mexican Cession following the Mexican-American War. All the while America’s economic fortunes grew steadily.

American representative democracy was thus put into action, and the experiment in self-government seemed to be succeeding. But how did democratic society affect its citizens? Considering this question with students gives them the opportunity to study life in a democratic republic. This includes the ways in which
America’s founding principles were not upheld, with respect to slavery and the treatment of Native Americans.

The study of America’s “manifest destiny” is an opportunity for students to enter the minds of Americans at the time and attempt to understand the spirit of the democratic age. Based on the circumstances, it seemed almost inevitable that America would spread many of its unique ideas and accomplishments throughout all of North America. Yet this sentiment was sometimes in tension with America’s founding principles. The culmination of this spirit in the Mexican-American War would gain for America an astonishing amount of new land, resources, and opportunity, but also bring closer the prospect of civil war.

How Teachers Can Learn More

TEXTS

*Land of Hope*, Wilfred McClay

ONLINE COURSES | Online.Hillsdale.edu

*The Great American Story*  
*American Heritage*

Lesson Planning Resources

TEACHER RESOURCES

*Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition*, Volume 1, Wilfred McClay  
*The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic*, H.A. Guerber  
*Westward Expansion*, Anne Goudvis and Stephanie Harvey  
*The Civil War and Reconstruction*, Anne Goudvis and Stephanie Harvey

STUDENT RESOURCES

*Meet George Washington*, Joan Heilbroner  
*Meet Thomas Jefferson*, Marvin Barrett  
*The Journals of Lewis and Clark*, Liz Sonneborn  
*Early Presidents and Social Reformers: Reader*, Core Knowledge Foundation  
*Westward Expansion Before the Civil War: Reader*, Core Knowledge Foundation

TRADE BOOKS

*A New Nation*, Betsy Maestro  
*Daniel Boone*, John Zronik  
*Leave It to Abigail*, Barb Rosenstock
This Is Washington, D.C., Miroslav Sasek
The Louisiana Purchase, Michael Burgan
The War of 1812, Kevin Cunningham
So Tall Within, Gary Schmidt
Frederick’s Journey, Doreen Rappaport
This is Texas, Miroslav Sasek

PRIMARY SOURCES

Thanksgiving Proclamation, George Washington
Letter to the Hebrew Congregation, George Washington
Lesson Plans, Assignments, and Quizzes
Lesson 1 — The New Government

Lesson Objective

Students learn about the first decades of American self-government under the Constitution, including the major events and developments during the presidencies of George Washington and John Adams.

Teacher Preparation

Create a note outline based on the following:

**Student Texts**
- *Meet George Washington* Pages 55–63
- *Early Presidents and Social Reformers* Pages 22–35
- *Westward Expansion Before the Civil War* Pages 1–15
- Primary Sources See below.

**Teacher Texts**
- *The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic* Pages 109–119
- *Westward Expansion* Pages 49–51

**Trade Books**
- *Daniel Boone*
- *A New Nation*
- *Leave It to Abigail*
- *This Is Washington, D.C.*

**Online.Hillsdale.edu**
- *The Great American Story* Lectures 5 and 6
- *American Heritage* Lecture 5

Student Preparation

**Assignment 1:** Students pre–read *Meet George Washington*, pages 55–63 (based on grade level reading ability).

**Assignment 2:** Students pre–read *Early Presidents and Social Reformers*, pages 22–35 (grades 4 and 5 only).

**Assignment 3:** Students pre–read *Westward Expansion Before the Civil War*, pages 1–15 (grade 5 only).
CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography and Places
- New York City
- Mount Vernon
- Philadelphia
- New Orleans
- Washington City in the Federal District of Columbia
- Executive Mansion
- Northwest Territory

Persons
- George Washington
- Daniel Boone
- John Adams
- Thomas Jefferson
- Alexander Hamilton
- James Madison
- Eli Whitney

Terms and Topics
- Bill of Rights
- Father of Our Country
- cabinet
- tariff
- national bank
- Whiskey Rebellion
- French Revolution
- Jay’s Treaty
- Fugitive Slave Law
- cotton gin
- Federalist Party
- Democratic-Republican Party
- XYZ Affair
- Alien and Sedition Acts
- Kentucky and Virginia
- Resolutions
- nullify

Primary Sources
- Thanksgiving Proclamation, George Washington
- Letter to the Hebrew Congregation, George Washington

To Know By Heart
- “Hail, Columbia” —Joseph Hopkinson

Timeline
- 1787 Constitutional Convention
- 1789 Elections held; First Congress convened;
  George Washington inaugurated

Images
- Historical figures and events
- Depictions of Federal Hall and Washington’s inauguration
- Early maps and designs for Washington, DC, and the Executive Mansion
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Biographies and the roles of George Washington and John Adams
- George Washington’s travels to New York City for his inauguration
- The travels of Citizen Genêt in the United States
- The ebb and flow of the friendship between John Adams and Thomas Jefferson
- Stories of the building of Washington, DC
- Thomas Jefferson walking to his inauguration and riding bareback around Washington, DC
- The death of George Washington

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- Why would George Washington’s presidency be so important for America’s future?
- What challenges did George Washington face during his presidency?
- What presidential traditions did George Washington give us?
- What was Alexander Hamilton’s vision of the kind of country America should become?
- What was Thomas Jefferson’s vision of the kind of country America should become?
- What did George Washington and John Adams think about Great Britain and Revolutionary France?
- What did Thomas Jefferson think about Great Britain and Revolutionary France?
- What did Eli Whitney’s cotton gin do?
- How did the cotton gin change the future of slavery?
- What did George Washington say about parties and divisions?
- What did George Washington say about wars and alliances?
- What did George Washington say about learning and doing the right thing?
- What did it mean for a state to try to nullify a federal law?
- Why was the election of 1800 called the “revolution of 1800” by Thomas Jefferson?
- Questions from the US Civics Test:
  - Question 37: The president of the United States can serve only two terms. Why?
  - Question 47: What does the president’s cabinet do?
  - Question 86: George Washington is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 89: Alexander Hamilton is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 119: What is the capital of the United States?

KEYS TO THE LESSON

With the Constitution ratified following robust debate, America embarked on the next phase of its experiment with self-government. Success was far from assured. The first statesmen to govern within this new system would play a decisive role in determining not only the immediate success of the fledgling republic but also its long-term well-being. Nearly every action would set a precedent, and there were very real threats to the country, both from without and from within. The statesmanship of George Washington and John Adams was indispensable for setting these precedents while steering the young nation through many trials, including deepening domestic division. When this division was ameliorated through a peaceful national election in 1800, followed by a transfer of power in 1801, the United States could mark a successful passage through its first dozen years of self-government under the Constitution, setting the stage for the next two hundred years of American government and history.
Teachers might best plan and teach The New Government with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Spend time teaching about the importance of George Washington in these first years under the Constitution, including his character and his example. Of special note is Washington’s setting of precedents for the presidency, his unifying example, his balancing of competing interests and views, and his efforts to prevent the young country from being dragged into a foreign war. To gain a sense of Washington’s teachings and the way in which his words and comportment established beneficial precedents, read and discuss with students his Thanksgiving Proclamation and letter to the Hebrew congregation in Newport, Rhode Island.
- Discuss briefly the different views on the kind of economic activity and country held by Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton.
- The dominant issue facing America was navigating the conflict engulfing Europe during the French Revolution. More pointedly, the danger with respect to the French Revolution itself involved the conflicting sympathies that various Americans had toward Great Britain or France. George Washington was again vital in charting a course of neutrality, which kept the fragile nation out of a conflict that might have ruined it and its experiment forever.
- Mark 1793 as the year in which Eli Whitney developed his cotton gin. Explain the ideal cotton-growing climate in the Southern states and yet the laborious and slow work of separating cotton seeds from the cotton. Then show how Whitney’s gin worked and how it revolutionized the cotton industry. Cotton plantations quickly began to expand and revitalized the demand for slave labor that had been in general decline through many of the founding years.
- Talk with students about the Fugitive Slave Law, which Congress passed to allow for the enforcement of Article IV, Section 2, of the Constitution, and about the laws many Northern legislatures passed in response, including those that allowed alleged fugitive slaves to defend themselves in court and sought to prevent the kidnapping of free African Americans.
- Explain how the plan for surveying and settling the Northwest Territory went into effect through the Northwest Ordinance. Highlight how the distribution of public lands through the township system along with an allotment for a public school were both unique in world history.
- Discuss the roles of Jay’s Treaty and Pinckney’s Treaty in establishing the extents of the United States’ territory.
- Emphasize for students the great growth in population and industry during this decade, including further settlement westward and new conflicts between Native Americans and settlers, such as the Northwest Indian War. Explore how disease, treaties, conflict, population density, and competing ideas of land and property factored into westward settlement and the reduction in the number and locations of Native Americans. Conflict, especially on the frontier, was still common—a combination of misunderstanding, outright dishonesty, and revenge. Where treaties were employed, their slightest violation usually gave the opposing side an excuse to act with force, thus undermining any kind of agreement. The distant and unsettled frontier left most nationally decreed restrictions on settlement unenforced.
- Consider how voting privileges expanded with the removal of property requirements, what was then a monumental development in self-government unique to America.
- Conclude the treatment of George Washington’s presidency with a discussion of the main ideas in his Farewell Address. Especially significant points to read and discuss with students include his warnings about party and the importance of union; his advocacy for remaining independent of other nations with respect to war and alliances; and his emphasis on religion, education, and
upright moral conduct as essential to the success of the United States. Implied throughout is the necessity of reverence for the rule of law.

- Discuss John Adams’s presidency, beginning with a review of his contributions during the Revolution. Note with students how Adams had a hard act to follow and little of the respect, admiration, or mystique that Washington had possessed. Help students to understand Adams’s major accomplishments, including building a navy and navigating a neutral position with respect to the French wars of revolution, not to mention following the precedents set by Washington, thus lending them greater permanence.

- Based on previous conversation about the competing views for the country (as put forward by Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton), trace the development of political parties during the Washington and Adams administrations, culminating in the election of 1800, during which the American people were deeply divided. The threat of civil unrest was high, and Jefferson’s defeat of Adams posed a risk that such unrest would overflow during the first attempt to transfer power. That the transfer of power was, however, entirely peaceful after twelve years of rule by one regime seemed to confirm the sturdiness of the Constitution and the prudence of those who governed for that first decade. Students should appreciate how extraordinarily rare such transfers of power are in history and what allowed the Americans to avoid bloodshed—the all-too-common outcome in the history of nations.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS**

**Activity 1:** Have students draw depictions of life in the two different visions of America as argued for by Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson. Then have them present on what they drew and why.

**Activity 2:** Have students draw a map showing how land in the Northwest Territory was allotted for different purposes. Ask plenty of questions in the process.

---

**Assignment 1:** Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

**Assignment 2:** What were some of the precedents and examples George Washington set as president? (2–4 sentences)

**Assignment 3:** Why did George Washington believe it was important for people to be education and good in order for America to succeed? (2–4 sentences)
MATCHING: Write the letter of each definition to the correct word it defines.

_____ Father of Our Country
_____ cabinet
_____ Fugitive Slave Law
_____ Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions
_____ Executive Mansion

A. a reference to George Washington
B. efforts by states to cancel a law passed by Congress
C. required judges to review proof that a supposedly escaped slave had in fact been a slave
D. the president’s closest advisors
E. the president’s home

SHORT ANSWER: Answer the following in complete sentences.

1. What challenges did George Washington face during his presidency?

_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

2. What did George Washington and John Adams think about Great Britain and Revolutionary France?

_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

3. How did the cotton gin change the future of slavery?

_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

4. What did George Washington say about parties and divisions?

_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

5. What did George Washington say about learning and doing the right thing?

_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
Lesson 2 — Prospects, Uncertainties, and War

1801–1815

6–7 classes

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about events during the presidencies of Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, including Americans’ conflict with the British in the War of 1812.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts

Meet Thomas Jefferson  Pages 29–62
Early Presidents and Social Reformers  Pages 46–57
Westward Expansion Before the Civil War  Pages 16–21

Teacher Texts

Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1  Pages 100–118
The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic  Pages 120–132
Westward Expansion  Pages 7–9, 34–48

Trade Books

A New Nation
The Louisiana Purchase
The War of 1812

Online.Hillsdale.edu

The Great American Story  Lecture 6
American Heritage  Lectures 5 and 7

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students pre-read Meet Thomas Jefferson, pages 29–62 (based on grade level reading ability).

Assignment 2: Students pre-read Early Presidents and Social Reformers, pages 46–57 (grades 4 and 5 only).

Assignment 3: Students pre-read Westward Expansion Before the Civil War, pages 16–21 (grade 5 only).
CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography and Places
Monticello                Missouri River
Barbary Coast              Lake Erie
Louisiana Territory        Washington, DC
St. Louis

Persons
Thomas Jefferson          James Madison
Alexander Hamilton         Tecumseh
Meriwether Lewis           Oliver Perry
William Clark              Francis Scott Key
Sacagawea                  Andrew Jackson

Terms and Topics
Federalists                impressment
Democratic-Republicans    Battle of Tippecanoe
“unconstitutional”         War of 1812
Louisiana Purchase         USS Constitution
Corps of Discovery          Battle of Lake Erie
Barbary Pirates            Burning of Washington
Act Prohibiting Importation of Slaves of 1807
Battle of New Orleans

To Know by Heart
“The Star-Spangled Banner”

Timeline
1812–15       War of 1812
1815          Battle of New Orleans

Images
Historical figures and events
Landscape pictures of geographic places featured in this lesson
Washington, DC, depictions
Statue of Thomas Jefferson (Hillsdale College campus)
Jefferson Memorial
Images and uniforms of British and American officers and soldiers
Depictions of figures at various scenes and moments in battle
Relevant forts
USS Constitution in Boston Harbor
Depictions of the Executive Mansion on fire
Depictions of the defense of Fort McHenry
Scenes from the Battle of New Orleans
Statue of James Madison (Hillsdale College campus)

**STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART**

- Biographies and the roles of Thomas Jefferson and James Madison
- Thomas Jefferson’s walk to and from his inauguration
- Entries from the diaries of Meriwether Lewis and William Clark
- Aaron Burr killing Alexander Hamilton in a duel
- Dolley Madison fleeing the British with the portrait of George Washington
- The burning of Washington, DC, including the Executive Mansion
- The defense of Fort McHenry and the writing of “The Star-Spangled Banner”
- Andrew Jackson’s various duels and adventures
- The Battle of New Orleans and how it occurred after a peace treaty had been signed—unbeknownst to the battle participants

**QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND**

- What were the major actions of Thomas Jefferson’s presidency?
- What was the impact of the Louisiana Purchase on America’s future?
- What was the Corps of Discovery Expedition like?
- What did Congress and Thomas Jefferson outlaw in 1808?
- What were Thomas Jefferson’s views and actions regarding slavery?
- What does it mean for the Supreme Court to declare a law to be “unconstitutional”?
- What were the main characteristics of James Madison’s presidency?
- Why did America fight the British in the War of 1812?
- Why was the Battle of New Orleans important for America’s future, even though it was fought after a peace treaty had been signed?
- What were the outcomes of the War of 1812?
- Questions from the US Civics Test:
  - Question 87: Thomas Jefferson is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 88: James Madison is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 90: What territory did the United States buy from France in 1803?
  - Question 91: Name one war fought by the United States in the 1800s.
  - Question 117: Name one American Indian tribe in the United States.
  - Question 123: What is the name of the national anthem?

**KEYS TO THE LESSON**

Changes in power have historically been among the most tumultuous moments in a nation’s history. America’s first transition from Federalist to Democratic-Republican control not only avoided much tumult but was perfectly peaceful. But how would the nation cope with new policies? And perhaps even more importantly, how would those making those changes behave? It turned out that Thomas Jefferson the president ended up being far less revolutionary than Thomas Jefferson the thinker and party leader. His policies were relatively conservative and even tended in the direction of Federalist positions. Yet challenges remained, particularly during the years of the Napoleonic Wars, culminating with the War of 1812 under
James Madison. But even when the young nation made serious mistakes, somehow America seemed to emerge the better for it.

Teachers might best plan and teach Prospects, Uncertainties, and War with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Begin the lesson with a review of Thomas Jefferson’s childhood and biography. Like so many of his contemporary American Founders and statesmen, Jefferson had an exceptional mind with many interests and plenty of practical political skill. Of particular note is his storied career as a political thinker and statesman, his devotion to education, and the contradiction between his private efforts and statements against slavery and his continued ownership of slaves at Monticello.

- Treat Thomas Jefferson’s presidency chronologically, including events that do not directly relate to him. The almost unilateral Louisiana Purchase and the military expedition against the Barbary pirates in the Mediterranean are two examples of Jefferson’s use of presidential power.

- Teach students about *Marbury v. Madison* and what it means for the Supreme Court to determine the constitutionality of a law or presidential action. The assertion of its coequality with the other branches in *Marbury* ensured that power was equally distributed and equally accountable to the people. Clarify that each branch of the government has an equal responsibility only to do what they judge to be constitutional, with the final say always coming back to the people.

- Tell students the stories of the Corps of Discovery Expedition through the Louisiana Territory. Be sure to show plenty of drawings and maps from Meriwether Lewis and William Clark’s sketchbooks. Use this opportunity to review geography material as the Corps traveled westward.

- Discuss the continued menace of the Napoleonic Wars and Americans’ attempts to trade with both the French and the British. Illustrate clearly for students why impressment of American sailors was such an affront. Outline Thomas Jefferson’s struggles (like Washington and Adams before him) with the British.

- Conclude the Jefferson administration by noting how Thomas Jefferson cemented the two-term limit tradition for presidents by following Washington’s example. In the last year of his presidency, Jefferson also signed into law in 1808 the abolition of the international slave trade, the earliest moment the Constitution allowed for it to be abolished.

- Introduce James Madison with a review of his biography and his role in the Constitutional Convention and ratification debates. From this background students should not be surprised that he had become president, just as many Americans at the time had likewise been unsurprised. The entirety of Madison’s presidency, however, would be absorbed with British aggression and an outright war.

- Tell the stories of Tecumseh’s attempts to unite Native Americans east of the Mississippi River against American settlers and Tecumseh’s defeat at the Battle of Tippecanoe by forces under William Henry Harrison. The internal divisions over whether to defy a more powerful enemy or to capitulate were present within many Native American tribes in their responses to settlers and the United States government.

- Ask students to identify and compare the various advantages and disadvantages of each side at the outset of the War of 1812 and how these shifted over the years. Having students take simple notes as a “T-Chart” can be effective for this part of the lesson.

- Introduce students to the contemporary style of warfare by using images, maps, and artifacts. This approach will provide a foundation for their subsequent study of battles, help them to understand
what happens in battle, and allow them to appreciate the bravery of soldiers fighting on both sides.

- Explain in general each side's strategy at various stages of the war and the tactics and battle plans employed in some important battles.
- Teach major battles with some detail, focusing on the story and its drama. Students should understand how the battles came to be, the key stories, factors, and moments from the battles themselves, and the significance of their various outcomes on subsequent events. Employ battle maps as appropriate.
- Note the great division between New England and the rest of the country in the War of 1812. In addition to secession talks, some New England states and New York actively supplied the British through trade for much of the war.
- Of particular note in the War of 1812 are the frontier nature of fighting around the Great Lakes, the Americans’ actual attempt to conquer Canada, the American naval victories on inland lakes such as that of Commodore Oliver Perry in the Battle of Lake Erie as well as the Battle of Plattsburgh Bay on Lake Champlain, the half-hearted British fighting in the early years of the war due to their preoccupation with Napoleon, the British invasions of Washington, Baltimore, New York, and New Orleans, and the writing of “The Star-Spangled Banner.”
- Introduce Andrew Jackson, the soldier and frontier lawyer-statesman. Consider the warfare of the day and the understandings each side held as to the means and purpose of combat. Explore with students accounts of Jackson as a military commander by both those in his command and his Native American opponents. Jackson will, of course, be covered again in future lessons, but this is an opportunity to introduce and tell some of the early stories that show the different sides to Andrew Jackson.
- Conclude this lesson with the Battle of New Orleans, which technically occurred after peace had been agreed to. Note the diverse and ragtag army under Andrew Jackson’s command and their utter decimation of the regular British forces, including three generals. The Battle of New Orleans left Americans with a sense of triumph and pride from a war that had largely lacked such decisive victories, and which had included several embarrassing defeats and policy failures. The war would be the last major conflict with a foreign power that America would fight on its own soil.

STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS

Activity 1: Have students draw a map of Corps of Discovery Expedition.

Activity 2: Have students make their own sketches of photographs of animals that the Corps of Discovery had documented. Make reference to the journal sketches of Meriwether Lewis and William Clark to imitate style and layout. Encourage students to be accurate and pay close attention to details, color, and proportion.

Activity 3: Assign each student a different event to draw from the War of 1812. Then have students arrange themselves in the correct order of events in class and have each present briefly what they drew, the story behind it, its relationship to other scenes, and why they depicted it the way they did.
Assignment 1: Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

Assignment 2: Choose a battle from the War of 1812 and retell the story of what happened in the battle (1 paragraph).

Assignment 3: Have students learn by heart and recite the first stanza of “The Star-Spangled Banner.” Ask questions of the students about the meaning of different lines.
Lesson 3 — The American Way

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the Era of Good Feelings under James Monroe, the rivalry between John Quincy Adams and Andrew Jackson, continued American expansion, and the practice of American democracy.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
- Early Presidents and Social Reformers
- Westward Expansion Before the Civil War

Teacher Texts
- Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1
- The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic
- Westward Expansion

Online.Hillsdale.edu
- The Great American Story
- American Heritage

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students pre-read Early Presidents and Social Reformers, pages 58–73 (grades 4 and 5 only).

Assignment 2: Students pre-read Westward Expansion Before the Civil War, pages 22–37 (grade 5 only).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography and Places
- Mexico
- Tejas
- Deep South
- Maine
- Missouri

Persons
- James Monroe
- Henry Clay
- John Quincy Adams
- Andrew Jackson
Stephen F. Austin
Joseph Smith

William Lloyd Garrison

Terms and Topics
- The Virginia Dynasty
- “Era of Good Feelings”
- 49th Parallel
- immigration
- Erie Canal
- railroad
- steamship
- Second Great Awakening

Mormonism
- slave trade
- cotton gin
- King Cotton
- Missouri Compromise
- 36° 30’ line
- Monroe Doctrine
- Democratic Party

To Know by Heart
- “The Erie Canal” —John Addington Symonds

Timeline
- 1820 Missouri Compromise

Images
- Historical figures and events
- Landscape pictures of geographic places featured in this lesson
- First versions of inventions from this time period, such as steamboats and railroad
- The Erie Canal
- Photos of cotton plantations today
- Depictions of life as a slave
- Depictions of the Second Great Awakening gatherings and revival scenes
- “Old Hickory” campaign paraphernalia
- Maps of Mexico and Texas

Stories for the American Heart
- Biographies and the roles of James Monroe, John Quincy Adams, and Andrew Jackson
- The deaths of Thomas Jefferson and John Adams on July 4, 1826
- Andrew Jackson’s many duels, rivalries, feats, and accomplishments, before he became president
- Margaret Bayard Smith’s account of the inauguration of Andrew Jackson

Questions for the American Mind
- From where did many immigrants come during the 1820s and 1830s?
- How was transportation changing during the early 1800s?
- How did farming change during the early 1800s?
- What happened in the Second Great Awakening?
- What was society and life like in the South compared to the North and West?
- What was life like for slaves during the early nineteenth century?
- Why did the cotton gin increase the demand for slaves?
- Why did Missouri becoming a state increase disagreements over slavery?
- What did the Missouri Compromise do?
- What was Henry Clay like when he was in politics?
- How were parts of Texas first settled by Americans?
- What did the Monroe Doctrine say?
- What were Adams-Jackson campaigns like?
- Why did Andrew Jackson promote the common man?
- Question from the US Civics Test:
  - Question 118: Name one example of an American innovation.

**Keys to the Lesson**

The “Era of Good Feelings” that followed the War of 1812—complete with prosperity at home and peace abroad—permitted America to develop further its unique potential. As America “grew up” its version of democracy became clearer. Perhaps no individual channeled or seemed to embody this democratic spirit of the time and the stake of the common man more fully than Andrew Jackson. And perhaps no one has talked about the nature of democratic self-government in America as well as the French observer Alexis de Tocqueville did during his visits to America. From statesmen like Jackson to observers like Tocqueville, we have an excellent window into what American self-government was like in the early nineteenth century.

Teachers might best plan and teach The American Way with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Teach students about the background and biography of James Monroe, whose accomplishments prior to his becoming president were already storied and remarkable, and the impressive streak of Virginian presidents—sometimes called the “Virginia Dynasty.”
- Note the beginning of one of the first great immigration waves of the nineteenth century. With Europe in shambles following the Napoleonic Wars, European immigrants found new security, personal ownership of land, and opportunity in America, with half settling in New York and Philadelphia, while the other half settled in what is now the Midwest.
- Explore with students the great changes in technology and transportation during the 1820s and 1830s, including canals, the railroad, the steamboat, and advances in agriculture, including how these changes actually worked and what their effects were.
- Survey the main ideas of the Second Great Awakening.
- Review the effects of the cotton gin on the practice of slavery in slaveholding states, and the economic value of slavery and the domestic slave trade. Greater percentages of slaves were also shifted decisively into manual field work while new justifications for slavery were often created based on religious interpretation and outright prejudice. Note the years in which different states were admitted as free states or outlawed slavery themselves. Nevertheless, even as the free-state/slave-state balance was maintained, the country was gradually losing the argument of many antislavery Founders, in whose view slavery was to be kept on the path to extinction as a temporary evil destined for its own ruin.
- Provide students with insights into Southern culture and society. Give an overview of Southern socioeconomic demography. Be sure to address the planter class—including the variety of estate sizes within the planter class—the free subsistence farmers, enslaved African Americans, etc. Spend some time on the life of slaves and the culture that emerged among slaves; include reading
specific slave narratives. *Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition*, Volume 1’s treatment of these themes on pages 151–158 is an excellent aid in these discussions.

- Discuss with students the major factors that have produced the great wealth and prosperity of America, namely the freedom to innovate and invest, property rights, a peaceful daily life governed by the rule of law and consent of the governed, and the ability to patent ideas and inventions. Discuss also the extent to which many Southerners and even Northerners and Englishmen made considerable fortunes off of slavery and cotton textiles during the nineteenth century.

- Present the question over Missouri’s admission as a state as the first major reemergence of the slavery issue after the founding and a mark of the growing divide in America in the post–cotton gin era. It was clear from this fierce debate, which involved talks of secession, that the hopes of many Founders that slavery would resolve itself organically were no longer tenable with the invention of the cotton gin, and that the deepest of America’s divisions could not be ignored forever. As the elderly Thomas Jefferson noted at the time, the crisis over Missouri could be the death knell of the Union. Even though conflict would be postponed forty years, the temporary peace acquired by the Missouri Compromise would leave the problem of slavery to haunt America for those four decades.

- Use this opportunity to introduce major statesmen of the period, especially Henry Clay (the Great Compromiser) and John Quincy Adams. On Clay in particular, give students an insight into how skilled he was in politics and how he elevated the power of Congress.

- Discuss the settlement of Texas by Stephen Austin and other Americans during the 1820s, for the emergence of this American outpost within New Spain and then in Mexico would be consequential for events of subsequent decades.

- Note the importance of the Monroe Doctrine and how unrealistically ambitious it was. Nonetheless, it did secure George Washington’s view of foreign policy as America’s standard position and, combined with good timing, was actually effective in fulfilling what it said.

- Review with students Andrew Jackson’s biography, full of impressive triumphs and controversial actions, particularly with respect to Native American tribes and Jackson’s thwarting of civilian authority over the military.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS**

**Activity 1:** Have each student choose an invention or an innovation in transportation from the time period, draw it, and present about it to the class, being able to answer questions along the way.

**Activity 2:** Have students draw scenes depicting the daily life of slaves on Southern plantations. Options should include depictions of dehumanizing and harsh suffering, how slaves lived when they were not working, and the cultural practices and traditions that emerged in slave communities. Students should then present to the class and be able to answer questions.
Assignment 1: Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

Assignment 2: What factors made the time after the War of 1812 an “Era of Good Feelings”? (2–4 sentences).

Assignment 3: Why were people becoming increasingly concerned about whether or not a new state would allow slavery (2–4 sentences).
Unit 3 — Formative Quiz 2

MULTIPLE CHOICE: Circle the option that best answers each question.

1. What was the Virginia Dynasty?
   a. a group of farmers from Virginia upset about whiskey prices
   b. four of the first five presidents, who were all from Virginia: Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe
   c. a company sent to explore the western frontier
   d. those who were descended from the Jamestown Colony

2. What was the “Era of Good Feelings”?
   a. the years of plenty in the Jefferson administration
   b. a name for the relationship between John Quincy Adams and Andrew Jackson
   c. the years during the War of 1812
   d. the years after the War of 1812 under President James Monroe

3. To what did the 49th Parallel refer?
   a. the border that the Americans wanted with British lands in Canada
   b. the compromise border between America and the British lands in Canada
   c. the border that the British wanted between their lands in Canada and America
   d. the disputed border between the United States and Mexico

4. Where was the Erie Canal located?
   a. Ohio
   b. Massachusetts
   c. Pennsylvania
   d. New York

5. Which state was admitted along with Missouri in the Missouri Compromise?
   a. Michigan
   b. Vermont
   c. Maine
   d. Wisconsin
**SHORT ANSWER: Answer the following in complete sentences.**

6. From where did many immigrants come during the 1820s and 1830s?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

7. How did farming change during the early 1800s?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

8. Why did the cotton gin increase the demand for slaves?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

9. What did the Monroe Doctrine say?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

10. What were Adams-Jackson campaigns like?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
Lesson 4 — Manifest Destiny

1829–1848

8–9 classes

**LESSON OBJECTIVE**

Students learn about the presidency of Andrew Jackson, the Mexican-American War, and expansion to the Pacific Ocean under the banner of “manifest destiny,” along with the issues associated with such expansion.

**TEACHER PREPARATION**

Create a note outline based on the following:

**Student Texts**
- *Early Presidents and Social Reformers* Pages 80–81, 90–105
- *Westward Expansion Before the Civil War* Pages 38–75

**Teacher Texts**
- *The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic* Pages 138–151

**Trade Books**
- *So Tall Within*
- *Frederick's Journey*
- *This is Texas*

**Online.Hillsdale.edu**
- *The Great American Story* Lectures 7, 8, and 9
- *American Heritage* Lectures 5, 6, and 7

**STUDENT PREPARATION**

**Assignment 1:** Students pre–read *Early Presidents and Social Reformers*, pages 80–81 and 90–105. (grades 4 and 5 only).

**Assignment 2:** Students pre–read *Westward Expansion Before the Civil War*, pages 38–57 (grade 5 only).

**Assignment 3:** Students pre–read *Westward Expansion Before the Civil War*, pages 58–75 (grade 5 only).
**CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON**

### Geography and Places
- Republic of Texas
- Oregon Country
- Rio Grande
- California Territory

### Persons
- Henry Clay
- Sam Houston
- Antonio López de Santa Anna
- Davy Crockett
- Sequoyah
- Brigham Young
- Elizabeth Cady Stanton
- Sojourner Truth
- William Lloyd Garrison
- Frederick Douglass
- Levi and Catharine Coffin
- Harriet Tubman
- James Polk
- Zachary Taylor
- Abraham Lincoln

### Terms and Topics
- Nat Turner Rebellion
- Nullification Crisis
- Bank of the United States
- Indian Removal Act
- Cherokee
- Trail of Tears
- The Alamo
- Texas Revolution
- temperance
- abolitionism
- Underground Railroad
- manifest destiny
- 49th Parallel
- annexation
- Spot Resolutions
- Mexican-American War
- Mexican Cession

### Timeline
- 1836  Texas independence
- 1846–48  Mexican-American War

### Images
- Historical figures and events
- First flags of Texas
- Uniforms and munitions of soldiers in the Mexican-American War
- Depictions of battles and battlefields, including strategy and tactics
- Depictions of figures at various scenes and moments in battle
- Maps: overall strategies, specific battles
- Relevant forts
- Medical equipment
- Reenactment photos

### STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART
- Biographies and the roles of Andrew Jackson, Sam Houston, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton
- Frederick Douglass’s account of his experience with a slave breaker
• Toasts between Andrew Jackson and John C. Calhoun regarding nullification at a Democratic Party dinner
• Accounts of the Battle of the Alamo
• Accounts of traveling the Oregon Trail
• The sudden illness and death of William Henry Harrison
• The feud between John Tyler and Henry Clay
• The US Marines entering the “Halls of Montezuma” during the Mexican-American War
• John Quincy Adams suffering a stroke at his desk in the House of Representatives, and subsequent death in the Speaker’s Room

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

• How did Andrew Jackson appear to help the common person?
• What was the question of nullification all about?
• How did Andrew Jackson respond to decisions of the Supreme Court with which he disagreed?
  Why did he believe he was justified to act in these ways?
• How did the Texas Revolution come about?
• What happened at the Alamo?
• Why did the Texans want to become part of the United States?
• In which ways did abolitionists work to abolish slavery?
• How did the Underground Railroad work?
• What was the idea of “manifest destiny”? Why did many Americans believe in it?
• Why did people want to go west to the Oregon Country?
• How did the Mexican-American War begin?
• Why did the Americans win the Mexican-American War?
• What did America get by winning the Mexican-American War?
• Questions from the US Civics Test:
  - Question 91: Name one war fought by the United States in the 1800s.
  - Question 117: Name one American Indian tribe in the United States.

KEYS TO THE LESSON

The democratic age was one in which the interests of the common man became leading goals of many statesmen, even while profoundly undemocratic institutions such as slavery remained. At the same time, a spirit of optimistic expansion imbued American politics, eventually termed America’s “manifest destiny” to settle from coast to coast. Confidence in the benefits of American freedom and self-government, coupled with other motivations and seemingly endless opportunities for expansion, fueled this spirit. Expansion, however, often involved displacing Native Americans in ways that lacked honor or justice. At America’s then-southwestern border, Americans who had settled in Texas were fighting their own revolution against Mexico. The resulting Republic of Texas and its potential admission to the Union stalked the next decade of American politics, as the slavery question lurked over all other debates. The Texas question came to a head with the Mexican-American War, the consequences of which would re-ignite the slavery debate and drive the nation toward civil strife.

Teachers might best plan and teach Manifest Destiny with emphasis on the following approaches:
When teaching about Andrew Jackson and his presidency, consider with students the theme of his democratic appeal, namely in favor of the common man. At its heart, this meant a faith in the rightness of the views of the common man and the defense of his station in life against larger commercial interests. In short, the Jeffersonian view of America began to push back against the Hamiltonian view. Ask students the ways they see policies during the 1830s benefit the Jeffersonian view rather than the Hamiltonian.

Teach about Nat Turner’s revolt and the hardening of the slaveholding position during the 1830s and 1840s.

Talk about the growing North-South divide, over both slavery and economics, such as the 1833 Nullification Crisis over the tariff.

Tell the story of the treaties made after the passage of the Indian Removal Act and the removal of Native Americans who disagreed with the treaties, especially their treatment and suffering on the Trail of Tears. *Land of Hope*’s treatment of this topic on pages 115–117 is very good. When teaching the resettlement chapter of American and Native American history in particular, it is important to capture the diversity of thoughts, motivations, and actions by the different parties: bad, good, and mixed. The general treatment of Native Americans is a bitter and sad part of America’s history, and unfortunately one that may have been better if a more deliberate and imaginative policy were devised, and if the view of the human person laid out in the Declaration of Independence had been more consistently referenced in relationships with the indigenous population. Additionally, spend time teaching about efforts to maintain Native American heritage, such as how Sequoyah and the Cherokee sought to preserve their culture.

Share the stories of the Texas Revolution, including the Alamo, Texas’s subsequent efforts to join the United States, and the effects of the Texas question on American political issues, such as slavery.

Discuss the immigration waves from Ireland and Germany during the 1840s, where most of the people settled first in New York and New England. Also discuss the growing reform efforts in the areas of temperance, women’s political participation, and especially abolitionism.

Introduce and discuss the idea of “manifest destiny” with students. *Land of Hope*’s treatment of this topic on pages 154–155 is especially helpful. In brief, manifest destiny involved many different dimensions, some of which were noble; others less so. Even then, the meaning of this expression in the minds of different people varied greatly. The common point is that many Americans believed—based on the situation at the time—that America was destined to reach from coast to coast across a comparably sparsely populated wilderness, and to do great things for freedom, human flourishing, and individuals in the process. This was the sentiment that influenced many decisions during the 1830s and 1840s.

Present the less-than-honorable origins and intentions behind the Mexican-American War within the contexts of the annexation of Texas, manifest destiny, the consequences of expansion for the slave-state/free-state balance of power, and the resistance to the war by figures such as Abraham Lincoln and Henry David Thoreau.

Teach the Mexican-American War with a pace that captures the swiftness with which it was fought and concluded. Explain each side’s general strategy at various stages of the war and the battles themselves in more general terms compared to the War of Independence and the War of 1812. Employ battle maps often. As with any conflict, draw attention to the key contributions of both leaders and common soldiers in the war. Of special interest in teaching this war is foreshadowing the many soldiers who would rise to famous generalships during the Civil War a
dozen years later. Finally, conclude with the terms of the peace treaty, especially as it concerned American territory.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS**

**Activity 1:** Have students draw a map of the Underground Railroad routes and an accompanying scene. Then have students present and explain what they drew.

**Activity 2:** Have students draw a scene from the Texas Revolution or Mexican-American War, including a map of the United States before and after the war. Then have students present and explain what they drew.

---

**Assignment 1:** Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

**Assignment 2:** Why did Andrew Jackson think it was important to pay attention to what the “common man” wanted? (2–4 sentences)

**Assignment 3:** How did Texas become a republic and then a state? (2–4 sentences)
APPENDIX A

Talk about History

Study Guides

Tests

Writing Assignment
TALK ABOUT HISTORY

Student Name: ___________________________  Due: ______________

Story/Lesson from History: __________________________________________

1. Who/what did you learn about in history class today?
   Student Answer: ________________________________________________

2. Who were the most important characters in the story?
   Student Answer: ________________________________________________

3. Tell me more about one of those characters.
   Student Answer: ________________________________________________

4. Tell me about the most exciting/interesting part of the story today.
   Student Answer: ________________________________________________

Parent Signature: ________________________________  Date: ______________

TALK ABOUT HISTORY

Student Name: ___________________________  Due: ______________

Story/Lesson from History: __________________________________________

1. Who/what did you learn about in history class today?
   Student Answer: ________________________________________________

2. Who were the most important characters in the story?
   Student Answer: ________________________________________________

3. Tell me more about one of those characters.
   Student Answer: ________________________________________________

4. Tell me about the most exciting/interesting part of the story today.
   Student Answer: ________________________________________________

Parent Signature: ________________________________  Date: ______________
Unit 3 | Test 1 — Study Guide

Lesson 1 | The New Government
Lesson 2 | Prospects, Uncertainties, and War

Test on ____________

TIMELINE

When given dates in order, match events from a list to the years or dates that they happened.

1787        Constitutional Convention
1812–15     War of 1812
1815        Battle of New Orleans

PERSONS

Identify each, provide biographical details, and explain what he or she thought or did in specific periods or events.

George Washington  Meriwether Lewis  Tecumseh
John Adams         William Clark   Francis Scott Key
Thomas Jefferson   Sacagawea      James Madison
Alexander Hamilton

TERMS AND TOPICS

Identify each and explain its significance to the period of history studied.

Bill of Rights     Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions
Father of Our Country
Whiskey Rebellion
Cotton gin         nullify
Federalist Party   “unconstitutional”
Democratic-Republican Party
Louisiana Purchase
Corps of Discovery

Barbary Pirates impressment
War of 1812        USS Constitution
Battle of New Orleans
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

Be familiar with each of the following stories.

- The presidency of George Washington
- Biographies and the roles of Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton after 1789
- The ebb and flow of the friendship between John Adams and Thomas Jefferson
- The death of George Washington
- Dolley Madison fleeing the British with the portrait of George Washington
- The defense of Fort McHenry and the writing of “The Star-Spangled Banner”
- The Battle of New Orleans and how it occurred after a peace treaty had been signed

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Based on notes from lessons and conversations, answer each of the following.

☐ What presidential traditions did George Washington give us?
☐ What was Thomas Jefferson’s vision of the kind of country America should become?
☐ How did the cotton gin change the future of slavery?
☐ What did George Washington say about wars and alliances?
☐ What did George Washington say about learning and doing the right thing?
☐ Why was the election of 1800 called the “revolution of 1800” by Thomas Jefferson?
☐ What was the impact of the Louisiana Purchase on America’s future?
☐ What was the Corps of Discovery Expedition like?
☐ What did Congress and Thomas Jefferson outlaw in 1808?
☐ Why did America fight the British in the War of 1812?
☐ What were the outcomes of the War of 1812?
Unit 3 | Test 1 — The Early Republic

Lesson 1 | The New Government
Lesson 2 | Prospects, Uncertainties, and War

**TIMELINE:** Write the letter of each event next to the date or years it took place.

1787 ______ A. Battle of New Orleans
1812–15 ______ B. Constitutional Convention
1815 ______ C. War of 1812

**MATCHING:** Write the letter of each definition to the correct word it defines.

____ John Adams
A. a brave Native American leader who attempted to unite tribes against the U.S. government
B. a leading revolutionary figure who served an overlooked role as America’s second president
C. a young genius who imagined a factory-based country
D. famed American battleship that fought during the War of 1812; nicknamed “Old Ironsides”
E. sailors from Tripoli who demanded countries pay them or else have their ships attacked and cargo stolen; Thomas Jefferson had the U.S. Navy fight them to stop this practice
F. the first ten amendments to the Constitution which guaranteed freedoms such as the freedoms of religion and of speech
G. the idea that a state can ignore a law passed by Congress
H. the power of the judicial branch to decide that a law broke the Constitution
I. when the British forced American sailors to serve in the British navy; a cause of the War of 1812
MULTIPLE CHOICE: Circle the option that best answers each question.

1. What invention increased the demand for slave labor?
   a. steamboat
   b. railroad
   c. cotton gin
   d. Erie Canal

2. Who is known as the Father of Our Country?
   a. Benjamin Franklin
   b. George Washington
   c. Alexander Hamilton
   d. Thomas Jefferson

3. President Thomas Jefferson doubled the size of America through what action?
   a. The War of 1812
   b. war against the Barbary Pirates
   c. war against the French revolutionaries
   d. Louisiana Purchase

4. Who guided the Corps of Discovery and fostered friendly relationships with Native Americans in the west?
   a. Sacagawea
   b. Dolley Madison
   c. Aaron Burr
   d. Tecumseh

5. Who wrote “The Defense of Fort McHenry”?
   a. Eli Whitney
   b. Oliver Perry
   c. Francis Scott Key
   d. James Madison
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART: *Tell me about the presidency of George Washington.*


QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND: *Answer the following in complete sentences.*

6. What presidential traditions did George Washington give us?


7. What was Thomas Jefferson’s vision of the kind of country America should become?


8. How did the cotton gin change the future of slavery?


9. What did George Washington say about learning and doing the right thing?


10. What did Congress and Thomas Jefferson outlaw in 1808?


Unit 3 | Test 2 — Study Guide

Lesson 3 | The American Way
Lesson 4 | Manifest Destiny

Test on ______________

**TIMELINE**

When given chronological dates, match events from a list to the years or dates that they happened.

- 1820  Missouri Compromise
- 1836  Texas independence
- 1846–48  Mexican-American War

**PERSONS**

Identify each, provide biographical details, and explain what he or she thought or did in specific periods or events.

- James Monroe
- John Quincy Adams
- Andrew Jackson
- Stephen F. Austin
- William Lloyd Garrison
- Davy Crockett
- Sequoyah
- Frederick Douglass
- Harriet Tubman
- James Polk
- Abraham Lincoln

**TERMS AND TOPICS**

Identify each and explain its significance to the period of history studied.

- Tejas
- Deep South
- “Era of Good Feelings”
- Erie Canal
- railroad
- steamship
- Second Great Awakening
- slave trade
- 36° 30’ line
- Monroe Doctrine
- Republic of Texas
- Oregon Country
- Nat Turner Rebellion
- Trail of Tears
- The Alamo
- temperance
- abolitionism
- Underground Railroad
- manifest destiny
- Mexican-American War
- Mexican Cession
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

Be familiar with each of the following stories.

- The biography and presidency of Andrew Jackson
- The deaths of Thomas Jefferson and John Adams on July 4, 1826
- Frederick Douglass’s account of his experience with a slave breaker
- Accounts of the Battle of the Alamo
- Accounts of traveling the Oregon Trail

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Based on notes from lessons and conversations, answer each of the following.

☐ From where did many immigrants come during the 1820s and 1830s?
☐ How did farming change during the early 1800s?
☐ What was society and life like in the South compared to the North and West?
☐ What was life like for slaves during the early nineteenth century?
☐ Why did the cotton gin increase the demand for slaves?
☐ Why did Andrew Jackson promote the common man?
☐ How did Andrew Jackson appear to help the common person?
☐ Why did the Texans want to become part of the United States?
☐ In which ways did abolitionists work to abolish slavery?
☐ What was the idea of “manifest destiny”? Why did many Americans believe in it?
☐ How did the Mexican-American War begin?
☐ What did America get by winning the Mexican-American War?
Unit 3 | Test 2 — The Early Republic

Lesson 3 | The American Way
Lesson 4 | Manifest Destiny

**Timeline:** Write the letter of each event next to the date or years it took place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>A. Mexican-American War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>B. Missouri Compromise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846–48</td>
<td>C. Texas independence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Matching:** Write the letter of each definition to the correct word it defines.

- __Second Great Awakening__
- __John Quincy Adams__
- __Stephen F. Austin__
- __Frederick Douglass__
- __Republic of Texas__
- __Trail of Tears__
- __Oregon Country__
- __Abraham Lincoln__
- __Mexican Cession__

A. a bountiful area in the Pacific Northwest to which many settlers moved
B. a young Congressman who opposed the Mexican-American War
C. an escaped slave who taught himself and then became a leading orator in favor of abolition
D. an expression of new Christian denominations and religious zeal, mainly among people living away from the Atlantic coast and large cities
E. the man who first led Americans to settle the parts of Mexico known as Tejas
F. the country founded by Americans that fought to be independent from Mexico
G. the lands acquired at the end of the Mexican-American War, including what would become California, Nevada, Arizona, and Utah
H. the son of a former president and president himself who sparred with Andrew Jackson and pro-slavery interests
I. when Native Americans died during their forced removal from their homelands under new treaty agreements
MULTIPLE CHOICE: Circle the option that best answers each question.

1. Who was the Cherokee leader who developed a unique alphabet in order to preserve Cherokee culture and language?
   a. Sequoyah
   b. Tecumseh
   c. Sacagawea
   d. John Ross

2. What was the major transportation project that connected the Hudson River to Lake Erie?
   a. Great Western Canal
   b. Pony Express
   c. Hudson Railroad
   d. Erie Canal

3. The Missouri Compromise allowed slavery in Missouri but otherwise prevented it from spreading west above what boundary?
   a. 49th Parallel
   b. 36° 30' line
   c. 54th Parallel
   d. Rio Grande

4. What was the American policy that warned European nations not to start any new colonies in the Western Hemisphere?
   a. Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo
   b. Treaty of Ghent
   c. Madison Doctrine
   d. Monroe Doctrine

5. What was the movement to end the production and drinking of alcohol called?
   a. abolitionism
   b. temperance
   c. Mormonism
   d. Manifest Destiny
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART: *Tell me about the deaths of Thomas Jefferson and John Adams.*

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND: *Answer the following in complete sentences.*

6. What was society and life like in the South compared to the North and West?

7. What was life like for slaves during the early nineteenth century?

8. Why did Andrew Jackson promote the common man?

9. What was the idea of “manifest destiny”? Why did many Americans believe in it?

10. How did the Mexican-American War begin?
Writing Assignment — The Early Republic

DIRECTIONS

In one paragraph, retell the story of America’s westward settlement during the 1830s and 1840s.
APPENDIX B

Primary Sources

George Washington
President George Washington

A Proclamation

Proclamation

October 3, 1789

Federal Hall | New York City, New York

Thanksgiving Proclamation

Background

In response to a joint resolution of Congress, President George Washington issued this proclamation.

Annotations

By the President of the United States of America, a Proclamation.

Whereas it is the duty of all Nations to acknowledge the providence of Almighty God, to obey his will, to be grateful for his benefits, and humbly to implore his protection and favor—and whereas both Houses of Congress have by their joint Committee requested me “to recommend to the People of the United States a day of public thanksgiving and prayer to be observed by acknowledging with grateful hearts the many signal favors of Almighty God especially by affording them an opportunity peaceably to establish a form of government for their safety and happiness.”

Now therefore I do recommend and assign Thursday the 26th day of November next to be devoted by the People of these States to the service of that great and glorious Being, who is the beneficent Author of all the good that was, that is, or that will be—that we may then all unite in rendering unto him our sincere and humble thanks—for his kind care and protection of the People of this Country previous to their becoming a Nation—for the signal and manifold mercies, and the favorable interpositions of his Providence which we experienced in the course and conclusion of the late war—for the great degree of tranquility,
Thanksgiving Proclamation
George Washington

union, and plenty, which we have since enjoyed—for the peaceable and rational manner, in which we have been enabled to establish constitutions of government for our safety and happiness, and particularly the national One now lately instituted—for the civil and religious liberty with which we are blessed; and the means we have of acquiring and diffusing useful knowledge; and in general for all the great and various favors which he hath been pleased to confer upon us.

And also that we may then unite in most humbly offering our prayers and supplications to the great Lord and Ruler of Nations and beseech him to pardon our national and other transgressions—to enable us all, whether in public or private stations, to perform our several and relative duties properly and punctually—to render our national government a blessing to all the people, by constantly being a Government of wise, just, and constitutional laws, discreetly and faithfully executed and obeyed—to protect and guide all Sovereigns and Nations (especially such as have shewn kindness unto us) and to bless them with good government, peace, and concord—To promote the knowledge and practice of true religion and virtue, and the increase of science among them and us—and generally to grant unto all Mankind such a degree of temporal prosperity as he alone knows to be best.

Given under my hand at the City of New-York the third day of October in the year of our Lord 1789.

George Washington
President George Washington

To the Hebrew Congregation in Newport, Rhode Island

LETTER

August 21, 1790

BACKGROUND

During President George Washington’s goodwill visit to Newport following Rhode Island’s ratification of the Constitution, Moses Seixas—a leading official in Newport and a member of the local Jewish synagogue—publicly read a letter to Washington. Washington responded three days later in a letter of his own.

ANNOTATIONS

Gentlemen:

While I receive, with much satisfaction, your Address replete with expressions of esteem; I rejoice in the opportunity of assuring you, that I shall always retain grateful remembrance of the cordial welcome I experienced in my visit to Newport, from all classes of Citizens.

The reflection on the days of difficulty and danger which are past is rendered the more sweet, from a consciousness that they are succeeded by days of uncommon prosperity and security. If we have wisdom to make the best use of the advantages with which we are now favored, we cannot fail, under the just administration of a good Government, to become a great and happy people.

The Citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy: a policy worthy of

imitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that toleration is spoken of, as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people, that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural rights. For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support.

It would be inconsistent with the frankness of my character not to avow that I am pleased with your favorable opinion of my Administration and fervent wishes for my felicity. May the Children of the Stock of Abraham, who dwell in this land, continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other Inhabitants; while every one shall sit in safety under his own vine and fig tree, and there shall be none to make him afraid. May the father of all mercies scatter light and not darkness in our paths, and make us all in our several vocations useful here, and in his own due time and way everlastingly happy.
UNIT 4

The American Civil War

1848–1877

UNIT PREVIEW
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Why Teach the American Civil War

"Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent, a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure."

These famous opening lines from President Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg express why the Civil War was fought. Whether America, founded in liberty and equality, could long endure depended on whether the nation’s original contradiction, slavery, could be abolished while still preserving the country’s existence as a union. American students must know how the ideas at the heart of their country were undermined by slavery; but they must also learn how heroic Americans committed to America’s founding ideas made
great sacrifices and sometimes gave their lives, so that these ideas of liberty and equality might prevail over the dehumanizing tyranny of slavery. And students must learn that, like those in Lincoln's audience, it is up to each American to oppose tyranny and dehumanization to ensure that “government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.”

Enduring Ideas from this Unit

1. That slavery was the original contradiction in America, and that slavery is immoral, unjust, dehumanizing, and in violation of the inherent dignity and equal possession of natural rights of each person, as are any ways in which one person or group of people is favored over another due to the color of their skin.

2. That at its heart, the Civil War was fought over the issue of slavery: first, whether slavery would expand in America; next, whether it would be permitted at all; and last, whether the half of the country that opposed slavery would let the country be divided and the injustice to continue elsewhere, instead of fighting to preserve a union that would guarantee liberty and abolish slavery.

3. That President Abraham Lincoln exemplified American statesmanship as he piloted the nation toward fulfillment of its founding ideas, ended the barbarous and tyrannical institution of slavery, and nevertheless abided by the rule of law in doing so.

4. That the period of Reconstruction following the Civil War witnessed a realization of civil rights for freedmen, producing greater degrees of justice and equality that would nevertheless be challenged both during Reconstruction and in following decades.

What Teachers Should Consider

The American Civil War is one of the most important events in American history if only for its attempt to prove, with the blood of hundreds of thousands of Americans, that a people may freely govern themselves and organize themselves to preserve the liberty and equal natural rights of all.

Many students may not know that America was founded on these ideas. Fewer, perhaps, know that America even succeeded in proving these ideas true, striving to live up to them for twenty years, before such progress was eclipsed after Reconstruction. Although subsequent decades would manifest different kinds of failures to guarantee the equal protection of natural rights in certain parts of the country, the Civil War demonstrated that some statesmen and a considerable portion of Americans were committed to carrying out America’s founding promise to the point of bloodshed.

Teachers will greatly benefit from studying not only the war itself but also the thoughts, words, and deeds of the statesman who conducted the war for the Union: President Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln’s ideas and speeches, and his political actions, should constitute for students a model of prudence, both in the public arena and in their own lives. His understanding of the issue of slavery, not merely in the abstract but as it existed in America, can teach students much about their country and its history.
This unit should begin, therefore, with an understanding of slavery as it was found in America in 1848. The teacher should especially emphasize the changes in the status and practice of slavery since the founding in 1776. The teacher should also emphasize changes in legal and public opinion toward the institution since the Constitution went into effect in 1789. In brief, both had entrenched slavery instead of keeping it on the gradual path to extinction, where the founding generation had arguably placed it.

Abraham Lincoln saw these legal and public opinion shifts most clearly, and he saw that such changes struck directly at the ideas on which America was founded. In brief, his entire public career as well as the founding of the Republican Party were devoted to checking this change, to returning slavery to the path of extinction, and to fulfilling the founding ideas of constitutional self-government. Lincoln’s arguments to these ends dominate the crescendo leading to war in spring of 1861. At its heart, this is what the Civil War was about.

The teacher will be able to enrich his or her students by cultivating their imaginations with the events, battles, and images of the Civil War, the bloodiest conflict in which Americans have ever been involved. Strategy, battles, and the general history of the war should be taught in detail. The teacher should learn and share accounts and images of the important moments and figures who contributed to Union victory in 1865. Meanwhile, Lincoln’s careful yet effective maneuverings—both to preserve the Union and to seize the constitutional opportunity afforded him to emancipate the slaves—should be followed in detail.

The unit best concludes with a study of the period known as Reconstruction. Perhaps never in history was so much hoped for, achieved, and mismanaged in so short a period of time with respect to liberty and equality under the law. Students should learn to appreciate both the sacrifices of the Civil War and its immediate achievements during Reconstruction. Nevertheless, students should also learn about the emergence of different kinds of injustice, especially for African Americans living in the former rebel states: injustices that would be perpetuated for a century.

How Teachers Can Learn More

**TEXTS**

*Land of Hope*, Wilfred McClay
*A Short History of the Civil War*, James Stokesbury
*Battle Cry of Freedom*, James McPherson

**ONLINE COURSES** | Online.Hillsdale.edu

*The Great American Story*
*Civil Rights in American History*
*Constitution 101*
Lesson Planning Resources

**TEACHER RESOURCES**

*Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition*, Wilfred McClay  
*The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic*, H.A. Guerber  
*The Civil War and Reconstruction*, Anne Goudvis and Stephanie Harvey  
*Westward Expansion*, Anne Goudvis and Stephanie Harvey  
*Fields of Fury*, James McPherson

**STUDENT RESOURCES**

*Meet Abraham Lincoln*, Barbara Cary  
*The Civil War: Reader*, Core Knowledge Foundation

**TRADE BOOKS**

*If You Lived When There Was Slavery in America*, Anne Kamma  
*If You Traveled on the Underground Railroad*, Ellen Levine  
*Abraham Lincoln and Frederick Douglass*, Russell Freedman  
*If You Lived at the Time of the Civil War*, Kay Moore  
*The Boys’ War*, Jim Murphy

**PRIMARY SOURCES**

*Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass*, Frederick Douglass  
“House Divided” speech, Abraham Lincoln  
First inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln  
Emancipation Proclamation, Abraham Lincoln  
Gettysburg Address, Abraham Lincoln  
Second inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln  
13th Amendment
LESSON PLANS, ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS, AND FORMATIVE QUIZZES
Lesson 1 — The Expansion of Slavery

1848–1854

9-10 classes

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn how the defenders of slavery began to assert that slavery was a “positive good” that ought to be expanded throughout the country instead of an existing evil that should be contained and kept on the path to extinction.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts

Meet Abraham Lincoln
Pages 1–44

The Civil War: Reader
Pages 42–51

Primary Sources
See below.

Teacher Texts

Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition
Chapters 19 and 20

The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic
Pages 150–159

Westward Expansion
Pages 124–134, 193–199

The Civil War and Reconstruction
Pages 13–15, 21–66, 146–151

Trade Books

If You Lived When There Was Slavery in America

If You Traveled on the Underground Railroad

Abraham Lincoln and Frederick Douglass

Online.Hillsdale.edu

The Great American Story
Lecture 9

Civil Rights in American History
Lecture 3

Constitution 101
Lecture 6

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students pre-read Meet Abraham Lincoln, pages 1–44, in segments (grades 3–4) or The Civil War, pages 42–51 (grade 5).
**CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON**

**Geography & Places**
- California
- Kansas–Nebraska Territory

**Persons**
- Abraham Lincoln
- Millard Fillmore
- Frederick Douglass
- Sojourner Truth
- Harriet Beecher Stowe
- Harriet Tubman
- William Lloyd Garrison
- Franklin Pierce
- Stephen Douglas

**Terms and Topics**
- King Cotton
- antebellum
- Gold Rush
- secession
- Compromise of 1850
- Fugitive Slave Law
- abolitionism
- Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass
- Uncle Tom’s Cabin
- Underground Railroad
- Kansas-Nebraska Act
- popular sovereignty

**Primary Sources**
- Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, Frederick Douglass

**To Know by Heart**
- “Knowledge makes a man unfit to be a slave.” — Frederick Douglass
- “Frederick Douglass” — Robert Hayden
- “So you’re the little woman who wrote the book that started this great war.” — Abraham Lincoln to Harriet Beecher Stowe upon their meeting
- “Harriet Tubman,” Eloise Greenfield

**Timeline**
- 1846–48 Mexican–American War
- 1849 California Gold Rush

**Images**
- Historical figures and events
- Depictions of the life of slaves and the horrors of slavery
- Maps of the free versus slave-state breakdown when changes occur
- Pictures of first–edition copies of Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass and Uncle Tom’s Cabin
- Statue of Frederick Douglass (on the Hillsdale College campus)
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Biographies and the roles of Frederick Douglass, Harriet Tubman, and Abraham Lincoln prior to the Civil War
- Childhood biography of Abraham Lincoln
- Grade–level appropriate scenes from *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass* and *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*
- Actions of Harriet Tubman and the Underground Railroad

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- Even though many wanted to abolish slavery, why did many leading Founders think that permitting slavery and keeping the Americans united would be the only way eventually to get rid of slavery?
- How did the Founders restrict slavery at the founding more than it had been before?
- How can we judge the actions of some Founders who expressed their belief that slavery was wrong but did not free their slaves in their lifetimes?
- Why did the Founders expect that slavery would eventually die out on its own?
- What invention after the Founding made cotton more valuable and actually increased slavery, which ruined the Founders’ guess that slavery would end on its own?
- Why did slavery thrive in the South?
- What was life like for slaves in the Southern states?
- How did John C. Calhoun reject the Founders’ views on slavery as expressed in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution?
- Who was Frederick Douglass and what did he do?
- How did Frederick Douglass show that slavery was evil?
- How would Frederick Douglass have replied to John C. Calhoun’s assertions?
- Why did the South want to expand slavery? Why did the North want to stop slavery’s expansion, and some even want to abolish it where it existed?
- Who were the abolitionists? What kinds of things did they do to try to end slavery?
- Who was Harriet Tubman and what did she do?
- Who was Harriet Beecher Stowe and what did her book, *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, do?
- How did the Underground Railroad work?
- What did Northerners and Southerners argue about whenever a new state was going to be made?
- Why did slave states want to expand the number of slave states in the western territories?
- What were the terms of the Compromise of 1850? Was it really a “compromise”? Why or why not?
- Was Abraham Lincoln for or against slavery? Why?
- What did the Kansas–Nebraska Act do?
- What was Stephen A. Douglass trying to accomplish with the Kansas–Nebraska Act?
- Did the Kansas–Nebraska Act help or hurt the preservation of the Union?
- What was the idea of “popular sovereignty”?
- Why did Abraham Lincoln believe “popular sovereignty” was wrong?
- Question from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 75: What group of people was taken and sold as slaves?
The status of slavery in 1848 was markedly different than it was when the Founders crafted the Constitution in 1787. The gradual decline in the profitability of slavery, evident during the founding, was forecast to continue—but this trend reversed direction upon the invention of the cotton gin in 1793. From then on, the demand for slave labor in the Southern states rapidly compounded. But the free population in the South was vastly outstripped by the burgeoning population of the North. If nothing changed, demographics and geography would eventually give Americans living in the North the power to limit slavery through law and perhaps even abolish it entirely through a constitutional amendment. Slaveholders in the South needed to change this trajectory by expanding slavery westward into the territories. Students need to understand that to justify such expansion, slavery advocates in the South had to change the opinion of Northerners: either to believe slavery to be morally good or, at the very least, to view slavery as merely a matter of the will of the majority, what Stephen Douglas called “popular sovereignty.” Moral relativism, the idea that there is no “right” or “wrong” besides what the majority of people want, and a belief in unfettered democracy through the vote of the majority were the slaveholders’ pillars in arguing to preserve slavery. Students should understand that Abraham Lincoln favored government “of the people, by the people, and for the people” but also saw how just letting a vote of the majority decide whether slavery was good or evil violated equality, freedom, and human dignity. Lincoln went about waging an oratorical war in defense of objective standards of truth and justice, of good and evil. Students should also learn how abolitionists, of both African and European descent, continued to publicize the horrors of slavery for Americans in Northern states far removed from witnessing slavery firsthand. Abolitionists also shepherded escaped slaves to freedom in the Northern states and Canada.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Expansion of Slavery with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Read aloud with students parts of *Meet Abraham Lincoln* or *The Civil War*, asking questions throughout.
- Review with students the status of slavery over the initial decades of the country’s history. At the founding, slavery was generally either openly condemned by those in the North or defended by those in the South. Its toleration by northern delegates and others who were opposed to slavery at the time of the founding was for the sake of a unity that even many abolitionists believed was the only eventual path toward abolition. The Declaration of Independence established the country on principles of equality that could and would be cited to demand the end of slavery, the Northwest Ordinance had prohibited the expansion of slavery, the Constitution refused to give legal standing to the institution, and many states had restricted or abolished slavery outright. Lastly, many leading Founders, including those who held slaves, believed that the profitability of slavery was gradually but decisively waning and that slavery would die out on its own in a relatively short period of time. The invention of the cotton gin in 1793 by Eli Whitney, however, greatly increased the profitability of slavery and reignited slaveholders’ interest in perpetuating and expanding slavery.
- Help students to imagine and understand the dehumanizing and brutal tyranny of slavery, emphasizing that the sheer fact that some people owned other human beings is and always will be morally reprehensible. Moreover, as Frederick Douglass argued, slavery actually dehumanized the master as well as the slave.
Demonstrate for students how the growth in population in the North compared to the South would eventually allow Northern states to restrict slavery further and perhaps even abolish it with a constitutional amendment. Slaveholders recognized that they had to expand the number of slave states if they were to prohibit such actions by Northerners.

Show students how slavery actually weakened the South as a whole while supporting the lifestyle of the elite few. For all other Southerners, slavery lowered the value and wages of labor by non-slaves, limited innovation, and thwarted economic development in the South. The Civil War would reveal the weakness of the position in which Southerners’ insistence on slavery had placed them. A simple comparison of the Northern to the Southern economy, development, and society before and during the Civil War illustrates the case.

Teach students how the slavery issue nearly resulted in civil war over the question of expanding slavery into the territories acquired from Mexico after the Mexican-American War, brought to a head when California, after a population surge during the California Gold Rush, applied to become a state without slavery. California’s lone admission as a free state would have increased Northern power in Congress and the Electoral College against Southern states on the issue of slavery.

Show how the Compromise of 1850 was not really a “compromise” in the real sense of the word. A “compromise” would involve all parties sacrificing something of their position to achieve a common outcome. The Compromise of 1850, however, was not one bill but five separate bills that had five separate lines of voting. Students should understand what some of these acts did, especially the Fugitive Slave Law. These laws may have avoided war in the short term, but it only deepened and delayed the divisions tearing at the country over the next ten years.

Ask students about the effects of the Fugitive Slave Law, which compelled Northerners to assist in capturing escaped slaves and encouraged the practice of abducting free African Americans living in the North and forcing them into slavery.

Teach students about the various parts of the abolitionist movement and its major figures. Students should learn that there was great diversity among abolitionists, especially in their underlying views about America’s governing principles and the best way to abolish slavery. For instance, William Lloyd Garrison actually agreed with the slaveholder reading of the Constitution while Frederick Douglass moved from this view to that of Abraham Lincoln that the Constitution was pro-freedom. One might read aloud with students some portions of Douglass’s *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass* and discuss Harriet Beecher Stowe’s *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, important works in making Northerners, most of whom had never seen slavery in practice, aware of its moral evil. Other abolitionists, such as Harriet Tubman and those running the Underground Railroad, heroically worked to lead escaped slaves to freedom. In general, most abolitionists appealed to the principles of equality stated in the Declaration of Independence in justifying their cause.

Tell students the childhood and political biography of Abraham Lincoln, to show how he rose from poverty and obscurity to become arguably America’s greatest president.

Have students learn what the Kansas-Nebraska Act did. Focus specifically on the idea of popular sovereignty and the idea that right and wrong amount to the mere will of the majority opinion.

Explain why Abraham Lincoln believed the Kansas-Nebraska Act was dangerous. Students should understand that Lincoln saw slavery to be, above all, a moral question of right and wrong, of good and evil, and one that every American ought to take seriously as such. Lincoln also believed that leaving slavery to the vote of the majority was opposed to the ideas of the Declaration of Independence, and that slavery was simply a form of majority tyranny, one of the very dangers in
democracy that the Founders had warned against. Finally, Lincoln condemned the Kansas-
Nebraska Act as reversing the stance the Constitution, the Northwest Ordinance, and
the founding generation had toward slavery: that it should be contained until it was
abolished and by no means allowed to spread.

STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS

Activity 1: Have students draw a map of the United States leading up to the Civil War. Have them
draw and label states that enter the union as either free or slave states. Students should track how
the admittance of each state affects electoral representation (this activity can be assigned at the
end of the lesson or be an ongoing activity as states are admitted).

Assignment 1: Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which
parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson.
Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

Assignment 2: What did the Founders think and do about slavery? (2–4 sentences)

Assignment 3: What was life like for a slave? (2–4 sentences)

Assignment 4: How did abolitionists work to try to abolish slavery? (2–4 sentences)

Assignment 5: Retell the biography of one of the following: Frederick Douglass, Harriet Tubman,
or Abraham Lincoln (1–2 paragraphs).
Formative Quiz 1

MATCHING: Write the letter of each definition to the correct word it defines.

- King Cotton
- Gold Rush
- Fugitive Slave Law
- Kansas–Nebraska Act
- abolitionism

A. a law that let the people decide if two western territories would have slavery or not
B. a law that made it easier for Southerners to recapture escaped slaves in the North
C. efforts to end slavery
D. the main crop on which the Southern economy relied and which slaves harvested
E. when thousands of Americans headed west in hopes of quick riches while ballooning the size of the California Territory

SHORT ANSWER: Answer the following in complete sentences.

1. How did the Founders restrict slavery at the founding more than it had been before?

_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

2. What invention after the Founding made cotton more valuable and actually increased slavery, which ruined the Founders’ guess that slavery would end on its own?

_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

3. How did Frederick Douglass show that slavery was evil?

_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

4. Who was Harriet Tubman and what did she do?

_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

5. What was the idea of “popular sovereignty”?

_________________________________________________________________________________
Lesson 2 — Toward Civil War

1854–1861

7–8 classes

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn how Abraham Lincoln and the new Republican Party’s opposition to the expansion of slavery led Southern states to secede from the Union, resulting in civil war.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts

Meet Abraham Lincoln Pages 45–50
The Civil War: Reader Pages 52–73
Primary Sources See below.

Teacher Texts

Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition Chapter 20
The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic Pages 160–169
The Civil War and Reconstruction Pages 67–78

Trade Book

If You Lived at the Time of the Civil War

Online.Hillsdale.edu

The Great American Story Lecture 9
Civil Rights in American History Lecture 3
Constitution 101 Lecture 6

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students pre–read Meet Abraham Lincoln, pages 45–50 (grades 3–4) or The Civil War, pages 52–73 (grade 5).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places

Kansas–Nebraska Territory
Harpers Ferry
Fort Sumter
Persons
Abraham Lincoln
Frederick Douglass
Stephen Douglas
James Buchanan
John Brown

Terms and Topics
Bleeding Kansas
“a house divided”
popular sovereignty
Democratic Party
Republican Party
Lincoln–Douglas Debates
“don’t care”
majority tyranny
“apple and frame” metaphor
Wilberforce University

Primary Sources
“House Divided” speech, Abraham Lincoln

To Know by Heart
“A house divided against itself cannot stand.” — Abraham Lincoln, paraphrasing from the words of Jesus of Nazareth in the Bible

Timeline
1854 Republican Party founded
1860 Election of Abraham Lincoln; South Carolina secedes
April 12, 1861 Attack on Fort Sumter

Images
Historical figures and events
Depictions of the Lincoln–Douglas Debates
Campaign materials
Map of the 1860 election results
Fort Sumter

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART
- The breakdown of civil dialogue resulting in Preston Brooks’s attack on Charles Sumner
- What the Lincoln–Douglas Debates were like
- The scenes at the nominating conventions for each party in 1860
- The young girl who suggested to Abraham Lincoln that he grow a beard
- The first shots fired on Fort Sumter

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND
- What was Bleeding Kansas like and why did it happen?
- What kind of person was Abraham Lincoln?
- What was Abraham Lincoln’s childhood like?
- How did Abraham Lincoln learn?
- Why did people create the Republican Party?
- Why did Abraham Lincoln worry that the Dred Scott v. Sandford decision would allow slavery anywhere in the country?
- Did Abraham Lincoln believe the Founders created a country to protect slavery or to end slavery? Why did he think this?
- Why did Abraham Lincoln believe it was necessary to say that slavery was evil?
- Why did Abraham Lincoln say it was wrong to “not care” about whether people vote for slavery or not?
- What did Abraham Lincoln mean when he said that “a house divided against itself cannot stand?”
- Why were slavery apologists in the South, especially the plantation owners, fearful of Lincoln’s election? How would the end of slavery change their way of life, considering both the debts many were under and their lifestyle?
- How did Abraham Lincoln end up winning the 1860 election?
- What did Southern states do after Abraham Lincoln was elected?
- What did Abraham Lincoln mean when he wrote that the Declaration of Independence was like a golden apple and that the Constitution was a picture frame of silver?
- What did Abraham Lincoln do after he was elected but before Fort Sumter was attacked?
- What happened at Fort Sumter and how did Abraham Lincoln respond?
- What was the reason, at first, why the North fought the Civil War?
- How was slavery the real reason the Civil War was fought?
- Question from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 94: Abraham Lincoln is famous for many things. Name one.

**Keys to the Lesson**

The passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act in 1854 sparked the little-known Abraham Lincoln to redouble his efforts to engage in the growing national debate over slavery in America. He saw a tremendous threat in the argument put forward by the bill’s sponsor, Stephen Douglas, that slavery was not a moral question but rather one that should simply be decided by the will of the majority. From 1854 to the outbreak of the Civil War in 1861, Lincoln would combat the idea that the morality of slavery was to be determined merely by majority opinion. Students should come to see this arc to Lincoln’s words and deeds. They should understand how he took up and articulated the heart of the matter regarding the morality of slavery and that slavery struck at America’s founding idea that all men are created equal. Roger Taney’s majority opinion in Dred Scott v. Sandford interpreted the Constitution to legitimize slavery, and Lincoln argued against both popular sovereignty and Taney’s position throughout his debates with Douglas. The moral question regarding slavery, manifesting itself in the practical questions of the expansion of slavery, is what a civil war would be fought over. After all, the formal move to secession—a constitutionally debatable claim also at issue in the approach to war—and the war itself was triggered in response to Lincoln being elected president on the position that slavery was wrong and should not be expanded.

Teachers might best plan and teach Toward Civil War with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Read aloud with students parts of Meet Abraham Lincoln or The Civil War, asking questions throughout.
• Emphasize the breakdown in civil dialogue in the several violent episodes related to slavery preceding the Civil War: Bleeding Kansas, Preston Brooks’s attack on Charles Sumner, and John Brown’s raid on the federal armory at Harpers Ferry. Go into some detail to bring these events alive for students. For example, it was Colonel Robert E. Lee who led federal troops to put down Brown’s uprising.

• Clarify the party alignment that was emerging in 1854. The Democratic Party was dividing between those who favored the principle of “popular sovereignty,” in which a state or territory could vote to allow slavery or not, and those who explicitly favored slavery. Meanwhile, the Republican Party was founded in 1854 in opposition to laws encouraging the spread of slavery. The split of the Democratic Party and the consolidation of the Republican Party in 1860 assured the election of Lincoln and significantly contributed to the coming of the Civil War.

• Consider Abraham Lincoln’s arguments against Roger Taney’s majority opinion in *Dred Scott v. Sandford* that asserted that slaves are not humans but only property, and that the Constitution protects their enslavement just as it does any other property. Lincoln points out that Taney’s ruling rejected the Founders’ view on slavery and would lead, together with Stephen Douglas’s popular sovereignty, to the spread of slavery throughout the country. By extension, this reasoning would also allow for other forms of majority tyranny.

• Help students think through Lincoln’s understanding of the evil of slavery and its relationship to the founding ideas of America: that all men are created equal, have unalienable rights, and that legitimate government is based on the consent of the governed. Students should see that the political question regarding the expansion of slavery ultimately depended on whether Americans believed slavery was good or evil.

• Read aloud parts of Lincoln’s “House Divided” speech in class. Consider the apparently harmful stance that Stephen Douglas takes in his position of popular sovereignty, that he does not care about what a group of people does regarding slavery, so long as the majority opinion decides it. Students should be asked why this is problematic.

• Tell students the stories of the Lincoln-Douglas Debates, presenting the settings and atmosphere as imaginatively as possible.

• Remind students that Lincoln did not believe the president could simply end slavery by his own will. While he could sign or veto laws in order to restrict its spread, abolishing slavery would likely require a constitutional amendment explicitly doing so, and that would require decades of changing public opinion, particularly in slaveholding states. His goal in the meantime was to return slavery to the path of eventual extinction via law and to convince public opinion of its immorality.

• Help students to understand the various pressures that were mounting on the Southern states during the 1850s, from increased abolitionist activities to the sheer industrial might of the Northern states to a burgeoning plantation debt as other countries produced more cotton and the price of cotton fell as a result.

• Tell students the stories of Lincoln’s speeches and his reception during these years, including the founding of the Republican Party and the various conventions in 1856 and especially 1860. Students should sense the drama of the times.

• Share with students the apple and frame metaphor that Lincoln used to describe the relationship between the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. Help students understand the arguments with respect to the American founding and slavery.
• Provide a clear overview of events between Lincoln’s election and South Carolina’s attack on Fort Sumter in Charleston Harbor. Students should learn both Lincoln and the South’s accounts of what happened.

• There were, of course, other factors and dimensions that impelled each side to fight the Civil War. Students should be familiar with these, as well as the view of most Southerners that the war was about defending what they saw as the rights of their states. This view and Lincoln’s counterview and incumbent duty to preserve the Union and Constitution may have been the occasion for the Civil War, but students should understand that the war was, at its heart, fought over whether slavery would be permitted to spread and so remain indefinitely, or be restricted and returned to the path to extinction on which the founding generation had left it. This question was, in turn, based on the morality of slavery, which Abraham Lincoln would later maintain in his Gettysburg Address was a question about the rejection or fulfillment of the ideas on which America was founded.

STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS

Activity 1: Assign each student a different event to draw from the Mexican–American War to the first shots fired at Fort Sumter. Then have students arrange themselves in the correct order of events in class and have each present briefly what they drew, the story behind it, its relationship to other scenes, and why they depicted it the way they did.

Assignment 1: Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

Assignment 2: Why did Abraham Lincoln think it was so important that people understand how evil and wrong slavery was? (2–4 sentences)

Assignment 3: Make a T–chart. On one side, write out the virtues and qualities that made Abraham Lincoln a good statesman. On the other side, write and explain events or decisions in which these qualities were on display. Continue to track these decisions throughout the study of the Civil War.

Assignment 4: Answer the following question: Why and how did the Civil War begin? (2–4 sentences)
Lesson 3 — The Civil War

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the major figures, common soldiers, strategy, and specific battles of the American Civil War, including a close study of the statesmanship of President Abraham Lincoln.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
- Meet Abraham Lincoln Pages 51–68
- The Civil War: Reader Pages 74–113, 130–157
- Primary Sources See below.

Teacher Texts
- Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition Chapters 21 and 22
- The Civil War and Reconstruction Pages 79–237, 252–273
- Fields of Fury As helpful

Trade Book
- If You Lived at the Time of the Civil War
- The Boys’ War

Online.Hillsdale.edu
- The Great American Story Lecture 10
- Constitution 101 Lecture 7

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students pre-read Meet Abraham Lincoln, pages 51–68 (grades 3–4) or The Civil War, pages 74–113, 130–157, in segments and at the teacher’s discretion (grade 5).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places
- Fort Sumter
- Union
- Confederacy
- Richmond
- West Virginia
- Border States
- Appomattox Court House
- Ford’s Theatre
### Persons
- Abraham Lincoln
- Jefferson Davis
- George McClellan
- Robert E. Lee
- Thomas “Stonewall” Jackson
- Clara Barton
- Ulysses S. Grant
- William Tecumseh Sherman
- Martin Delany
- Robert Gould Shaw
- John Wilkes Booth

### Terms and Topics
- secession
- Confederate States of America
- railroads
- minié ball
- Army of the Potomac
- Army of Northern Virginia
- American Red Cross
- The Pony Express
- Battle of First Manassas/Bull Run
- ironclads
- USS Monitor*
- CSS Virginia
- abolition
- Battle of Antietam
- Battle of Fort Wagner
- Battle of Vicksburg
- Battle of Gettysburg
- Pickett’s Charge
- 54th Massachusetts Regiment
- Sherman’s “March to the Sea”

### Primary Sources
- First inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln
- Emancipation Proclamation, Abraham Lincoln
- Gettysburg Address, Abraham Lincoln

### To Know by Heart
- “Battle Hymn of the Republic,” first stanza — Julia Ward Howe
- Gettysburg Address — Abraham Lincoln
- "So Atlanta is ours, and fairly won." — William Tecumseh Sherman telegram announcing the fall of Atlanta to Abraham Lincoln
- “O Captain! My Captain!” — Walt Whitman

### Timeline
- 1861–65 Civil War
- 1863 Emancipation Proclamation takes effect
- July 1–3, 1863 Battle of Gettysburg
- April 9, 1865 Robert E. Lee surrenders at Appomattox
- April 14–15, 1865 Abraham Lincoln assassinated; Andrew Johnson becomes president

### Images
- Historical figures and events
- Landscape pictures of geographic places featured in this lesson

*A previous version referred to the USS Merrimack instead of the USS Monitor.
Soldier uniforms, weaponry, flags
Depictions and photographs of figures at various scenes and moments and in battle
Maps: overall strategies, specific battles
Relevant forts
Battle scene depictions and photographs
Medical equipment
Reenactment photos
Pictures of the Emancipation Proclamation, Gettysburg Address, etc.
Robert Gould Shaw and the 54th Massachusetts Regiment Memorial
Lincoln Memorial
Statue of Abraham Lincoln (Hillsdale College campus)

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Biographies and roles of Abraham Lincoln, Jefferson Davis, Robert E. Lee, Ulysses S. Grant, and William Tecumseh Sherman in the Civil War
- Robert E. Lee’s denial of Abraham Lincoln’s offer to command the Union forces
- Sullivan Ballou’s letter to his wife, Sarah, on the eve of the First Battle of Bull Run/Manassas, 1861
- How Stonewall Jackson got his nickname
- Battle of the ironclads
- The killing of Stonewall Jackson by friendly fire
- Fighting at Little Round Top and Pickett’s Charge
- The writing and delivery of the Gettysburg Address
- Robert E. Lee’s surrender to Ulysses S. Grant at Appomattox Court House
- Abraham Lincoln’s cabinet meeting regarding healing with the South just hours before his assassination
- Assassination of Abraham Lincoln at Ford’s Theatre
- Abraham Lincoln’s funeral train

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- Why did the Southern states think the Constitution allowed them to leave the United States?
- What was important about Virginia’s decision to secede? How did it come about?
- Why did Abraham Lincoln think that the Southern states could not leave the country?
- Why was Abraham Lincoln’s first goal for fighting the Civil War to preserve the Union?
- Why was Abraham Lincoln’s second goal for fighting the Civil War to stop the spread of slavery?
- How did Abraham Lincoln keep the border states in the Union?
- What things were helpful to the Union in the Civil War?
- What things were helpful to the Confederacy in the Civil War?
- How did the Union think they could win the war?
- How did the Confederacy think they could win the war?
- Why did both sides believe the war would end quickly?
- How did soldiers fight each other?
- What was it like to be a soldier in the Civil War?
- What did Clara Barton do during the Civil War?
- What was Robert E. Lee like? Why was he a good general?
• Why was Robert E. Lee conflicted over Lincoln’s offer to command the Union forces?
• How did the battle between the Monitor and the Virginia change naval warfare?
• What happened at the Battle of Antietam?
• What was the problem with most of the Union generals early in the war?
• What happened in the battle of the ironclads?
• What was the Emancipation Proclamation and what did it do?
• Why did Abraham Lincoln believe he could free the slaves in the Confederacy?
• How did the Emancipation Proclamation change Lincoln’s goals for the war?
• Why was the capture of New Orleans so important to the Northern strategy?
• What happened at the Battle of Vicksburg?
• What happened at the Battle of Gettysburg?
• What was Pickett’s Charge?
• How did the North win the Battle of Gettysburg? Why was this such a crucial victory?
• What did Abraham Lincoln say in the Gettysburg Address?
• What was Ulysses S. Grant like? Why was he a good general?
• What was William Tecumseh Sherman’s ‘total war’ strategy?
• What happened during the March to the Sea?
• Why were many people not happy with Abraham Lincoln before the 1864 election?
• Why did Robert E. Lee eventually surrender?
• What happened at Appomattox Court House?
• What were the most significant moments in the Civil War?
• Why did the Union win the Civil War?
• What happened to Abraham Lincoln just a few days after the end of the Civil War?
• Why did John Wilkes Booth shoot Abraham Lincoln? What did he do afterwards?
• Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 92: Name the U.S. war between the North and the South.
  - Question 93: The Civil War had many important events. Name one.
  - Question 94: Abraham Lincoln is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 95: What did the Emancipation Proclamation do?
  - Question 96: What U.S. war ended slavery?

**Keys to the Lesson**

The American Civil War may be the defining event in American history. The outcome of the Civil War determined whether the nation would live according to the principles of liberty, equality under law, and self-government, or reject those truths in favor of slavery, inequality, and tyrannical rule. Students should appreciate this about the bloodiest conflict in their nation’s history. They should also know the stories of the heroic actions both leaders and of ordinary citizens in that war, understand the strategies employed in general and in specific battles, and consider the key moments and factors that led the Union to ultimate victory. Additionally, students have an unmatched opportunity to understand statesmanship through the careful study of Abraham Lincoln’s thoughts, speeches, and actions as he led the nation through the Civil War.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Civil War with emphasis on the following approaches:
• Read aloud with students parts of *Meet Abraham Lincoln* or *The Civil War*, asking questions throughout.
Have students consider the arguments by the South and by Abraham Lincoln regarding the idea of “states’ rights” and the constitutionality of secession. Students should understand that there is no such thing as a “state right,” since rights belong only to persons. States (as governments) possess powers (not rights), as outlined in their state and in the federal Constitution, which the states are to use to protect the rights and the common good of their citizens (including from encroachment by the federal government by appealing to the Constitution itself). Read brief portions of Lincoln’s first inaugural address where he presents the case for how secession is unconstitutional and how he, having taken an oath in his office as president, can and must preserve the Constitution and Union.

Help students to see how the decision by Southern states to secede was largely determined by a small elite or even merely by governors. In Virginia, for example, the governor himself made the decision to secede without consulting the legislature. Moreover, insofar as slavery was the chief interest the South wanted to preserve, only a minority of Southerners owned slaves and even a smaller minority owned a large number of slaves on plantations. The majority of Southerners were not slaveholders and while fighting for their states would preserve slavery, many common Southerners fought for the argument of states’ rights rather than to preserve the institution of slavery.

Emphasize that the governing state known as the Confederacy was founded on the rejection of the principle of equality from the Declaration of Independence, and on an argument of the inequality of races, as asserted by its vice president, Alexander Stephens, who said that African American inferiority was the “cornerstone” of the Confederacy.

Teach students about the delicacy with which Abraham Lincoln had to approach the border states (slave states that remained in the Union) and why this delicacy was needed. Lincoln was mindful of this necessity when he wrote his first inaugural address.

Explain that Abraham Lincoln’s first goal in fighting the Civil War was to preserve the Union. It is important that students understand Lincoln’s reasoning. He was against slavery and wanted it abolished, but his constitutional obligation was to preserve the Union. If he acted otherwise, he would violate the Constitution and the rule of law, becoming no better than the seceding states and forfeiting his moral authority as the defender of the rule of law. Students should also know that while Lincoln did not believe he could abolish slavery alone or that abolishing slavery was the purpose for fighting the war, he nonetheless believed, like many of the Founders, that the only way to abolish slavery would be if the Union were preserved.

Have students think through and compare the various advantages and disadvantages each side had at the outset of the war and how these shifted during the war. Having students take simple notes, as a “T-Chart” can be effective for this part of the lesson.

Build students’ familiarity with the style of warfare in the mid-19th century, and show them plenty of images to do so. Students need this foundation for their subsequent study of battles. This helps them to imagine and understand what happens in battle and to appreciate the bravery of soldiers fighting on both sides.

Present to students explanations of each side’s strategy at various stages of the war and the tactics and battle plans employed in specific battles. Of special note are the Union’s Anaconda Plan, James Longstreet’s development of trench warfare, the siege and battle of Vicksburg, and Robert E. Lee’s strategy preceding Gettysburg, among others.

As with any conflict, dwell on the key contributions of both leaders and common soldiers in the war, especially Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, Ulysses S. Grant, and William Tecumseh Sherman.
Consider with students how the Civil War was a “brothers’ war,” that is, it was among fellow citizens, sometimes even friends and family members. Ask students how this is distinct from other wars. It is also, for this reason, considered one of the worst and most tragic kinds of war.

Share with students the unity found within the Union ranks in the cause of the United States and eventually the abolition of slavery. 1.3 million Union men of European ancestry fought in the Civil War and 180,000 African American men volunteered for the Union forces, making up nearly 10 percent of the Union army. Of all Union soldiers, 600,000 were wounded and approximately 360,000 Union men were killed.

Teach the war, especially the major battles and military campaigns, in some detail. Students should understand how the battles came to be, the key stories, factors, and moments from the battle itself, and the significance of their various outcomes on subsequent events. Employ battle maps often and have students track battles and campaigns.

Help students to note the major themes running through the early years of the war, namely how Confederate commanders carried the day repeatedly despite the North’s growing advantages, and how they exhibited military leadership and decisiveness. Students should also appreciate how unpopular Abraham Lincoln was in the North during much of the war.

Have students come to know Abraham Lincoln, in his personal life, interior thoughts and troubles, and his great love for his country. Students should also think about the thinking and decision-making that makes Lincoln perhaps the greatest statesman in American history.

Based on his writings, words, and deeds, show students how Abraham Lincoln always believed in the equal human dignity of African Americans and grew over the course of his career to see that African Americans were equal socially as well, a growth in understanding that he knew more Americans would need to develop in order for African Americans to be treated truly as equals. As his own experience showed, he believed this would take some time, particularly in slave-holding states.

Read aloud in class the Emancipation Proclamation and teach students the technicalities Abraham Lincoln navigated in thinking of it, drawing it up, and the timing of its promulgation. He had to retain the border states, abide by the Constitution, achieve victory, and earn the support of public opinion in order for slaves to be effectively freed—and he did it all. Students should understand that Lincoln’s justification for freeing the slaves involved exercising his executive powers as commander-in-chief of the armed forces during an armed rebellion. This is why Lincoln only had the authority to apply the Emancipation Proclamation to those states in actual rebellion, why it could not be applied to slave-holding border states not in rebellion, and why he knew that after the war, an amendment to the Constitution would be necessary to bring emancipation to all the states and make it permanent.

Read aloud with students and discuss the Gettysburg Address. It is a magnificent work of oratory, but it also gets at the heart of the American founding and the ideas that maintain the United States. It also shows the importance of defending and advancing those ideas, both in the Civil War and in our own day, as is incumbent on every American citizen.

Note the importance of Abraham Lincoln’s choice of Ulysses S. Grant as General-in-Chief of the entire Union Army. Grant’s decisiveness combined with William Tecumseh Sherman’s boldness proved essential in prosecuting the war from late 1863 onward.

Recap the war by considering major statistics, including the number of causalities and deaths on each side. Ask what stance Americans today should have towards those who fought in the Civil War, distinguishing between Northern soldiers and Southern soldiers. When considering
Southern soldiers, be sure to note the tragic death of so many Americans, even if they were fighting for a confederate government dedicated to preserving slavery. As noted previously, most of those doing the actual fighting for the South did not own slaves and believed that they were fighting for their country as well.

- Share some of the main ideas in Abraham Lincoln’s second inaugural address. Lincoln addresses many topics within the speech, both reflecting on the war and outlining a plan for after the war. In some respects, this speech is “part two” of what Lincoln began to assert in the Gettysburg Address. One of the main ideas Lincoln suggests, however, is that the Civil War was a punishment for the whole nation. This punishment was not necessarily for the mere existence of slavery but because, unlike the founding generation, the nation had in the time since the founding not continued to work for the abolition of the evil of slavery. While no country will ever be perfect, a people should work to make sure its laws do not promote the perpetuation of a practice that violates the equal natural rights of its fellow citizens.

- To set up the following unit, outline for students Abraham Lincoln’s preliminary plans for reconstruction, and impress upon students the immense historical consequences of Lincoln’s assassination.

**Strengthening Understanding: Post-Lesson Activities and Assignments**

**Activity 1:** Assign each student a different event to draw from the Civil War. Then have students arrange themselves in the correct order of events in class and have each present briefly what they drew, the story behind it, its relationship to other scenes, and why they depicted it the way they did.

**Activity 2:** Have students draw a map of the United States during the Civil War and then draw and label the Union, Confederate, and Border states, strategy, and battle sites of the Civil War (this activity can be assigned at the end of the lesson or be an ongoing activity as battles are taught).

**Assignment 1:** Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

**Assignment 2:** Why did Abraham Lincoln and the Union fight the Civil War? (2–4 sentences)

**Assignment 3:** Have students learn by heart and recite the Gettysburg Address.

**Assignment 4:** Choose a battle from the Civil War and retell the story of what happened in the battle (1 paragraph).
Formative Quiz 2

Covering Lesson 3
10-15 minutes

**MULTIPLE CHOICE:** Circle the option that best answers each question.

1. What was the name of Confederate general who was famous for standing and fighting, but who was accidentally killed by friendly fire?
   a. George McClellan
   b. Thomas “Stonewall” Jackson
   c. Robert E. Lee
   d. William Tecumseh Sherman

2. What was the name of the all-African American regiment that fought bravely at Fort Wagner?
   a. 54th Tennessee
   b. 1st American
   c. 54th Massachusetts
   d. 25th Douglass

3. What was the name of the round bullet that so inflicted devastating wounds on Civil War soldiers?
   a. Brown Bess
   b. Rifle
   c. minié ball
   d. silver bullet

4. What Union victory made Abraham Lincoln confident enough that the Emancipation Proclamation would carry weight among Northerners?
   a. Gettysburg
   b. Bull Run
   c. Fort Wagner
   d. Antietam

5. Which Union victory secured the western theatre of war and propelled Ulysses S. Grant to command the entire Union forces?
   a. Gettysburg
   b. Bull Run
   c. Vicksburg
   d. Antietam
SHORT ANSWER: Answer the following in complete sentences.

6. What was important about Virginia’s decision to secede? How did it come about?
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

7. How did Abraham Lincoln keep the border states in the Union?
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

8. What things were helpful to the Union in the Civil War?
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

9. What was the problem with most of the Union generals early in the war?
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

10. What happened during the March to the Sea?
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
Lesson 4 — Reconstruction
1865–1877
4-5 classes

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the remarkable fulfillment of civil rights for freedmen during Reconstruction despite the objections of some and then the reversal of many of those realizations in Southern states during Reconstruction and after its end in 1877.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
- *The Civil War: Reader* Pages 158–189
- Primary Sources See below.

Teacher Texts
- *Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition* Chapters 23 and 24
- *The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic* Pages 196–202
- *The Civil War and Reconstruction* Pages 274–317
- *Westward Expansion* Pages 20–22, 208–215

Trade Book
- *If You Lived at the Time of the Civil War*

Online.Hillsdale.edu
- *The Great American Story* Lecture 11
- *Civil Rights in American History* Lectures 4 and 5

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students pre–read *The Civil War*, pages 158-189 (grade 5 only).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places
- Former Confederacy

Persons
- Andrew Johnson
- Hiram Revels
- Ulysses S. Grant
- Elijah McCoy
- Rutherford B. Hayes
Terms and Topics

Reconstruction and Reconstruction
Radical Republicans and black codes
Freedmen and scalawags and carpetbaggers
13th, 14th, 15th Amendments and Ku Klux Klan Acts
Military districts and Transcontinental Railroad
Freedmen’s Bureau and Jim Crow
Sharecropping and Battle of Little Bighorn

Primary Sources

13th Amendment

To Know by Heart

First line of the 13th Amendment
“Lift Every Voice and Sing” — James Weldon Johnson
“Sympathy” — Paul Laurence Dunbar

Timeline

1865–77 Reconstruction

Images

Historical figures and events
Maps showing the gradual re-admittance of Southern states
Photographs of African Americans in the South, both in freedom and with the heavy restrictions placed on their freedom

Stories for the American Heart

- The swearing in of Hiram Revels to the US Senate
- Completion of the Transcontinental Railroad at Promontory Point, Utah

Questions for the American Mind

- What does reconstruction mean?
- What was the North like after the Civil War?
- What was the South like after the Civil War?
- How did Northerners and Southerners feel about each other after the Civil War?
- What plans did Abraham Lincoln have for Reconstruction?
- Why did Abraham Lincoln wish to avoid punishing the South after the war?
- How did the assassination of Abraham Lincoln drastically change the future of American history following the Civil War?
- What plans did the Radical Republicans have for Reconstruction?
- Why did Andrew Johnson and the Republicans not get along?
- Why was Andrew Johnson impeached?
- What did a Confederate state have to do in order to rejoin the Union?
- What changes did Republicans make to the Constitution?
- What did the 13th Amendment do?
- How did life improve for African Americans in the South during Reconstruction? Which liberties were secured to them?
- How did some people and governments in the former confederate states continue to try to hurt African Americans during Reconstruction? How were newly-secured freedoms suppressed or denied?
- How did Republicans in the North attempt to defend and protect African Americans in the South during Reconstruction?
- How were African Americans in the South forced to fend for themselves?
- What was Ulysses S. Grant’s presidency like?
- What happened in the election of 1876 and the Compromise of 1877?
- How did some people and governments in the former confederate states continue to try to hurt African Americans in the South after Reconstruction?
- How were the black codes designed to freedmen like slaves again?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 63: There are four amendments to the U.S. Constitution about who can vote. Describe one of them.
  - Question 97: What amendment gives citizenship to all persons born in the United States?
  - Question 98: When did all men get the right to vote?
  - Question 126: Name three national U.S. holidays.
  - Question 127: What is Memorial Day?

**KEYS TO THE LESSON**

Even before the battlefield fighting was over, a new kind of struggle would emerge to determine the status of former slaves now made free. In decisive ways, Abraham Lincoln’s assassination was devastating for the prospects of healing the nation while effectively securing the equal rights of freedmen. Not only was the desire for vengeance that Lincoln attempted to abate unleashed against the South, but the Republicans controlling Congress themselves fought bitterly with President Andrew Johnson over the purpose and method of Reconstruction. While some remarkable gains were made for African Americans in the South, particularly in fulfilling in law the core ideas enunciated in the American founding and fought for by the Union, objections to such fulfillments remained, new injustices were established, and the management of Reconstruction was in disarray. The Compromise of 1877 ended the period of Reconstruction, leaving the protections African Americans had gained without federal protection, resulting in decades of restrictions on their rights and liberties.

Teachers might best plan and teach Reconstruction with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Have students consider the effect of Abraham Lincoln’s assassination on Reconstruction and the future of America, especially as regards civil rights for African Americans. Lincoln’s focus was healing the nation while simultaneously providing for the effective and long-term establishment of equal rights for African Americans. Vice President Andrew Johnson succeeded Lincoln after his assassination.
- The transformation of a society away from decades of slavery was no small task. Depict Reconstruction as being tragically undermined and strained by the conflicts between
Have students read the 13th Amendment to the Constitution and discuss the laws passed during Reconstruction. It is important to note the major and meaningful efforts Northerners made to guarantee the rights of African Americans.

- Teach students about both the important gains and protections Republicans won for African Americans during Reconstruction as well as the ways in which these were undermined by actions in the former confederate states and Johnson himself. Students should gain an appreciation of the remarkable speed and degrees to which former slaves were incorporated into the civil body early in Reconstruction, including the thousands of African Americans who would hold office at the local, state, and even federal level. But they should also understand the ways that Johnson resisted equal treatment of African Americans and in doing so encouraged and allowed certain bad policies (such as “black codes” passed by state legislatures and movements such as what would become the Ku Klux Klan) in the former Confederacy. In fact, many of the reversals of reconstruction began during the presidential reconstruction of Johnson, who was decidedly against secession but by no means opposed to slavery. Congress repeatedly had to override his vetoes and enact Constitutional amendments to prevent his defense of inequalities.

- Have students learn about the ways in which many civil rights achievements were thwarted or undone both during and after Reconstruction. For instance, spend time discussing how as Southerners were refranchised, African American officials were voted out of office and how “black codes” would eventually become Jim Crow laws. Discuss how “black codes” limited freedmen’s civil rights and imposed economic restrictions, including making being unemployed illegal, prohibiting landownership, requiring long-term labor contracts, prohibiting assemblies of freedmen only, prohibiting teaching freedmen to read or write, segregating public facilities, prohibiting freedmen from serving on juries, and carrying out corporal punishments for violators, among other restrictions and injustices. Note also the use of poll taxes and literacy tests to prohibit African Americans from voting.

- Explain how sharecropping made it nearly impossible for freedmen to accumulate enough capital to purchase their own land or set-off on a different pursuit. Moreover, students should be aware of the struggle facing freedmen who were still in a society prejudiced against them, without capital, land, or even the ability to read.

- Explain the emergence of groups such as the Ku Klux Klan and the power that their intimidation of African Americans and Republicans had in diminishing the political participation of freedmen.

- Teach students how Republicans passed and President Ulysses S. Grant signed into law the Ku Klux Klan Acts to prohibit intimidation of freedmen exercising their civil rights. Grant also empowered the president to use the armed forces against those who tried to deny freedmen equal protection under the laws. Nonetheless, such measures were usually sloppily enforced.

- At the same time, note the improvements during Reconstruction in building hospitals, creating a public school system, securing civil rights in principle, and fostering community within the freedmen community, especially in marital and family stability and through vibrant churches.

- Explain that Reconstruction effectively ended with the Compromise of 1877 that settled the disputed election of 1876. Congress (now controlled by the Democratic Party) would allow
Republican Rutherford B. Hayes to be declared president in exchange for his withdrawing federal troops in former confederate states. Point out that in the backdrop was both continuing Southern resistance and a gradual waning of Northern zeal for (and political interest in) reform within the South.

- Ask students to consider the tragic nature of Reconstruction: a time of so much hoped for and achieved in applying the principle of equal natural rights was repeatedly undermined and mismanaged, then suddenly ended for political expediency, enabling new forms of injustice in certain areas of the country, after a war to end injustice had consumed the lives of hundreds of thousands of Americans.
- Nevertheless, make sure students do not lose sight of the momentous achievements in liberty, equality, and self-government fulfilled because of the Civil War. Students should appreciate the very significant achievements of Lincoln and the Civil War while looking forward to future generations of Americans who would seek to live up to the fundamental principles of America in their own times.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS**

**Activity 1:** Have students draw a map of the United States after the Civil War and then track the re-admittance of states into the Union during Reconstruction (this activity can be assigned at the end of the lesson or be an ongoing activity as battles are taught).

**Assignment 1:** Have students and parents complete a “Talk about History” assignment in which parents ask their child a series of questions about what they learned in history from a given lesson. Parents record the answers and the student returns to school (provided in appendix).

**Assignment 2:** What were the good things and bad things that happened during Reconstruction? (2–4 sentences)

**Assignment 3:** How might Reconstruction have been different had Abraham Lincoln been alive? What would Lincoln have done the same and different than what happened? (2–4 sentences)
APPENDIX A

Talk about History

Study Guides

Tests

Writing Assignment
TALK ABOUT HISTORY

Student Name: ____________________________  Due: ______________

Story/Lesson from History: ____________________________________________

1. Who/what did you learn about in history class today?
   Student Answer: _________________________________________________

2. Who were the most important characters in the story?
   Student Answer: _________________________________________________

3. Tell me more about one of those characters.
   Student Answer: _________________________________________________

4. Tell me about the most exciting/interesting part of the story today.
   Student Answer: _________________________________________________

Parent Signature: ____________________________  Date: ______________

TALK ABOUT HISTORY

Student Name: ____________________________  Due: ______________

Story/Lesson from History: ____________________________________________

1. Who/what did you learn about in history class today?
   Student Answer: _________________________________________________

2. Who were the most important characters in the story?
   Student Answer: _________________________________________________

3. Tell me more about one of those characters.
   Student Answer: _________________________________________________

4. Tell me about the most exciting/interesting part of the story today.
   Student Answer: _________________________________________________

Parent Signature: ____________________________  Date: ______________
Study Guide — Unit 4, Test 1

Lesson 1 | The Expansion of Slavery
Lesson 2 | Toward Civil War

Test on ______________

TIMELINE

When given dates in order, match events from a list to the years or dates that they happened.

1849  California Gold Rush
1860  Election of Abraham Lincoln; South Carolina secedes
April 12, 1861  Attack on Fort Sumter

PERSONS

Identify each, provide biographical details, and explain what he or she thought or did in specific periods or events.

Abraham Lincoln  Sojourner Truth  Harriet Tubman
Frederick Douglass  Harriet Beecher Stowe  Stephen Douglas

TERMS AND TOPICS

Identify each and explain its significance to the period of history studied.

cotton gin  Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass  Bleeding Kansas
Antebellum  Frederick Douglass  a house divided
secession  Uncle Tom’s Cabin  Republican Party
Compromise of 1850  Underground Railroad  Dred Scott v. Sandford
abolitionism  popular sovereignty  Lincoln–Douglas Debates

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

Be familiar with each of the following stories.

- Biographies and the roles of Frederick Douglass, Harriet Tubman, and Abraham Lincoln prior to the Civil War
- Actions of Harriet Tubman and the Underground Railroad
- The first shots fired on Fort Sumter
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Based on notes from lessons and conversations, answer each of the following.

☐ Even though many wanted to abolish slavery, why did the Founders think that permitting slavery and keeping the Americans united would be the only way eventually to get rid of slavery?

☐ Why did the Founders expect that slavery would eventually die out on its own?

☐ What invention after the founding made cotton more valuable and actually increased slavery, which ruined the Founders’ guess that slavery would end on its own?

☐ How did Frederick Douglass show that slavery was evil?

☐ Who were the abolitionists? What kinds of things did they do to try to end slavery?

☐ How did the Underground Railroad work?

☐ Why did slave states want to expand the number of slave states in the western territories?

☐ Why did Abraham Lincoln believe “popular sovereignty” was wrong?

☐ Why did people create the Republican Party?

☐ Did Abraham Lincoln believe the Founders created a country to protect slavery or to end slavery?

   Why did he think this?

☐ What did Abraham Lincoln mean when he said that “a house divided against itself cannot stand?”

☐ What did Southern states do after Abraham Lincoln was elected?

☐ What happened at Fort Sumter and how did Abraham Lincoln respond?

☐ How was slavery the real reason the Civil War was fought?
The American Civil War — Test 1

Lesson 1 | The Expansion of Slavery
Lesson 2 | Toward Civil War

**TIMELINE:** Write the letter of each event next to the date or years it took place.

1849
1860
April 12, 1861

A. Election of Lincoln; South Carolina secedes
B. California Gold Rush
C. Attack on Fort Sumter

**MATCHING:** Write the letter of each definition to the correct word it defines.

___ antebellum
___ abolitionism
___ Republican Party
___ popular sovereignty
___ Bleeding Kansas
___ Dred Scott v. Sandford
___ a house divided
___ Lincoln–Douglas Debates
___ secession

A. a new political group formed to prevent the spread of slavery
B. a series of public conversations between two Illinois Senate candidates about whether slavery should be expanded and how that decision should be made
C. a Supreme Court decision that said slaves were not people
D. efforts to end slavery
E. fighting over whether slavery would exist in a new territory; hinted at the Civil War
F. Lincoln’s warning about the threat of disunity over slavery to America
G. the time before the Civil War
H. when a state attempts to leave the United States
I. where the people get to vote on whether to have slavery or not in a territory or state

**MULTIPLE CHOICE:** Circle the option that best answers each question.

1. Which invention radically increased the demand for slave labor after the American founding?
   a. the light bulb
   b. the steamboat
   c. the train
   d. the cotton gin
2. What was the series of separate agreements that merely postponed civil war?
   a. Great Compromise
   b. Three-Fifths Compromise
   c. Compromise of 1850
   d. Bad Compromise

3. Who was the “little lady” who wrote the book called *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* that helped Northerners imagine the horrors of slavery?
   a. Harriet Tubman
   b. Phyllis Wheatley
   c. Sojourner Truth
   d. Harriet Beecher Stowe

4. Who was an escaped slave who bravely led many other slaves to freedom on the Underground Railroad?
   a. Harriet Tubman
   b. Frederick Douglass
   c. William Lloyd Garrison
   d. Harriet Beecher Stowe

5. Who was raised in a log cabin, taught himself instead of going to school, and came to argue that slavery was a moral evil that needed to be resisted?
   a. Stephen Douglas
   b. Abraham Lincoln
   c. Henry Clay
   d. Millard Fillmore

6. Who was the Illinois Senator who argued that when slavery would exist in state should be left up to the people to decide by voting?
   a. Abraham Lincoln
   b. Henry Clay
   c. Millard Fillmore
   d. Stephen Douglas

**QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND:** Answer the following in complete sentences.

7. Even though many wanted to abolish slavery, why did the Founders think that permitting slavery and keeping the Americans united would be the only way eventually to get rid of slavery?

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________
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8. How did the Underground Railroad work?

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

9. Why did slave states want to expand the number of slave states in the western territories?

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

10. Why did Abraham Lincoln believe “popular sovereignty” was wrong?

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

11. What happened at Fort Sumter and how did Abraham Lincoln respond?

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART: Tell me about the life of Frederick Douglass.

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
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Study Guide — Unit 4, Test 2

Lesson 3 | The Civil War
Lesson 4 | Reconstruction

Test on __________

**TIMELINE**

*When given dates in order, match events from a list to the years or dates that they happened.*

1861–65  Civil War
April 14–15, 1865  Abraham Lincoln assassinated; Andrew Johnson becomes president
1865–77  Reconstruction

**PERSONS**

*Identify each, provide biographical details, and explain what he or she thought or did in specific periods or events.*

Abraham Lincoln  Clara Barton  Andrew Johnson
Jefferson Davis  Ulysses S. Grant  Hiram Revels
Robert E. Lee  William Tecumseh Sherman  Rutherford B. Hayes
Thomas “Stonewall” Jackson  John Wilkes Booth

**TERMS AND TOPICS**

*Identify each and explain its significance to the period of history studied.*

Confederate States of America  American Red Cross  Pickett’s Charge
minié ball  ironclads  54th Massachusetts
Reconstruction  Battle of Gettysburg  Sherman’s “March to the Sea”
13th Amendment  sharecropping  Jim Crow
freedmen  black codes  Compromise of 1877
Freedmen’s Bureau  scalawags & carpetbaggers
Transcontinental Railroad
**STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART**

*Be familiar with each of the following stories.*

- Battle of the ironclads
- Fighting at Little Round Top and Pickett’s Charge
- The writing and delivery of the Gettysburg Address
- Robert E. Lee’s surrender to Ulysses S. Grant at Appomattox Court House
- Assassination of Abraham Lincoln at Ford’s Theatre
- The swearing in of Hiram Revels to the U.S. Senate

**QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND**

*Based on notes from lessons and conversations, answer each of the following.*

□ Why did Abraham Lincoln think that the Southern states cannot leave the country?

□ Why was Abraham Lincoln’s first goal for fighting the Civil War to preserve the Union?

□ Why was Abraham Lincoln’s second goal for fighting the Civil War to stop the spread of slavery?

□ How did soldiers fight each other in the Civil War?

□ What was the problem with most of the Union generals early in the war?

□ What was the Emancipation Proclamation and what did it do?

□ How did the North win the Battle of Gettysburg? Why was this such a crucial victory?

□ What was Ulysses S. Grant like? Why was he a good general?

□ What happened during the March to the Sea?

□ Why did the Union win the Civil War?

□ What does reconstruction mean?

□ Why did Andrew Johnson and the Republicans not get along?

□ How did life improve for African Americans in the South during Reconstruction?

□ How did some people and governments in the Southern states continue to try to hurt African Americans during and after Reconstruction?

□ What happened in the election of 1876 and the compromise of 1877?
TIMELINE: Write the letter of each event next to the date or years it took place.

1861–1865 ______ A. Reconstruction
April 14–15, 1865 ______ B. Lincoln assassinated; Johnson president
1865-1877 ______ C. Civil War

MATCHING: Write the letter of each definition to the correct word it defines.

____ Confederate States of America
A. a form of transportation that could carry Americans all the way between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans

____ minié ball
B. a round bullet that inflicted terrible wounds during the Civil War

____ 54th Massachusetts
C. an all-African American regiment of soldiers who fought bravely at Fort Wagner for the Union

____ March to the Sea
D. former slaves who were freed by the Civil War

____ Reconstruction
E. General Sherman’s path of destruction from Atlanta to Savannah, Georgia

____ freedmen
F. laws Southern governments created targeted at restricting the freedoms of African Americans

____ sharecropping
G. the country the Southern states attempted to form during the Civil War

____ black codes
H. the only jobs available to former slaves in the South, in which they farmed for former slave-owners; little better than slavery

____ Transcontinental Railroad
I. the period following the Civil War in which Northerners controlled the government in Southern states

MULTIPLE CHOICE: Circle the option that best answers each question.

1. Which former U.S. Senator became the president of the Confederacy?
   a. Abraham Lincoln
   b. Jefferson Davis
   c. Robert E. Lee
   d. Stonewall Jackson
2. When the USS Monitor and the CSS Virginia clashed, it was the first battle of what kind of naval ship?  
   a. tall ships  
   b. submarines  
   c. ironclads  
   d. canoes

3. Who was the Union general who had not done well at West Point but who was bold and decisive in combat?  
   a. Robert E. Lee  
   b. George McClelland  
   c. Ulysses S. Grant  
   d. Thomas “Stonewall” Jackson

4. Who was considered the “Angel of the Battlefield” in her efforts to minister to wounded and dying soldiers during the Civil War by founding the American Red Cross?  
   a. Harriet Tubman  
   b. Clara Barton  
   c. Sojourner Truth  
   d. Harriet Beecher Stowe

5. Who was the Confederate sympathizer who shot Abraham Lincoln after Lincoln expressed giving voting rights to African Americans?  
   a. Thomas “Stonewall” Jackson  
   b. Andrew Johnson  
   c. William Tecumseh Sherman  
   d. John Wilkes Booth

6. Who was the first African American Senator, appointed and sworn in during Reconstruction?  
   a. Frederick Douglass  
   b. Hiram Revels  
   c. Rutherford B. Hayes  
   d. Andrew Johnson

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND: Answer the following in complete sentences.

7. Why was Abraham Lincoln’s second goal for fighting the Civil War to stop the spread of slavery?

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
8. What was the problem with most of the Union generals early in the war?
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

9. What was the Emancipation Proclamation and what did it do?
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

10. Why did the Union win the Civil War?
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

11. How did life improve for African Americans in the South during Reconstruction? How did it not improve?
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART: Tell me about the fighting at Little Round Top and Pickett’s Charge at the Battle of Gettysburg.
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
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Writing Assignment — The American Civil War

DIRECTIONS

In 1 paragraph, explain why America fought the Civil War based on what Abraham Lincoln argued in the Gettysburg Address.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________
APPENDIX B

Primary Sources

Frederick Douglass
Abraham Lincoln
The American People
BACKGROUND

The former slave and abolitionist Frederick Douglass wrote this autobiography on his life as a slave and his eventual escape and life in freedom.

ANNOTATIONS

I WAS born in Tuckahoe, near Hillsborough, and about twelve miles from Easton, in Talbot county, Maryland. I have no accurate knowledge of my age, never having seen any authentic record containing it. By far the larger part of the slaves know as little of their ages as horses know of theirs, and it is the wish of most masters within my knowledge to keep their slaves thus ignorant. I do not remember to have ever met a slave who could tell of his birthday. They seldom come nearer to it than planting-time, harvest-time, cherry-time, spring-time, or fall-time. A want of information concerning my own was a source of unhappiness to me even during childhood. The white children could tell their ages. I could not tell why I ought to be deprived of the same privilege. I was not allowed to make any inquiries of my master concerning it. He deemed all such inquiries on the part of a slave improper and impertinent, and evidence of a restless spirit. The nearest estimate I can give makes me now between twenty-seven and twenty-eight years of age. I come to this, from hearing my master say, some time during 1835, I was about seventeen years old.

My mother was named Harriet Bailey. She was the daughter of Isaac and Betsey Bailey,

---

Frederick Douglass, *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass: An American Slave* (Boston: Anti-Slavery Office, 1845).
both colored, and quite dark. My mother was of a darker complexion than either my grand-
mother or grandfather.

My father was a white man. He was admitted to be such by all I ever heard speak of my
parentage. The opinion was also whispered that my master was my father; but of the cor-
rectness of this opinion, I know nothing; the means of knowing was withheld from me. My
mother and I were separated when I was but an infant—before I knew her as my mother.
It is a common custom, in the part of Maryland from which I ran away, to part children
from their mothers at a very early age. Frequently, before the child has reached its twelfth
month, its mother is taken from it, and hired out on some farm a considerable distance off,
and the child is placed under the care of an old woman, too old for field labor. For what
this separation is done, I do not know, unless it be to hinder the development of the child’s
affection toward its mother, and to blunt and destroy the natural affection of the mother
for the child. This is the inevitable result.

I never saw my mother, to know her as such, more than four or five times in my life; and
each of these times was very short in duration, and at night. She was hired by a Mr. Stewart,
who lived about twelve miles from my home. She made her journeys to see me in the night,
travelling the whole distance on foot, after the performance of her day’s work. She was a
field hand, and a whipping is the penalty of not being in the field at sunrise, unless a slave
has special permission from his or her master to the contrary—a permission which they
seldom get, and one that gives to him that gives it the proud name of being a kind master.
I do not recollect of ever seeing my mother by the light of day. She was with me in the night.
She would lie down with me, and get me to sleep, but long before I waked she was gone.
Very little communication ever took place between us. Death soon ended what little we
could have while she lived, and with it her hardships and suffering.

She died when I was about seven years old, on one of my master’s farms, near Lee’s Mill. I
was not allowed to be present during her illness, at her death, or burial. She was gone long
before I knew any thing about it. Never have enjoyed, to any considerable extent, her soothing presence, her tender and watchful care, I received the tidings of her death with much the same emotions I should have probably felt at the death of a stranger.

Called thus suddenly away, she left me without the slightest intimation of who my father was. The whisper that my master was my father, may or may not be true; and, true or false, it is of but little consequence to my purpose whilst the fact remains, in all its glaring odi-ousness, that slaveholders have ordained, and by law established, that the children of slave women shall in all cases follow the condition of their mothers; and this is done too obviously to administer to their own lusts, and make a gratification of their wicked desires prof-itable as well as pleasurable; for by this cunning arrangement, the slaveholder, in cases not a few, sustains to his slaves the double relation of master and father.

I know of such cases, and it is worthy, of remark that such slaves invariably suffer greater hardships, and have more to contend with, than others. They are, in the first place, a con-stant offence to their mistress. She is ever disposed to find fault with them; they can seldom do anything to please her; she is never better pleased than when she sees them under the lash, especially when she suspects her husband of showing to his mulatto children favors which he withholds from his black slaves. The master is frequently compelled to sell this class of his slaves, out of deference to the feelings of his white wife; and, cruel as the deed may strike any one to be, for a man to sell his own children to human flesh-mongers, it is often the dictate of humanity for him to do so; for, unless he does this, he must not only whip them himself, but must stand by and see one white son tie up his brother, of but few shades darker complexion than himself, and ply the gory lash to his naked back; and if he lisp one word of disapproval, “it is set down to his parental partiality, and only makes a bad matter worse, both for himself and the slave whom he would protect and defend….

I have had two masters. My first master’s name was Anthony. I do not remember his first name. He was generally called Captain Anthony—a title which, I presume, he acquired by sailing a craft on the Chesapeake Bay. He was not considered a rich slaveholder. He owned two or three farms, and about thirty slaves. His farms and slaves were under the care of an
overseer. The overseer’s name was Plummer. Mr. Plummer was a miserable drunkard, a profane swearer, and a savage monster. He always went armed with a cowskin and a heavy cudgel. I have known him to cut and slash the women’s heads so horribly, that even master would be enraged at his cruelty, and would threaten to whip him if he did not mind himself.

Master, however, was not a humane slaveholder. It required extraordinary barbarity on the part of an overseer to affect him. He was a cruel man, hardened by a long life of slaveholding. He would at times seem to take great pleasure in whipping a slave. I have often been awakened at the dawn of day by the most heart-rending shrieks of an own aunt of mine, whom he used to tie up to a joist, and whip upon her naked back till she was literally covered with blood. No words, no tears, no prayers, from his gory victim, seemed to move his iron heart from its bloody purpose. The louder she screamed, the harder he whipped; and where the blood ran fastest, there he whipped longest. He would whip her to make her scream, and whip her to make her hush; and not until overcome by fatigue, would he cease to swing the blood-clotted cowskin. I remember the first time I ever witnessed this horrible exhibition. I was quite a child, but I well remember it. I never shall forget it whilst I remember any thing. It was the first of a long series of such outrages, of which I was doomed to be a witness and a participant. It struck me with awful force. It was the blood-stained gate, the entrance to the hell of slavery, through which I was about to pass. It was a most terrible spectacle. I wish I could commit to paper the feelings with which I beheld it…. 

As to my own treatment while I lived on Colonel Lloyd’s plantation, it was very similar to that of the other slave children. I was not old enough to work in the field, and there being little else than field work to do, I had a great deal of leisure time. The most I had to do was to drive up the cows at evening, keep the fowls out of the garden, keep the front yard clean, and run of errands for my old master’s daughter, Mrs. Lucretia Auld. The most of my leisure time I spent in helping Master Daniel Lloyd in finding his birds, after he had shot them. My connection with Master Daniel was of some advantage to me. He became quite attached to me, and was a sort of protector of me. He would not allow the older boys to impose upon me, and would divide his cakes with me.
I was seldom whipped by my old master, and suffered little from any thing else than hunger and cold. I suffered much from hunger, but much more from cold. In hottest summer and coldest winter, I was kept almost naked—no shoes, no stockings, no jacket, no trousers, nothing on but a coarse tow linen shirt, reaching only to my knees. I had no bed. I must have perished with cold, but that, the coldest nights, I used to steal a bag which was used for carrying corn to the mill. I would crawl into this bag, and there sleep on the cold, damp, clay floor, with my head in and feet out. My feet have been so cracked with the frost, that the pen with which I am writing might be laid in the gashes.

We were not regularly allowance. Our food was coarse corn meal boiled. This was called mush. It was put into a large wooden tray or trough, and set down upon the ground. The children were then called, like so many pigs, and like so many pigs they would come and devour the mush; some with oyster shells, others with pieces of shingle, some with naked hands, and none with spoons. He that ate fastest got most; he that was strongest secured the best place; and few left the trough satisfied. I was probably between seven and eight years old when I left Colonel Lloyd’s plantation. I left it with joy. I shall never forget the ecstasy with which I received the intelligence that my old master (Anthony) had determined to let me go to Baltimore, to live with Mr. Hugh Auld, brother to my old master’s son-in-law, Captain Thomas Auld. I received this information about three days before my departure. They were three of the happiest days I ever enjoyed. I spent the most part of all these three days in the creek, washing off the plantation scurf, and preparing myself for my departure.…

I often found myself regretting my own existence, and wishing myself dead; and but for the hope of being free, I have no doubt but that I should have killed myself, or done something for which I should have been killed. While in this state of mind, I was eager to hear any one speak of slavery. I was a ready listener. Every little while, I could hear something about the abolitionists. It was some time before I found what the word meant. It was always used in such connections as to make it an interesting word to me. If a slave ran away and succeeded in getting clear, or if a slave killed his master, set fire to a barn, or did any thing very wrong in the mind of a slaveholder, it was spoken of as the fruit of abolition. Hearing the word in
this connection very often, I set about learning what it meant. The dictionary afforded me little or no help. I found it was “the act of abolishing;” but then I did not know what was to be abolished. Here I was perplexed. I did not dare to ask any one about its meaning, for I was satisfied that it was something they wanted me to know very little about. After a patient waiting, I got one of our city papers, containing an account of the number of petitions from the north, praying for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and of the slave trade between the States. From this time I understood the words *abolition* and *abolitionist*, and always drew near when that word was spoken, expecting to hear something of importance to myself and fellow-slaves. The light broke in upon me by degrees. I went one day down on the wharf of Mr. Waters; and seeing two Irishmen unloading a scow of stone, I went, unasked, and helped them. When we had finished, one of them came to me and asked me if I were a slave. I told him I was. He asked, “Are ye a slave for life?” I told him that I was. The good Irishman seemed to be deeply affected by the statement. He said to the other that it was a pity so fine a little fellow as myself should be a slave for life. He said it was a shame to hold me. They both advised me to run away to the north; that I should find friends there, and that I should be free. I pretended not to be interested in what they said, and treated them as if I did not understand them; for I feared they might be treacherous. White men have been known to encourage slaves to escape, and then, to get the reward, catch them and return them to their masters. I was afraid that these seemingly good men might use me so; but I nevertheless remembered their advice, and from that time I resolved to run away. I looked forward to a time at which it would be safe for me to escape. I was too young to think of doing so immediately; besides, I wished to learn how to write, as I might have occasion to write my own pass. I consoled myself with the hope that I should one day find a good chance. Meanwhile, I would learn to write.

The idea as to how I might learn to write was suggested to me by being in Durgin and Bailey’s ship yard, and frequently seeing the ship carpenters, after hewing, and getting a piece of timber ready for use, write on the timber the name of that part of the ship for which it was intended. When a piece of timber was intended for the larboard side, it would be marked thus –“L.” When a piece was for the starboard side, it would be marked thus –“S.”
A piece for the larboard side forward, would be marked thus—“L. F.” When a piece was for starboard side forward, it would be marked thus—“S. F.” For larboard aft, it would be marked thus—“L.A.” For starboard aft, it would be marked thus—“S. A.” I soon learned the names of these letters, and for what they were intended when placed upon a piece of timber in the ship-yard. I immediately commenced copying them, and in a short time was able to make the four letters named. After that, when I met with any boy who I knew could write, I would tell him I could write as well as he. The next word would be, “I don’t believe you. Let me see you try it.” I would then make the letters which I had been so fortunate as to learn, and ask him to beat that. In this way I got a good many lessons in writing, which it is quite possible I should never have gotten in any other way. During this time, my copy-book was the board fence, brick wall, and pavement; my pen and ink was a lump of chalk. With these, I learned mainly how to write. I then commenced and continued copying the Italics in Webster’s Spelling Book, until I could make them all without looking on the book. By the time, my little Master Thomas had gone to school, and learned how to write, and had written over a number of copy-books. These had been brought home, and shown to some of our near neighbors, and then laid aside. My mistress used to go to class meeting at the Wilk Street meeting-house every Monday afternoon, and leave me to take care of the house. When left thus, I used to spend the time in writing in the spaces left in Master Thomas’s copy-book, copying what he had written. I continued to do this until I could write a hand very similar to that of Master Thomas. Thus after a long tedious effort for years, I finally succeeded in learning to write…..

Things went on without very smoothly indeed, but within there was trouble. It is impossible for me to describe my feelings as the time of my contemplated start drew near. I had a number of warm-hearted friends in Baltimore, — friends that I loved almost as I did my life, -and the thought of being separated from them forever was painful beyond expression. It is my opinion that thousands would escape from slavery, who now remain, but for the strong cords of affection that bind them to their friends. The thought of leaving my friends was decidedly the most painful thought with which I had to contend. The love of them was
my tender point, and shook my decision more than all things else. Besides the pain of sepa-
ration, the dread and apprehension of a failure exceeded what I had experienced at my
first attempt. The appalling de feat I then sustained returned to torment me. I felt assured
that, if I failed in this attempt, my case would be a hopeless one — it would seal my fate as
a slave forever. I could not hope to get off with anything less than the severest punishment,
and being placed beyond the means of escape. It required no very vivid imagination to
depict the most frightful scenes through which I should have to pass, in case I failed. The
wretchedness of slavery, and the blessedness of freedom, were perpetually before me. It
was life and death with me. But I remained firm, and, according to my resolution, on the
third day of September, 1838, I left my chains, and succeeded in reaching New York with-
out the slightest interruption of any kind. How I did so, - what means I adopted, - what
direction I travelled, and by what mode of conveyance, — I must leave unexplained, for the
reasons before mentioned.

I have been frequently asked how I felt when I found myself in a free State. I have never
been able to answer the question with any satisfaction to myself. It was a moment of the
highest excitement I ever experienced. I suppose I felt as one may imagine the un armed
mariner to feel when he is rescued by a friendly man-of-war from the pursuit of a pirate.
In writing to a dear friend, immediately after my arrival at New York, I said I felt like one
who had escaped a den of hungry lions. This state of mind, however, very soon subsided ;
and I was again seized with a feeling of great insecurity and loneliness. I was yet liable to be
taken back, and subjected to all the tortures of slavery. This in itself was enough to damp
the ardor of my enthusiasm. But the loneliness overcame me. There I was in the midst of
thousands, and yet a perfect stranger; without home and without friends, in the midst of
thousands of my own brethren –children of a com mon Father, and yet I dared not to un-
fold to any one of them my sad condition. I was afraid to speak to any one for fear of speak-
ing to the wrong one, and thereby falling into the hands of money-loving kidnappers,
whose business it was to lie in wait for the panting fugitive, as the ferocious beasts of the
forest lie in wait for their prey. The motto which I adopted when I started from slavery was
this—"Trust no man!" I saw in every white man an enemy, and in almost every colored
man cause for distrust. It was a most painful situation; and, to understand it, one must needs experience it, or imagine himself in similar circumstances. Let him be a fugitive slave in a strange land—a land given up to be the hunting-ground for slaveholders—whose inhabitants are legalized kidnappers—where he is every moment subjected to the terrible liability of being seized upon by his fellow men, as the hideous crocodile seizes upon his prey! I say, let him place himself in my situation—without home or friends—without money or credit—wanting shelter, and no one to give it—wanting bread, and no money to buy it, -and at the same time let him feel that he is pursued by merciless men-hunters, and in total darkness as to what to do, where to go, or where to stay, -perfectly helpless both as to the means of defence and means of escape, -in the midst of plenty, yet suffering the terrible gnawings of hunger, — in the midst of houses, yet having no home, —among fellow-men, yet feeling as if in the midst of wild beasts, whose greediness to swallow up the trembling and half-famished fugitive is only equalled by that with which the monsters of the deep swallow up the helpless fish upon which they subsist, —I say, let him be placed in this most trying situation, —the situation in which I was placed, -then, and not till then, will he fully appreciate the hardships of, and know how to sympathize with, the toil-worn and whip-scarred fugitive slave.
ABRAHAM LINCOLN (R-IL)
To the Illinois Republican Party Convention
SPEECH EXCERPTS
June 16, 1858
House of Representatives Chamber at the Illinois State Capitol | Springfield, Illinois

BACKGROUND
Abraham Lincoln delivered this speech upon his nomination by the Illinois Republican Party to be its candidate for U.S. Senate in Illinois.

ANNOTATIONS
Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Convention:

If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could then better judge what to do, and how to do it.

We are now far into the fifth year, since a policy was initiated, with the avowed object, and confident promise, of putting an end to slavery agitation.

Under the operation of that policy, that agitation has not only, not ceased, but has constantly augmented.

In my opinion, it will not cease, until a crisis shall have been reached, and passed.

"A house divided against itself cannot stand."

I believe this government cannot endure, permanently half slave and half free.

I do not expect the Union to be dissolved—I do not expect the house to fall—but I do expect

it will cease to be divided.

It will become *all* one thing, or *all* the other.

Either the *opponents* of slavery, will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction; or its *advocates* will push it forward, till it shall become alike lawful in *all* the States, *old* as well as *new*—*North* as well as *South*…

Auxiliary to all this, and working hand in hand with it, the Nebraska doctrine, or what is left of it, is to *educate* and *mold* public opinion, at least *Northern* public opinion, not to *care* whether slavery is voted *down* or voted *up*.

This shows exactly where we now are; and *partially* also, whither we are tending.…
PRESIDENT ABRAHAM LINCOLN (R)
First Inaugural Address

BACKGROUND
Abraham Lincoln delivered this speech at his inauguration amidst declarations of secession by southern states.

ANNOTATIONS
Fellow citizens of the United States:

In compliance with a custom as old as the government itself, I appear before you to address you briefly, and to take, in your presence, the oath prescribed by the Constitution of the United States, to be taken by the President "before he enters on the execution of his office."

…The course here indicated will be followed, unless current events, and experience, shall show a modification, or change, to be proper; and in every case and exigency, my best discretion will be exercised, according to circumstances actually existing, and with a view and a hope of a peaceful solution of the national troubles, and the restoration of fraternal sympathies and affections….

One section of our country believes slavery is right, and ought to be extended, while the other believes it is wrong, and ought not to be extended. This is the only substantial dispute.

The fugitive slave clause of the Constitution, and the law for the suppression of the foreign slave trade, are each as well enforced, perhaps, as any law can ever be in a community where

the moral sense of the people imperfectly supports the law itself. The great body of the people abide by the dry legal obligation in both cases, and a few break over in each. This, I think, cannot be perfectly cured; and it would be worse in both cases after the separation of the sections, than before. The foreign slave trade, now imperfectly suppressed, would be ultimately revived without restriction, in one section; while fugitive slaves, now only partially surrendered, would not be surrendered at all, by the other.

Physically speaking, we cannot separate. We cannot remove our respective sections from each other, nor build an impassable wall between them. A husband and wife may be divorced, and go out of the presence, and beyond the reach of each other; but the different parts of our country cannot do this. They cannot but remain face to face; and intercourse, either amicable or hostile, must continue between them. Is it possible then to make that intercourse more advantageous, or more satisfactory, after separation than before? Can aliens make treaties easier than friends can make laws? Can treaties be more faithfully enforced between aliens, than laws can among friends? Suppose you go to war, you cannot fight always; and when, after much loss on both sides, and no gain on either, you cease fighting, the identical old questions, as to terms of intercourse, are again upon you.

This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember, or overthrow it. I can not be ignorant of the fact that many worthy, and patriotic citizens are desirous of having the national constitution amended. While I make no recommendation of amendments, I fully recognize the rightful authority of the people over the whole subject, to be exercised in either of the modes prescribed in the instrument itself; and I should, under existing circumstances, favor, rather than oppose, a fair opportunity being afforded the people to act upon it....

My countrymen, one and all, think calmly and well, upon this whole subject. Nothing valuable can be lost by taking time. If there be an object to hurry any of you, in hot haste, to a step which you would never take deliberately, that object will be frustrated by taking time;
but no good object can be frustrated by it. Such of you as are now dissatisfied, still have the old Constitution unimpaired, and, on the sensitive point, the laws of your own framing under it; while the new administration will have no immediate power, if it would, to change either. If it were admitted that you who are dissatisfied, hold the right side in the dispute, there still is no single good reason for precipitate action. Intelligence, patriotism, Christianity, and a firm reliance on Him, who has never yet forsaken this favored land, are still competent to adjust, in the best way, all our present difficulty.

In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The government will not assail you. You can have no conflict, without being yourselves the aggressors. You have no oath registered in Heaven to destroy the government, while I shall have the most solemn one to "preserve, protect and defend it."

I am loath to close. We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battle-field, and patriot grave, to every living heart and hearthstone, all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.
PRESIDENT ABRAHAM LINCOLN (R-IL)

A Proclamation

AN ORDER

January 1, 1863

Emancipation Proclamation

BACKGROUND

On September 22, 1862 after the Union victory in the Battle of Antietam, Abraham Lincoln announced this order concerning property in slaves in the rebelling states, which took effect January 1, 1863.

ANNOTATIONS

By the President of the United States of America: A Proclamation.

Whereas, on the twenty-second day of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-two, a proclamation was issued by the President of the United States, containing, among other things, the following, to wit:

"That on the first day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, all persons held as slaves within any State or designated part of a State, the people whereof shall then be in rebellion against the United States, shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free; and the Executive Government of the United States, including the military and naval authority thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of such persons, and will do no act or acts to repress such persons, or any of them, in any efforts they may make for their actual freedom….

Now, therefore I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, by virtue of the power in me vested as Commander-in-Chief, of the Army and Navy of the United States in time of actual armed rebellion against authority and government of the United States, and as a

fit and necessary war measure for suppressing said rebellion, do, on this first day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, and in accordance with my purpose so to do publicly proclaimed for the full period of one hundred days, from the day first above mentioned, order and designate as the States and parts of States wherein the people thereof respectively, are this day in rebellion against the United States, the following, to wit:…

And by virtue of the power, and for the purpose aforesaid, I do order and declare that all persons held as slaves within said designated States, and parts of States, are, and henceforward shall be free; and that the Executive government of the United States, including the military and naval authorities thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of said persons.

And I hereby enjoin upon the people so declared to be free to abstain from all violence, unless in necessary self-defense; and I recommend to them that, in all cases when allowed, they labor faithfully for reasonable wages.

And I further declare and make known, that such persons of suitable condition, will be received into the armed service of the United States to garrison forts, positions, stations, and other places, and to man vessels of all sorts in said service.

And upon this act, sincerely believed to be an act of justice, warranted by the Constitution, upon military necessity, I invoke the considerate judgment of mankind, and the gracious favor of Almighty God.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.
Done at the City of Washington, this first day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the eighty-seventh.

By the President:

Abraham Lincoln

William H. Seward, Secretary of State.
President Abraham Lincoln (R)

On the Consecration of the Soldiers’ National Cemetery

Speech

November 19, 1863

Soldiers’ National Cemetery | Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

Gettysburg Address

Background

Abraham Lincoln delivered these remarks at the dedication of the Union cemetery for those soldiers killed in the Battle of Gettysburg in the summer of 1863.

Annotations

Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth, on this continent, a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived, and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battle-field of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting-place for those who here gave their lives, that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But, in a larger sense, we can not dedicate—we can not consecrate—we can not hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly

---

advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they here gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.
PRESIDENT ABRAHAM LINCOLN (R)
Second Inaugural Address

SPEECH

March 4, 1865
U.S. Capitol | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

Having been reelected and with the end of the Civil War in sight, Abraham Lincoln delivered this speech at his inauguration to a second term as president.

ANNOTATIONS

Fellow Countrymen:

At this second appearing to take the oath of the presidential office, there is less occasion for an extended address than there was at the first. Then a statement, somewhat in detail, of a course to be pursued, seemed fitting and proper. Now, at the expiration of four years, during which public declarations have been constantly called forth on every point and phase of the great contest which still absorbs the attention, and engrosses the energies of the nation, little that is new could be presented. The progress of our arms, upon which all else chiefly depends, is as well known to the public as to myself; and it is, I trust, reasonably satisfactory and encouraging to all. With high hope for the future, no prediction in regard to it is ventured.

On the occasion corresponding to this four years ago, all thoughts were anxiously directed to an impending civil-war. All dreaded it—all sought to avert it. While the inaugural address was being delivered from this place, devoted altogether to saving the Union without war, insurgent agents were in the city seeking to destroy it without war—seeking to dissolve

the Union, and divide effects, by negotiation. Both parties deprecated war; but one of them would make war rather than let the nation survive; and the other would accept war rather than let it perish. And the war came.

One eighth of the whole population were colored slaves, not distributed generally over the Union, but localized in the Southern part of it. These slaves constituted a peculiar and powerful interest. All knew that this interest was, somehow, the cause of the war. To strengthen, perpetuate, and extend this interest was the object for which the insurgents would rend the Union, even by war; while the government claimed no right to do more than to restrict the territorial enlargement of it. Neither party expected for the war, the magnitude, or the duration, which it has already attained. Neither anticipated that the cause of the conflict might cease with, or even before, the conflict itself should cease. Each looked for an easier triumph, and a result less fundamental and astounding. Both read the same Bible, and pray to the same God; and each invokes His aid against the other. It may seem strange that any men should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces; but let us judge not that we be not judged. The prayers of both could not be answered; that of neither has been answered fully. The Almighty has His own purposes.

"Woe unto the world because of offenses! for it must needs be that offenses come; but woe to that man by whom the offense cometh!" If we shall suppose that American Slavery is one of those offenses which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which, having continued through His appointed time, He now wills to remove, and that He gives to both North and South, this terrible war, as the woe due to those by whom the offense came, shall we discern therein any departure from those divine attributes which the believers in a Living God always ascribe to Him? Fondly do we hope—fervently do we pray—that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue, until all the wealth piled by the bond-man's two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash, shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so still it must be said "the judgments of the Lord, are true and righteous altogether."
With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just, and a lasting peace, among ourselves, and with all nations.
**U.S. Congress and States**

**Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution**

**Amendment**

December 18, 1865

United States of America

**BACKGROUND**

The U.S. Congress passed and three-quarters of states ratified the Thirteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution by December 6, 1865, and the amendment was acknowledged as effective by Secretary of State William Seward on December 18, 1865.

**ANNOTATIONS**

Section 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

Section 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

---

The House Joint Resolution proposing the 13th amendment to the Constitution, January 31, 1865; Enrolled Acts and Resolutions of Congress, 1789-1999; General Records of the United States Government; Record Group 11; National Archives.
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Why Teach the British Colonies of North America

Christopher Columbus’s discovery of what was then termed “The New World” is one of the most consequential events in all of recorded history. It was as if another half of Earth was being opened to the peoples of Europe, Africa, and Asia, and the changes that followed this momentous discovery were immense. Students should be especially aware of the profound effects of the initial contact of European explorers with the indigenous peoples of North America. They should understand the ways of life characteristic of Native American tribes, the exploits of European explorers and settlers, and the triumphs
and tragedies that defined the relationships between settlers and natives. Students should also study closely the manner in which the British colonies of North America were established, since those first settlements would be the seedbed of our country. Our unique American heritage began here, on these coasts, among scattered settlements of men and women pursuing economic independence or religious freedom, leaving behind their familiar lives to seek liberty and opportunity at what to them was the edge of the world. With the promise of freedom at these far reaches also came untold hardships and daily dangers. The American story begins with those few who braved these risks for the freedom to pursue what all human beings desire to attain: happiness.

Enduring Ideas from This Unit

1. America’s varied and wondrous geography has played a crucial role in many of America’s successes.
2. The discovery, exploration, and settlement of the Western Hemisphere was one of the most consequential series of events in human history.
3. The contact between indigenous North American and European civilizations resulted in both benefits and afflictions for natives and colonists alike.
4. The British colonies of North America were unique, and their circumstances gradually shaped the character of the colonists into something unprecedented: the American.
5. The freedom afforded to the American colonists resulted in a degree of successful self-government unknown to the rest of the world in 1763.

What Teachers Should Consider

Imagine two more continents, an eighth and a ninth, with different terrain, untouched resources, seemingly limitless lands, and complete openness to any sort of political regime. This is the vision teachers might consider adopting in preparing students to learn American history. In other words, one can adopt an outlook similar to that of the people who began the first chapter in the story of America. Such an outlook will help students to see the origins of America as something that was fluid and not at all inevitable.

In the same way the explorers, settlers, and indigenous Native Americans keenly fixed their attention on the contours of the North American landscape, so should students of American history at the outset of their studies. A close study of American geography sets the stage on which Americans of every generation would act out their lives.

Europeans’ exploration and settlement of the Western Hemisphere is an extraordinary era in terms of historical impact, but it also contains engaging stories of intrepid discoverers and of the conditions they found and helped to shape. It is important to find the proper balance in conveying the story of that era. Students ought to step into the lives of these explorers and settlers and understand not only their motivations for undertaking such hazardous trips and ways of living but also their experiences on the Atlantic and on the fringes of an unknown continent. They should also think carefully and honestly about the interactions between Native Americans, explorers, and settlers. They will encounter a mixed picture. At times, they will see cooperation, care, and mutual respect; at other times they will see all the duplicity and
injustice that human nature is capable of. They will see these traits exhibited by all parties at various moments and in different circumstances.

Teachers should also focus on making clear the differences between England’s North American colonies and those of other emerging New World empires, such as Spain, France, and Portugal. They should bring out what was unique among the English settlers, from the form of their colonies’ settlements to the social and economic ventures of the colonists themselves, as well as their varied relationships to the mother country. Each English colony may be taught separately, each offering a distinct social and economic profile, while a final lesson may be devoted to studying the major events and movements in shared colonial American history. Together, students should come to see that an unplanned experiment was unfolding in the British colonies of North America: one that was shaping a unique society and citizenry, one that would be equipped for great accomplishments in the coming centuries.

How Teachers Can Learn More

**TEXTS**

*Albion’s Seed*, David Hackett Fischer  
*American Slavery, American Freedom*, Edmund Morgan  
*African Founders*, David Hackett Fischer  
*The Formative Years, 1607–1763*, Clarence Ver Steeg  
*The Roots of American Order*, Russell Kirk  
*Freedom Just Around the Corner*, Walter McDougall  
*American Heritage: A Reader*, ed. Hillsdale College History Faculty

**ONLINE COURSES** | Online.Hillsdale.edu

*The Great American Story*  
*American Heritage*

**Lesson Planning Resources**

**TEACHER RESOURCES**

*Land of Hope*, Wilfred McClay  
*A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope*, Wilfred McClay and John McBride

**STUDENT RESOURCES**

*Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition*, Volume 1, Wilfred McClay
PRIMARY SOURCES

Letter to King Ferdinand II, Christopher Columbus
The Mayflower Compact
“A Modell of Christian Charity,” John Winthrop
Preface to the Frame of Government of Pennsylvania
An Act for Freedom of Conscience in Pennsylvania
Magna Carta
English Bill of Rights
Second Treatise of Government, John Locke
LESSON PLANS, ASSIGNMENTS, AND QUIZZES
Lesson 1 — The Lands, Waters, and Peoples of America

Lesson Objective

Students learn about the geography of what would become the United States of America, including its physical contours, climate, advantages for civilization, and its Native American inhabitants, as well as the present-day political map of the United States.

Teacher Preparation

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1
Primary Sources

Pages xiii-xv, 1-3

See below.

Teacher Texts
Land of Hope
A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope

Pages xi–xiv, 2–7
Pages 1–7

Online.Hillsdale.edu
The Great American Story
American Heritage

Lectures 1 and 2
Lecture 1

Student Preparation

Assignment: Students read Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1, pages xiii-xv and 1-3 and prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Core Content in This Lesson

Topographic Geography
Atlantic Ocean
Caribbean Sea
San Salvador
Bahamas
Puerto Rico
St. Lawrence River
Appalachian Mountains
Green Mountains
Lake Champlain
Adirondack Mountains
Finger Lakes

Lake Ontario
Niagara River
Niagara Falls
Lake Erie
Cape Cod
Nantucket
Long Island
Manhattan Island
Hudson River
Catskill Mountains
Allegheny River
Allegheny Mountains
District of Columbia
Potomac River
Chesapeake Bay
James River
Blue Ridge Mountains
Shenandoah Valley
Outer Banks
Great Smoky Mountains
Gulf of Mexico
Mississippi River
Mississippi Delta
Lake Pontchartrain
Ohio River
Ohio River Valley
Detroit/St. Clair Rivers
Lake St. Clair
Lake Huron
Lake Michigan
Straits of Mackinac
Michigan’s Lower Peninsula
Michigan’s Upper Peninsula
Lake Superior
Great Lakes
Cumberland Gap
49th Parallel

Great Plains
Missouri River
Rio Grande
Rocky Mountains
Continental Divide
Yellowstone National Park
Old Faithful
Great Salt Lake
Oklahoma Panhandle
Texas Panhandle
Colorado River
Grand Canyon
Gadsden Purchase
Puget Sound
Columbia River
Mount St. Helens
San Francisco Bay
Sierra Nevada
Death Valley
Mojave Desert
Pacific Ocean
Yukon River
Mount McKinley/Denali
Bering Sea
Bering Strait
Hawaiian Islands

Political Geography
Virginia, Richmond
Massachusetts, Boston
New Hampshire, Concord
Maryland, Annapolis
Connecticut, Hartford
Rhode Island, Providence
Delaware, Dover
North Carolina, Raleigh
South Carolina, Columbia
New Jersey, Trenton
New York, Albany
Pennsylvania, Harrisburg
Georgia, Atlanta
Washington, District of Columbia
Vermont, Montpelier
Kentucky, Frankfort
Tennessee, Nashville
Ohio, Columbus

Louisiana, Baton Rouge
Indiana, Indianapolis
Mississippi, Jackson
Illinois, Springfield
Alabama, Montgomery
Maine, Augusta
Missouri, Jefferson City
Arkansas, Little Rock
Michigan, Lansing
Florida, Tallahassee
Texas, Austin
Iowa, Des Moines
Wisconsin, Madison
California, Sacramento
Minnesota, St. Paul
Oregon, Salem
Kansas, Topeka
West Virginia, Charleston
Nevada, Carson City       New Mexico, Santa Fe
Nebraska, Lincoln         Arizona, Phoenix
Colorado, Denver          Alaska, Juneau
North Dakota, Bismarck     Hawaii, Honolulu
South Dakota, Pierre      New England Region
Montana, Helena           Mid-Atlantic Region
Washington, Olympia       Southern Region
Idaho, Boise              Midwest Region
Wyoming, Cheyenne          Great Lakes States
Utah, Salt Lake City      Southwestern Region
Oklahoma, Oklahoma City    Pacific Northwestern Region

Terms and Topics
- glaciers
- continental shelf
- land bridge
- Mayas
- Aztecs
- Incas
- Hopewell
- Adena
- urban
- cities
- suburbs
- towns
- rural

Images
- Maps
- Famous or exemplar landscapes, landmarks, bodies of water, present-day cities, and other geographic features
- Illustrations of indigenous peoples, civilizations, and life
- Photographs of Aztec, Maya, Inca, Hopewell, and Ancestral Pueblo ruins

STORY FOR THE AMERICAN HEART
- Christopher Columbus's crew on their voyage and sighting land

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND
- How would you describe the topography of the United States?
- What resources and advantages does this land afford for the flourishing of a developed civilization? How does it compare to other places in the world?
- What are the various regions, and what are the topographical features that define each of them?
- Where did the indigenous peoples of North and South America come from? How do we believe they came?
- What kinds of civilizations did different groups of indigenous peoples establish in different parts of the Americas?
- How did European and indigenous cultures differ from one another? Is there evidence of conflict among indigenous tribes?
KEYS TO THE LESSON

Every story has a setting, and the true story of history is no different. To tell and to teach this story effectively requires first introducing students to the stage on which Americans would act. Thus, American history should begin with a study of American geography. This inaugural lesson does not seek to inundate students with facts to memorize (though they will learn many). Rather, it seeks to transport them to the different places of America, not through an online virtual map but through the use of their own imaginations. Geography instruction is an excellent way to awaken and exercise the imaginations of students, priming them for all the other journeys which this course will ask their minds to undertake. Every history lesson will involve a similar setting of the stage in the students’ imaginations, and this lesson establishes that precedent. Of course, the lesson also gives students the “lay of the land” for the entire study of American history, beginning with an immersive trip through the country’s magnificent and diverse landscape and then mapping it onto the modern political map of their country. This geography lesson can be full of simple questions about what students observe, training them in the skill of careful discernment of detail. In addition, the collaborative effort of mapping out the country is an excellent way to build rapport, to learn names, and to ease into the school year. At the end of the lesson, the class may return to the virgin topography of the United States and place the various indigenous civilizations on it, learning the smattering of their history that has survived, and then return to the Atlantic and to the Spanish caravels and carracks just over the eastern horizon.

Teachers might best plan and teach The Lands, Waters, and Peoples of America with emphasis on the following approaches:

- The year of teaching history may begin with a number of brief conversations, introductions, procedures, and assessments of students’ prior knowledge of the historical period. It can include discussing the meaning of history and why we study it. It should help students to see that the reasons for studying history are various. Knowing the history of one’s country is an essential component of good citizenship. But history also can have value as a form of reflection on human nature and on the requirements of a good society. And like any subject, knowing history is good for its own sake, i.e., for the enjoyment and pleasure that comes with knowing. Being made aware of their motivations may allow students to ascend from “Because I have to” to this highest reason as the year proceeds.

- Begin by telling a story that will encourage students to use their imaginations and set the precedent for the way class will normally be taught. The story of Christopher Columbus’s crew sighting land is an excellent example. The story may be picked up when Columbus’s three ships are already en route. Paint the scene. Provide descriptions of the ship. Help students get a sense of what sailing was like in those days, and the dangers it involved. Draw out the sounds and smells onboard the ships. Introduce the kind of men on board, the letters and instructions they had with them, and what they may have been thinking from moment to moment. Talk about their captain: his appearance, thoughts, and comportment. Share the story of how recently the crew had nearly mutinied against him, and how he quelled their fears. Describe the sudden appearance of a large flock of birds the previous day. Finally, bring students to the very early morning of October 12, 1492, after the view from the ship’s rail had not changed for weeks, when the call came from the masts, “La tierra!” Land!
Next should come a lesson on the geography of what would become the United States. First go backwards and talk about the geological changes that shaped the continent over time using maps readily available online.

Treat the physical topography of the United States, following the path that settlers would travel from the Atlantic seaboard westward to the Pacific Ocean. Introduce landmarks, bodies of water, and other physical characteristics, moving from east to west. The items listed under “Topographic Geography” follow in roughly this order. The goal is to make sure students are aware of these landmarks in order to develop an appreciation for the beauty and diversity of their country’s landscape.

Call upon students’ imaginations by describing the settings of what you introduce with vivid language that engages all their senses. Place them in particular climates with the correct weather depending on the season, including types of natural disasters to which an area is subject. Record all this information with the class on a physical map handed out to them and on its projection on the board. As the class proceeds from coast to coast, label the map together. Ask plenty of questions in the process. For review, project images of key areas discussed on the map and have students try to identify what is being projected. Show a map that reflects this topography, such as a raised relief map, and the distribution of natural resources and future trade routes connected with these resources.

Emphasize with students the tremendous advantages America’s land offers to human flourishing. America had excellent and untouched soils for cultivation, temperature and rainfall averages were ideal, and timber was plentiful. Native plants and animals suitable for human consumption were abundant, while imported livestock thrived. The virgin forests provided all the fuel needed for fires, heating, and cooking, as well as for building. Waterways were plentiful and mostly navigable; their importance cannot be overstated, and students should appreciate that the colonial-era Atlantic world imagined the world primarily in terms of water flow, especially in North America. Most of the country had mild winters with long, warm growing seasons and few areas subject to drought. As for security from foreign powers, the United States would have two massive oceans separating it from most of the rest of the world.

After thoroughly covering topography, transition to the modern political map with a new projected map and a corresponding political map handout. In teaching the political map, proceed in the order in which the first thirteen states were settled as colonies, and then in the order in which the remaining thirty-seven became states in the Union. Note special topographical, population, and trade characteristics of each state, including capitals, major cities, and special attractions or landmarks. Review the topography, weather, climate, and seasons in the process. Discuss how population is distributed in the states and across the country, and then group the states into different regions.

After covering the modern political United States, return to the topographical map and place the indigenous tribes onto the map of North America and into the environments in which the various tribes lived. The diversity of tribes is astounding, and highlighting several communities, particularly on the eastern seaboard, will put students in the right historical context and assist with teaching the events in subsequent lessons.

Explain how America is and always has been a land of immigrants. Even those who would be considered the indigenous or “native” peoples of both North and South America likely migrated from northeast Asia. Settlements and even great cities of Central and South America emerged in following years as migration resulted in people spreading over the land of the Western Hemisphere.
- Show the range of different Western Hemisphere civilizations through the millennia prior to Christopher Columbus, including their ways of life, customs, and beliefs. In conjunction with state and local history, explore the history and traditions of historical Native Americans from the school’s locality or state.
- Conclude this first lesson by reminding students that to Columbus, his crew, and the peoples of Europe, Africa, and Asia in 1492 (and for millennia before), none of this was known to them, and discovering the entirety of the New World would take hundreds of years, even after Columbus’s voyages.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Complete the topographical map of the United States together as a class and study it for a future map assessment (teacher created).

**Assignment 2:** Complete the political map of the United States together as a class and study it for a future map assessment (teacher created).
Reading Quiz 1.1

The British Colonies of North America | Lesson 1
Land of Hope, Volume 1, Pages xiii-xv, 1-3

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. What is one reason why the author thinks people must study history?

2. Name one major settlement in the Americas prior to European discovery.

3. Who was Leif Eriksson?

4. How did Native Americans first come to the Americas?
Lesson 2 — Exploration and Settlement

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the European exploration of North America and the first English settlement efforts at Roanoke, Jamestown, Plymouth, and Massachusetts Bay.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts

*Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1*

Primary Sources

Pages 3–11, 15–25

Primary Sources

See below.

Teacher Texts

*Land of Hope*

*A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope*

Pages 7–9, 13–14, 20–22, 24–25, 27–28

Online.Hillsdale.edu

*The Great American Story*  
Lecture 2

*American Heritage*  
Lecture 2

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students read *Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1*, pages 3–11 and prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).


Assignment 3: Students read and annotate excerpts from John Winthrop’s “A Modell of Christian Charity” and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genoa</th>
<th>Virginia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Salvador/Watling Island</td>
<td>Roanoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The New World”</td>
<td>Chesapeake Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Florida</td>
<td>Jamestown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Augustine</td>
<td>Cape Cod</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plymouth
Massachusetts Bay

Boston

Persons
Leif Erikson
Ferdinand and Isabella
Christopher Columbus
Ponce de Leon
Amerigo Vespucci
John Smith
Pocahontas

Lord De La Warr
John Rolfe
William Bradford
Miles Standish
Massasoit
John Winthrop

Terms and Topics
Silk Road
Renaissance
humanism
caravel
merchants
nation-states
*Niña, Pinta, and Santa María*
Taino
“Indians”
conquistadors
Columbian Exchange
smallpox
mercantilism
joint-stock companies
Virginia Company
indentured servants

Powhatan
“Starving Time”
tobacco
House of Burgesses
Separatist Puritans
Pilgrims
Mayflower
commoner
religious freedom
state of nature
social contract
rule of law
self-government
Wampanoag
Puritans

Primary Sources
Letter to King Ferdinand II, Christopher Columbus
The Mayflower Compact
“A Modell of Christian Charity,” John Winthrop

To Know by Heart

“We must consider that we shall be as a city upon a hill. The eyes of all people are upon us.” —John Winthrop

Timeline
Oct. 12, 1492   Columbus lands on San Salvador Island
1607   Jamestown settled
1619   Africans disembark at Jamestown;
       first meeting of the Virginia House of Burgesses
1620 Pilgrims settle Plymouth
1630 Puritans settle Massachusetts Bay

4th Thursday in November Thanksgiving Day

Images
- Historical figures and events
- World map prior to Columbus
- Caravel and carrack
- Maps of Columbus’s voyages and other exploration
- Dress of Native Americans, explorers, and settlers
- Waldseemüller and Ringmann map
- Illustrated map of Jamestown
- Mayflower
- Mayflower Compact facsimile
- First Thanksgiving

**STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART**

- Christopher Columbus’s account of making landfall
- Christopher Columbus’s voyages and interactions with natives
- Christopher Columbus’s death in poverty and believing he had failed
- The Lost Colony of Roanoke
- John Smith’s account of the founding of Jamestown
- The “Starving Time” at Jamestown
- Pocahontas, John Smith, and John Rolfe
- Excerpts from the diary of John Rolfe
- The voyage of the Mayflower
- William Bradford’s account of going ashore at Plymouth
- The first winter at Plymouth
- Accounts of the First Thanksgiving by Edward Winslow and William Bradford

**QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND**

- What events “unsettled” European civilization and influenced the decision to explore the seas beyond Europe? How so?
- What was Christopher Columbus’s theory?
- What were some of the ways in which Christopher Columbus’s voyages changed the world?
- In which ways was Christopher Columbus successful, and in which did he fail?
- From where do we get the name “America”?
- How was England’s approach to settlement different from that of other countries?
- What were the characteristics of the settlers in England’s first successful colonies?
- What motivated settlers to establish Jamestown?
- What problems did Jamestown’s settlers create and face? How did they manage to succeed?
- What two things happened in Jamestown in 1619?
- What motivated the Pilgrims to settle at Plymouth? What were their goals?
Why did the Pilgrims draft and sign the Mayflower Compact?
What is so extraordinary about the Mayflower Compact?
How did the First Thanksgiving come about? Why?
Based on John Winthrop’s writings, how did the Puritans at Massachusetts Bay envision their lives and the task before them in North America?
Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
- Question 73: The colonists came to America for many reasons. Name one.
- Question 74: Who lived in America before the Europeans arrived?
- Question 75: What group of people was taken and sold as slaves?

Keys to the Lesson

Christopher Columbus’s discovery of the New World was one of the signal achievements of the age of exploration. The ideas of Renaissance humanism fostered confidence in the capacities of man and led monarchs to sponsor expensive and risky voyages to the uncharted waters and lands an ocean away. Enterprising commoners braved the seas and these wild lands for their own fortunes and opportunity. Nearly one hundred years would pass before the English would attempt a permanent settlement in North America and another two decades before they found any success. Yet while Jamestown was founded chiefly on economic motives, the next two decades would see the Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay colonies founded, at least in part for religious and cultural ends. What was common to all these efforts was the desire for freedom to better their conditions—both the quality of earthly life and the preparation for eternal life. Put differently, they desired the freedom to seek happiness, made available to the common man in ways that had no parallel in the Old World.

Teachers might best plan and teach Exploration and Settlement with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Begin the teaching of American history by helping students gain historical perspective. Using the following reference points, ask them to compare today’s way of life with life in the centuries prior to the 1600s.
  - a political body based on natural rights and their equal protection
  - ability to believe and act on one’s beliefs without fear of arrest—or worse
  - ability to go about daily life without fear of being injured, killed, or having property taken
  - ability to possess the tools necessary to protect one’s food, shelter, family, and life
  - ability to put one’s thoughts into print without fear of arrest—or worse
  - ability to receive an education paid for, in part, by one’s neighbors
  - ability to speak one’s mind without fear of arrest—or worse
  - ability to vote for those who determine by law what one may or may not do
  - acquisition of clothing, food, and shelter
  - communication by internet, text, phone, mail
  - control of one’s ideas and inventions unless willingly shared with another
  - criticism or protest against those in power without fear of arrest—or worse
  - electricity, plumbing, heating, cooling
  - family structure
  - legal presumption of innocence when accused of a crime
  - literacy and numeracy
- possession of one's own land for food and shelter
- religious practices
- risk of disease and injury
- slavery
- the distance of one's physical travels
- the role of most men in family life and the community (working at home or out of doors; defending the family and community)
- the role of most women in family life and the community (working at home indoors; caring for the family and neighbors)
- the rule of law
- travel by plane, car, boat, horse and buggy, walking
- trial by a jury of one's neighbors
- trial for crimes effected quickly and publicly

- Offer students some background on the reasons why Europeans began exploring in the first place. If students have previously studied European history, then a brief review will be sufficient. For this course, students should generally understand the Renaissance idea of humanism and the confidence it offered European governments and merchants to leverage the full capacities of man. Humanism intersected with other cultural currents: trade interests in Asia, Muslim control of land routes, newly emerging and competing monarchs, growing prosperity among an expanding middle class, and new maritime technology. Riding these currents, those inspired by humanist ideas turned to the seas in search of what was beyond, first along the African coast, and then across the Atlantic. A short review of explorers who predated Christopher Columbus may be helpful.

- Relay to students the background to Christopher Columbus. Of important note is the attention he gave to new theories of navigation and the size, but not the shape, of the world.

- Of Columbus's first voyage, help students to imagine what he was doing and what his crew was undertaking as well. It was far from certain that they would find the route Columbus sought, or that they would survive trying. Even then, Columbus was confident of his theories and of his ability.

- Share the stories of each of Columbus's four voyages, marking the gradual decline in success, based on the stated goals of each trip.

- Consider Columbus's specific actions and what they might suggest about his overall character. On the one hand, he was intrepid and determined in pursuit of his theories. He was also a mariner of great skill. Read with students letters in which he claims to have initially secured the respectful treatment of the natives his crew encountered, mindful that we do not have an account from the natives themselves. On the other hand, he was sometimes an incompetent leader whom his men did not listen to or respect, particularly when he took to imposing severe punishments and permitting cruel actions against certain native groups. Columbus's importance in American history is that he established the first enduring links between the Old and New Worlds, initiating European civilization's influence on the Western Hemisphere.

- Use this opportunity to address with students the history of interactions between the indigenous peoples of North and South America and European explorers and settlers. Of paramount importance is that students not paint with too broad of a brush. The relationships varied widely. Many interactions and relationships were mutually respectful and cooperative. Others were brutal and unjust. Often the relations between the same groups ebbed and flowed between friendship
and conflict over time. Ask why misunderstandings, duplicity, and conflict between very different peoples and cultures—and between fallible individuals of all sorts—might arise.

- In addition to conflicts, discuss how the indigenous people’s lack of acquired immunity to diseases—notably smallpox, which most Europeans had been conditioned to survive—was a leading cause of the decline in the Native American population.

- Highlight the later years of Columbus’s life, including his removal as commander in Spanish-claimed territories, his shipwreck and stranding on Jamaica for a year, and Spain’s unwillingness to commission any further expeditions under his command. Columbus died as an abject failure in the eyes of the world and likely in his own eyes, as he never did find a passage to Asia yet also did not understand that what he had discovered was another half of planet Earth. Note how his sailings along the isthmus of Panama left him, unknowingly, just a few dozen miles from the vast Pacific Ocean, the existence of which he knew nothing.

- Explain that Italian mapmaker Amerigo Vespucci, after joining an outfit to the Western Hemisphere, asserted only after Columbus’s death that what Columbus had discovered were not parts of Asia but entirely “new” continents. German mapmakers Latinized and feminized his name into “America” on one of their first maps depicting the New World.

- Review other explorations between Columbus and the beginning of English settlement efforts in the late 1500s. Study Ponce de Leon’s discovery of Florida and the eventual settlement at St. Augustine, marking the first European presence in the future United States. Students need not study all of these events in detail, but they should grasp the overall strategy that Spain, Portugal, and even France adopted toward exploring and settling the New World, namely, a top-down, economically motivated approach under the direct centralized control of their respective monarchies. It will be important to contrast this approach with that of the English in the next lesson. Have students study maps of the Western Hemisphere and the domains these various powers had claimed for their respective crowns. It should also be noted that, as revealed in the history of exploration by Hernando Cortés and Francisco Pizarro, there was often a gulf between the monarchs’ directives to deal with natives justly and humanely and the ability to enforce such restraints across an ocean.

- Trace the paths of various explorers into the future states of America, particularly in Florida and the West. The presence of Catholic missionaries is of special note, highlighting one motivation for exploration.

- Explain how the conflicts between Protestants and Catholics for the English throne, England’s relative distance from continental Europe, and its growing naval strength delayed its interests in exploration beyond the commissioning of voyages by John Cabot. The English largely contented themselves through much of the sixteenth century with preying on Spanish ships returning from the New World with spices and bullion.

- Recount the first English effort to establish a permanent settlement in North America in the colony of Roanoke, which famously disappeared with barely a trace after a brief four-year existence.

- Set up the founding of Jamestown as emblematic of one important motivation for the English to establish a colony: material opportunity for the lower classes. Land ownership by common folk was extremely rare in almost all of Europe, and economic mobility itself was a relatively new and rare phenomenon. The organizers and settlers of Jamestown embodied the enterprising spirit that would come to define emigrants from England to North America, and, for that matter, millions of immigrants throughout America’s history. This degree of opportunity for the ordinary person was unprecedented. It partly explains why so many European commoners left what was familiar
and risked the greater likelihood of an earlier death to pursue it. The Jamestown settlers exemplified the idea of pursuing “the American dream.”

- Help students to appreciate the several periods when Jamestown was on the verge of failing and the many deaths incurred despite its eventual success. Of particular note was Jamestown’s original experiment with a form of communism. This collectivism, plus rampant disease, helped produce a disastrous first year and a half for the fledgling settlement. John Smith’s requirement that settlers earn their bread by their work and his guarantee of private property ownership, along with some much-needed assistance from the local Native Americans, not only saved the settlement but also became quintessentially American traits, both in law and in the character of the people. But even this near disaster paled in comparison to what was known as the “Starving Time,” in which failure was averted only by a return to the rule of law under Lord De La Warr. The turning point for Jamestown was the successful cultivation of tobacco by John Rolfe. While not the gold many settlers had originally envisioned, the crop would both shore up Jamestown’s existence and spread the news among the English and other Europeans that opportunities were present and realizable in English Virginia.

- Consider how the year 1619 at Jamestown offers a profound insight into colonial America:
  - On the one hand, it was in 1619 that the first enslaved Africans, having been taken from a Portuguese slave ship en route to Mexico by an English privateer, landed at Jamestown.
  - On the other hand, it was also in 1619 at Jamestown that the Virginia House of Burgesses first convened, marking the beginning of representative self-government in the colonies. This self-government would flourish for more than 150 years as the British colonists of North America largely governed themselves and developed the thoughts, practices, and habits of a self-governing people.

- Show how the founding of Plymouth was emblematic of the other important motivation for Englishmen to establish a colony: religion. In the wake of the Protestant Reformation, the Christian world was divided, with various forms of strife and severe restrictions on religious belief and practice. In England, these divisions were within Protestantism itself, with Puritans wishing to purify the Church of England of remaining Catholic trappings and Separatist Puritans (whom we call Pilgrims) seeking to establish a new, true Church of England. It was this latter group that sought not only the freedom to practice their form of Anglicanism but also to re-found the Church in the New World. This band of settlers had the marks of a utopian mindset, even when the English crown required a number of prisoners to embark with them on the Mayflower. And unlike the all-male group that originally settled Jamestown, the Mayflower’s passengers included dozens of families.

- Spend some time with the Mayflower Compact, signed off the coast of Cape Cod before the settlers went ashore. Emphasize the English tradition of the rule of law and of forms of democratic expression traced back at least to the Magna Carta. While it would still be decades before Thomas Hobbes and John Locke formulated the idea of the social contract, these Pilgrims made the social contract a reality. That is, facing a lawless wilderness (a state of nature) with families to protect and ex-convicts in their midst, the Pilgrims resorted to that English tradition of self-government under the rule of law—a social contract among themselves—with God as its ultimate judge. Both the Pilgrims at Plymouth in 1620 and the convening of the Virginia House of Burgesses down the coast at Jamestown in 1619, the first two successful English settlements, almost immediately practiced self-government. Self-government under law was therefore present at the very inception of America, a fact that makes America unique.
Note the terrible first winter the Pilgrims suffered at Plymouth, and how the Wampanoag Indians truly saved those who did survive. The next year, with the help of the Wampanoag, was a tremendous success, which Pilgrims and Native Americans together celebrated, and for which they gave thanks to God in what is considered America’s First Thanksgiving (notwithstanding a similar celebration in Spanish Florida in the previous century). Share accounts of this festive Thanksgiving from Edward Winslow and William Bradford.

Finally, discuss the founding of Massachusetts Bay Colony and the leadership of its first governor, John Winthrop. Like the Pilgrims, these Puritans were fierce critics of the Church of England. And like the Pilgrims, they saw the founding of a colony in New England as a sort of religious utopia. Unlike the Pilgrims, however, the Puritans at Massachusetts Bay sought not to separate from the Church of England but to establish a community that would help purify and correct the Church of England while remaining a part of it. As evident in Winthrop’s “A Modell of Christian Charity,” New England would convert Old England by its example. This settlement around Boston would be more of a theocracy than even its neighbor on Cape Cod. Together with Jamestown and Plymouth, the English had a beachhead in the New World, and the news spread far and wide across the Atlantic.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Tell of the founding and early years of either Jamestown, Plymouth, or Massachusetts Bay (2–3 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Taken together, how do the foundings of Jamestown, Plymouth, and Massachusetts Bay all demonstrate the principle and practice of self-government (1–2 paragraphs).
Reading Quiz 1.2

The British Colonies of North America | Lesson 2
Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1, Pages 3-11

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. What was one motivation for European exploration in the late 1400s?

2. What is one way that Europe was changing in the 1400s?

3. Which country got a head start on exploration, especially along the African coast?

4. Which Italian sailor successfully petition Spain to finance his voyage across the Atlantic?

5. What did this sailor believe he had found?
Reading Quiz 1.3

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. Which country did England defeat on the high seas in 1588, allowing England to be more deliberate about settling the New World?

2. What was England’s first successful colony in North America?

3. Who settled at Plymouth?

4. What legal agreement—named after a ship—proved an early example of social contract and self-government in the British colonies?

5. Who famously described the civilization the Puritans were establishing as a “city upon a hill”?
Unit 1 — Formative Quiz 1

Covering Lessons 1–2
10–15 minutes

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. What resources and advantages does this land afford for the flourishing of a developed civilization?

2. Where did the indigenous peoples of North and South America come from? How do we believe they came?

3. What events “unsettled” European civilization and influenced the decision to explore the seas beyond Europe?

4. How was England’s approach to settlement different from that of other countries?

5. What motivated the Pilgrims to settle at Plymouth? What were their goals?
Lesson 3 — The Colonies in Profile

Lesson Objective

Students learn about each of the thirteen colonies that would become the United States of America, including their foundings, topography, law, and economies, as well as the presence of indentured servitude and slavery.

Teacher Preparation

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts

- Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1
  Pages 25–27

- Primary Sources
  See below.

Teacher Texts

- Land of Hope
  Pages 25–30

- A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope
  Pages 22–23
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- The Great American Story
  Lecture 2

- American Heritage
  Lecture 2

Student Preparation

Assignment 1: Students read Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1, pages 25–27 and prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 2: Students read and annotate the Preface to the Frame of Government for Pennsylvania and An Act for Freedom of Conscience from Pennsylvania, and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).

Core Content in This Lesson

Geography & Places

| New Hampshire | Hudson River |
| Maryland      | New York    |
| Connecticut   | Pennsylvania|
| Rhode Island  | Philadelphia|
| Delaware      | Georgia     |
| Carolina      | New England Colonies |
| New Jersey    | Middle Colonies |
Southern Colonies
West Indies

The Congo
Gold Coast

Persons
Lord Baltimore
Roger Williams
Henry Hudson
Peter Stuyvesant
William Penn
James Oglethorpe
Olaudah Equiano

Terms and Topics
proprietary charter
royal charter
Harvard College
public education
Catholics
Toleration Act
Fundamental Orders
of Connecticut
religious freedom
township
county
piracy
Quakers
self-government
colonial assemblies
colonial governors
Roman Republic
mercantilism
free market
Navigation Acts
militia
Triangle Trade
indentured servitude
chattel slavery
Asante Empire
slave ships
Middle Passage
Deism
individualism
aristocracy

Primary Sources
Preface to the Frame of Government of Pennsylvania
An Act for Freedom of Conscience in Pennsylvania

Timeline
1607 Jamestown founded
1620 Pilgrims found Plymouth
1630 Puritans found Massachusetts Bay

Images
Historical figures and events
Landscape pictures of geographic places featured in this lesson
Map of the Triangle Trade
Blueprint of a slave ship
Depictions of indentured servants and then slaves in the colonies
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Roger Williams’s statements and efforts to establish religious toleration in Rhode Island
- The successful English takeover of New Amsterdam from the Dutch
- Adriaen van der Donck’s account of Peter Stuyvesant’s governance in New York
- James Oglethorpe’s attempts and failure to establish a debtors’ haven in Georgia
- Accounts from the Salem Witch Trials
- Anthony and Mary Johnson’s accumulation of significant property
- Selections from Olaudah Equiano’s *The Interesting Narrative of the Life of Olaudah Equiano*
- The lives and accomplishments of Cuffee Slocum and Paul Cuffe in New England
- Jean Bion’s account of life on a French slave ship

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- How may the English approach to settlement and colonization be best described?
- In what ways did different groups of European settlers see the New World as a place of opportunity and restoration?
- What was unique about religion in the colonies and in the eyes of the law?
- What were the roles of literacy and learning among the colonists?
- What is meant by self-government? How might it be said that the colonists governed themselves?
- What was distinctive about property ownership in the colonies?
- How did colonial economies vary from region to region?
- What was indentured servitude? How is it similar to and different from slavery?
- What are the origins of slavery in world history?
- How were Africans first enslaved, before being brought to the Western Hemisphere?
- What was it like to be an African on the Middle Passage and then a slave in the New World?
- How were African slaves distributed in the New World? What proportions of Africans were taken to which parts?
- How did slavery gradually expand and become sanctioned in law?
- What were the chief characteristics of the “American” colonists? What gave them these characteristics?
- How were the colonies’ leading citizens distinct from the aristocracies of Europe?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 14: Many documents influenced the U.S. Constitution. Name one.
  - Question 73: The colonists came to America for many reasons. Name one.
  - Question 75: What group of people was taken and sold as slaves?

KEYS TO THE LESSON

Teaching the histories of each colony helps students to understand and appreciate the humble origins of the future United States. It is also very revealing. Students can see in the early histories of many colonies the beginnings of traits that would eventually be hallmarks of American society, law, and citizenry.
Teachers might best plan and teach The Colonies in Profile with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Try to teach the colonies in the order in which they were founded (i.e., as listed above in “Geography and Places”). A map may be projected and distributed to students for reference as the lesson proceeds from colony to colony.
- Compare with students the basic structural differences between French, Spanish, and English colonies; i.e., the native fur trade (France), tributary native labor and precious metals (Spain), and settlement agriculture (England). There are mostly accidental historical reasons for why these three powers’ empires developed as they did, and these factors then had determinative long-term consequences.
- Note the seemingly haphazard approach the English took to colonization, largely shaped by the monarch and parliamentary politics in England at the time of each colonial settlement. For one, colonization was decentralized, and most of the original colonies were established as private property ventures, often sanctioned by the crown but really in the possession of private individuals through joint-stock companies. These were then populated not with government officials or hired agents but with men of all ranks who were also seeking their own opportunity, freedom, and plot of land. Both of these features accounted for the lack of an overall master plan for colonizing North America and marked important departures from the approaches taken by Spain, Portugal, and France. This lack of a plan would become a problem later when England would seek to centralize the administration of the colonies, largely in an effort to raise revenue and enforce the sovereignty of Parliament.
- Help students to understand the importance of these traits. Not only did the English approach to colonization trend toward greater independence from the monarchy, it also attracted and encouraged individuals and families who were independent-minded and determined. What the settlers did not bring with them from Europe were the legal class distinctions that defined the aristocratic and monarchial nations they left behind. These individuals (except for their British governors) were common people who immigrated to America seeking their freedom and to better their station in life. The rugged individualism, practice of personal independence, work ethic, and ingenuity to succeed would become well-known American characteristics and in some cases would result in the formation of new colonies by separation from an existing colony, as was the case in New England.
- Spend time on what it meant to make a living and survive in the daunting wilderness and how such perseverance shaped the character and mind of the colonists. This would include looking at lifestyles and kinds of work done in the colonies, the type of self-reliance necessary for such lives, and the ways in which Christian religious beliefs contributed to how communities functioned.
- Consider how strongly matters of religious faith defined colonial culture, largely because so many came to America to escape the religious persecutions or limitations of the Old World. From the Pilgrims and the Puritans to Roman Catholics and Jews, a wide variety of faiths (most of them Christian and many of whom were intolerant of one another in the Old World) permeated colonial settlements, and their adherents increasingly came to respect one another as neighbors. Establishing this religious freedom in law, moreover, was widespread and exceptional compared to the rest of the world, even while events such as the persecution of the Quakers in Massachusetts still occurred.
- Note also for the students that the diversity of religious belief was accompanied by the diversity of immigrants. New York and Rhode Island, for example, were well known for the number of people who had migrated there from many countries other than the British Isles.
• Help students appreciate that colonial America was highly literate and that the leading members of colonial society and government were educated in classical thought, ancient and contemporary history, and philosophy and politics (including thinkers of the moderate Enlightenment). Such high levels of literacy and learning were unheard of anywhere else in the world. Important factors that contributed to this high degree of literacy among the people was the insistence on being able to read the Bible, broad support for education, and collegiate preparation.

• Emphasize with students the degree of self-government that the colonists exercised. Include in this discussion the meaning of self-government. In brief, the colonists largely governed their own internal affairs (rule over local matters, including taxation, as opposed to international trade and security) through local legislatures and governance structures chosen by the people. This was partly due to the English tradition of legislative authority and the rule of law, the loose and decentralized pattern of British colonial settlements and rule compared to other empires. Another factor at play here was the great distance between London and the American eastern seaboard, which led to long periods of “benign neglect” of the colonies and the further development of local institutions of self-government. While all of the colonies would eventually become official royal colonies with royal governors, colony-wide legislative bodies were prolific, as were local governments such as townships, counties, and cities. Unlike almost every place in the world at that time and in history, the people were to a large extent ruling themselves. Read with students the various examples of self-government as enacted by colonial legislatures, such as the Preface to the Frame of Government of Pennsylvania and an Act for Freedom of Conscience in Pennsylvania.

• Outline for students the near universal ownership of firearms among the colonists for self-defense, for hunting, and, when necessary, for the common self-defense.

• Discuss how private property opportunities and protections enabled commoners to earn their livelihood in freedom and contributed to the characteristics of Americans as industrious and independent.

• Explain to students the several kinds of trade and vocational trades present in the various colonies. Farming was, of course, the main livelihood, but manufacturing, fishing, whaling, shipbuilding, and other trades (particularly in New England) rapidly emerged as key colonial contributions. Trade was principally with England, but the British colonies of North America developed robust trade among one another and with the colonies of other nations as well.

• Share with students the complex patterns of relationship between the colonists and Native Americans. The relationships ran the gamut from friendly to violent, varying widely depending on the tribe involved, with misunderstandings and clashes of cultures and languages. Disagreements abounded over the concepts of communal versus private property. Violent clashes occurred along the edges of the colonial frontier, and cross-frontier retaliations by both sides were not uncommon. Colonists could be caught in conflicts between various Native American tribes, and likewise, Native Americans were often caught in conflicts between European powers. Systematic displacement of Native Americans was usually limited to localities during this period (such as after King Philip’s War in southern New England and through the Indian slave trade on the South Carolina frontier). Displacement over time was primarily due to devastation from disease and gradual, individual settlement westward.

• Mention that a number of colonists criticized some of the ways that colonial governments dealt with Native Americans. These also condemned and sought to remove slavery from their colonies. Arguments for justice toward Native Americans and Africans often cited Christian religious beliefs and moral philosophy.
Review with students the emergence of chattel slavery during the Renaissance in Europe and through colonization, then address slavery in what would become the future United States. When teaching students about the history of slavery in the British colonies of North America, be mindful of the following:

- Help students to understand why a full understanding of the human person, of equality, and of justice all make slavery an evil action and practice, violating the principle that all people are equal in their humanity and possession of natural rights. Therefore, no one person may automatically infringe on the humanity or rights of another unless some initial violation of another’s rights has occurred.

- Discuss with students how racism is the belief that some people are superior or inferior to others based on race, racial characteristics, or ancestry, how racism arises from a failure to recognize the equal dignity and value of each human being, and how racism manifests itself through the voluntary acts of individual people, both private words and actions and public speech and actions, such as laws and regulations.

- Discuss the history of slavery in world history, from ancient times through the middle ages and in different places, leading up to the transatlantic slave trade. Portugal first began using African slaves on their sugar plantations off the west African coast, manifesting the chattel and race-based aspects of slavery in European colonies. The slave trade gradually made its way to the various colonies established throughout the Western Hemisphere, particularly with the cultivation of sugar cane in the Caribbean.

- Ask students to imagine the Middle Passage and the barbarities of slavery and the slave trade. Overall, of the nearly 11 million Africans who survived being brought to the Western Hemisphere, around 3 percent, or about 350,000, were brought to the North American continent, with the rest of all Africans taken to other colonies in the Caribbean and South America.

- As mentioned in the previous lesson, the first Africans were brought to Jamestown by an English privateer who had captured a Portuguese slave ship en route from Africa, likely headed for Portugal’s South American colonies.

- Discuss the similarities and differences between slavery and indentured servitude. Indentured servitude was a common way for those who could not afford passage or to establish themselves in the New World to tie themselves to a sponsor for a number of years, offering free labor in exchange for passage across the Atlantic and shelter in the colonies. Oftentimes indentured servitude was not much different from slavery in its practice, as shown in transcripts from court cases of indentured servants claiming relief from a cruel master.

- It would be several decades before a law emerged in the southern colonies that concerned African colonists in particular or the practice of slavery. In 1662, forty-three years after the arrival of the first Africans at Jamestown, Virginia’s commanding general determined that a child born to an enslaved woman would also be a “servant for life,” and in 1668, corporal punishment for slaves was permitted in law. These appear to be the first laws regarding slavery in colonial America.

- The transatlantic slave trade grew with the sugar cane plantations of the Caribbean as far back as the early 1500s—plantations which also happened to become England’s most valuable colonies. At the same time, the source of labor shifted away from indigenous peoples, European convicts, and indentured servants to slaves. Although slavery was more widespread in the southern colonies (to grow tobacco and rice) and almost
universal in England’s Caribbean sugar plantations, few laws explicitly prohibited the practice in most colonies, at least at certain times in their histories. Consider also the early abolitionist efforts of some colonists, the Quakers, for example.

- Show students maps of the colonies around 1630, 1700, and 1730 that illustrate the real extent of settlement. They should see that the colonists mostly resided only along the Atlantic coast, still hardly a foothold compared to the vastness of the continental interior, the extent of which they did not yet fathom.

- Reflect with students on the unique American character that emerged among the free British colonists in North America. The harshness and risk of settling the New World gave them a certain grit and determination, along with an enterprising mind and innovative skill set. The universal demand for trade skills and farming in establishing a new civilization placed the vast majority of colonists within what we would call today the “working class.” In New England especially, colonists’ Protestantism made them widely literate for the sake of reading the Bible, skeptical of human sources of authority, and focused on individual improvement. At the same time, it made them highly idealistic, with many seeking to re-found Christendom. For many colonists, previous persecution granted them a deeper and more passionate sense of justice, of right and wrong. It also made them highly attuned to the politics on which freedom depended. A certain rugged, enterprising, and justice-loving individualism defined the colonists.

- Explain how a sort of unofficial aristocracy emerged throughout the colonies, but an aristocracy open to promotion by the meritorious; that is, based on merit, talent, and virtue instead of mere heredity. This unofficial class of leading citizens was also modeled more on the English gentleman rather than on the courts of continental Europe. Their stations in life ranged from planters in the south, where the aristocratic element was most prevalent, to clergy, merchants, professors, and manufacturers in the north. And in general, all of them were highly learned.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Explain how lifestyle varied between colonies (1–2 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Explain the origins of slavery, the transatlantic slave trade, and slavery in the New World (1–2 paragraphs).
Reading Quiz 1.4

The British Colonies of North America | Lesson 3
Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1, Pages 25-27

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question.

1. What was the name of the main religious group in Pennsylvania, founded by one of their members, William Penn?

2. Which colony was founded as a place for those who could not repay their debts to begin life anew?

3. Which colony was originally founded for Catholics, but quickly became majority Protestant?
Name__________________________ Date__________

Unit 1 — Formative Quiz 2

Covering Lesson 3
10–15 minutes

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. In what ways did different groups of European settlers see the New World as a place of opportunity and restoration?

2. What were the roles of literacy and learning among the colonists?

3. What are the origins of slavery in world history?

4. How did slavery gradually expand and become sanctioned in law?

5. How were the colonies’ leading citizens distinct from the aristocracies of Europe?
Lesson 4 — Major Events in the Colonies

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the major events and movements in colonial America and further study the ideas and experiences that were shaping the colonists during what Edmund Burke called the period of “salutary neglect.”

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
Land of Hope Young Reader's Edition, Volume 1 Pages 12–14, 28–36
Primary Sources See below.

Teacher Texts
Land of Hope Pages 14–20, 31–42
A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope Pages 15–19, 29–32

Online.Hillsdale.edu
The Great American Story Lectures 2 and 3
American Heritage Lectures 2 and 3

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students read Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1, pages 12–14 and 28–36, and prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 2: Students read and annotate excerpts from John Locke’s Second Treatise of Government and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places
Appalachian Mountains Mississippi River
Allegheny Mountains New Orleans
Ohio River Valley Quebec
The Great Lakes Montreal
Canada Duquesne
St. Lawrence River

Copyright © 2022 Hillsdale College. All Rights Reserved.
Persons

Thomas Hobbes
John Locke
Jonathan Edwards
George III

William Pitt
George Washington
Benjamin Franklin

Terms and Topics

King Philip’s War
Queen Anne’s War
Navigation Acts
English Civil War
The Enlightenment
Bacon’s Rebellion
Glorious Revolution
English Bill of Rights
“salutary neglect”
representation
self-government
township
The Great Awakening
Poor Richard’s Almanac
French and Indian War
Iroquois Confederacy
Battle of Jumonville Glen
Albany Congress
Fort Duquesne
Treaty of Paris

Primary Sources

Magna Carta
English Bill of Rights
Second Treatise of Government, John Locke

To Know by Heart

Selections from George Washington’s “Rules of Civility & Decent Behavior in Company and Conversation,” such as:
- “Be not apt to relate news if you know not the truth thereof.”
- “Speak not evil of the absent for it is unjust.”
- “Use no Reproachfull Language against any one neither Curse nor Revile.”

Timeline

1688 Glorious Revolution; English Bill of Rights
1754–63 The French and Indian War

Images

Historical figures and events
Dress of colonists from different periods and places
Uniforms and munitions of soldiers in the various wars
Depictions of battles and battlefields, including strategy and tactics, such as the Siege of Louisbourg
Colonial assembly buildings
Depictions of Great Awakening gatherings and revival scenes
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- A sermon by Jonathan Edwards
- George Washington and the cherry tree (legend)
- George Washington’s time as a surveyor
- George Washington’s first battles in the Virginia militia, including his survival and Braddock’s death
- John Winslow’s account of the Acadians during the French and Indian War
- Benjamin Franklin’s autobiography

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What was it like to wage war in North America during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries?
- What did the colonists learn from the English Civil War?
- Which ancient and Enlightenment figures and ideas influenced the leading colonists?
- What were John Locke’s ideas on natural law, natural rights, and the social contract? To what extent had these already been reflected in English law and, therefore, in colonial law?
- What is “salutary neglect”? In what senses were the colonists neglected and how was this neglect actually beneficial to them?
- What did self-government look like in the colonies?
- How did the Great Awakening contribute to a greater sense of unity between the colonies?
- What were the causes of the French and Indian War?
- What were the major battles and moments in the French and Indian War?
- What was the Albany Plan of Union? What did it reveal about the relationships among the colonies?
- Why did the British defeat the French in the French and Indian War?
- How did the Treaty of Paris reshape North America?
- What challenges and opportunities did the British and the British colonists face with the changes wrought by the Treaty of Paris?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 13: What is the rule of law?
  - Question 85: Benjamin Franklin is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 86: George Washington is famous for many things. Name one.

KEYS TO THE LESSON

Having learned about the establishment and characteristics of each colony, students should consider the major influences and events that shaped colonial history. These include, of course, events that occurred within the colonies themselves, but also certain ideas and events in Europe that had significant influence on the colonists, too. Treatment of the Enlightenment and the English Civil War does not need to be extensive in an American history class, but students should understand how these events affected and informed the colonists. Once the lesson enters the eighteenth century, special focus should be placed on the events that created in the colonists a sense of independence from Great Britain and of greater dependence on one another, even as they themselves did not fully recognize or articulate these trends. In general, this lesson should help students see what the colonists and colonies had become before they learn about the American founding.
Teachers might best plan and teach Major Events in the Colonies with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Review with students the relationships between Native Americans and the settlers. Note the variety of relationships and circumstances over time, helping students to recognize how much time colonial history spans. Disease was the main factor that sent the Native Americans into decline. When significant conflict did occur, it often involved an entangling of rivalries among Native American tribes and those of European powers and their colonies. In light of such conflicts, American colonists in particular were well versed in defending themselves with their own arms and in locally assembled citizen militias.

- Teach students about the various wars that occurred in the New World, either between settlers and Native Americans or with colonies of other countries. A lot of detail is not necessary, but students should appreciate that these wars were significant for those who were endangered by them and left largely to their own defenses. Students should also be introduced to the style, strategy, and tactics of seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century warfare, particularly as waged in North America.

- For a time, it was the Puritans who wound up in power in England. As Englishmen, the colonists followed the events of strife from across the ocean. Discuss with students the English Civil War, which involved and influenced some of the main political thought of the colonists, as well as the Glorious Revolution a few decades later. These political developments informed the colonists and drew their careful attention to political considerations.

- Read and discuss with students excerpts from the Magna Carta and the English Bill of Rights to show that there is a long history of understanding that a "fundamental law" exists, and that regardless of particular political institutions (such as the King or Parliament), that fundamental law grants rights and liberties.

- Review or discuss the intellectual influences on the Americans, particularly those who were the colonists’ unofficial aristocracy. In addition to a Judeo-Christian faith tradition and Greco-Roman philosophy and law, the Enlightenment also influenced leading colonists. Students should understand some of the Enlightenment's main principles and thinkers. In addition to the English Enlightenment's influence on Britain's North American colonists in general, Enlightenment ideas on politics were of special interest to a people governing themselves and carefully observing political events taking place back in England.

- Read with students some of the emblematic thought of John Locke—especially the social contract theory—that leading colonists would entertain in the mid-eighteenth century.

- Consider with students the English statesman Edmund Burke's idea that the colonists in British North America enjoyed a relationship of "salutary neglect" with respect to the English government. They were "neglected" in the sense that they were a month away by sea from England, which meant poor communication and the near impossibility of governing directly. The English also largely overlooked their colonies in North America, sometimes viewing the colonists merely as poor tradesmen, former criminals, religious radicals, and commoners of no noble birth. Compared to England's Caribbean colonies, they were also far less profitable. England's preoccupation with rivals Spain and France and her own civil war also left English kings and Parliament with relatively little thought to give the colonies. The mercantilist restrictions on trade, moreover, were seldom fully enforced or even capable of being completely enforced, and the colonies largely traded freely with the world.
Help students understand why this relationship of neglect was not, in Burke’s view, a disadvantage but actually healthy for the colonists. Overall, the colonists were still protected, especially on the seas, by the English. At the same time, however, they were not regulated or administratively directed beyond the general forms of governance; e.g., a royal governor and a local legislature. The colonists were largely free to take the enterprising, individualist spirit of common English settlers and, forced by necessity, to innovate and work hard to pursue livelihoods and security within their own spheres. Laws, moreover, could not wait for a two- or three-month lapse in communication. Colonists were both permitted and forced by circumstances to practice the elements of English law they had brought with them, including a recognition of certain rights and the limits of authority. The colonists had ample talent and opportunity to govern themselves: they had education and a group of leading colonists who were learned in classical thought; they had the English rule of law tradition; and they had general Enlightenment ideas. This tradition of self-government would allow for many generations of practice in self-rule as a feature of daily life. The colonists, therefore, were both used to and deeply practiced in locally governing themselves, replete with the ideas and habits that this process cultivated.

Briefly spend time reviewing the institutional forms that self-government took in the colonies. In general, representation by election determined the composition of the various colonial assemblies, beginning with the Virginia House of Burgesses in 1619. That representative self-government was the norm in the colonies was astonishing compared to the rest of the world and human history. The creation of the township was also a uniquely colonial American establishment, and the participation by the average colonist in local government was widespread.

Clarify for students that each colony originally did not see itself as part of a shared English colonial political state. Although their own proprietary charters were eventually replaced with royal charters, each colony viewed itself as its own separate entity, only loosely bound to the others by a common mother country and overall shared culture. This view would persist up to the eve of the Revolution.

Explore with students how the Great Awakening throughout the colonies provided the separate and distinct colonies with something they could hold in common. At the same time, it awakened a passion for right moral conduct and justice that could be attached to any cause.

Teach students about the various conflicts in which the British colonists of North America found themselves. Spend some time in particular with the French and Indian War. Of special note here is the presence of a young George Washington and the Virginia militia fighting alongside the British regulars. This is a good opportunity to introduce Washington, including his boyhood biography and his exploits in the war, and especially his actions during the attack on General Braddock. The French and Indian War was also important for providing the colonists another shared experience, this time amidst the adversities of war, and for demonstrating increased cooperation and a sense of unity, as evidenced by the Albany Congress. This is also a good place to introduce the architect of the Albany congress and plan, Benjamin Franklin, including teaching about his biography up to this juncture. In addition to fostering advances toward and experiences in united action, the French and Indian War is also of great importance for understanding the circumstances that would lead to the American Revolution.

Share with students maps showing the transfer of territory to the British Empire through the Treaty of Paris. Discuss with students what this meant for the relative power of Great Britain and
France and the new challenges and opportunities inherent in such a sudden change of territory and power.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Explain the major events and ideas that influenced American colonists' views of government (1–2 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Tell the story of the French and Indian War (1–2 paragraphs).
Reading Quiz 1.5

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question.

1. What major disruption in Europe would have a significant influence on the future British colonies in North America?

2. Name one major event from the 1600s in England that the author mentions.

3. How was George Washington involved in the French and Indian War?

4. What was the Great Awakening about?

5. What was the Enlightenment about?
APPENDIX A

Study Guide

Test

Writing Assignment
Unit 1 Test — Study Guide

TIMELINE

When given chronological dates, match events from a list to the years or dates that they happened.

Oct. 12, 1492    Columbus lands on San Salvador Island
1607           Jamestown settled
1619           Africans disembark at Jamestown; first meeting of the Virginia House of Burgesses
1620           Pilgrims settle Plymouth
1688           Glorious Revolution; English Bill of Rights
1730s          The Great Awakening
1754–63        The French and Indian War

GEOGRAPHY AND PLACES

Identify each on a map and/or tell where it is and explain its significance.

Genoa                     Plymouth                     The Great Lakes
San Salvador/Watling’s Island Massachusetts Bay Canada
“The New World”            Boston                         Mississippi River
La Florida                 New England Colonies New Orleans
St. Augustine             Middle Colonies                      Quebec
Virginia                   Southern Colonies                Montreal
Roanoke                    Appalachian Mountains       Duquesne
Jamestown                  Allegheny Mountains

PERSONS

Identify each, provide biographical details, and explain what he or she thought or did in specific periods or events.

Leif Erikson                John Rolfe                     Thomas Hobbes
Ferdinand and Isabella     William Bradford                John Locke
Christopher Columbus       Massasoit                     Jonathan Edwards
Ponce de Leon               John Winthrop                  George III
Amerigo Vespucci           Roger Williams                  George Washington
John Smith                  William Penn                   Benjamin Franklin
Pocahontas
TERMS AND TOPICS

Identify each and explain its significance to the period of history studied.

| glaciers | tobacco | chattel slavery |
| land bridge | House of Burgesses | Middle Passage |
| Hopewell | Pilgrims | Deism |
| urban | Mayflower | individualism |
| rural | commoner | aristocracy |
| Silk Road | religious freedom | King Philip’s War |
| nation-states | state of nature | English Civil War |
| Niña, Pinta, and Santa María | social contract | The Enlightenment |
| Taíno | self-government | Glorious Revolution |
| “Indians” | Wampanoag | English Bill of Rights |
| conquistadors | Puritans | “salutary neglect” |
| Columbian Exchange | public education | representation |
| smallpox | Fundamental Orders of Connecticut | The Great Awakening |
| joint-stock companies | religious freedom | French and Indian War |
| Virginia Company | colonial assemblies | Albany Congress |
| indentured servants | militia | Fort Duquesne |
| Powhatan | Triangle Trade | Treaty of Paris |

PRIMARY SOURCES

Based on annotations and notes from seminar conversations, be able to answer questions on each primary source. While you will not necessarily be asked why each primary source was created, what it did or argued, and what its effects were, being able to answer these kinds of questions will make you well-prepared.

The Mayflower Compact
“A Modell of Christian Charity,” John Winthrop
Magna Carta
English Bill of Rights
Second Treatise of Government, John Locke

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be third grade students.

- Christopher Columbus’s voyages and interactions with natives
- The “Starving Time” at Jamestown
- Pocahontas, John Smith, and John Rolfe
- The voyage of the Mayflower
- Accounts of the First Thanksgiving by Edward Winslow and William Bradford
- George Washington and the cherry tree (legend)
- George Washington’s time as a surveyor
- George Washington’s first battles in the Virginia militia, including his survival and Braddock’s death
- Benjamin Franklin’s autobiography

**QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND**

*Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.*

**Lesson 1 | The Lands, Waters, and Peoples of America**

- What resources and advantages does North America afford for the flourishing of a developed civilization? How does it compare to other places in the world?
- Where did the indigenous peoples of North and South America come from? How do we believe they came?
- What kinds of civilizations did different groups of indigenous peoples establish in different parts of the Americas?

**Lesson 2 | Exploration and Settlement**

- What was Christopher Columbus’s theory?
- What were some of the ways in which Christopher Columbus’s voyages changed the world?
- In which ways was Christopher Columbus successful, and in which did he fail?
- From where do we get the name “America”?
- What two things happened in Jamestown in 1619?
- What motivated the Pilgrims to settle at Plymouth? What were their goals?
- Why did the Pilgrims draft and sign the Mayflower Compact?
- Based on John Winthrop’s writings, how did the Puritans at Massachusetts Bay envision their lives and the task before them in North America?

**Lesson 3 | The Colonies in Profile**

- How may the English approach to settlement and colonization be best described?
- In what ways did the settlers and later colonists express a hope for renewal and restoration in the New World?
- What was unique about religion in the colonies and in the eyes of the law?
- What were the roles of literacy and learning among the colonists?
- What is meant by self-government? How might it be said that the colonists governed themselves?
- What was indentured servitude? How is it similar to and different from slavery?
- What are the origins of slavery in world history?
- What was it like to be an African on the Middle Passage and then a slave in the New World?
- How did slavery gradually expand and become sanctioned in law?
- What were the chief characteristics of the “American” colonists? What gave them these characteristics?
- In what sense was there an “unofficial aristocracy” in the colonies? What made it “unofficial” and how was it distinct from the aristocracies of Europe?
Lesson 4 | Major Events in the Colonies

☐ What did the colonists learn from the English Civil War?
☐ Which ancient and Enlightenment figures and ideas influenced the leading colonists?
☐ What were John Locke’s ideas on natural law, natural rights, and the social contract? To what extent had these already been reflected in English law and, therefore, in colonial law?
☐ What is “salutary neglect”? In what senses were the colonists neglected and how was this neglect actually beneficial to them?
☐ How did the Great Awakening contribute to a greater sense of unity between the colonies?
☐ What were the causes of the French and Indian War?
☐ In what ways did the French and Indian War foster a greater unity among the colonies?
☐ What was the Albany Plan of Union? What did it reveal about the relationships among the colonies?
☐ How did the Treaty of Paris reshape North America?
☐ What challenges and opportunities did the British and the British colonists face with the changes wrought by the Treaty of Paris?
Unit 1 | Test — The British Colonies of North America

TIMELINE

Write the letter of each event next to the date or years it took place.

- Oct. 12, 1492 — A. Africans disembark at Jamestown; first meeting of the Virginia House of Burgesses
- 1607 — B. Columbus lands on San Salvador Island
- 1619 — C. Glorious Revolution; English Bill of Rights
- 1620 — D. Jamestown settled
- 1688 — E. Pilgrims settle Plymouth
- 1730s — F. The French and Indian War
- 1754–63 — G. The Great Awakening

GEOGRAPHY AND PLACES

1. Label with dots and/or circle:
   - Jamestown
   - Plymouth
   - Boston
   - Appalachian Mountains
   - Ohio River Valley
   - The Great Lakes
   - Mississippi River
   - New Orleans
   - Quebec
   - Montreal
   - Duquesne

PERSONS, TERMS, AND TOPICS

Fill in the blank.

2. England’s first attempt at establishing a permanent settlement in North America was the _______ in present-day North Carolina. The experiment failed, however, when the colony disappeared without a trace four years into its existence.
3. England’s second attempt at colonization nearly failed on two occasions, and the settlers had a fraught relationship with the local Powhatan tribe. The eventual success of __________ came largely from __________’s successful cultivation of tobacco, which was exported to Europe at a great profit.

4. Not tolerated in England, the __________ were dismissed on a religious journey to Virginia under the leadership of William Bradford. Instead of settling in Virginia, however, they landed far to the north on the North American coast at Cape Cod and established __________

5. Originally founded by the Dutch, __________ was seized by the British in 1664. This meager but ideal harbor town at the mouth of the Hudson River, with commerce moving between Manhattan Island and Long Island, would become the largest city in the Americas.

6. Pennsylvania was named after its founder, __________, who intended the colony to be a haven for Quakers and a place that would tolerate different religions.

7. John Calvert, Lord of Baltimore, Ireland, founded __________ as a refuge for persecuted Catholics from England. Quickly, however, Catholics found themselves in a minority.

8. With an economy based on the large plantation farming of tobacco, indigo, and rice, the __________ colonies developed an aristocratic society and culture of leisure dependent upon a lower class of slaves and yeoman farmers.

9. The British colonies in North America were part of a trade pattern that included England, Caribbean colonies, and African colonies. The American colonies exported cod, ships, lumber, rum, iron, whale oil, tobacco, indigo, and other raw materials to England, and they imported guns, clothes, furniture, paper, and tea from England and slaves from Africa. Historians named this trade system after the shape its trade routes made on a map of the Atlantic: the __________.

10. The colonists’ relationship with England left them both free to establish their own governmental structures and in need of doing so. While the emergence of government institutions did not follow any set pattern, such institutions were all based on the English law tradition, they developed organically, and they epitomized American rule by the people, called __________.

11. Power struggles often arose within colonial governments between the elected assemblies and the royally appointed __________. There thus emerged a long pattern of colonial power challenging and usually proving superior to English authority within the colonies, partly due to claims of power originating from the people themselves.

12. Agreed to in 1215 by King John and the English barons, the __________, or “Great Charter,” was the first English pronouncement of the rule of law. Together with the Mayflower Compact and the English Bill of Rights, which concluded the Glorious Revolution, the colonists drew many ideas and much language from these principal English legal precedents.
13. The philosophy of the British Enlightenment thinker __________________ defined an increasingly popular idea in England and in the colonies: that of a social contract that would allot power in a political body beholden to the people in order to preserve and protect the natural rights human beings equally enjoyed by virtue of their humanity.

14. Of the ancient Greek and Roman political philosophers, the American aristocracy was influenced far more by the ancient __________________, especially regarding their understanding that a republic ultimately rests on the virtue of its citizens.

15. Irish Member of Parliament Edmund Burke captured the idea that England’s relative neglect of the colonies contributed to the colonists’ successful governance of themselves in the phrase __________________.

16. As the population of the colonies doubled every generation, westward expansion brought the British into conflict not only with Native Americans but also with the French in Canada, especially over who controlled the very fertile and wild lands west of the _______Mountains known as the Ohio River Valley.

17. ___________________ began his career as a surveyor from Virginia. His experience mapping and camping in the uncharted wilderness motivated him at age nineteen to join the Virginia militia, in which he rose to the rank of Major General.

18. To gain a secure alliance with the Iroquois Confederacy and to foster inter-colony cooperation during the French and Indian War, the seven most northern colonies met at the Albany Congress under the direction of the accomplished printer, thinker, statesman, and inventor from Philadelphia named __________________. While their plan for union was not adopted by the colonies, it was the first instance of united action among the several American colonies, and it became a model for future colonial cooperation.

**STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART**

*In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be third grade students.*

19. Christopher Columbus’s various interactions with Native Americans.
20. An account of the “Starving Time” at Jamestown.

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and writing should be employed, and responses must fully answer each question.

21. Where did the indigenous peoples of North and South America come from? How do we believe they came?

22. What motivated the Pilgrims to settle at Plymouth? What were their goals?

23. Why did the Pilgrims draft and sign the Mayflower Compact?

24. What are the origins of slavery in world history?

25. What was it like to be an African on the Middle Passage and then a slave in the New World?

26. What did the colonists learn from the English Civil War?
27. What is “salutary neglect”? In what senses were the colonists neglected and how was this neglect actually beneficial to them?

28. What were the causes of the French and Indian War?

29. How did the Treaty of Paris reshape North America?
Unit 1 | Writing Assignment — The British Colonies of North America

DIRECTIONS

Citing events and primary sources in your argument, write a 4–5 paragraph essay answering the question:

What are the most important historical moments or ideas in the history of the thirteen colonies, from the founding of Jamestown through the French and Indian War?
APPENDIX B

Primary Sources

Christopher Columbus
The Pilgrims
John Winthrop
William Penn
First Pennsylvania Provincial Assembly
John of England
Parliament of England
John Locke
ADMIRAL CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS

To King Ferdinand II of Aragon and Queen Isabella I of Castile

LETTER

February 15, 1493

The Niña | The Atlantic Ocean

BACKGROUND

Christopher Columbus informed King Ferdinand II of the discoveries on his first voyage in this letter from early 1493.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What does Christopher Columbus find on his voyage?

2. How does Columbus describe the islands?

3. How do the Native Americans treat Columbus and his crew?

4. What is the culture of the Native Americans as described by Columbus?

5. Why does Columbus believe his voyage was important?

---

Christopher Columbus, “Letter to King Ferdinand II,” American Studies at the University of Virginia, https://xroads.virginia.edu/~Hyper/HNS/Garden/columbus.html.
SIR: Since I know that you will be pleased at the great victory with which Our Lord has crowned my voyage, I write this to you, from which you will learn how in thirty-three days I passed from the Canary Islands to the Indies, with the fleet which the most illustrious King and Queen, our Sovereigns, gave to me. There I found very many islands, filled with innumerable people, and I have taken possession of them all for their Highnesses, done by proclamation and with the royal standard unfurled, and no opposition was offered to me.

To the first island which I found I gave the name "San Salvador," in remembrance of the Divine Majesty, Who had marvellously bestowed all this... To the second, I gave the name the island of "Santa Maria de Concepcion," to the third, "Fernandina," to the fourth, "Isabella," to the fifth island, "Juana," and so each received from me a new name.

When I came to Juana, I followed its coast to the westward, and I found it to be so extensive that I thought that it must be the mainland, the province of Cathay. And since there were neither towns nor villages on the seashore, but small hamlets only, with the people of which I could not have speech because they all fled immediately, I went forward on the same course, thinking that I could not fail to find great cities or towns. At the end of many leagues, seeing that there was no change and that the coast was bearing me northwards, which I wished to avoid, since winter was already approaching and I proposed to make from it to the south, and as, moreover, the wind was carrying me forward, I determined not to wait for a change in the weather and retraced my path as far as a remarkable harbour known to me. From that point, I sent two men inland to learn if there were a king or great cities. They travelled three days' journey, finding an infinity of
small hamlets and people without number, but nothing of importance. For this reason, they returned.

I understood sufficiently from other Indians, whom I had already taken, that this land was nothing but an island, and I therefore followed its coast eastward for one hundred and seven leagues to the point where it ended. From that point, I saw another island, distant about eighteen leagues from the first, to the east, and to it I at once gave the name "Espanola." I went there and followed its northern coast, as I had followed that of Juana, to the eastward for one hundred and eighty-eight great leagues in a straight line. This island and all the others are very fertile to a limitless degree, and this island is extremely so. In it there are many harbours on the coast of the sea, beyond comparison with others that I know in Christendom, and many rivers, good and large, which is marvellous. Its lands are high; there are in it many sierras and very lofty mountains, beyond comparison with that of Tenerife. All are most beautiful, of a thousand shapes; all are accessible and are filled with trees of a thousand kinds and tall, so that they seem to touch the sky. I am told that they never lose their foliage, and this I can believe, for I saw them as green and lovely as they are in Spain in May, and some of them were flowering, some bearing fruit, and some at another stage, according to their nature. The nightingale was singing and other birds of a thousand kinds, in the month of November, there where I went. There are six or eight kinds of palm, which are a wonder to behold on account of their beautiful variety, but so are the other trees and fruits and plants. In it are marvellous pine groves; there are very wide and fertile plains, and there is honey; and there are birds
of many kinds and fruits in great diversity. In the interior, there are mines of metals, and the population is without number.

Espanola is a marvel. The sierras and the mountains, the plains, the champaigns, are so lovely and so rich for planting and sowing, for breeding cattle of every kind, for building towns and villages. The harbours of the sea here are such as cannot be believed to exist unless they have been seen, and so with the rivers, many and great, and of good water, the majority of which contain gold. In the trees, fruits and plants, there is a great difference from those of Juana. In this island, there are many spices and great mines of gold and of other metals.

The people of this island and of all the other islands which I have found and of which I have information, all go naked, men and women, as their mothers bore them, although some of the women cover a single place with the leaf of a plant or with a net of cotton which they make for the purpose. They have no iron or steel or weapons, nor are they fitted to use them. This is not because they are not well built and of handsome stature, but because they are very marvellously timorous. They have no other arms than spears made of canes, cut in seeding time, to the ends of which they fix a small sharpened stick. Of these they do not dare to make use, for many times it has happened that I have sent ashore two or three men to some town to have speech with them, and countless people have come out to them, and as soon as they have seen my men approaching, they have fled, a father not even waiting for his son. This is not because ill has been done to any one of them; on the contrary, at every place where I have been and have been able to have speech with them, I have given to them of that which I had, such as cloth and many other
things, receiving nothing in exchange. But so they are, incurably timid. It is true that, after
they have been reassured and have lost this fear, they are so guileless and so generous
with all that they possess, that no one would believe it who has not seen it. They refuse
nothing that they possess, if it be asked of them; on the contrary, they invite any one to
share it and display as much love as if they would give their hearts. They are content with
whatever trifle of whatever kind that may be given to them, whether it be of value or
valueless. I forbade that they should be given things so worthless as fragments of broken
crockery, scraps of broken and lace tips, although when they were able to get them, they
fancied that they possessed the best jewel in the world…They took even the pieces of the
broken hoops of the wine barrels and, like savages, gave what they had, so that it seemed
to me to be wrong and I forbade it. I gave them a thousand handsome good things, which
I had brought, in order that they might conceive affection for us and, more than that,
might become Christians and be inclined to the love and service of Your Highnesses and
of the whole Castilian nation, and strive to collect and give us of the things which they
have in abundance and which are necessary to us.

They do not hold any creed nor are they idolaters; but they all believe that power and
good are in the heavens and were very firmly convinced that I, with these ships and men,
came from the heavens, and in this belief they everywhere received me after they had
mastered their fear. This belief is not the result of ignorance, for they are, on the contrary,
of a very acute intelligence and they are men who navigate all those seas, so that it is
amazing how good an account they give of everything. It is because they have never seen
people clothed or ships of such a kind.
As soon as I arrived in the Indies, in the first island which I found, I took some of the natives by force, in order that they might learn and might give me information of whatever there is in these parts. And so it was that they soon understood us, and we them, either by speech or by signs, and they have been very serviceable. At present, those I bring with me are still of the opinion that I come from Heaven, for all the intercourse which they have had with me. They were the first to announce this wherever I went, and the others went running from house to house, and to the neighbouring towns, with loud cries of, "Come! Come! See the men from Heaven!" So all came, men and women alike, when their minds were set at rest concerning us, not one, small or great, remaining behind, and they all brought something to eat and drink, which they gave with extraordinary affection.

In all the islands, they have very many canoes, which are like rowing fustas, some larger and some smaller; some are greater than a fusta of eighteen benches. They are not so broad, because they are made of a single log of wood, but a fusta would not keep up with them in rowing, since their speed is an incredible thing. In these they navigate among all those islands, which are innumerable, and carry their goods. I have seen one of these canoes with seventy or eighty men in it, each one with his paddle.

In all these islands, I saw no great diversity in the appearance of the people or in their manners and language. On the contrary, they all understand one another, which is a very curious thing, on account of which I hope that their Highnesses will determine upon their conversion to our holy faith, towards which they are very inclined.
I have already said how I went one hundred and seven leagues in a straight line from west to east along the seashore of the island of Juana, and as a result of this voyage I can say that this island is larger than England and Scotland together, for, beyond these one hundred and even leagues, there remain to the westward two provinces to which I have not gone. One of these provinces they call "Avan," and there people are born with tails. These provinces cannot have a length of less than fifty or sixty leagues, as I could understand from those Indians whom I have and who know all the islands.

The other island, Espanola, has a circumference greater than all Spain from Collioure by the seacoast to Fuenterabia in Vizcaya, for I voyaged along one side for one hundred and eighty-eight great leagues in a straight line from west to east. It is a land to be desired and, when seen, never to be left. I have taken possession of all for their Highnesses, and all are more richly endowed than I know how or am able to say, and I hold all for their Highnesses, so that they may dispose of them as they do of the kingdoms of Castile and as absolutely. But especially, in this Espanola, in the situation most convenient and in the best position for the mines of gold and for all trade as well with the mainland here as with that there, belonging to the Grand Khan, where will be great trade and profit, I have taken possession of a large town, to which I gave the name "Villa de Navidad," and in it I have made fortifications and a fort, which will now by this time be entirely completed. In it I have left enough men for such a purpose with arms and artillery and provisions for more than a year, and a fusta, and one a master of all seacraft, to build others, and I have established great friendship with the king of that land, so much so, that he was proud to call me "brother" and to treat me as such. And even were he to change his attitude to one
of hostility towards these men, he and his do not know what arms are. They go naked, as I have already said, and they are the most timorous people in the world, so that the men whom I have left there alone would suffice to destroy all that land, and the island is without danger for their persons, if they know how to govern themselves.

In all these islands, it seems to me that all men are content with one woman, and to their chief or king they give as many as twenty.

It appears to me that the women work more than do the men. I have been able to learn if they hold private property; it seemed to me to be that all took a share in whatever any one had, especially of eatable things.

In these islands I have so far found no human monstrosities, as many expected, but on the contrary the whole population is very well tried, nor are they negroes as in Guinea, but their hair is flowing and they are not born where there is intense force in the rays of the sun... In these islands, where there are high mountains, the cold was severe this winter, but they endure it, being used to it and with the help of meats which they consume with many and extremely hot spices. Thus I have found no monsters, nor had a report of any, except in an island "Carib," which is the second at the coming into the Indies, and which is inhabited by people who are regarded in all the islands as very fierce and who eat human flesh. They have many canoes with which they range through all the islands of India and pillage and take whatever they can. They are no more malformed than are the others, except that they have the custom of wearing their hair long like women, and they use bows and arrows of the same cane stems, with a small piece of wood
at end, owing to their lack of iron which they do not possess. They are ferocious among these other people who are cowardly to an excessive degree, but I make no more account of them than of the rest. These are they who have intercourse with the women of "Matini-no," which is the first island met on the way from Spain to the Indies, in which there is not a man. These women engage in no feminine occupation, but use bows and arrows of cane, like those already mentioned, and they arm and protect themselves with plates of copper, of which they have much.

In another island, which they assure me is larger than Espanola, the people have no hair. In it there is incalculable gold, and from it and from the other islands I bring with me Indians as evidence.

In conclusion, to speak only of what has been accomplished on this voyage, which was so hasty, their Highnesses can see that I will give them as much gold as they may need, if their Highnesses will render me very slight assistance; presently, I will give them spices and cotton, as much as their Highnesses shall command; and mastic, as much as they shall order to be shipped and which, up to now, has been found only in Greece, in the island of Chios, and the Seignory sells it for what it pleases; and aloe, as much as they shall order to be shipped; and slaves, as many as they shall order, and who will be from the idolaters. I believe also that I have found rhubarb and cinnamon, and I shall find a thousand other things of value, which the people whom I have left there will have discovered, for I have not delayed at any point, so far as the wind allowed me to sail, except in the town of Navidad, in order to leave it secured and well established, and in truth I should have done much more if the ships had served me as reason demanded.
This is enough. And thus the eternal God, Our Lord, gives to all those who walk in His way triumph over things which appear to be impossible, and this was notably one. For, although men have talked or have written of these lands, all was conjectural, without ocular evidence, but amounted only to this, that those who heard for the most part listened and judged rather by hearsay than from even a small something tangible. So that, since Our Redeemer has given the victory to our most illustrious King and Queen, and to their renowned kingdoms, in so great a matter, for this all Christendom ought to feel delight and make great feasts and give solemn thanks to the Holy Trinity, with many solemn prayers for the great exaltation which they shall have in the turning of so many peoples to our holy faith, and afterwards for the temporal benefits, because not only Spain but all Christendom will have hence refreshment and gain.

This is an account of the facts, thus abridged.

Done in the caravel, on the Canary Islands, on the fifteenth day of February, in the year one thousand four hundred and ninety-three.

At your orders.

THE ADMIRAL.
THE UNDERSIGNED SUBJECTS OF KING JAMES

Agreement Between the Settlers of New Plymouth

LAW

November 11, 1620

Mayflower | Off the Coast of Cape Cod, Colony of Virginia

BACKGROUND

The settlers who traveled to the British possession of Virginia on the Mayflower drafted and signed this agreement pertaining to their governance before disembarking in the New World.

ANNOTATIONS

IN THE NAME OF GOD, AMEN. We, whose names are underwritten, the Loyal Subjects of our dread Sovereign Lord King James, by the Grace of God, of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, King, Defender of the Faith, &c. Having undertaken for the Glory of God, and Advancement of the Christian Faith, and the Honour of our King and Country, a Voyage to plant the first Colony in the northern Parts of Virginia; Do by these Presents, solemnly and mutually, in the Presence of God and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil Body Politick, for our better Ordering and Preservation, and Furtherance of the Ends aforesaid: And by Virtue hereof do enact, constitute, and frame, such just and equal Laws, Ordinances, Acts, Constitutions, and Officers, from time to time, as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the general Good of the Colony; unto which we promise all due Submission and Obedience.

IN WITNESS whereof we have hereunto subscribed our names at Cape-Cod the eleventh of November, in the Reign of our Sovereign Lord King James, of England, France, and Ireland, the eighteenth, and of Scotland the fifty-fourth, Anno Domini; 1620.

GOVERNOR JOHN WINTHROP

A Modell of Christian Charity

SPEECH

April 8, 1630

BACKGROUND

John Winthrop, governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, delivered these remarks aboard the *Arabella* toward the end of its voyage across the Atlantic Ocean.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Why does John Winthrop say God gives different conditions to different people?

2. What are the work, end, and means of the Massachusetts Bay Colony?

3. What does it mean to be “a city on the hill,” according to Winthrop?

“A Model of Christian Charity,” Hanover Historical Texts Collection, https://history.hanover.edu/texts/winthmod.html
[Original Source: Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society (Boston, 1838), 3rd Series 7:31-48.]
GOD ALMIGHTY in his most holy and wise providence, hath so disposed of the condition of mankind, as in all times some must be rich, some poor, some high and eminent in power and dignity; others mean and in submission.

The Reason hereof.

1 Reas. First to hold conformity with the rest of his world, being delighted to show forth the glory of his wisdom in the variety and difference of the creatures, and the glory of his power in ordering all these differences for the preservation and good of the whole; and the glory of his greatness, that as it is the glory of princes to have many officers, so this great king will have many stewards, Counting himself more honored in dispensing his gifts to man by man, than if he did it by his own immediate hands.

2 Reas. Secondly that he might have the more occasion to manifest the work of his Spirit: first upon the wicked in moderating and restraining them: so that the rich and mighty should not eat up the poor nor the poor and despised rise up against and shake off their yoke. 2ly In the regenerate, in exercising his graces in them, as in the great ones, their love, mercy, gentleness, temperance etc., in the poor and inferior sort, their faith, patience, obedience etc.

3 Reas. Thirdly, that every man might have need of others, and from hence they might be all knit more nearly together in the Bonds of brotherly affection. From hence it appears plainly that no man is made more honorable than another or more wealthy etc., out of any particular and singular respect to himself, but for the glory of his creator and the common good of the creature, man. Therefore God still reserves the property of these gifts to himself as Ezek. 16. 17. he there calls wealth, his gold and his silver, and Prov. 3. 9. he claims their service as his due, honor the Lord with thy riches etc.--All men being thus (by divine providence) ranked into two sorts, rich and poor; under the first are comprehended all such as are able to live comfortably by their own means duly improved;
and all others are poor according to the former distribution. There are two rules whereby we are to walk one towards another: Justice and Mercy. These are always distinguished in their act and in their object, yet may they both concur in the same subject in each respect; as sometimes there may be an occasion of showing mercy to a rich man in some sudden danger or distress, and also doing of mere justice to a poor man in regard of some particular contract etc. There is likewise a double Law by which we are regulated in our conversation towards another; in both the former respects, the law of nature and the law of grace, or the moral law or the law of the gospel, to omit the rule of justice as not properly belonging to this purpose otherwise than it may fall into consideration in some particular cases. By the first of these laws man as he was enabled so with all is commanded to love his neighbor as himself. Upon this ground stands all the precepts of the moral law, which concerns our dealings with men. To apply this to the works of mercy; this law requires two things. First that every man afford his help to another in every want or distress. Secondly, that he perform this out of the same affection which makes him careful of his own goods, according to that of our Savior, (Math.) *Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you.* This was practiced by Abraham and Lot in entertaining the angels and the old man of Gibea. The law of Grace or of the Gospel hath some difference from the former; as in these respects, First the law of nature was given to man in the estate of innocency; this of the Gospel in the estate of regeneracy. 2ly, the former propounds one man to another, as the same flesh and image of God; this as a brother in Christ also, and in the communion of the same Spirit, and so teaches to put a difference between Christians and others. *Do good to all, especially to the household of faith;* upon this ground the Israelites were to put a difference between the brethren of such as were strangers though not of the Canaanites.

...It rests now to make some application of this discourse, by the present design, which gave the occasion of writing of it. Herein are 4 things to be propounded: first the persons, 2ly the work, 3ly the end, 4thly the means. 1. For the persons. We are a company professing ourselves fellow members of Christ, in which respect only though we were absent from each other many miles, and had our employments as far distant, yet we
ought to account ourselves knit together by this bond of love, and, live in the exercise of it, if we would have comfort of our being in Christ. This was notorious in the practice of the Christians in former times; as is testified of the Waldenses, from the mouth of one of the adversaries Aeneas Sylvius "mutuo ament pere antequam norunt," they use to love any of their own religion even before they were acquainted with them. Not only for the work we have in hand. It is by a mutual consent, through a special overruling providence and a more than an ordinary approbation of the Churches of Christ, to seek out a place of Cohabitation and Consortship under a due form of Government both civil and ecclesiastical. In such cases as this, the care of the public must oversway all private respects, by which, not only conscience, but mere civil policy, does bind us. For it is a true rule that particular Estates cannot subsist in the ruin of the public. 3ly The end is to improve our lives to do more service to the Lord; the comfort and increase of the body of Christ, whereof we are members; that ourselves and posterity may be the better preserved from the common corruptions of this evil world, to serve the Lord and work out our Salvation under the power and purity of his holy ordinances. 4thly for the means whereby this must be effected. They are twofold, a conformity with the work and end we aim at. These we see are extraordinary, therefore we must not content ourselves with usual ordinary means. Whatsoever we did, or ought to have, done, when we lived in England, the same must we do, and more also, where we go. That which the most in their churches maintain as truth in profession only, we must bring into familiar and constant practice; as in this duty of love, we must love brotherly without dissimulation, we must love one another with a pure heart fervently. We must bear one another’s burdens. We must not look only on our own things, but also on the things of our brethren. Neither must we think that the Lord will bear with such failings at our hands as he does from those among whom we have lived…

When God gives a special commission he looks to have it strictly observed in every article; When he gave Saul a commission to destroy Amalek, He indented with him upon certain articles, and because he failed in one of the least, and that upon a fair pretense, it lost him the kingdom, which should have been his reward, if he had observed his
commission. Thus stands the cause between God and us. We are entered into Covenant with Him for this work. We have taken out a commission. The Lord hath given us leave to draw our own articles. We have professed to enterprise these and those accounts, upon these and those ends. We have hereupon besought Him of favor and blessing. Now if the Lord shall please to hear us, and bring us in peace to the place we desire, then hath he ratified this Covenant and sealed our Commission, and will expect a strict performance of the articles contained in it; but if we shall neglect the observation of these articles which are the ends we have propounded, and, dissembling with our God, shall fall to embrace this present world and prosecute our carnal intentions, seeking great things for ourselves and our posterity, the Lord will surely break out in wrath against us; be revenged of such a [sinful] people and make us know the price of the breach of such a Covenant.

Now the only way to avoid this shipwreck, and to provide for our posterity, is to follow the counsel of Micah, to do justly, to love mercy, to walk humbly with our God. For this end, we must be knit together, in this work, as one man. We must entertain each other in brotherly affection. We must be willing to abridge ourselves of our superfluities, for the supply of other's necessities. We must uphold a familiar commerce together in all meekness, gentleness, patience, and liberality. We must delight in each other; make other's conditions our own; rejoice together, mourn together, labor and suffer together, always having before our eyes our commission and community in the work, as members of the same body. So shall we keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. The Lord will be our God, and delight to dwell among us, as his own people, and will command a blessing upon us in all our ways. So that we shall see much more of his wisdom, power, goodness and truth, than formerly we have been acquainted with. We shall find that the God of Israel is among us, when ten of us shall be able to resist a thousand of our enemies; when he shall make us a praise and glory that men shall say of succeeding plantations, "the Lord make it likely that of New England." For we must consider that we shall be as a city upon a hill. The eyes of all people are upon us. So that if we shall deal falsely with our God in this work we have undertaken, and so cause him to withdraw his present help from us, we shall be made a story and a by-word through the world. We shall
open the mouths of enemies to speak evil of the ways of God, and all professors for God's sake. We shall shame the faces of many of God's worthy servants, and cause their prayers to be turned into curses upon us till we be consumed out of the good land whither we are a going.

I shall shut up this discourse with that exhortation of Moses, that faithful servant of the Lord, in his last farewell to Israel, Deut. 30. Beloved there is now set before us life and good, Death and evil, in that we are commanded this day to love the Lord our God, and to love one another, to walk in his ways and to keep his Commandments and his Ordinance and his laws, and the articles of our Covenant with him, that we may live and be multiplied, and that the Lord our God may bless us in the land whither we go to possess it. But if our hearts shall turn away, so that we will not obey, but shall be seduced, and worship and serve other Gods, our pleasure and profits, and serve them; it is propounded unto us this day, we shall surely perish out of the good land whither we pass over this vast sea to possess it;

Therefore let us choose life that we, and our seed may live, by obeying His voice and cleaving to Him, for He is our life and our prosperity.
WILLIAM PENN

Preface to the Frame of Government

CONSTITUTION EXCERPT

May 5, 1682
Province of Pennsylvania

BACKGROUND

William Penn, Founder of the Province of Pennsylvania, wrote this preface for the colony's first constitution.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. According to William Penn, does God desire a government for mankind?

2. What is the purpose of government?

3. Are the people meant to participate in government?

4. What is the importance of good men to a community?

5. What is the relationship between liberty and obedience?

When the great and wise God had made the world, of all his creatures, it pleased him to choose man his Deputy to rule it: and to fit him for so great a charge and trust, he did not only qualify him with skill and power, but with integrity to use them justly. This native goodness was equally his honor and his happiness, and whilst he stood here, all went well; there was no need of coercive or compulsive means; the precept of divine love and truth, in his bosom, was the guide and keeper of his innocency. But lust prevailing against duty, made a lamentable breach upon it; and the law, that before had no power over him, took place upon him, and his disobedient posterity, that such as would not live comformable to the holy law within, should fall under the reproof and correction of the just law without, in a Judicial administration.

This the Apostle teaches in divers of his epistles: “The law,” says he, “was added because of transgression.” In another place, "knowing that the law was not made for the righteous man; but for the disobedient and ungodly, for sinners, for unholy and prophane, for murderers, for whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, and for man-stealers, for liars, for perjured persons," etc., but this is not all; he opens and carries the matter of government a little further: "let every soul be subject to the higher powers; for there is no power but of God. The powers that be are ordained of God: whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to evil: wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same." "He is the minister of God to thee for good." "Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but for conscience sake."

This settles the divine right of government beyond exception, and that for two ends: first, to terrify evil doers: secondly, to cherish those that do well; which gives government a life beyond corruption, and makes it as durable in the world, as good men shall be. So that government seems to me a part of religion itself, a filing sacred in its institution and end. For, if it does not directly remove the cause, it crushes the effects of evil, and is as such, though a lower, yet an emanation of the same Divine Power, that is both author and object of pure religion; the difference lying here, that the one is more free and mental, the
other more corporal and compulsive in its operations: but that is only to evil doers; government itself being otherwise as capable of kindness, goodness and charity, as a more private society. They weakly err, that think there is no other use of government than correction, which is the coarsest part of it: daily experience tells us that the care and regulation of many other affairs, more soft, and daily necessary, make up much of the greatest part of government; and which must have followed the peopling of the world, had Adam never fell, and will continue among men, on earth, under the highest attainments they may arrive at, by the coming of the blessed Second Adam, the Lord from heaven. Thus much of government in general, as to its rise and end.

For particular frames and models, it will become me to say little; and comparatively I will say nothing. My reasons are:

First. That the age is too nice and difficult for it; there being nothing the wits of men are more busy and divided upon. It is true, they seem to agree to the end, to wit, happiness; but, in the means, they differ, as to divine, so to this human felicity; and the cause is much the same, not always want of light and knowledge, but want of using them rightly. Men side with their passions against their reason, and their sinister interests have so strong a bias upon their minds, that they lean to them against the good of the things they know.

Secondly. I do not find a model in the world, that time, place, and some singular emergences have not necessarily altered; nor is it easy to frame a civil government, that shall serve all places alike.

Thirdly. I know what is said by the several admirers of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy, which are the rule of one, a few, and many, and are the three common ideas of government, when men discourse on the subject. But I choose to solve the controversy with this small distinction, and it belongs to all three: Any government is free to the people under it, whatever be the frame, where the laws rule, and the people are a party to those laws, and more than this is tyranny, oligarchy, or confusion.
But lastly, when all is said, there is hardly one frame of government in the world so ill designed by its first founders that in good hands, [it] would not do well enough; and story tells us, the best in ill ones can do nothing that is great or good; witness the Jewish and Roman states. Governments, like clocks, go from the motion men give them; and as governments are made and moved by men, so by them they are ruined too. Wherefore governments rather depend upon men, than men upon governments. Let men be good, and the government cannot be bad; if it be ill, they will cure it. But if men be bad, let the government be never so good, they will endeavor to warp and spoil it to their turn.

I know some say, let us have good laws, and no matter for the men that execute them: but let them consider, that though good laws do well, good men do better: for good laws may want good men, and be abolished or evaded by ill men, but good men will never want good laws nor suffer ill ones. It is true, good laws have some awe upon-ill ministers, but that is where they have not power to escape or abolish them and the people are generally wise and good: but a loose and depraved people (which is the question) love laws and an administration like themselves. That, therefore, which makes a good constitution, must keep it, vie: men of wisdom and virtue, qualities, that because they descend not with worldly inheritances, must be carefully propagated by a virtuous education of youth; for which after ages will owe more to the care and prudence of founders and the successive magistracy than to their parents for their private patrimonies.

These considerations of the weight of government and the nice and various opinions about it made it uneasy to me to think of publishing the ensuing frame and conditional laws, foreseeing both the censures they will meet with from men of differing humors and engagements and the occasion they may give of discourse beyond my design.

But, next to the power of necessity, (which is a solicitor that will take no denial) this induced me to a compliance, that we have (with reverence to God and good conscience to men) to the best of our skill contrived and composed the frame and laws of this government to the great end of all government; viz., to support power in reverence with the people and to secure the people from the almost of power; that they may be free by
their just obedience, and the magistrates honorable for their just administration; for liberty without obedience is confusion, and obedience without liberty is slavery. To carry this evenness is partly owing to the constitution, and partly to the magistracy. Where either of these fail, government will be subject to convulsions, but where both are wanting, it must be totally subverted; then where both meet, the government is like to endure, which I humbly pray and hope God will please to make the lot of this of Pennsylvania. Amen.

WILLIAM PENN.
FIRST PENNSYLVANIA PROVINCIAL ASSEMBLY

An Act for Freedom of Conscience

LAW

December 7, 1682

Province of Pennsylvania | Chester, Pennsylvania

BACKGROUND

William Penn, Governor of Pennsylvania, insisted upon this law, which the Pennsylvania Provincial Assembly passed in 1682.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What is the proper end of government?

2. Why are there laws?

3. What is the freedom of conscience?

4. What are its limits?

5. What are the punishments given for breaking this law?

Whereas the glory of almighty God and the good of mankind is the reason and end of
government and, therefore, government in itself is a venerable ordinance of God. And
forasmuch as it is principally desired and intended by the Proprietary and Governor and
the freemen of the province of Pennsylvania and territories thereunto belonging to make
and establish such laws as shall best preserve true Christian and civil liberty in opposition
to all unchristian, licentious, and unjust practices, whereby God may have his due, Caesar
his due, and the people their due, from tyranny and oppression on the one side and
insolence and licentiousness on the other, so that the best and firmest foundation may be
laid for the present and future happiness of both the Governor and people of the province
and territories aforesaid and their posterity.

Be it, therefore, enacted by William Penn, Proprietary and Governor, by and with the
advice and consent of the deputies of the freemen of this province and counties aforesaid
in assembly met and by the authority of the same, that these following chapters and
paragraphs shall be the laws of Pennsylvania and the territories thereof.

Chap. i. Almighty God, being only Lord of conscience, father of lights and spirits, and the
author as well as object of all divine knowledge, faith, and worship, who can only
enlighten the mind and persuade and convince the understandings of people, in due
reverence to his sovereignty over the souls of mankind:

Be it enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that no person now or at any time hereafter
living in this province, who shall confess and acknowledge one almighty God to be the
creator, upholder, and ruler of the world, and who professes him or herself obliged in
conscience to live peaceably and quietly under the civil government, shall in any case be
molested or prejudiced for his or her conscientious persuasion or practice. Nor shall he or
she at any time be compelled to frequent or maintain any religious worship, place, or
ministry whatever contrary to his or her mind, but shall freely and fully enjoy his, or her,
Christian liberty in that respect, without any interruption or reflection. And if any person
shall abuse or deride any other for his or her different persuasion and practice in matters
of religion, such person shall be looked upon as a disturber of the peace and be punished accordingly.

But to the end that looseness, irreligion, and atheism may not creep in under pretense of conscience in this province, be it further enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that, according to the example of the primitive Christians and for the ease of the creation, every first day of the week, called the Lord’s day, people shall abstain from their usual and common toil and labor that, whether masters, parents, children, or servants, they may the better dispose themselves to read the scriptures of truth at home or frequent such meetings of religious worship abroad as may best suit their respective persuasions.

Chap. ii. And be it further enacted by, etc., that all officers and persons commissioned and employed in the service of the government in this province and all members and deputies elected to serve in the Assembly thereof and all that have a right to elect such deputies shall be such as profess and declare they believe in Jesus Christ to be the son of God, the savior of the world, and that are not convicted of ill-fame or unsober and dishonest conversation and that are of twenty-one years of age at least.

Chap. iii. And be it further enacted, etc., that whosoever shall swear in their common conversation by the name of God or Christ or Jesus, being legally convicted thereof, shall pay, for every such offense, five shillings or suffer five days imprisonment in the house of correction at hard labor to the behoove of the public and be fed with bread and water only during that time.

Chap. v. And be it further enacted, etc., for the better prevention of corrupt communication, that whosoever shall speak loosely and profanely of almighty God, Christ Jesus, the Holy Spirit, or the scriptures of truth, and is legally convicted thereof, shall pay, for every such offense, five shillings or suffer five days imprisonment in the house of correction at hard labor to the behoove of the public and be fed with bread and water only during that time.
Chap. vi. And be it further enacted, etc., that whosoever shall, in their conversation, at any time curse himself or any other and is legally convicted thereof shall pay for every such offense five shillings or suffer five days imprisonment as aforesaid.
**BACKGROUND**

Following the loss of English territory in France, England was left weak and vulnerable. In order to regain power, King John attempted to assert total authority over all the barons of England. Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, attempted to prevent the potential civil war by drafting the Magna Carta, which was signed by King John.

**ANNOTATIONS**

JOHN, by the grace of God King of England, Lord of Ireland, Duke of Normandy and Aquitaine, and Count of Anjou, to his archbishops, bishops, abbots, earls, barons, justices, foresters, sheriffs, stewards, servants, and to all his officials and loyal subjects,

Greeting.

KNOW THAT BEFORE GOD, for the health of our soul and those of our ancestors and heirs, to the honour of God, the exaltation of the holy Church, and the better ordering of our kingdom, at the advice of our reverend fathers…and other loyal subjects:

(1) FIRST, THAT WE HAVE GRANTED TO GOD, and by this present charter have confirmed for us and our heirs in perpetuity, that the English Church shall be free, and shall have its rights undiminished, and its liberties unimpaired. That we wish this so to be observed, appears from the fact that of our own free will, before the outbreak of the

---

present dispute between us and our barons, we granted and confirmed by charter the freedom of the Church’s elections – a right reckoned to be of the greatest necessity and importance to it – and caused this to be confirmed by Pope Innocent III. This freedom we shall observe ourselves, and desire to be observed in good faith by our heirs in perpetuity.

5 TO ALL FREE MEN OF OUR KINGDOM we have also granted, for us and our heirs for ever, all the liberties written out below, to have and to keep for them and their heirs, of us and our heirs: …

(4) The guardian of the land of an heir who is under age shall take from it only reasonable revenues, customary dues, and feudal services. He shall do this without destruction or damage to men or property. If we have given the guardianship of the land to a sheriff, or to any person answerable to us for the revenues, and he commits destruction or damage, we will exact compensation from him, and the land shall be entrusted to two worthy and prudent men of the same ‘fee’, who shall be answerable to us for the revenues, or to the person to whom we have assigned them. If we have given or sold to anyone the guardianship of such land, and he causes destruction or damage, he shall lose the guardianship of it, and it shall be handed over to two worthy and prudent men of the same ‘fee’, who shall be similarly answerable to us.

10 (5) For so long as a guardian has guardianship of such land, he shall maintain the houses, parks, fish preserves, ponds, mills, and everything else pertaining to it, from the revenues of the land itself. When the heir comes of age, he shall restore the whole land to him, stocked with plough teams and such implements of husbandry as the season demands and the revenues from the land can reasonably bear.

15 (6) Heirs may be given in marriage, but not to someone of lower social standing. Before a marriage takes place, it shall be made known to the heir’s next-of-kin.
(7) At her husband’s death, a widow may have her marriage portion and inheritance at once and without trouble. She shall pay nothing for her dower, marriage portion, or any inheritance that she and her husband held jointly on the day of his death…

(8) No widow shall be compelled to marry, so long as she wishes to remain without a husband. But she must give security that she will not marry without royal consent, if she holds her lands of the Crown, or without the consent of whatever other lord she may hold them of.

(9) Neither we nor our officials will seize any land or rent in payment of a debt, so long as the debtor has movable goods sufficient to discharge the debt…

(12) No ‘scutage’ or ‘aid’ may be levied in our kingdom without its general consent, unless it is for the ransom of our person, to make our eldest son a knight, and (once) to marry our eldest daughter. For these purposes only a reasonable ‘aid’ may be levied…

(13) The city of London shall enjoy all its ancient liberties and free customs, both by land and by water. We also will and grant that all other cities, boroughs, towns, and ports shall enjoy all their liberties and free customs.

(14) To obtain the general consent of the realm for the assessment of an ‘aid’ – except in the three cases specified above – or a ‘scutage’, we will cause the archbishops, bishops, abbots, earls, and greater barons to be summoned individually by letter…

(16) No man shall be forced to perform more service for a knight’s ‘fee’, or other free holding of land, than is due from it.

(17) Ordinary lawsuits shall not follow the royal court around, but shall be held in a fixed place…
(20) For a trivial offence, a free man shall be fined only in proportion to the degree of his
offence, and for a serious offence correspondingly, but not so heavily as to deprive him of
his livelihood. In the same way, a merchant shall be spared his merchandise, and a villein
the implements of his husbandry, if they fall upon the mercy of a royal court. None of
these fines shall be imposed except by the assessment on oath of reputable men of the
neighbourhood.

(21) Earls and barons shall be fined only by their equals, and in proportion to the gravity
of their offence.

(22) A fine imposed upon the lay property of a clerk in holy orders shall be assessed upon
the same principles, without reference to the value of his ecclesiastical benefice…

(24) No sheriff, constable, coroners, or other royal officials are to hold lawsuits that
should be held by the royal justices…

(30) No sheriff, royal official, or other person shall take horses or carts for transport from
any free man, without his consent.

(31) Neither we nor any royal official will take wood for our castle, or for any other
purpose, without the consent of the owner.

(32) We will not keep the lands of people convicted of felony in our hand for longer than
a year and a day, after which they shall be returned to the lords of the ‘fees’ concerned…

(38) In future no official shall place a man on trial upon his own unsupported statement,
without producing credible witnesses to the truth of it.

(39) No free man shall be seized or imprisoned, or stripped of his rights or possessions, or
outlawed or exiled, or deprived of his standing in any way, nor will we proceed with force
against him, or send others to do so, except by the lawful judgment of his equals or by the
law of the land.

(40) To no one will we sell, to no one deny or delay right or justice…

(45) We will appoint as justices, constables, sheriffs, or other officials, only men that
know the law of the realm and are minded to keep it well…

(51) As soon as peace is restored, we will remove from the kingdom all the foreign
knights, bowmen, their attendants, and the mercenaries that have come to it, to its harm,
with horses and arms.

(52) To any man whom we have deprived or dispossessed of lands, castles, liberties, or
rights, without the lawful judgment of his equals, we will at once restore these. In cases of
dispute the matter shall be resolved by the judgment of the twenty-five barons…

(55) All fines that have been given to us unjustly and against the law of the land, and all
fines that we have exacted unjustly, shall be entirely remitted or the matter decided by a
majority judgment of the twenty-five barons referred to below in the clause for securing
the peace together with Stephen, archbishop of Canterbury, if he can be present…

(60) All these customs and liberties that we have granted shall be observed in our
kingdom in so far as concerns our own relations with our subjects. Let all men of our
kingdom, whether clergy or laymen, observe them similarly in their relations with their
own men.

(61) SINCE WE HAVE GRANTED ALL THESE THINGS for God, for the better
ordering of our kingdom, and to allay the discord that has arisen between us and our
barons, and since we desire that they shall be enjoyed in their entirety, with lasting
strength, for ever, we give and grant to the barons the following security:
The barons shall elect twenty-five of their number to keep, and cause to be observed with all their might, the peace and liberties granted and confirmed to them by this charter.

If we, our chief justice, our officials, or any of our servants offend in any respect against any man, or transgress any of the articles of the peace or of this security, and the offence is made known to four of the said twenty-five barons, they shall come to us – or in our absence from the kingdom to the chief justice – to declare it and claim immediate redress. If we, or in our absence abroad the chief justice, make no redress within forty days, reckoning from the day on which the offence was declared to us or to him, the four barons shall refer the matter to the rest of the twenty-five barons, who may distrain upon and assail us in every way possible, with the support of the whole community of the land, by seizing our castles, lands, possessions, or anything else saving only our own person and those of the queen and our children, until they have secured such redress as they have determined upon. Having secured the redress, they may then resume their normal obedience to us…

If one of the twenty-five barons dies or leaves the country, or is prevented in any other way from discharging his duties, the rest of them shall choose another baron in his place, at their discretion, who shall be duly sworn in as they were.

In the event of disagreement among the twenty-five barons on any matter referred to them for decision, the verdict of the majority present shall have the same validity as a unanimous verdict of the whole twenty-five, whether these were all present or some of those summoned were unwilling or unable to appear.

The twenty-five barons shall swear to obey all the above articles faithfully, and shall cause them to be obeyed by others to the best of their power.

We will not seek to procure from anyone, either by our own efforts or those of a third party, anything by which any part of these concessions or liberties might be revoked or
diminished. Should such a thing be procured, it shall be null and void and we will at no
time make use of it, either ourselves or through a third party…

(63) IT IS ACCORDINGLY OUR WISH AND COMMAND that the English Church
shall be free, and that men in our kingdom shall have and keep all these liberties, rights,
and concessions, well and peaceably in their fullness and entirety for them and their heirs,
of us and our heirs, in all things and all places for ever.

Both we and the barons have sworn that all this shall be observed in good faith and
without deceit. Witness the abovementioned people and many others.

Given by our hand in the meadow that is called Runnymede, between Windsor and
Staines, on the fifteenth day of June in the seventeenth year of our reign.
Parliament of England

An Act Declaring the Rights and Liberties of the Subject and Settling the Succession of the Crown

Constitutional Law

February 13, 1689
Parliament | London, England

English Bill of Rights

Background

Following a civil war, revolution, the Cromwell Protectorate, and a second, bloodless revolution, the English Parliament enacted this law in 1689.

Annotations

An Act Declaring the Rights and Liberties of the Subject and Settling the Succession of the Crown.

Whereas the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons assembled at Westminster, lawfully, fully and freely representing all the estates of the people of this realm, did upon the thirteenth day of February in the year of our Lord one thousand six hundred eighty-eight present unto their Majesties, then called and known by the names and style of William and Mary, prince and princess of Orange, being present in their proper persons, a certain declaration in writing made by the said Lords and Commons in the words following, viz.:

Whereas the late King James the Second, by the assistance of diverse evil counsellors, judges and ministers employed by him, did endeavor to subvert and extirpate the Protestant religion and the laws and liberties of this kingdom;

By assuming and exercising a power of dispensing with and suspending of laws and the execution of laws without consent of Parliament…

By levying money for and to the use of the Crown by pretense of prerogative for other time and in other manner than the same was granted by Parliament;

By raising and keeping a standing army within this kingdom in time of peace without consent of Parliament, and quartering soldiers contrary to law;

By causing several good subjects being Protestants to be disarmed at the same time when papists were both armed and employed contrary to law;

By violating the freedom of election of members to serve in Parliament;

By prosecutions in the Court of King’s Bench for matters and causes cognizable only in Parliament, and by diverse other arbitrary and illegal courses;

And whereas of late years partial corrupt and unqualified persons have been returned and served on juries in trials, and particularly diverse jurors in trials for high treason which were not freeholders;

And excessive bail hath been required of persons committed in criminal cases to elude the benefit of the laws made for the liberty of the subjects;

And excessive fines have been imposed;

And illegal and cruel punishments inflicted;

And several grants and promises made of fines and forfeitures before any conviction or judgment against the persons upon whom the same were to be levied;

All which are utterly and directly contrary to the known laws and statutes and freedom of this realm;
And whereas the said late King James the Second having abdicated the government and
the throne being thereby vacant, his Highness the prince of Orange (whom it hath pleased
Almighty God to make the glorious instrument of delivering this kingdom from popery
and arbitrary power) did (by the advice of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and diverse
principal persons of the Commons) cause letters to be written to the Lords Spiritual and
Temporal being Protestants, and other letters to the several counties, cities, universities,
boroughs and cinque ports, for the choosing of such persons to represent them as were of
right to be sent to Parliament, to meet and sit at Westminster upon the two and twentieth
day of January in this year one thousand six hundred eighty and eight [old style date], in
order to such an establishment as that their religion, laws and liberties might not again be
in danger of being subverted, upon which letters elections having been accordingly made;

And thereupon the said Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons, pursuant to their
respective letters and elections, being now assembled in a full and free representative of
this nation, taking into their most serious consideration the best means for attaining the
ends aforesaid, do in the first place (as their ancestors in like case have usually done) for
the vindicating and asserting their ancient rights and liberties declare

That the pretended power of suspending the laws or the execution of laws by regal
authority without consent of Parliament is illegal;

That the pretended power of dispensing with laws or the execution of laws by regal
authority, as it hath been assumed and exercised of late, is illegal…

That levying money for or to the use of the Crown by pretence of prerogative, without
grant of Parliament, for longer time, or in other manner than the same is or shall be
granted, is illegal;

That it is the right of the subjects to petition the king, and all commitments and
prosecutions for such petitioning are illegal;
That the raising or keeping a standing army within the kingdom in time of peace, unless it be with consent of Parliament, is against law;

That the subjects which are Protestants may have arms for their defense suitable to their conditions and as allowed by law;

That election of members of Parliament ought to be free;

That the freedom of speech and debates or proceedings in Parliament ought not to be impeached or questioned in any court or place out of Parliament;

That excessive bail ought not to be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted;

That jurors ought to be duly impaneled and returned, and jurors which pass upon men in trials for high treason ought to be freeholders;

That all grants and promises of fines and forfeitures of particular persons before conviction are illegal and void;

And that for redress of all grievances, and for the amending, strengthening and preserving of the laws, Parliaments ought to be held frequently.

…Having therefore an entire confidence that his said Highness the prince of Orange will perfect the deliverance so far advanced by him, and will still preserve them from the violation of their rights which they have here asserted, and from all other attempts upon their religion, rights and liberties, the said Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons assembled at Westminster do resolve that William and Mary, prince and princess of Orange, be and be declared king and queen of England, France and Ireland and the dominions thereunto belonging, to hold the crown and royal dignity of the said kingdoms and dominions to them, the said prince and princess, during their lives and the life of the survivor to them, and that the sole and full exercise of the regal power be only in and
executed by the said prince of Orange in the names of the said prince and princess during their joint lives, and after their deceases the said crown and royal dignity of the same kingdoms and dominions to be to the heirs of the body of the said princess, and for default of such issue to the Princess Anne of Denmark and the heirs of her body, and for default of such issue to the heirs of the body of the said prince of Orange. And the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons do pray the said prince and princess to accept the same accordingly…

…Now in pursuance of the premises the said Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons in Parliament assembled, for the ratifying, confirming and establishing the said declaration and the articles, clauses, matters and things therein contained by the force of law made in due form by authority of Parliament, do pray that it may be declared and enacted that all and singular the rights and liberties asserted and claimed in the said declaration are the true, ancient and indubitable rights and liberties of the people of this kingdom, and so shall be esteemed, allowed, adjudged, deemed and taken to be; and that all and every the particulars aforesaid shall be firmly and strictly holden and observed as they are expressed in the said declaration, and all officers and ministers whatsoever shall serve their Majesties and their successors according to the same in all time to come…And for preventing all questions and divisions in this realm by reason of any pretended titles to the crown, and for preserving a certainty in the succession thereof, in and upon which the unity, peace, tranquility and safety of this nation doth under God wholly consist and depend, the said Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons do beseech their Majesties that it may be enacted, established and declared, that the crown and regal government of the said kingdoms and dominions, with all and singular the premises thereunto belonging and appertaining, shall be and continue to their said Majesties and the survivor of them during their lives and the life of the survivor of them, and that the entire, perfect and full exercise of the regal power and government be only in and executed by his Majesty in the names of both their Majesties during their joint lives; and after their deceases the said crown and premises shall be and remain to the heirs of the body of her Majesty…
people aforesaid most humbly and faithfully submit themselves, their heirs and posterities for ever, and do faithfully promise that they will stand to, maintain and defend their said Majesties, and also the limitation and succession of the crown herein specified and contained, to the utmost of their powers with their lives and estates against all persons whatsoever that shall attempt anything to the contrary. And whereas it hath been found by experience that it is inconsistent with the safety and welfare of this Protestant kingdom to be governed by a popish prince, or by any king or queen marrying a papist, the said Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons do further pray that it may be enacted, that all and every person and persons that is, are or shall be reconciled to or shall hold communion with the see or Church of Rome, or shall profess the popish religion, or shall marry a papist, shall be excluded and be for ever incapable to inherit, possess or enjoy the crown and government of this realm and Ireland and the dominions thereunto belonging or any part of the same, or to have, use or exercise any regal power, authority or jurisdiction within the same…

…Provided that no charter or grant or pardon granted before the three and twentieth day of October in the year of our Lord one thousand six hundred eighty-nine shall be any ways impeached or invalidated by this Act, but that the same shall be and remain of the same force and effect in law and no other than as if this Act had never been made.
**ANONYMOUS (JOHN LOCKE)**

*Two Treatises of Government*

**BOOK EXCERPTS**

December 1689

England

**BACKGROUND**

English doctor and political thinker John Locke published this work on government during the time of Glorious Revolution in England, which was read and influential among colonial leaders in the British North American colonies during the following century.

**GUIDING QUESTIONS**

1. Why do men form political societies according to Locke?
2. What are the two powers man possesses in the state of nature?

---

123. If man in the state of nature be so free, as has been said; if he be absolute lord of his own person and possessions, equal to the greatest, and subject to nobody, why will he part with his freedom? Why will he give up his empire, and subject himself to the dominion and control of any other power? To which it is obvious to answer, that though in the state of nature he hath such a right, yet the enjoyment of it is very uncertain, and constantly exposed to the invasion of others; for all being kings as much as he, every man his equal, and the greater part no strict observers of equity and justice, the enjoyment of the property he has in this state is very unsafe, very unsecure. This makes him willing to quit a condition, which, however free, is full of fears and continual dangers: and it is not without reason, that he seeks out, and is willing to join in society with others, who are already united, or have a mind to unite, for the mutual preservation of their lives, liberties, and estates, which I call by the general name, property.

124. The great and chief end, therefore, of men’s uniting into commonwealths, and putting themselves under government, is the preservation of their property. To which in the state of nature there are many things wanting. First, There wants an established, settled, known law, received and allowed by common consent to be the standard of right and wrong, and the common measure to decide all controversies between them: for though the law of nature be plain and intelligible to all rational creatures; yet men being biased by their interest, as well as ignorant for want of studying it, are not apt to allow of it as a law binding to them in the application of it to their particular cases.

125. Secondly, In the state of nature there wants a known and indifferent judge, with authority to determine all differences according to the established law: for every one in that state being both judge and executioner of the law of nature, men being partial to themselves, passion and revenge is very apt to carry them too far, and with too much heat, in their own cases; as well as negligence, and unconcernedness, to make them too remiss in other men’s.
126. Thirdly, In the state of nature there often wants power to back and support the sentence when right, and to give it due execution. They who by any injustice offend, will seldom fail, where they are able, by force to make good their injustice; such resistance many times makes the punishment dangerous, and frequently destructive, to those who attempt it.

127. Thus mankind, notwithstanding all the privileges of the state of nature, being but in an ill condition, while they remain in it, are quickly driven into society. Hence it comes to pass that we seldom find any number of men live any time together in this state. The inconveniencies that they are therein exposed to, by the irregular and uncertain exercise of the power every man has of punishing the transgressions of others, make them take sanctuary under the established laws of government, and therein seek the preservation of their property. It is this makes them so willingly give up every one his single power of punishing, to be exercised by such alone, as shall be appointed to it amongst them; and by such rules as the community, or those authorized by them to that purpose, shall agree on. And in this we have the original right of both the legislative and executive power, as well as of the governments and societies themselves.

128. For in the state of nature, toomit the liberty he has of innocent delights, a man has two powers. The first is to do whatsoever he thinks fit for the preservation of himself and others within the permission of the law of nature: by which law, common to them all, he and all the rest of mankind are one community, make up one society, distinct from all other creatures. And, were it not for the corruption and viciousness of degenerate men, there would be no need of any other; no necessity that men should separate from this great and natural community, and by positive agreements combine into smaller and divided associations. The other power a man has in the state of nature, is the power to punish the crimes committed against that law. Both these he gives up, when he joins in a private, if I may so call it, or particular politic society, and incorporates into any commonwealth, separate from the rest of mankind.
129. The first power, viz. “of doing whatsoever he thought fit for the preservation of himself,” and the rest of mankind, he gives up to be regulated by laws made by the society, so far forth as the preservation of himself and the rest of that society shall require; which laws of the society in many things confine the liberty he had by the law of nature.

130. Secondly, The power of punishing he wholly gives up, and engages his natural force, (which he might before employ in the execution of the law of nature, by his own single authority, as he thought fit) to assist the executive power of the society, as the law thereof shall require: for being now in a new state, wherein he is to enjoy many conveniencies, from the labor, assistance, and society of others in the same community, as well as protection from its whole strength; he is to part also, with as much of his natural liberty, in providing for himself, as the good, prosperity, and safety of the society shall require; which is not only necessary, but just, since the other members of the society do the like....
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Why Teach the American Founding

The beginning is the most important part of any endeavor, for a small change at the beginning will result in a very different end. How much truer this is of the most expansive of human endeavors: founding and sustaining a free country. The United States of America has achieved the greatest degree of freedom and prosperity for the greatest proportion of any country’s population in the history of humankind. How is it that the common American’s pursuit of happiness has resulted in such exceptional outcomes over time? This phenomenon compels mindful young Americans to seek to understand how their nation has achieved such results. And America’s youth could find no greater source of understanding than the history of their country’s founding, starting with their forefathers’ ideas, words, and deeds.
Enduring Ideas from This Unit

1. The United States is unprecedented in establishing its existence not on grounds of racial origin nor family privilege but on ideas asserted to be true of all people at all times: namely, on the equal human dignity of each person.
2. America was founded on the view that government should be controlled by the people themselves and limited to the purpose of protecting each person’s natural rights and fostering the common good.
3. Regular, ordinary Americans of everyday means sacrificed their security and very lives to defend these truths about human beings and civic life against a tyranny of the most powerful nation of its day.
4. The United States Constitution’s chief quality is that it allows the people to govern themselves with respect for the dignity of each person while both channeling and restraining the natural ambition of human beings to gain power and recognition.
5. The Constitution is a carefully wrought and considered document, and its original intent and structure should be honored both for the sake of our forebears, to whom we and the world owe our freedom and prosperity, and because the events of the last two hundred years have proven the Constitution’s remarkable achievements time and time again.

What Teachers Should Consider

The United States of America is unprecedented in many ways in the course of human history, but most significantly in the opportunity all its citizens have to pursue unmatched conditions of freedom, security, and prosperity. The country owes its unprecedented success to an unprecedented founding, a beginning forged and canonized in the Declaration of Independence, the War of Independence, and the U.S. Constitution.

And yet, never have so many Americans known so little about this founding. As for love of country, one cannot love (or even consider loving) what one does not know.

The teaching of the American founding is perhaps the most necessary series of lessons a teacher can share with his or her students if those students intend to enjoy the benefits of living in America for the duration of their lives.

With this in mind, a teacher ought to take special care to learn the history and ideas of the American founding. Ambiguity in the teacher’s own understanding, or assumptions derived from anywhere but careful scholarship and a deep reading of America’s founding documents, will leave him or her unprepared to help students understand this history accurately.

The teacher might best open the unit with lessons aimed at understanding why the colonists declared independence in the first place. It was not to avoid paying taxes or about wanting to preserve slavery. (These are misconceptions at best, distortions at worst.) It was to choose—between liberty under self-government and servitude under tyranny. Class may proceed at a brisk pace through the years 1763–1776, touching on the many acts of the British and respective colonial responses to those acts. Spend time on the conflicts and battles; students should chart the gradual shift in public sentiment toward independence.
The Declaration of Independence itself deserves careful study. Such lessons may begin with stories of the writing of the Declaration. Students should read the whole document, and teachers can foster extensive conversations about what it says, what it means, and why it says it. The majority of the conversation should dwell on the first, second, and final paragraphs of the Declaration. Understanding what is meant by those words is pivotal to understanding American history, what makes America an exceptional nation, and the responsibilities every American citizen has. The list of grievances should be discussed in light of the previous history that led to the Declaration.

The American War of Independence should be taught so as to fill the moral imaginations of students with images of the heroic characters and actions of its American participants. Strategy, battles, and the general arc of the war should be taught in detail, punctuated with accounts of the key moments and figures who contributed to America’s ultimate victory. The ideas for which the War of Independence was fought are matched in the American memory only by the stories of those who fought for them.

When teaching the aftermath of the War of Independence up to the Constitutional Convention, teachers should make clear that America’s foray into governing itself entirely independent of Great Britain initially trended toward abject failure. The Articles of Confederation ordered public affairs in a reactionary rather than prudent manner. Students should understand that the Constitutional Convention, in many respects, saved the country from another sort of tyranny: majority tyranny.

Finally, the Constitutional Convention and the Constitution itself should be studied in tandem and in detail. A major aid in doing so is to read selections of the Federalist Papers. Students should consider carefully both the structure of the Constitution and the Framers’ intentions in so constructing it. Students should understand that nothing in the Constitution was haphazardly decided. Given the unprecedented long-term success of the Constitution, students should appreciate that any changes to the Constitution warrant careful and complete understanding of why the Framers crafted it the way they did, as explained in their own words.

How Teachers Can Learn More

**TEXTS**

- *The Glorious Cause*, Robert Middlekauff
- *We Still Hold These Truths*, Matthew Spalding
- *The Political Theory of the American Founding*, Thomas West
- *The Constitutional Convention*, James Madison
- *African Founders*, David Hackett Fischer
- *No Property in Man*, Sean Wilentz
- *The American Heritage: A Reader*, ed. Hillsdale College History Faculty
- *The U.S. Constitution: A Reader*, ed. Hillsdale College Politics Faculty (ConstitutionReader.com)
ONLINE COURSES | Online.Hillsdale.edu

The Great American Story
Civil Rights in American History
Introduction to the Constitution
Constitution 101
The Federalist Paper

Lesson Planning Resources

TEACHER RESOURCES

Land of Hope, Wilfred McClay
The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic, H.A. Guerber
A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope, Wilfred McClay and John McBride
A Short History of the American Revolution, James Stokesbury

STUDENT RESOURCES

Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1, Wilfred McClay

PRIMARY SOURCES

“Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death!,” Patrick Henry
Common Sense, Thomas Paine
Declaration of Independence, Draft
Declaration of Independence
Resignation Speech, George Washington
The United States Constitution
The Bill of Rights
LESSON PLANS, ASSIGNMENTS, AND QUIZZES
Lesson 1 — Self-Government or Tyranny

1763–1776

9-10 classes

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn how new British exertions of authority over the colonists led to the Declaration of Independence.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1 Chapter 5
Primary Sources See below.

Teacher Texts
Land of Hope Pages 42–48
The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic Pages 68–80
A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope Pages 29–43

Online.Hillsdale.edu
The Great American Story Lecture 3

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students read Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1, chapter 5, and prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 2: Students read and annotate excerpts from Paine’s Common Sense and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places

Boston Lexington and Concord
Philadelphia Fort Ticonderoga
Independence Hall

Persons

George III Crispus Attucks
Charles Townshend Paul Revere
George Washington Samuel Adams
John Hancock Benjamin Franklin
Patrick Henry
John Adams
Abigail Adams
Ethan Allen
Thomas Paine
Thomas Jefferson

Terms and Topics
salutary neglect
self–government
representation
consent
French and Indian War
Proclamation of 1763
Stamp Act
Sons of Liberty
mob
tar and feather
Declaratory Act
Townshend Acts
non–importation agreements

Boston Massacre
Committees of Correspondence
Boston Tea Party
Intolerable Acts
First Continental Congress
Minutemen
Battles of Lexington & Concord
Siege of Fort Ticonderoga
Second Continental Congress
Continental Army
Battle of Bunker Hill
Olive Branch Petition
Liberation of Boston

Primary Sources
“Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death!,” Patrick Henry
Common Sense, Thomas Paine

To Know by Heart
“Appeal to Heaven”
“Don’t Tread On Me”
“Join or Die”
“Give me liberty or give me death!” — Patrick Henry
“The shot heard round the world.”
“Don’t fire till you see the whites of their eyes!” — Israel Putnam, William Prescott, or legend

Timeline
1754–1763 French and Indian War
1763 Proclamation Line
1770 Boston Massacre
1773 Boston Tea Party
1774 Intolerable Acts
1775 Lexington and Concord, Ticonderoga, Bunker Hill
July 4, 1776 Declaration of Independence signed

Images
Historical figures and events
Revolutionary era flags
Non–importation agreement example
Paul Revere’s Engraving of Boston Harbor under occupation
Paul Revere’s Engraving of the Boston Massacre
Independence Hall (exterior and interior)
Battle maps and battle scene depictions
Uniforms and arms of the Minutemen, the Continental Army soldiers, and the Redcoats
Medical equipment

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Biographies and the roles of George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, Samuel Adams, Patrick Henry, Thomas Paine, and Thomas Jefferson up through 1776
- Boston Massacre
- John Adams fair-mindedly representing the British soldiers after the Boston Massacre Boston Tea Party
- Boston Tea Party
- Patrick Henry’s “Give me liberty or give me death!” speech
- Paul Revere’s Ride
- Minutemen at the Battles of Lexington and Concord
- Ethan Allen, Henry Knox, and the Green Mountain Boys capturing the guns from Fort Ticonderoga
- Letters of John and Abigail Adams
- John Adams’s nomination of George Washington to command the Continental Army
- Battle of Bunker Hill
- Liberation of Boston
- John Adams’s nomination of Thomas Jefferson to draft the Declaration of Independence

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- Why had the colonies been mostly left to their own devices? Why was this “neglect” “salutary”?  
- How did the British situation following the French and Indian War lead the British to exert more authority over the colonists?  
- In what ways did the British begin to exert control over the colonists without their consent?  
- What did the Proclamation Act of 1763 attempt to do? What change did it reveal in the relationship between Parliament and the colonists? How did the colonists respond?  
- To what extent were Americans justified in claiming the rights of Englishmen?  
- What did the Stamp Act do? Why did this act in particular undermine the principle of self-government and consent? How did the colonists respond?  
- What is self-government? In what ways was the colonists’ freedom to govern themselves threatened and curtailed by the British between 1763 and 1776?  
- What is the relationship between this question of representative self-government and that of liberty and tyranny?  
- What were the two oftentimes competing approaches the colonists took to addressing Parliament’s actions?  
- How did the Boston Massacre change public opinion among the colonists? How did John Adams successfully preserve the rule of law?  
- Why did Parliament pass the Intolerable Acts? What did they do (5 actions)?  
- How did the Continental Congress respond to the Coercive (Intolerable) Acts?
- Was war inevitable? Was independence?
- In what ways did Thomas Paine’s *Common Sense* influence public opinion?
- What actions by the British in the spring of 1776 prompted Richard Henry Lee of Virginia to introduce a motion for independence?
- To what extent was the American Revolution not made but prevented? To what extent was it revolutionary?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 77: Name one reason why the Americans declared independence from Britain.
  - Question 85: Benjamin Franklin is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 86: George Washington is famous for many things. Name one.

**Keys to the Lesson**

For more than 150 years, the British colonists of North America rarely quarreled with their countrymen on the other side of the Atlantic. Then in 1763, the British began to claim new control over the colonists. What followed were thirteen years of increased tension and sometimes violent clashes leading to outright war in 1775 and, in 1776, the declaring of independence by the colonists and the formation of a new country separate from British power. This decade and a half gave birth to the nation each American citizen calls home. It is imperative that American students know the people, actions, and stories that led to the founding of their country. The chief aim of teaching these fourteen years, therefore, is to help students to understand the actions by both Great Britain and the colonists that compelled the Americans to such a separation and to found a new, unprecedented kind of country.

Teachers might best plan and teach Self-Government or Tyranny with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Have students consider the issues the British in North America faced following the French and Indian War (in Europe, the Seven Years’ War), namely, the risk of further conflict (and associated costs) with Native Americans as colonists moved westward, and the massive debt that Great Britain had accumulated in the late war.
- Show how Great Britain’s attempted solutions to these problems (prohibiting colonial expansion and the sudden enforcement of lax tax laws) marked the first shift in the relationship between Great Britain and the colonists and heralded the end of the period of “salutary neglect,” during which American colonists had grown accustomed to practicing self-government.
- Help students see the pattern that this initial shift would grow into: attempts by the British (Parliament and, to a certain extent, King George III) to exert more control, alternating with American resistance to what they argued were infringements on their rights as Englishmen.
- Teach about each of the British acts: what they were, why they were passed, how the colonists resisted, and what happened next as a consequence.
- Consider at length that self-government, or representative self-government, was at the heart of the issue. Emphasize that this was not merely a nice-sounding phrase. Instead, the colonists gradually came to recognize the following as a question of liberty or tyranny: whether they were self-governed through their elected representatives or were dictated to and controlled by a distant government in which they had no consent. Make clear that this was the question: not merely whether the colonists would have representation in Parliament (it was
impractical) nor whether they had to pay taxes, but whether or not people must be controlled by the will of others in government without their free consent.

- Explain how the Americans organized themselves to engage with and resist the British, a capacity born of decades of practice in self-government and a trait of American citizens for subsequent generations. In due course, the Boston Massacre impressed on public opinion the British position’s semblance to tyranny.

- Emphasize for students how there were often two competing approaches to responding to British actions: one that attempted deliberation and petition, and another that resorted to destruction of property and even tarring and feathering. In the end, the former approach prevailed, resorting to arms only as necessary to defend their assertion of rights, self-government, and liberty.

- Highlight that it was the Boston Tea Party, however, that brought issues to a head, prompting the British to respond to various actions in Massachusetts with the Intolerable Acts. Help students to consider that in five separate, odious ways, these acts show how preventing a people from governing themselves in even something as simple as a tax on paper and tea can lead to tyranny if not effectively recognized and resisted.

- Spend time illustrating how it was really across 1774–75, in response to the execution of the Intolerable Acts, that specific Founding Fathers marshaled their talents and ideas, eventually leading to declaring independence and forming a new nation by summer 1776.

- Read aloud with students Patrick Henry’s “Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death!” Speech.

- Teach in some detail the open armed conflicts at Lexington and Concord, Fort Ticonderoga, and Bunker Hill. Students should learn how these battles bolstered the patriot cause and transformed public opinion in these final two years of British rule.

- Have students read as a preparatory homework assignment excerpts from Thomas Paine’s *Common Sense*. In class, have a seminar conversation on the text. Target questions at helping students to see how and why Paine’s pamphlet proved decisive in shifting public opinion at the start of 1776. Questions on pages 42–43 of *A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope* may be helpful.

- Finally, emphasize how the news in the spring of 1776—that the British had hired German mercenary soldiers to deploy against British-Americans, and were now selectively encouraging slave rebellions in the colonies, while the Continental Congress recommended that the colonies begin forming their own governments—were key factors in moving a majority of the state delegates at the Second Continental Congress to commission a committee to draft a potential declaration of independence.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1**: Explain the key questions and moments between 1763 and 1776 that led the colonists to declare independence (2–3 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2**: Explain how the Americans believed they were preserving self-government against British tyranny (1–2 paragraphs).
Reading Quiz 2.1

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. What mountain range did the Royal Proclamation of 1763 attempt to prevent the colonists from crossing?

2. To whom did the Quartering Act force the colonial legislatures to provide lodging and food?

3. What did the Declaratory Act declare about Parliament’s authority over the colonists?

4. What did a group of colonists dump into Boston Harbor in 1773 that resulted in a tyrannical retaliation by the British?

5. Name one of the battles you read about that occurred prior to the Declaration of Independence?
**Unit 2 — Formative Quiz 1**

**Covering Lesson 1**

10-15 minutes

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. Why had the colonies been mostly left to their own devices? Why was this “neglect” “salutary”?

2. What did the Stamp Act do? Why did this act in particular undermine the principle of self-government and consent?


4. In which ways did Thomas Paine’s *Common Sense* influence public opinion?

5. Which actions by the British in the spring of 1776 prompted Richard Henry Lee of Virginia to introduce a motion for independence?
Lesson 2 – The Declaration of Independence

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the movement in favor of independence and about the drafting and signing of the Declaration of Independence. They also read the Declaration of Independence and engage in a seminar conversation about its contents and ideas.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

**Student Texts**
- Primary Sources
  - See below.

**Teacher Texts**
- *Land of Hope* Pages 48–51
- *The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic* Pages 81–82

**Online.Hillsdale.edu**
- *The Great American Story* Lecture 3
- *Introduction to the Constitution* Lectures 1, 2, 3
- *Constitution 101* Lecture 2
- *Civil Rights in American History* Lectures 1, 2, 3

STUDENT PREPARATION

**Assignment:** Students read and annotate the Declaration of Independence and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

**Geography & Places**
- Philadelphia
- Independence Hall

**Persons**
- Benjamin Franklin
- Thomas Jefferson
- John Adams

**Terms and Topics**
Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God
self-evident natural rights equality unalienable liberty license
pursuit of happiness consent of the governed list of grievances slavery self-government representation Liberty Bell

Primary Sources
Declaration of Independence, First Draft
Declaration of Independence

To Know by Heart
First two paragraphs of the Declaration of Independence

“And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor.” — Final sentence of the Declaration of Independence

Timeline
July 2, 1776 Second Continental Congress votes for independence
July 4, 1776 Declaration of Independence signed

Images
Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and John Adams
Independence Hall (exterior and interior)
Photos or facsimiles of original Declaration of Independence
National Archives Building and Rotunda
Jefferson Memorial
Statue of Thomas Jefferson (Hillsdale College campus)

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

▪ The first public reading of the Declaration of Independence at the State House Yard, the tolling of the Liberty Bell, and the removal of the royal coat of arms

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

▪ What were the various audiences that the Declaration of Independence sought to address?
▪ In its opening lines, what is the Declaration claiming to be doing and what does it want its audience to do in response?
▪ What are “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God”?
▪ What is a “self–evident” truth?
▪ What does it mean that “all men are created equal”?
▪ What is a right?
According to the Declaration of Independence, from where do natural rights come?
What does it mean to say that men are “endowed by their creator” with the rights?
What does “unalienable” mean?
What is liberty according to the Founders? How is it distinct from license?
Why did Jefferson use “the pursuit of happiness” instead of “property”?
What is the purpose of government?
From where does government derive its just powers?
What are the people free—and even obligated—to do if the government fails or violates its purpose?
Ought it to be easy or frequent for a people to overthrow and replace its government? If not, under which circumstances may they do so?
In which ways did Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, and the Second Continental Congress alter Thomas Jefferson’s first draft of the Declaration of Independence? What were the reasons for these various changes?
Why did Thomas Jefferson’s first draft of the Declaration of Independence include condemnations of King George for perpetuating the Atlantic slave trade?
Why did northern delegates, who were opposed to slavery and wanted it abolished, believe that compromising with southern delegates by omitting the issue of slavery from the Declaration’s list of grievances would be more likely to lead to the abolition of slavery than splitting with the southern colonies over the issue in 1776?
How does the fact that America was founded with the words of the Declaration of Independence make America the exception in the history of nations, even exceptional?
America is a country whose existence and purpose for existing rests on belief in and commitment to certain ideas its Founders asserted to be objectively true. What are these truths?
Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 8: Why is the Declaration of Independence important?
  - Question 9: What founding document said the American colonies were free from Britain?
  - Question 10: Name two important ideas from the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution.
  - Question 11: The words “Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness” are in what founding document?
  - Question 75: What group of people was taken and sold as slaves?
  - Question 77: Name one reason why the Americans declared independence from Britain.
  - Question 78: Who wrote the Declaration of Independence?
  - Question 79: When was the Declaration of Independence adopted?
  - Question 81: There were 13 original states. Name five.
  - Question 85: Benjamin Franklin is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 87: Thomas Jefferson is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 125: What is Independence Day?
  - Question 126: Name three national U.S. holidays.
KEYS TO THE LESSON

The Declaration of Independence was not merely a renunciation of dependence on Great Britain. It was, in fact, generative. It created an entity—a nation—that stood on its own, had its own existence, and was independent of other nations. Even today, it offers guiding principles that continue to shape our arguments about the nature and limits of political authority. In brief, the Declaration of Independence created and still defines the United States of America.

Like an organizational mission statement, the Declaration is an indication of the Founders’ intention, a guiding star for our political life, and a benchmark for measuring our public institutions. Americans should consider all questions concerning the public sphere in light of the truths asserted in the Declaration. The Declaration of Independence should be both the beginning and end for students’ understanding of their country, their citizenship, and the benefits and responsibilities of being an American.

Referring questions of our common life to the Declaration of Independence does not mean that Americans should be forced or manipulated to believe the ideas of the Declaration to be true. But this unit asks students at least to consider whether the Declaration’s claims are true. Indeed, Thomas Jefferson and the delegates at the Second Continental Congress addressed the Declaration of Independence not only to Americans in 1776 but also to the critical judgment of American students in the 21st Century, for, as they stated, “a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation” [emphasis added]. The lasting claim of the Declaration is that there are certain truths about all men having unalienable rights. As a historical matter, as well, students should think seriously about how the American founding—and the continuation of the American experiment—has succeeded or failed against its stated objectives.

Students should take it upon themselves to study and consider seriously the Declaration of Independence as the foundation and even the heart of their country’s existence. While a more extensive study of the Declaration should occur in a separate government class, including consideration of the thinkers who influenced the Founders, the historical treatment of the American Revolution deserves several class periods of conversation on the text of the Declaration.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Declaration of Independence with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Help students to see that the Founders intended to speak to them, to posit truths for their consideration and ultimate judgment. “[A] decent respect to the opinions of mankind” means that the Declaration was not merely intended as an argument about the unique situation of the colonists in 1776; the Founders submitted their claims to the judgment of all people in all times because they were asserting truths about all people in all times. This especially includes future Americans and, in this case, American students.
- Lead students through a complete reading of the Declaration of Independence in the course of a seminar conversation. Pause frequently to ask students questions on the various parts of the text, especially the first two paragraphs. Questions on pages 47–52 of A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope may be helpful.
Help students to consider that the Founders are making assertions of the existence of objective truth by referencing “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God” and by describing the truths as “self-evident.” This abides by the first law of logic, that of contradiction, which is the basis of all reasoning and of our capacity to make sense of reality: i.e., that something cannot both be and not be at the same time in the same way. The use of the words “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God” ties truth to an external reality (nature) with fixed and reliable features (laws). “Self-evident” ties truth to fixed definitions—a “self-evident” claim is one that is true by definition of the idea in question, like the claim that a triangle has three sides. A “self-evident” truth is not merely a matter of perspective; it can be known and understood by anyone at any time.

Note that for the Founders, the “Laws…of Nature’s God” implied that this understanding of nature was consistent with the Christian tradition within which the American founding occurred. Other references to divine sources of truth in the Declaration include that men are “endowed by their Creator” and its appeals to “the Supreme Judge of the world” and to “the protection of divine Providence.”

Ask students what the Declaration means by “all men are created equal.” For one thing, “men” means human being not males as opposed to females. Based on the totality of their writings available, the principal authors of the Declaration meant that men and women share equally in human dignity and in possession of natural rights or freedoms that are simply part of being human. A consistent application of equality would make slavery impossible—and the Second Continental Congress could scarcely have missed this point. This meaning of equality did not suggest equality in talent, property, or other accidentals to one’s humanity, qualities that are unique to a particular person and circumstance.

Note that the mere articulation that all men are created equal was revolutionary. Compared to the degree and universality of equality we take for granted today, such a statement and contemporary limits on the principle in practice leave the Founders open to much potential criticism. For example, in general, women, men without land, and African Americans were not able to vote. But the mere fact that most men were able to vote was a significant departure from what was normal in the rest of the world. And even though civil equality was not universal, the statement about inherent and equal dignity of all people was unheard of at the time. Many Founders believed (and the centuries since have proven them correct) that this founding principle would allow for ever greater realizations of equality through history. In brief, were it not for the Founders’ assertion of human equality, albeit imperfectly put into practice, the kind of equality we are used to today likely would never have arisen, or certainly not from American shores.

Ask students what the Declaration states to be the purpose of government. Students should understand the Declaration’s argument that government is created to secure the natural rights of each person.

Ask students about the source of a government’s power. The Declaration explains that government power comes from the free consent of the people. Students should also consider the Declaration’s argument that people do not receive their rights from government, nor do they surrender their fundamental rights to it. Instead, the rights to “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness” are natural—they are inherent in being human—and government is delegated power by the sovereign people to secure their rights and pursue the common good. Rather than surrendering their rights to government, people create government to protect their rights. The Declaration describes these rights as “unalienable,” meaning that they cannot be relinquished or taken away, though they may be forfeited when a person violates the rights of
another person, (e.g., the penalty for taking someone else’s life or liberty might be to lose your own life or liberty).

- Help students to understand what is meant by self-government: legitimate government exists to secure rights and derives its “just powers from the consent of the governed,” that is, from the citizen body. The fundamental purpose of government is clear and its powers are limited. As a result, and by design, the people have the liberty to govern themselves in most aspects of their daily lives.

- Read the list of grievances and ask students to connect each grievance to the historical events they studied in the previous lesson. Then ask students to explain how those events violate the statements made in the first two paragraphs of the Declaration.

- Provide students with a copy of the first draft of the Declaration of Independence that tracks the edits made by the Second Continental Congress. Ask students why specific changes were made. Spend time especially with the sections that addressed slavery and were removed.

- When discussing compromises between the principled claims of the Declaration and the brutal matter of slavery, be mindful of the following:
  - Slavery was one of the few matters of disagreement among the colonial revolutionaries in their otherwise generally united challenge to England. Those who opposed slavery as well as those who favored it agreed about the growing threat of British tyranny.
  - Many of the American Founders, especially those from northern colonies, strongly opposed slavery but nevertheless accepted a temporary compromise on the issue, believing that an independent and united country would provide the best prospect for actually abolishing slavery. Without unity between northern and southern colonies, either the colonists would have lost the war, in which case slavery would simply be continued by Great Britain, or the southern colonies would have formed their own separate country, in which case the North would have no power over the South to abolish slavery. The key for the American Founders, especially those who opposed slavery, would be to continue efforts against slavery as a united country—united around the principles of the Declaration of Independence.
  - The idea that a country can be founded on a principle—rather than merely on claims of territory, tribe, or military power—is uniquely American. America’s founding principle that “all men are created equal and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights” was unprecedented. Almost all recognized that the statement of the principles, despite a compromise that allowed for the pre-existing institution’s continuing existence, undermined the legitimacy of slavery.
  - Many northern Founders and even some slaveholding Founders recognized the hypocrisy of claiming the principle of equality in spite of the continuing institution of slavery. Nevertheless, some southern Founders did not believe this phrase to be true for slaves and therefore did not believe it was hypocritical.
  - Many have understood the principle of equality as the enduring object or goal of American political life, with each generation seeking further to expand the conditions of political equality. This was the view of many Founders, as well as of Abraham Lincoln, abolitionists like Frederick Douglass, and civil rights leaders like Martin Luther King Jr., who called the Declaration a “promissory note to which every American was to fall heir” in his 1963 “I Have a Dream” speech.
Slavery and the subsequent inequality and violations of the rights of the descendants of slaves, as well as of women and certain immigrants, are glaring ways in which the country has fallen short of its founding idea.

The Declaration’s principle of equality—and the persistence and bravery of Americans of all origins to sacrifice and even die insisting that the nation should live up to the principle—has led to unprecedented achievements of human equality and the protection of equal rights.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Explain the meaning of key lines, phrases, and ideas in the first two paragraphs of the Declaration of Independence (1–2 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Recite by heart the first two paragraphs and the final paragraph of the Declaration of Independence.

**Assignment 3:** Explain why the Americans believed they had more than “light and transient” causes to justify their revolution (1–2 paragraphs).
Lesson 3 — The War of Independence

Lessons Objective

Students learn about the major figures, common soldiers, strategy, and specific battles of the American War of Independence.

Teacher Preparation

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Text

*Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1* Chapter 6
Primary Sources See below.

Teacher Texts

*Land of Hope* Pages 52–58
*The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic* Pages 83–102
*A Short History of the American Revolution* As helpful
*A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope* Pages 63–68
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*The Great American Story* Lecture 4

Student Preparation

**Assignment 1:** Students read *Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1*, chapter 6, and prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Core Content in This Lesson

Geography & Places

| Delaware River | Valley Forge |
| Saratoga       | Yorktown    |
| Fort West Point|             |

Persons

| George Washington | Henry Knox |
| Phillis Wheatley | John Paul Jones |
| John Adams       | Horatio Gates |
| Abigail Adams    | Marquis de Lafayette |
| Ethan Allen      | Tadeusz Kościuszko |
Baron von Steuben  
Nathanael Greene  
Benedict Arnold  
John Burgoyne  
Charles Cornwallis  
Alexander Hamilton

**Terms and Topics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patriot/Revolutionary</th>
<th>Tory/Loyalist</th>
<th>Articles of Confederation</th>
<th>Continental Army</th>
<th>privateer</th>
<th>Brown Bess Musket</th>
<th>volley</th>
<th>Battle of New York</th>
<th>mercenary</th>
<th>Hessians</th>
<th>Crossing of the Delaware</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Battle of Trenton</td>
<td>Betsy Ross Flag</td>
<td>Yankee Doodle</td>
<td>Battle of Saratoga</td>
<td>guerrilla warfare</td>
<td>French Treaty of Alliance</td>
<td>volley</td>
<td>Battle of Yorktown</td>
<td>Newburgh Conspiracy</td>
<td>American Cincinnatus</td>
<td>Treaty of Paris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Primary Sources**

- Resignation Speech, George Washington
- “Liberty and Peace,” Phillis Wheatley

**To Know by Heart**

- “These are the times that try men’s souls.” — Thomas Paine, *The Crisis*
- Yankee-Doodle, first stanza

**Timeline**

- (1775) 1776–1783: War of Independence
- July 4, 1776: Declaration of Independence signed
- Christmas, 1776: Battle of Trenton
- 1777: Battle of Saratoga
- 1777–78: Winter Quarters at Valley Forge
- 1781 (Fall): Battle of Yorktown; Cornwallis Surrenders
- 1783: Treaty of Paris

**Images**

- Historical figures
- Landscape pictures of geographic places featured in this lesson
- Depictions of figures at various scenes, moments, and in battle
- “Washington Crossing the Delaware” painting
- Betsy Ross Flag and other flags
- Maps: overall strategies, specific battles
- Relevant forts
- Medical equipment
- Reenactment photos
- Washington Monument
- Statue of George Washington (Hillsdale College campus)
Images and uniforms of British and American officers and soldiers

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- The fates of the signers of the Declaration of Independence
- David Bushnell’s submarine attack
- Maryland 400 and the Battle of Brooklyn
- Retreat from Manhattan
- Washington’s Crossing of the Delaware
- The American farmers joining the Battle of Saratoga
- Washington encouraging his men at Valley Forge
- Stories of Margaret Corbin, Molly Pitcher, Abigail Adams, and Martha Washington during the war
- Washington on horseback at the Battle of Monmouth
- The playing of the “World Turned Upside Down” after Yorktown (possibly legend)
- Washington’s dismissal of the Newburgh Conspiracy
- George III’s comments on Washington resigning his command (possibly legend)
- Washington’s resignation

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What were the advantages and disadvantages that the Americans and British each faced at the outset of the war?
- What was the style of warfare in the War of Independence, including battlefield strategy, weapons, ammunition, medical care, etc.?
- What were the overall strategies that each side pursued in the course of the war?
- What were the major contributions and moments in George Washington’s generalship during the war?
- How did each of the following battles begin, what happened in them, and what was their significance: Bunker Hill, Trenton, and Yorktown?
- Why was the situation so dire in winter 1776?
- Why was the Battle of Saratoga so significant? What did the Americans gain from its newfound ally?
- What happened at Valley Forge over the winter of 1777–78?
- What important contribution did Baron von Steuben make to the Continental Army?
- What were the most significant moments in the War of Independence?
- What factors, figures, moments, etc., led the Americans to victory?
- What were the terms of the Treaty of Paris?
- Why were soldiers on the verge of mutiny in 1783? How did George Washington resolve the crisis?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 76: What war did the Americans fight to win independence from Britain?
  - Question 80: The American Revolution had many important events. Name one.
  - Question 86: George Washington is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 89: Alexander Hamilton is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 121: Why does the flag have 13 stripes?
Question 122: Why does the flag have 50 stars?
Question 124: The Nation’s first motto was “E Pluribus Unum.” What does that mean?

**KEYS TO THE LESSON**

The American Revolution was truly a “David and Goliath” clash: a fledging strand of remote colonies loosely cooperating as one through a continental, mostly citizen army, fought and won independence from the greatest military power in the world. Students should appreciate this about the war of their forefathers. They should also know key stories of the heroic actions of the leaders and the many common folk in that struggle, understand the strategies employed in general and in specific battles, and consider the key moments and factors that led the Americans to victory.

Teachers might best plan and teach the War of Independence with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Discuss how the new states organized themselves in the Articles of Confederation. Students do not need to know the inner workings of this first constitution, as they will learn more about it in the next lesson. Students should understand, however, the general contours of power and how it operated. They should also understand the ways in which many of its weaknesses were intentional, weaknesses that would manifest themselves as serious problems at various points during the war.
- Ask students to identify and compare the various advantages and disadvantages of each side at the outset of the war and how these shifted over the years. Having students take simple notes as a “T-Chart” can be effective for this part of the lesson.
- Introduce students to the contemporary style of warfare by using images, maps, and artifacts. This approach will provide a foundation for their subsequent study of battles, help them to understand what happens in battle, and allow them to appreciate the bravery of soldiers fighting on both sides.
- Help students to empathize with the common Continental Army soldier and perceive the risk facing all the colonists, especially the leaders. Conditions were truly awful at many points in the war. The prospect of imminent defeat and the dire consequences for all involved weighed heavily upon the colonists throughout the war. The leaders—the men we now consider the American Founders—would most certainly have been shot or hanged if they were captured or the war was lost. In spite of the risks, they risked everything and sacrificed much for the cause of freedom and self-government. Students should appreciate the great debt we owe them.
- Explain each side’s strategy at various stages of the war and the tactics and battle plans employed in specific battles.
- Teach major battles in detail. Students should understand how the battles came to be, the key stories, factors, and moments from the battles themselves, and the significance of their various outcomes on subsequent events. Employ battle maps often. *A Short History of the American Revolution* is a great aid for teaching these battles; students may enjoy reading select accounts of these battles from this work, too.
- As with any conflict, draw attention to the key contributions of both leaders and common soldiers in the war. George Washington should be especially considered, not so much in his battle tactics as in his overall strategy for the war and his stirring leadership of his soldiers. Read aloud
Washington’s resignation speech, presenting it as vividly as possible and helping students appreciate the significance of Washington’s character and example.

- Explain how the principles of the Declaration of Independence were already effecting change among the Americans even prior to the resolution of the war. By the end of the war, every northern state except for New York and New Jersey had explicitly outlawed slavery, and some New England colonies had allowed African Americans to vote. Students should also learn of the outsized contributions of African American soldiers in the war, with five thousand serving in the Continental Army over the course of the war and, by some accounts, African Americans composing nearly a quarter of the American forces at Yorktown.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Explain the reasons why the Americans won the War of Independence (1–2 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Retell the history of the War of Independence (2–3 paragraphs).
Reading Quiz 2.2

The American Founding | Lesson 3
_Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1, Chapter 6_

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question.

1. What was one disadvantage that the United States had in the Revolutionary War?

2. What was one advantage that the United States had in the Revolutionary War?

3. Who was the general of the Continental Army?

4. Which country allied with the Americans following the Battle of Saratoga?

5. What was the final major battle of the war in which the Americans defeated the British and General Charles Cornwallis surrendered?
DIRECTIONS: Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. What were the overall strategies that each side pursued in the course of the war?

2. Why was the situation so dire in winter 1776?

3. What happened at Valley Forge over the winter of 1777–78?

4. What important contribution did Baron von Steuben make to the Continental Army?

5. What were the terms of the Treaty of Paris?
Lesson 4 — The United States Constitution

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the drafting of the Constitution, the debates within the Constitutional Convention and its ratification by the states, the political thought undergirding the Constitution, and the basic structure and powers of the federal government.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
- Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1
- Primary Sources

Teacher Texts
- Land of Hope
- The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic
- A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope

Online.Hillsdale.edu
- The Great American Story
- Constitution 101
- Civil Rights in American History
- The Federalist Papers

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students read Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1, chapter 7, and prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 2: Students read Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1, chapter 8, and prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places
- Northwest Territory
- Philadelphia
- Independence Hall
Persons
James Madison
Gouvernour Morris
James Wilson
George Washington
Alexander Hamilton
John Jay
Publius
Benjamin Banneker

Terms and Topics
Articles of Confederation
Land Ordinance of 1785
township
debt cancellation laws
Shays’ Rebellion
Northwest Ordinance
Constitutional Convention
Father of the Constitution
Constitution
natural rights
equality
consent of the governed
self–government
faction
majority tyranny
ambition
representation
republicanism
extended sphere
federalism
limited government
enumerated powers
separation of powers
checks and balances
Virginia Plan
New Jersey Plan
Great Compromise
Three–Fifths Clause
legislative power
Congress
bicameralism
House of Representatives
Senate
budget
impeachment
executive powers
Electoral College
cabinet
Commander–in–Chief
veto power
judicial powers
Marbury v. Madison
judicial review
Article IV, Section 2
amendment
The Federalist
Anti–Federalists
Article I, Section 9
ratifying conventions
Bill of Rights
freedom of religion
free exercise
establishment clause
freedom of speech
freedom of the press
right to assembly
right to keep and bear arms
due process

Primary Sources
The United States Constitution
The Bill of Rights

To Know by Heart
“Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the
happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.”
— Northwest Ordinance of 1787, Article 3
Preamble to the U.S. Constitution
“A republic, if you can keep it.” — Benjamin Franklin
“If men were angels, no government would be necessary.” — Federalist 10
First Amendment
Second Amendment

Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1781</td>
<td>Articles of Confederation take effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 17, 1787</td>
<td>Constitutional Convention concludes (Constitution Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1789</td>
<td>Constitution takes effect; George Washington elected president</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Images

Paintings of historical figures and events
Depictions of scenes from the Constitutional Convention
Photographs of Independence hall (exterior and interior)
Photos or facsimiles of the original Articles of Confederation, Northwest Ordinance, Constitution, The Federalist Papers, and Bill of Rights
The Signing of the American Constitution painting, Samuel Knecht
Statue of James Madison (Hillsdale College campus)
National Archives Building and the Rotunda for the Charters of Freedom
Paintings by Barry Faulkner in the Rotunda for the Charters of Freedom

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Delegates meeting in City Tavern in Philadelphia to discuss the Constitution—in–making “after hours”
- Benjamin Franklin’s story about the sun on George Washington’s chair being a sunrise for the country
- Benjamin Franklin’s reply to a woman’s question about what the Constitutional Convention had created: “A republic, if you can keep it,” and what this means
- The correspondence between Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Banneker

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What did the Land Ordinance of 1785 do, especially with respect to public vs. private ownership of land and public education?
- What did the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 do, especially with respect to the future of western lands, public education, and preventing the expansion of slavery?
- What were the specific problems of the Articles of Confederation? What issues did they permit to arise and fester?
- Which event especially impressed on the Founders, particularly James Madison and George Washington, the need to revisit the Articles of Confederation?
- Who was the intellectual leader among the many very talented men at the Philadelphia convention, known as the “Father of the Constitution”?
- What is the relationship between the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution?
- What was The Federalist, what was its purpose, and why do we still read it?
What did *The Federalist* argue about each of the following:
- human nature
- faction
- majority tyranny
- republicanism

What were the major disagreements at the Constitutional Convention?

What are the various ways that the Constitution addresses the issue of faction?

What is federalism? Why is it important?

What is separation of powers? Why is it a principle for the arrangement of government power, and how does the Constitution achieve this?

What are the offices and main powers of each branch of government?

What are checks and balances how can each branch check the power of the others?

Contrast the character of the House of Representatives to that of the Senate, explaining the purpose for these differences and how their features (method of selection, qualifications, term lengths, percentage of each house up for election at a given time, etc.) contribute to their respective purposes.

How does a bill become a law?

What is the Electoral College, how did it originally work, and what is its purpose?

What was the nature of the Founders’ compromise with slavery at the time of the founding for the sake of the union? Would it have been possible to abolish slavery in the southern colonies without union?

Why did many in the founding generation expect that slavery would eventually die out so long as it was not allowed to expand?

What efforts did some founders make to abolish slavery?

What are the three clauses related to slavery in the Constitution? Explain each.

How was the Three-Fifth Compromise a partial victory for slaveholders and a partial victory for abolitionists?

Why does the Constitution make it so hard for it to be amended?

What were the different views towards the Constitution during the ratification debate?

What do each of the following amendments in the Bill of Rights guarantee and why: 1st, 2nd, 9th, and 10th?

What is due process? Why is it such an important legal guarantor of freedom?

To whom are elected officials and the Constitution itself ultimately subject?

Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
- Question 1: What is the form of government of the United States?
- Question 2: What is the supreme law of the land?
- Question 3: Name one thing the U.S. Constitution does.
- Question 4: The U.S. Constitution starts with the words “We the People.” What does “We the People” mean?
- Question 6: What does the Bill of Rights protect?
- Question 10: Name two important ideas from the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution.
- Question 13: What is the rule of law?
- Question 14: Many documents influenced the U.S. Constitution. Name one.
- Question 82: What founding document was written in 1787?
Question 83: The Federalist Papers supported the passage of the U.S. Constitution. Name one of the writers.

Question 84: Why were the Federalist Papers important?

Question 86: George Washington is famous for many things. Name one.

Question 88: James Madison is famous for many things. Name one.

Question 89: Alexander Hamilton is famous for many things. Name one.

**Keys to the Lesson**

“[I]t seems to have been reserved to the people of this country, by their conduct and example, to decide the important question, whether societies of men are really capable or not of establishing good government from reflection and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend for their political constitutions on accident and force.” Thus wrote Alexander Hamilton in the opening paragraph of *Federalist* 1 in support of the newly proposed United States Constitution. Indeed, it is the Constitution that gives institutional form to the principles of the Declaration of Independence. It is, as Abraham Lincoln would later express it, the “frame of silver” meant to adorn and, most importantly, to protect the “apple of gold” that is the Declaration of Independence and the truths it asserts. The Constitution is the vehicle for the American experiment in self-government.

Study of the Constitution and of the history of its creation shows students how and that human beings are able to govern themselves in freedom, securing the equal protection of rights and the dignity of each person through reflection, deliberation, and choice. This is a significant thing for students to grasp, for if a constitution cannot achieve these ends, then force and violence are the only alternatives left to mankind.

Students need not study all of the political philosophy that undergirded the Constitutional Convention and the Constitution itself, nor need they understand all the details of the function of government; they will study these facets to the Constitution extensively in separate American Civics lessons. They should, however, understand the main principles and structure of the Constitution and the government it established, and know the stories from the Constitutional Convention and the ratification debates. Selections from *The Federalist* for the teacher as well as the Bill of Rights for the students will be helpful to accomplish these purposes.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Constitution with emphasis on the following approaches. While the length of this advice is larger than advice for other lessons, it is owing to the ease with which so many features of the Constitution can be taught incorrectly, with significant consequences. Therefore, this advice includes many corrections to common misconceptions that can be quickly addressed in class. As mentioned, the vast majority of the political philosophy and mechanics of the Constitution are reserved for separate civics lessons.

- Consider the two major legislative achievements under the Articles of Confederation, the Land Ordinance of 1785 and the Northwest Ordinance of 1787. Students should understand the historic emphasis the Founders placed on public education, private land ownership, and preventing the spread of slavery, as evident in these laws.
- Revisit the structure of the Articles of Confederation and the issues that emerged under such a structure during the War of Independence, namely: the debt cancellation laws by states (a clear
example of majority tyranny), varieties of currencies, interstate trade barriers, separate agreements between states and foreign powers, the inability to enforce the Treaty of Paris against the British with respect to western territories, and Shays’ Rebellion.

- Lead students through the process of the Constitutional Convention. Help them see that the Convention was arranged to ensure that all the states were able to speak and be represented. Through stories of the various debates and compromises, explain the difficulty of establishing a government that would satisfy all parties.

- Describe the environment and people of the Constitutional Convention, as well as the history and tone of the ratification debate that followed.

- Share with students the main arguments in *Federalist* 9, 10, and 51. These key documents should afford the teacher a review of the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the problems of the Articles of Confederation and also illustrate the purposes of the Constitution. The form of the Constitution follows its function with respect to human nature and the purposes for which governments are established, per the Declaration of Independence. *The Federalist* explains both of these functions and the nature of men.

- Read, annotate, and discuss the Constitution with particular attention to the Preamble, the structure of government that the Constitution establishes, and the reasons for this structure. Questions on pages 56–62 of *A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope* may be helpful.

- Clarify that the Constitution establishes a republic, not a democracy. In a pure democracy the people make all legislative decisions by direct majority vote; in a republic, the people elect certain individuals to represent their interests in deliberating and voting. The deliberations and voting record of representatives should usually reflect but should also be more refined than that of the entire people voting directly. Sometimes this distinction is described in terms of direct democracy vs. representative democracy.

- Explain the importance of the principles of separation of powers and federalism, and why these ideas are central to the Constitution’s safeguards against the corrupting tendency of power.

- Consider how the Constitution repeatedly structures federal institutions to refine and enlarge the will of the people.

- Explain how the House of Representatives is meant to be a more dynamic and immediate expression of the people’s will, while the Senate is meant to be more deliberative and circumspect.

- Emphasize that the Framers of the Constitution were chiefly concerned with allowing the will of the majority to rule—thereby guaranteeing the consent of the governed—while still preserving the rights of the minority and thereby securing justice.

- Describe the American Founders’ understanding of human nature. They understood human nature to be fixed and unchanging, good but also flawed and tending toward corrupting power. In response to human nature, government must guard against the opposite dangers of lawlessness and tyranny, accounting for the realities of human nature and rejecting the possibility of utopia.

- Show how the Constitution does not deny, demonize, or elevate human nature, but rather seeks to channel the powers of human beings into constructive institutions while mitigating man’s baser tendencies. In brief, the Constitution is constructed on a deep and accurate understanding of fixed human nature born of the Founders’ knowledge of history, their own experience, and their prudence.

- Ask about the source and purpose of a government’s power. Review how the Declaration of Independence claims that government power comes from the free consent of the people, and ask students to identify whether and how the Constitution accomplishes that goal.
- Distinguish the focus of the federal government compared to the state governments.
- Teach the structure, makeup, and powers of each branch of government and explain why the Founders made them so. Students should understand how each branch works, how they work together, and how the branches check and balance one another.
- Clarify how the Electoral College works and why the Founders chose this process for electing the president. One of the original reasons was to provide a way for the people’s representatives, the electors, to prevent a tyrannical or fraudulent choice, but most states abandoned this purpose when they enacted laws binding electors to the state’s popular vote. Another reason was to ensure that presidential candidates would pay attention to the interests of those to whom it was harder or less politically efficient to travel geographically. This has forced presidential candidates to address the concerns not merely of large population centers like cities but also of rural and more remote populations. Together with equal representation among states in the Senate, the Electoral College has discouraged a majority tyranny of urban interests.
- Take the time to consider, read, and discuss the ways in which slavery was addressed in the Constitution, including the extents to which the Constitution both left slavery in place and also placed new national limits on it. As Frederick Douglass and Abraham Lincoln would later acknowledge, the Declaration’s principle of equality and the Constitution’s arrangements gave the Founders the belief that they had placed slavery on the path to eventual extinction. This of course does not excuse the fact that many of these founders still held African Americans in slavery during their lifetimes.
- Clarify for students the arguments of northerners and southerners concerning the Three-Fifths Clause. The clause was not about the humanity of slaves; it was strictly about how much representation slave-owning states would receive in Congress and the Electoral College. The great hypocrisy of the slaveholders was that while they refused to call a slave a human being, they insisted that each slave be counted as a whole person for purposes of representation. In fact, it was the anti-slavery Founders who did not want slaves counted at all in the Constitution for the purposes of representation. The fact that slaves were only counted as three-fifths for the purposes of representation was a disappointment for southern states, as they had demanded they be counted as a whole person. It was a partial victory for northern opponents to slavery, as it would give the slaveholding states less influence in lawmaking than they wished. Additionally, students should understand that in the mind of those opposed to slavery, this compromise was the only politically viable route if they were to secure southern support for the Constitution, without which the country would become disunited, with the South able to perpetuate slavery indefinitely as their own country without northern abolitionists. Students need not agree with the tenets of the compromise, but they must understand it as the founders themselves understood it.
- Remind students that the slave trade was not formally limited in the states (the Continental Congress had temporarily banned the practice in 1774) until the passage of the Constitution, which allowed for it to be outlawed nationwide in 1808 (which it was) and for Congress to discourage it by imposing tariffs on the slave trade in the meantime. Students should understand that without the compromise that allowed this twenty-year delay, the power to abolish the slave trade would not have been granted by the slaveholding interest in the first place.
- Consider with students the significance of the Constitution not using the word “slave” and instead using “person.” Refusing to use the word “slave” avoided giving legal legitimacy to slavery. Even Article IV, Section 2, Clause 3 emphasizes that slavery was legal based on certain state, not federal, laws. The use of the word “person” forced even slaveholders to recognize the
humanity of the slave: that he or she was in fact a human person, not property. There would be no federally-recognized “property in man.”

- Point out for students that clauses that were not about slavery but which slaveholding interests could use to their benefit were not therefore deliberately pro-slavery clauses. Such a logical fallacy would implicate as morally evil anything hijacked for use in committing a wrong act, for example, a road used by bank robbers in their getaway would be “pro-robbery.”

- Consider with students the sectional nature of views on slavery during the founding. The majority of northerners and northern founders (e.g., John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Benjamin Rush, Gouverneur Morris, and John Jay) spoke and wrote extensively on the immorality of slavery and its need to be abolished. Some northern founders, such as John Jay, Alexander Hamilton, and Benjamin Franklin, founded or served in abolitionist societies.

- Consider also that even among the southern founders who supported slavery or held slaves, several leading founders expressed regret and fear of divine retribution for slavery in America, such as Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and George Washington. Some freed their slaves as well, such as George Washington, who by the end of his life freed the slaves in his family estate. And many, like Thomas Jefferson, nevertheless maintained that slaves were men in full possession of the natural rights of all men. Making these observations does not diminish the inhumaneness of slavery or dismiss the wrong of racism by certain colonists or other individual Americans living in other generations.

- Ask students how to judge the Founders who owned slaves and yet supported the Declaration of Independence and Constitution. Students should consider their public and private lives as well as their words and deeds. Taken altogether, students should recognize the difficulty in assigning an absolute moral judgment that a person is entirely bad or entirely good while still being able to pass judgment on specific actions.

- Have students also consider the distinction between judging character absolutely versus judging individual actions. When they do, students will encounter figures who did both much that was good and also some that was bad, and that this contradiction runs through the heart of every person.

- Be careful with the phrase “consider the times,” as this phrase can easily give the impression that truth and morality (good and evil) are merely relative to one’s viewpoint or historical time period. Instead, help students understand that “to consider the times” in which the American colonists and Founders lived is not to excuse moral injustices or to justify relativism. We should consider the circumstances at the time and weigh them against principles that transcend time. It is not whitewashing or rewriting history. It is recognizing the reality of history and honestly assessing how figures at the time acted within their circumstances in light of the truth.

- Note the belief of many Founders, based on the evidence at the time, that slavery was naturally on the way to extinction. Public opinion had steadily grown against it; the principles of the Declaration of Independence and Revolution would continue to be a force toward realizing equality; and the Constitution had further restricted slavery, permitted further restrictions by holding the union together, and kept slavery on its path to extinction.

- Teach students about the Anti-Federalists’ concerns with the Constitution, the arguments for and against a Bill of Rights, and how the Federalists ultimately convinced states to ratify the Constitution (provided that a Bill of Rights was included).

- Read aloud with students the Bill of Rights. Pause frequently to ask students questions on various parts of the text. Questions on pages 79–84 of A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope may be helpful.
• Help students understand why each of the rights found in the Bill of Rights corresponds to the preservation of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and how these rights answer some of the grievances in the Declaration of Independence as well as the problems under the Articles of Confederation. Especially consider the 1st, 2nd, 5th, and 10th Amendments.

• Explain that the Founders did not believe the Bill of Rights encompassed all the rights of men in society, nor that these rights came from government. Some of the rights enumerated in the Bill of Rights are natural rights. Many are derivative civil rights through which the constitutional process abides by and secures underlying natural rights. Between the Bill of Rights, the limited purposes of government, and the enumerated powers, emphasize for students how America has a limited government.

• Finally, tell about the first elections, meetings of the Electoral College, and George Washington’s inauguration in 1789. If students have already studied the French Revolution, remind them that just a few short months later the French Revolution would commence, leading to a far different outcome than the American Revolution and Constitution.

**Strengthening Understanding: Post-Lesson Assignments**

**Assignment 1:** Explain how the Constitution distributes power among the three branches of government (1–2 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Explain what separation of powers and federalism each are and how they guard against the tendency governments to use power to become tyrannical (1–2 paragraphs).

**Assignment 3:** Explain why the Framers believed it should be relatively difficult to change the Constitution. Explain why they made an exception by including the Bill of Rights as the first ten amendments (1–2 paragraphs).
Reading Quiz 2.3

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question.

1. Are we sure that the band at Yorktown played “The World Turned Upside Down”?

2. What was the name of the first constitution and government under which the United States attempted to govern itself?

3. The Northwest Ordinance prohibited what from the territories of what is now much of the Great Lakes region of the Midwest?

4. What did the farmer and war veteran Daniel Shays do?

5. In which city did delegates meet to draft a new Constitution?
Reading Quiz 2.4

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. Who presided over the Constitutional Convention?

2. Who was known as “the Father of the Constitution”?

3. Although the convention was held in secrecy, how do we know so much about what happened?

4. Which powerful new office was created in the Constitution?

5. The compromise between representation by population or representation by state that decided to do both through a two-house Congress is known as the _____________ Compromise.
APPENDIX A

Study Guides

Tests

Writing Assignment
Unit 2 | Test 1 — Study Guide

Lesson 1 | Self-Government or Tyranny
Lesson 2 | The Declaration of Independence

Test on ____________

TIMELINE

When given chronological dates, match events from a list to the years or dates that they happened.

1754–1763 French & Indian War
1763 Proclamation Line
1770 Boston Massacre
1773 Boston Tea Party
1774 Intolerable Acts
1775 Battles of Lexington and Concord and of Bunker Hill
July 4, 1776 Declaration of Independence signed

GEOGRAPHY AND PLACES

Identify each on a map and/or tell where it is and explain its significance.

Boston Independence Hall Ticonderoga
Philadelphia Lexington and Concord

PERSONS

Identify each, provide biographical details, and explain what he or she thought or did in specific periods or events.

George III Samuel Adams Ethan Allen
George Washington Benjamin Franklin Thomas Paine
John Hancock Patrick Henry Thomas Jefferson
Crispus Attucks John Adams Henry Knox
Paul Revere Abigail Adams

TERMS AND TOPICS

Identify each and explain its significance to the period of history studied.

salutary neglect Sons of Liberty Intolerable Acts
self-government mob Minutemen
representation tar and feather Second Continental Congress
French and Indian War Declaratory Act Continental Army
Proclamation of 1763 Boston Massacre Olive Branch Petition
Stamp Act Boston Tea Party
Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God
self–evident
natural rights
equality
unalienable
liberty
pursuit of happiness
consent of the governed
slavery
Patriot/Revolutionary
Tory/Loyalist

MAJOR CONFLICTS

Explain how each battle began, narrate what happened in it and how, and explain the significance of the battle’s outcome.

French and Indian War
Lexington & Concord
Fort Ticonderoga
Bunker Hill

PRIMARY SOURCES

Based on annotations and notes from seminar conversations, be able to answer questions on each primary source. While you will not necessarily be asked why each primary source was created, what it did or argued, and what its effects were, being able to answer these kinds of questions will make you well prepared.

Common Sense, Thomas Paine
Declaration of Independence

TO KNOW BY HEART

Be prepared to fill in missing words and/or identify the speaker and context.

“Give me liberty or give me death!” — Patrick Henry
First two paragraphs of the Declaration of Independence

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be 3rd grade students.

- Biographies and the roles of George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, and Thomas Jefferson up through 1776
- Boston Massacre
- Boston Tea Party
- Minutemen at the Battles of Lexington and Concord
- Ethan Allen, Henry Knox, and the Green Mountain Boys capturing the guns from Fort Ticonderoga
- Battle of Bunker Hill
- Liberation of Boston
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.

Lesson 1 | Self-Government or Tyranny

□ Why had the colonies been mostly left to their own devices? Why was this “neglect” “salutary”?
□ How did the British situation following the French and Indian War lead the British to exert more authority over the colonists?
□ In what ways did the British begin to exert control over the colonists without their consent?
□ What is self–government? In what ways was the colonists’ freedom to govern themselves threatened and curtailed by the British between 1763 and 1776?
□ What were the two oftentimes competing approaches the colonists took to addressing Parliament’s actions?
□ How did the Boston Massacre change public opinion among the colonists?
□ Why did Parliament pass the Intolerable Acts? What did they do (five actions)?
□ In what ways did Thomas Paine’s *Common Sense* influence public opinion?
□ What actions by the British in the spring of 1776 prompted Richard Henry Lee of Virginia to introduce a motion for independence?

Lesson 2 | The Declaration of Independence

□ What are “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God”?
□ What is a “self–evident” truth?
□ What does it mean that “all men are created equal”?
□ What is a right?
□ According to the Declaration of Independence, from where do natural rights come?
□ What does “unalienable” mean?
□ What is liberty according to the Founders?
□ Why did Jefferson use “the pursuit of happiness” instead “of property”?
□ What is the purpose of government?
□ From where does a government derive its just powers?
□ What are the people free—and even obligated—to do if the government fails or violates its purpose?
□ Why did northern delegates, who were opposed to slavery and wanted it abolished, believe that compromising with southern delegates by omitting the issue of slavery from the Declaration’s list of grievances would be more likely to lead to the abolition of slavery than splitting with the southern colonies over the issue in 1776?
□ How does the fact that America was founded with the words of the Declaration of Independence make America the exception in the history of nations, even exceptional?
Unit 2 | Test 1 — The American Founding

Lesson 1 | Self-Government or Tyranny
Lesson 2 | The Declaration of Independence

TIMELINE

Write the letter of each event next to the date or years it took place.

- 1754–63
- 1763
- 1770
- 1773
- 1774
- 1775
- July 4, 1776

A.
B.
C.
D.
E.
F.
G.

Battles of Lexington & Concord and Bunker Hill
Boston Massacre
Boston Tea Party
Declaration of Independence signed
French and Indian War
Intolerable Acts
Proclamation Line

GEOGRAPHY AND PLACES

1. Draw a line indicating the border that the Proclamation of 1763 attempted to establish.

2. Label with dots the locations of Lexington & Concord, Fort Ticonderoga, and Philadelphia.

Map courtesy of A Teachers Guide to Land of Hope.
PERSONS, TERMS, AND TOPICS

Fill in the blank with the letter of the correct answer.

A. Benjamin Franklin  
B. Boston Massacre  
C. Boston Tea Party  
D. Declaration of Independence  
E. First Continental Congress  
F. Intolerable Acts  
G. Lexington and Concord  
H. Patrick Henry  
I. Proclamation Line  
J. salutary neglect  
K. Sons of Liberty  
L. Thomas Jefferson  
M. Thomas Paine

3. After acquiring lands from France following the French and Indian War, many British colonists hoped they would finally be able to settle further westward. In order to avoid additional conflict with the Native Americans and the related expenses of defense, the British enacted the ________________, which declared that no American was allowed to move west of the Appalachians, and those already there must move back east.

4. This action by the British signaled the end of ________________, or the tradition of allowing the colonists to govern themselves largely independent of Parliament that had made the colonists practiced in self-government.

5. In 1774, Parliament passed the Sugar Act. It did not create a new tax; rather it halved the previous sugar tax but, for the first time, actually tried to enforce it. No group found these new taxes so disagreeable as the ________________ led by Samuel Adams in Boston.

6. In 1770, British redcoats, abused and provoked by a mob, fired on a crowd of civilians. Though judged in court to be innocent of any wrong-doing, the event known as the ________________ changed public opinion and increased the tension between the British and the British colonists.

7. Tensions had seemed to ease by late 1773. But by then the British Parliament had granted the East India Trading Company a monopoly for selling tea in the American colonies. In response to yet another piece of British legislation not consented to by the colonial assemblies, colonists threw three shiploads of tea into Boston harbor in an event today known as the ________________.

8. Parliament responded to this event by passing a series of acts known as the ________________ Acts. These acts included closing Boston harbor and, perhaps most alarmingly, disbanding the colonial government in Massachusetts. These actions, moreover, were to be enforced by sending more armed soldiers and the British navy to the colonies.

9. Delegates from twelve colonies assembled at the ________________ in response to these extraordinary acts of Parliament.

10. The final push for Revolution came in the years of 1775 and 1776. In April of 1775, the first shots of the war were fired in the battles of ________________, when British soldiers attempted to seize a colonial armory, officially beginning a revolution many were still trying to avoid.
11. Following these battles, ____________________ gave a rousing speech in the Virginia House of Burgesses crying the words, “Give me liberty! Or give me death!”

12. Public opinion shifted sharply against the British in early 1776 when ____________________ published Common Sense in January of that year.

13. The rejection of offers of conciliation and the news that the British had hired Hessian mercenaries against their own people led delegates to the Second Continental Congress to vote for and sign the ____________________ to dissolve the “political bands” connecting the American states with Great Britain.

14. This document was written by a committee composed of ____________________, John Adams, and its main author, ____________________.

**MAJOR CONFLICTS**

*Explain how each battle began, narrate what happened in it and how, and explain the significance of the battle’s outcome.*

15. Bunker Hill
KNOW BY HEART

Fill in missing words using the correct letters and identify the source.

A. abolish  
B. destructive  
C. equal  
D. governed  
E. governments  
F. happiness  
G. liberty  
H. life  
I. secure  
J. self–evident  
K. truths  
L. unalienable rights

16. “We hold these __________________ to be __________________, that all men are ______________, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain ________________, that among these are ______________, ________________ and the pursuit of ________________.—That to ________________ these rights, ________________ are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the ________________,—That whenever any Form of Government becomes ________________ of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to ________________ it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.”

Source: ______________________________________

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be 3rd grade students.

17. Tell the story of the Boston Massacre.

18. Tell the story of the battles of Lexington and Concord.
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and writing should be employed and responses must fully answer each question.

19. What is self–government? In what ways was the colonists’ freedom to govern themselves threatened and curtailed by the British between 1763 and 1776?

20. What were the two oftentimes competing approaches the colonists took to addressing Parliament’s actions?

21. What are “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God”?

22. What is a “self–evident” truth?

23. What does it mean that “all men are created equal”?

24. What is the purpose of government?

25. Why did northern delegates, who were opposed to slavery and wanted it abolished, believe that compromising with southern delegates by omitting the issue of slavery from the Declaration’s list of grievances would be more likely to lead to the abolition of slavery than splitting with the southern colonies over the issue in 1776?
Unit 2 | Test 2 — Study Guide

Lesson 3 | The War of Independence
Lesson 4 | The Constitution

Test on ______________

TIMELINE

When given chronological dates, match events from a list to the years or dates that they happened.

(1775) 1776–1783 War of Independence
1775 Battles of Lexington and Concord and of Bunker Hill
July 4, 1776 Declaration of Independence signed
1776 (Christmas) Battle of Trenton
1777 Battle of Saratoga
1777–78 Winter Quarters at Valley Forge
1781 Battle of Yorktown; Cornwallis Surrenders
1783 Treaty of Paris
September 17, 1787 Constitutional Convention concludes (Constitution Day)
1789 Constitution takes effect; George Washington elected president

GEOGRAPHY AND PLACES

Identify each on a map and/or tell where it is and explain its significance.

Boston Fort Ticonderoga Yorktown
Philadelphia Delaware River Northwest Territory
Independence Hall Saratoga
Lexington and Concord Valley Forge

PERSONS

Identify each, provide biographical details, and explain what he or she thought or did in specific periods or events.

George III Horatio Gates Charles Cornwallis
George Washington George Rogers Clark Alexander Hamilton
Benjamin Franklin Marquis de Lafayette James Madison
John Adams Baron von Steuben John Jay
Ethan Allen Nathanael Greene Publius
Henry Knox Benedict Arnold
TERMS AND TOPICS

Identify each and explain its significance to the period of history studied.

Patriot/Revolutionary  Father of the Constitution  executive powers
Tory/Loyalist  Constitution  Electoral College
Articles of Confederation  faction  Commander-in-Chief
Continental Army  majoritarian tyranny  veto power
privateer  republicanism  judicial powers
Brown Bess Musket  extended sphere  judicial review
volley  federalism  amendment
mercenary  limited government  The Federalist
Hessians  enumerated powers  Anti–Federalists
Betsy Ross Flag  separation of powers  Bill of Rights
Yankee Doodle  checks and balances  freedom of religion
guerilla warfare  Virginia Plan  free exercise
French Treaty of Alliance  New Jersey Plan  establishment clause
Newburgh Conspiracy  Great Compromise  freedom of speech
American Cincinnatus  Three-Fifths Compromise  freedom of the press
Treaty of Paris  legislative power  right to assembly
debt cancellation laws  Congress  right to bear arms
Shays’ Rebellion  bicameralism  due process
Northwest Ordinance  House of Representatives
Constitutional Convention  Senate  

MAJOR CONFLICTS

Explain how each battle began, narrate what happened in it and how, and explain the significance of the battle’s outcome.

Lexington & Concord  New York  Yorktown
Fort Ticonderoga  Trenton
Bunker Hill  Saratoga

PRIMARY SOURCES

Based on annotations and notes from seminar conversations, be able to answer questions on each primary source. While you will not necessarily be asked why each primary source was created, what it did or argued, and what its effects were, being able to answer these kinds of questions will make you well prepared.

The United States Constitution
The Bill of Rights
TO KNOW BY HEART

*Be prepared to fill in missing words and/or identify the speaker and context.*

“These are times that try men’s souls.” — Thomas Paine, *The Crisis*

“Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.” — Northwest Ordinance of 1787, Article 3

Preamble to the U.S. Constitution

“A republic, if you can keep it.” — Benjamin Franklin

First Amendment

Second Amendment

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

*In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be 3rd grade students.*

- Biography of George Washington between 1776 and 1789
- Minutemen at the Battles of Lexington and Concord
- Ethan Allen, Henry Knox, and the Green Mountain Boys capturing the guns from Fort Ticonderoga
- Battle of Bunker Hill
- Liberation of Boston
- Washington’s Crossing of the Delaware
- The American farmers joining the Battle of Saratoga
- Washington encouraging his men at Valley Forge
- Stories of Margaret Corbin, Molly Pitcher, Abigail Adams, and Martha Washington during the war
- Washington’s dismissal of the Newburgh Conspiracy
- Washington’s resignation
- Benjamin Franklin’s reply to a woman’s question about what the Constitutional Convention had created: “A republic, if you can keep it,” and what this means

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

*Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.*

Lesson 3 | The War of Independence

☐ What were the advantages and disadvantages that the Americans and British each faced at the outset of the war?

☐ What were the overall strategies that each side pursued in the course of the war?

☐ What were the major contributions and moments in George Washington’s generalship during the war?

☐ Why was the Battle of Saratoga so significant? What did the Americans gain from their newfound ally?

☐ What important contribution did Baron von Steuben make to the Continental Army?
What factors, figures, moments, etc., led the Americans to victory?

Why were soldiers on the verge of mutiny in 1783? How did George Washington resolve the crisis?

Lesson 4 | The U.S. Constitution

What did the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 do, especially with respect to the future of western lands, public education, and preventing the expansion of slavery?

What were the specific problems of the Articles of Confederation? What issues did they permit to arise and fester?

What is the relationship between the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution?

What did The Federalist argue about each of the following:
- human nature
- faction
- majority tyranny
- morality

What were the major disagreements at the Constitutional Convention?

What was the great issue regarding representation? How was it resolved?

What are the various ways that the Constitution addresses the issue of faction?

What is federalism? Why is it important?

What is separation of powers, why is it a principle for the arrangement of government power, and how does the Constitution achieve this?

Contrast the character of the House of Representatives to that of the Senate, explaining the purpose for these differences and how their features (method of selection, qualifications, term lengths, percentage of each house up for election at a given time, etc.) contribute to their respective purposes.

What is the Electoral College, how did it originally work, and what is its purpose?

What was the nature of the Founders’ compromise with slavery at the time of the founding for the sake of the union? Would it have been possible to abolish slavery in the southern colonies without union?

Why did many in the founding generation expect that slavery would eventually die out so long as it was not allowed to expand?

What efforts did some founders make to abolish slavery?

How was the Three-Fifth Compromise a partial victory for slaveholders and a partial victory for abolitionists?

Why does the Constitution make it so hard for it to be amended?

What do each of the following amendments in the Bill of Rights guarantee and why: 1st, 2nd, 9th, and 10th?

To whom are elected officials and the Constitution itself ultimately subject?
Unit 2 | Test 2 — The American Founding

Lesson 3 | The War of Independence
Lesson 4 | The Constitution

Timeline

Write the letter of each event next to the date or years it took place.

(1775) 1776–83 War of Independence

A. Battle of Saratoga
B. Battle of Trenton
C. Battle of Yorktown; Cornwallis surrenders
D. Battles of Lexington and Concord and of Bunker Hill
E. Constitutional Convention concludes (Constitution Day)
F. Constitution takes effect; Washington inaugurated
G. Declaration of Independence signed
H. Treaty of Paris
I. Winter quarters at Valley Forge

Geography and Places

1. Label with dots the locations of Trenton, Saratoga, Valley Forge, and Yorktown.

Map courtesy of A Teachers Guide to Land of Hope.
PERSONS, TERMS, AND TOPICS

Fill in the blank with the letter of the correct answer.

A. Articles of Confederation  G. federalism  M. separation of powers
B. Baron von Steuben  H. Federalists  N. Shays’ Rebellion
C. bicameral  I. Newburgh Conspiracy  O. slavery
D. Bill of Rights  J. Northwest Ordinance  P. Yorktown
E. Constitutional Convention  K. Patriots
F. Continental Army  L. Presidency

2. The United States of America at the beginning of the War for Independence were far from a united people. Two groups existed in the country: Tories who remained loyal to the King, and ____________ who fought for the cause of independence.

3. The American forces, known as the ________________, consisted of a variety of militia and other enlistments who were often poorly supplied and rarely paid. Due to the miserable conditions, it was no surprise that 20% of the men deserted the army each winter and went home.

4. Throughout the course of the war, the Americans were aided by a number of persons. Among these pro–American Europeans was the Prussian drill officer, the ________________ who provided the American army with professional training at Valley Forge.

5. In October of 1781, the British General Cornwallis found himself surrounded by the French Navy on the waters and 17,000 French and American troops on land in the Battle of ________________. The surrender of 8,000 British troops convinced the British to make peace.

6. After the final battle of the war but prior to formal peace being arranged, unrest in the Continental Army almost led to an overthrow of the Congress. This movement towards overthrow was called the ________________, and was only ended by a dramatic officer’s meeting called by George Washington.

7. One of the greatest acts passed in America’s first government was the ________________ which banned slavery in the territories and promoted religion and knowledge through a system of public supported schools.

8. Amidst the war, the founders had formed the ________________ which established the first American government. It lacked, however, any real executive power and thus floundered throughout its ten years of existence.

9. In 1786, an American Revolution veteran led an uprising of farmers against banks which were foreclosing homes and imprisoning debtors. The initial inability of the government to put down what was known as ____________ led many founders to believe the government needed serious revisions.
10. In 1787, delegates appointed by state legislatures met in Philadelphia at the ____________ to revise the existing government. The delegates opted instead to begin from scratch and worked to draft a new Constitution.

11. An important principle of the Constitution was the ____________ where power is divided between three branches of government that then have the ability to check and balance each other, thus preventing the accumulation of power in one person or branch, what some founders called the very definition of tyranny.

12. Power was also divided between national, state, and local governments, a system known as ____________, which again prevented power from being dangerously centralized.

13. At this convention, delegates had to compromise on several points. One of which, known as the Great Compromise, created a ____________ legislature, one house of which determined representation by state population while the other gave each state equal representation.

14. Major additions to the government formed by the Constitution was a united and energetic executive branch called the ____________ and an independent judiciary called the Supreme Court.

15. While the Constitution compromised on the issue of ____________ in the Constitution, the Constitution place new national restrictions on slavery while still preserving the Union, which many abolitionists believed would be the only way to end the institution.

16. Those who supported the ratification of the Constitution were called ____________ while those who were opposed were known as Anti-Federalists.

17. Although the Founders included many measures intended to prevent national government tyranny, many states demanded the first Congress pass a ____________ which explicitly lists the rights belonging to citizens that government may not infringe upon.

**MAJOR CONFLICTS**

_**Explain how each battle began, narrate what happened in it and how, and explain the significance of the battle’s outcome.**_

18. Saratoga
19. Yorktown

**KNOWN BY HEART**

*Fill in missing words using the correct letters and identify the source.*

A. assemble  
B. Blessings of Liberty  
C. Constitution  
D. Justice  
E. more perfect Union  
F. People  
G. press  
H. religion  
I. speech

20. “We the ____________ of the United States, in Order to form a _______________, establish ______________, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the _________________ to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this _________________ for the United States of America.”

Source:______________________________

21. “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of ____________, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of _________________, or of the ____________; or the right of the people peaceably to _________________, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”

Source:______________________________

**STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART**

*In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be 3rd grade students.*

23. Tell the story of the winter quarters at Valley Forge.

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and writing should be employed and responses must fully answer each question.

24. What were the advantages and disadvantages that the Americans and British each faced at the outset of the War of Independence?

25. What factors, figures, moments, etc., led the Americans to victory?

26. What is the relationship between the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution?

27. What did *The Federalist* argue about human nature and majority tyranny?

28. Why did the Founders expect that slavery would eventually die out?

29. What does the Second Amendment in the Bill of Rights guarantee and why?

30. What does the Ninth Amendment in the Bill of Rights guarantee and why?
Unit 2 | Writing Assignment — The American Founding

Due on ____________

DIRECTIONS

Citing events and primary sources in your argument, write a 4–5 paragraph essay answering the question:

How and on what principles was America founded?
APPENDIX B

Primary Sources

Patrick Henry

Thomas Paine

Thomas Jefferson

The Second Continental Congress

George Washington

The American People
PATRICK HENRY, DELEGATE TO THE SECOND VIRGINIA CONVENTION

On the Resolution for a State of Defense

SPEECH

March 23, 1775
St. John’s Episcopal Church | Richmond, Virginia

Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death

BACKGROUND

Just weeks before the battles of Lexington and Concord in Massachusetts, Patrick Henry delivered this speech in support of raising a company of cavalry or infantry in every Virginian county.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Why does Patrick Henry think reconciliation with Great Britain is impossible?

2. What are the only alternatives to war with Great Britain?

Mr. President:

No man thinks more highly than I do of the patriotism, as well as abilities, of the very worthy gentlemen who have just addressed the House. But different men often see the same subject in different lights; and, therefore, I hope it will not be thought disrespectful to those gentlemen if, entertaining as I do opinions of a character very opposite to theirs, I shall speak forth my sentiments freely and without reserve. This is no time for ceremony.

The question before the House is one of awful moment to this country. For my own part, I consider it as nothing less than a question of freedom or slavery; and in proportion to the magnitude of the subject ought to be the freedom of the debate. It is only in this way that we can hope to arrive at truth, and fulfill the great responsibility which we hold to God and our country. Should I keep back my opinions at such a time, through fear of giving offense, I should consider myself as guilty of treason towards my country, and of an act of disloyalty toward the Majesty of Heaven, which I revere above all earthly kings.

Mr. President, it is natural to man to indulge in the illusions of hope. We are apt to shut our eyes against a painful truth, and listen to the song of that siren till she transforms us into beasts. Is this the part of wise men, engaged in a great and arduous struggle for liberty? Are we disposed to be of the number of those who, having eyes, see not, and, having ears, hear not, the things which so nearly concern their temporal salvation? For my part, whatever anguish of spirit it may cost, I am willing to know the whole truth; to know the worst, and to provide for it.

I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience. I know of no way of judging of the future but by the past. And judging by the past, I wish to know what there has been in the conduct of the British ministry for the last ten years to justify those hopes with which gentlemen have been pleased to solace themselves and the House.

Is it that insidious smile with which our petition has been lately received? Trust it not, sir; it will prove a snare to your feet. Suffer not yourselves to be betrayed with a kiss.
Ask yourselves how this gracious reception of our petition comports with those warlike preparations which cover our waters and darken our land. Are fleets and armies necessary to a work of love and reconciliation? Have we shown ourselves so unwilling to be reconciled that force must be called in to win back our love? Let us not deceive ourselves, sir. These are the implements of war and subjugation; the last arguments to which kings resort.

I ask gentlemen, sir, what means this martial array, if its purpose be not to force us to submission? Can gentlemen assign any other possible motive for it? Has Great Britain any enemy, in this quarter of the world, to call for all this accumulation of navies and armies? No, sir, she has none. They are meant for us: they can be meant for no other. They are sent over to bind and rivet upon us those chains which the British ministry have been so long forging.

And what have we to oppose to them? Shall we try argument? Sir, we have been trying that for the last ten years. Have we anything new to offer upon the subject? Nothing. We have held the subject up in every light of which it is capable; but it has been all in vain. Shall we resort to entreaty and humble supplication? What terms shall we find which have not been already exhausted? Let us not, I beseech you, sir, deceive ourselves longer.

Sir, we have done everything that could be done to avert the storm which is now coming on. We have petitioned; we have remonstrated; we have supplicated; we have prostrated ourselves before the throne, and have implored its interposition to arrest the tyrannical hands of the ministry and Parliament. Our petitions have been slighted; our remonstrances have produced additional violence and insult; our supplications have been disregarded; and we have been spurned, with contempt, from the foot of the throne!

In vain, after these things, may we indulge the fond hope of peace and reconciliation. There is no longer any room for hope. If we wish to be free—if we mean to preserve inviolate those inestimable privileges for which we have been so long contending—if we mean not basely to abandon the noble struggle in which we have been so long engaged, and which we have pledged ourselves never to abandon until the glorious object of our contest shall
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be obtained—we must fight! I repeat it, sir, we must fight! An appeal to arms and to the
God of hosts is all that is left us!

They tell us, sir, that we are weak; unable to cope with so formidable an adversary. But
when shall we be stronger? Will it be the next week, or the next year? Will it be when we
are totally disarmed, and when a British guard shall be stationed in every house? Shall we
gather strength by irresolution and inaction? Shall we acquire the means of effectual re-
sistance by lying supinely on our backs and hugging the delusive phantom of hope, until
our enemies shall have bound us hand and foot?

Sir, we are not weak if we make a proper use of those means which the God of nature hath
placed in our power. Three millions of people, armed in the holy cause of liberty, and in
such a country as that which we possess, are invincible by any force which our enemy can
send against us.

Besides, sir, we shall not fight our battles alone. There is a just God who presides over the
destinies of nations, and who will raise up friends to fight our battles for us. The battle, sir,
is not to the strong alone; it is to the vigilant, the active, the brave. Besides, sir, we have no
election. If we were base enough to desire it, it is now too late to retire from the contest.
There is no retreat but in submission and slavery! Our chains are forged! Their clanking
may be heard on the plains of Boston! The war is inevitable—and let it come! I repeat it,
sir, let it come.

It is in vain, sir, to extenuate the matter. Gentlemen may cry, peace, peace—but there is no
peace. The war is actually begun! The next gale that sweeps from the north will bring to our
ears the clash of resounding arms! Our brethren are already in the field! Why stand we here
idle? What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear, or peace so
sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?

Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me
liberty or give me death!
**THOMAS PAINE**

*Common Sense*

**PAMPHLET EXCERPT**

January 10, 1776

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

**BACKGROUND**

After outright conflict the previous year at Lexington and Concord and Bunker Hill, and with Boston occupied by the British army and navy, Thomas Paine wrote this pamphlet on the relationship between the British and the American colonists.

**GUIDING QUESTIONS**

1. What event has convinced Paine of the necessity of independence?

2. Why does Paine criticize the protection that Great Britain provided the American colonies?

3. How does the colonies’ connection to Great Britain negatively impact the colonists economically?

4. How does Paine believe the Americans should organize themselves?

---

Introduction

PERHAPS the sentiments contained in the following pages are not yet sufficiently fashionable to procure them general favor. A long habit of not thinking a thing wrong gives it a superficial appearance of being right, and raises at first a formidable outcry in defense of custom. But tumult soon subsides. Time makes more converts than reason.

As a long and violent abuse of power is generally the means of calling the right of it in question (and in matters too which might never have been thought of, had not the sufferers been aggravated into the inquiry), and as the King of England hath undertaken in his own Right to support the Parliament in what he calls Theirs, and as the good people of this country are grievously oppressed by the combination, they have an undoubted privilege to inquire into the pretensions of both, and equally to reject the usurpation of either. . . .

The cause of America is in a great measure the cause of all mankind. Many circumstances hath and will arise which are not local, but universal, and through which the principles of all Lovers of Mankind are affected, and in the event of which their Affections are interested. The laying a Country desolate with Fire and Sword, declaring War against the natural rights of all Mankind, and extirpating the Defenders thereof from the Face of the Earth, is the Concern of every Man to whom Nature hath given the Power of feeling; of which Class, regardless of Party Censure, is the AUTHOR.

Thoughts on the Present State of American Affairs.

In the following pages I offer nothing more than simple facts, plain arguments, and common sense: and have no other preliminaries to settle with the reader, than that he will divest himself of prejudice and prepossession, and suffer his reason and his feelings to determine for themselves: that he will put on, or rather that he will not put off, the true character of a man, and generously enlarge his views beyond the present day....

Now is the seed-time of Continental union, faith and honour. The least fracture now will be like a name engraved with the point of a pin on the tender rind of a young oak; the wound would enlarge with the tree, and posterity read it in full grown characters.
By referring the matter from argument to arms, a new æra for politics is struck—a new method of thinking hath arisen. All plans, proposals, &c. prior to the nineteenth of April, *i.e.* to the commencement of hostilities, are like the almanacks of the last year; which tho’ proper then, are superceded and useless now….

I have heard it asserted by some, that as America has flourished under her former connection with Great-Britain, the same connection is necessary towards her future happiness, and will always have the same effect. Nothing can be more fallacious than this kind of argument. We may as well assert that because a child has thrived upon milk, that it is never to have meat, or that the first twenty years of our lives is to become a precedent for the next twenty. But even this is admitting more than is true; for I answer roundly, that America would have flourished as much, and probably much more, had no European power taken any notice of her. The commerce by which she hath enriched herself are the necessaries of life, and will always have a market while eating is the custom of Europe.

But she has protected us, say some. That she hath engrossed us is true, and defended the Continent at our expense as well as her own, is admitted; and she would have defended Turkey from the same motive, *viz.* for the sake of trade and dominion.

Alas! we have been long led away by ancient prejudices and made large sacrifices to superstition. We have boasted the protection of Great Britain, without considering, that her motive was *interest* not *attachment*; and that she did not protect us from our enemies on our account; but from *her enemies* on *her own account*, from those who had no quarrel with us on any *other account*, and who will always be our enemies on the *same account*. Let Britain waive her pretensions to the Continent, or the Continent throw off the dependance, and we should be at peace with France and Spain, were they at war with Britain. The miseries of Hanover last war ought to warn us against connections….

I challenge the warmest advocate for reconciliation to show a single advantage that this continent can reap by being connected with Great Britain. I repeat the challenge; not a single advantage is derived. Our corn will fetch its price in any market in Europe, and our imported goods must be paid for buy them where we will…
It is the good fortune of many to live distant from the scene of present sorrow; the evil is not sufficiently brought to their doors to make them feel the precariousness with which all American property is possessed. But let our imaginations transport us a few moments to Boston; that seat of wretchedness will teach us wisdom, and instruct us for ever to renounce a power in whom we can have no trust. The inhabitants of that unfortunate city who but a few months ago were in ease and affluence, have now no other alternative than to stay and starve, or turn out to beg. Endangered by the fire of their friends if they continue within the city, and plundered by the soldiery if they leave it, in their present situation they are prisoners without the hope of redemption, and in a general attack for their relief they would be exposed to the fury of both armies…

No man was a warmer wisher for a reconciliation than myself, before the fatal nineteenth of April, 1775, but the moment the event of that day was made known, I rejected the hardened, sullen-tempered Pharaoh of England for ever; and disdain the wretch, that with the pretended title of FATHER OF HIS PEOPLE can unfeelingly hear of their slaughter, and composedly sleep with their blood upon his soul.

But admitting that matters were now made up, what would be the event? I answer, the ruin of the Continent. And that for several reasons.

*First.* The powers of governing still remaining in the hands of the King, he will have a negative over the whole legislation of this Continent. And as he hath shown himself such an inveterate enemy to liberty, and discovered such a thirst for arbitrary power, is he, or is he not, a proper person to say to these colonies, *You shall make no laws but what I please!*? And is there any inhabitant of America so ignorant as not to know, that according to what is called the *present constitution*, this Continent can make no laws but what the king gives leave to; and is there any man so unwise as not to see, that (considering what has happened) he will suffer no law to be made here but such as suits his purpose? We may be as effectually enslaved by the want of laws in America, as by submitting to laws made for us in England….

*Secondly.* That as even the best terms which we can expect to obtain can amount to no more than a temporary expedient, or a kind of government by guardianship, which can last no
longer than till the Colonies come of age, so the general face and state of things in the interim will be unsettled and unpromising. Emigrants of property will not choose to come to a country whose form of government hangs but by a thread, and who is every day tottering on the brink of commotion and disturbance; and numbers of the present inhabitants would lay hold of the interval to dispose of their effects, and quit the Continent.

But the most powerful of all arguments is, that nothing but independance, i. e. a Continental form of government, can keep the peace of the Continent and preserve it inviolate from civil wars. I dread the event of a reconciliation with Britain now, as it is more than probable that it will be followed by a revolt some where or other, the consequences of which may be far more fatal than all the malice of Britain.…

Besides, the general temper of the Colonies, towards a British government will be like that of a youth who is nearly out of his time; they will care very little about her: And a government which cannot preserve the peace is no government at all, and in that case we pay our money for nothing; and pray what is it that Britain can do, whose power will be wholly on paper, should a civil tumult break out the very day after reconciliation?...

If there is any true cause of fear respecting independance, it is because no plan is yet laid down. Men do not see their way out. Wherefore, as an opening into that business I offer the following hints; at the same time modestly affirming, that I have no other opinion of them myself, than that they may be the means of giving rise to something better. Could the straggling thoughts of individuals be collected, they would frequently form materials for wise and able men to improve into useful matter.

Let the assemblies be annual, with a president only. The representation more equal, their business wholly domestic, and subject to the authority of a Continental Congress.

Let each Colony be divided into six, eight, or ten, convenient districts, each district to send a proper number of Delegates to Congress, so that each Colony send at least thirty. The whole number in Congress will be at least 390. Each congress to sit and to choose a President by the following method. When the Delegates are met, let a Colony be taken from the
whole thirteen Colonies by lot, after which let the Congress choose (by ballot) a president from out of the Delegates of that Province. In the next Congress, let a Colony be taken by lot from twelve only, omitting that Colony from which the president was taken in the former Congress, and so proceeding on till the whole thirteen shall have had their proper rotation. And in order that nothing may pass into a law but what is satisfactorily just, not less than three fifths of the Congress to be called a majority. He that will promote discord, under a government so equally formed as this, would have joined Lucifer in his revolt.

But as there is a peculiar delicacy from whom, or in what manner, this business must first arise, and as it seems most agreeable and consistent that it should come from some intermediate body between the governed and the governors, that is, between the Congress and the People, let a Continental Conference be held in the following manner, and for the following purpose,

A Committee of twenty six members of congress, viz. Two for each Colony. Two Members from each House of Assembly, or Provincial Convention; and five Representatives of the people at large, to be chosen in the capital city or town of each Province, for, and in behalf of the whole Province, by as many qualified voters as shall think proper to attend from all parts of the Province for that purpose; or, if more convenient, the Representatives may be chosen in two or three of the most populous parts thereof. In this conference, thus assembled, will be united the two grand principles of business, knowledge and power. The Members of Congress, Assemblies, or Conventions, by having had experience in national concerns, will be able and useful counsellors, and the whole, being impowered by the people, will have a truly legal authority.

The conferring members being met, let their business be to frame a Continental Charter, or Charter of the United Colonies; (answering to what is called the Magna Charta of England) fixing the number and manner of choosing Members of Congress, Members of Assembly, with their date of sitting; and drawing the line of business and jurisdiction between them: Always remembering, that our strength is Continental, not Provincial. Securing freedom and property to all men, and above all things, the free exercise of religion, according
to the dictates of conscience; with such other matter as it is necessary for a charter to con-
tain. Immediately after which, the said conference to dissolve, and the bodies which shall be chosen conformable to the said charter, to be the Legislators and Governors of this Con-
tinent for the time being: Whose peace and happiness, may GOD preserve. AMEN…

A government of our own is our natural right: and when a man seriously reflects on the precariousness of human affairs, he will become convinced, that it is infinitely wiser and safer, to form a constitution of our own in a cool deliberate manner, while we have it in our power, than to trust such an interesting event to time and chance …

O! ye that love mankind! Ye that dare oppose not only the tyranny but the tyrant, stand forth! Every spot of the old world is overrun with oppression. Freedom hath been hunted round the Globe. Asia and Africa have long expelled her. Europe regards her like a stranger, and England hath given her warning to depart. O! receive the fugitive, and prepare in time an asylum for mankind.
A Declaration

June 1776
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Draft of the Declaration of Independence

BACKGROUND

Thomas Jefferson drafted and the Committee of Five edited this initial version of what would become the Declaration of Independence. This draft includes the edits that the Second Continental Congress made.

ANNOTATIONS

Key:

word = language deleted by Congress from Jefferson’s draft
«word» = language added by Congress to Jefferson’s draft

A DECLARATION By the REPRESENTATIVES of the UNITED STATES of AMERICA,
in «GENERAL» CONGRESS ASSEMBLED

When in the Course of human Events it becomes necessary for one People to dissolve the Political Bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the Powers of the Earth the separate & equal Station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God entitle them, a decent Respect to the Opinions of Mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the Separation.

We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with inherent and unalienable Rights, that among these are Life,
Liberty, & the Pursuit of Happiness: —That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the Consent of the governed; that whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these Ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or abolish it, & to institute new Government, laying it's Foundation on such Principles, & organizing it's Powers in such Form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety & Happiness. Prudence indeed will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light & transient Causes; and accordingly all Experience hath shown that Mankind are more disposed to suffer, while Evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the Forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long Train of Abuses & Usurpations begun at a distinguished period and pursuing invariably the same Object, evinces a Design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their Right, it is their Duty to throw off such Government, & to provide new Guards for their future Security. Such has been the patient Sufferance of these Colonies; & such is now the Necessity which constrains them to expunge «alter» their former Systems of Government. The History of the present King of Great-Britain is a History of unremitting «repeated» Injuries & Usurpations, among which appears no solitary fact to contradict the uniform tenor of the rest but all have«all having» in direct Object the Establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid World for the truth of which we pledge a faith yet unsullied by falsehood.

He has refused his Assent to Laws, the most wholesome & necessary for the public Good.

He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly, & continually for opposing with manly Firmness his Invasions on the Rights of the People.

He has refused for a long Time, after such Dissolutions, to cause others to be elected, whereby the Legislative Powers, incapable of Annihilation, have returned to the People at large for their exercise; the State remaining in the meantime exposed to all the Dangers of Invasion from without, & Convulsions within.
He has endeavored to prevent the Population of these states; for that Purpose obstructing
the laws for Naturalization of Foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their Migra-
tions hither, & raising the Conditions of new Appropriations of Lands.

He has made our Judges dependent on his Will alone, for the Tenure of their Offices, & the
Amount & payment of their Salaries.

He has erected a Multitude of new Offices by a self assumed power and sent hither Swarms
of new Officers to harass our People and eat out their Substance.

He has kept among us in Times of Peace, Standing Armies, and ships of war without the
consent of our Legislatures.

He has affected to render the Military independent of, & superior to the Civil power.

He has combined with others to subject us to a Jurisdiction foreign to our Constitution, &
unacknowledged by our Laws; giving his Assent to their Acts of pretended Legislation:
For quartering large Bodies of Armed Troops among us:
For protecting them, by a mock-Trial, from Punishment for any Murders which they
should commit on the Inhabitants of these States:
For cutting off our Trade with all Parts of the World:
For imposing Taxes on us without our consent:
For depriving us «, in many Cases,» of the Benefits of Trial by Jury:
For transporting us beyond Seas to be tried for pretended Offences:
For abolishing the free System of English Laws in a neighboring Province, establishing
therein an arbitrary Government, and enlarging it's Boundaries, so as to render it at once
an Example and fit Instrument for introducing the same absolute Rule into
these states «Colonies»:
For taking away our Charters, abolishing our most valuable Laws, and altering funda-
mentally the Forms of our Governments:
For suspending our own Legislatures, & declaring themselves invested with Power to leg-
islate for us in all Cases whatsoever.
He has abdicated Government here by withdrawing his governors, and declaring us out of his allegiance & protection, declaring us out of his Protection, and Waging war against us. He has plundered our Seas, ravaged our Coasts, burnt our towns, & destroyed the Lives of our People.

He is, at this time Transporting large Armies of foreign Mercenaries to complete the works of Death, Desolation & Tyranny, already begun with circumstances of Cruelty and Perfidy, scarce paralleled in the most barbarous Ages, & totally unworthy the Head of a civilized Nation. He has constrained our fellow Citizens taken Captive on the high Seas to bear Arms against their Country, to become the Executioners of their Friends & Brethren, or to fall themselves by their Hands. He has excited domestic Insurrections amongst us, & has endeavored to bring on the Inhabitants of our Frontiers, the merciless Indian Savages, whose known Rule of Warfare, is an undistinguished Destruction, of all Ages, Sexes, & Conditions of existence. He has incited treasonable insurrections of our fellow citizens, with the allurements of forfeiture & confiscation of our property. He has waged cruel war against human nature itself, violating it's most sacred rights of life and liberty in the persons of a distant people who never offended him, captivating & carrying them into slavery in another hemisphere, or to incur miserable death in their transportation thither. This piratical warfare, the opprobrium of INFIDEL powers, is the warfare of the CHRISTIAN king of Great Britain. Determined to keep open a market where MEN should be bought & sold, he has prostituted his negative for suppressing every legislative attempt to prohibit or to restrain this execrable commerce. And that this assemblage of horrors might want no fact of distinguished die, he is now exciting those very people to rise in arms among us, and to purchase that liberty of which he has deprived them, by murdering the people on whom he also obtruded them: thus paying off former crimes committed against the LIBERTIES of one people, with crimes which he urges them to commit against the LIVES of another. In every stage of these Oppressions we have Petitioned for Redress in the most humble Terms: Our repeated Petitions have been answered only by repeated Injury. A Prince whose Character is thus marked by every act which may define a Tyrant, is unfit to be the Ruler of a «free» People who mean to be free. Future ages will scarcely believe that the hardness of
one man adventured, within the short compass of twelve years only, to lay a foundation so broad & so undisguised for tyranny over a people fostered & fixed in principles of freedom.

Nor have we been wanting in Attentions to our British Brethren. We have warned them from Time to Time of Attempts by their Legislature to extend a «an unwarrantable» jurisdiction over these our states «us». We have reminded them of the Circumstances of our Emigration & Settlement here, no one of which could warrant so strange a pretension: that these were effected at the expense of our own blood & treasure, unassisted by the wealth or the strength of Great Britain: that in constituting indeed our several forms of government, we had adopted one common king, thereby laying a foundation for perpetual league & amity with them: but that submission to their parliament was no part of our constitution, nor ever in idea, if history may be credited: and. We have appealed to their native Justice and Magnanimity as well as to «, and we have conjured them by» the Ties of our common Kindred to disavow these Usurpations, which were likely to«, would inevitably» interrupt our Connection and Correspondence. They too have been deaf to the Voice of Justice & of Consanguinity, and when occasions have been given them, by the regular course of their laws, of removing from their councils the disturbers of our harmony, they have, by their free election, re-established them in power. At this very time too they are permitting their chief magistrate to send over not only soldiers of our common blood, but Scotch & foreign mercenaries to invade & destroy us. These facts have given the last stab to agonizing affection, and manly spirit bids us to renounce forever these unfeeling brethren. We must endeavor to forget our former love for them, and hold them as we hold the rest of mankind, enemies in war, in peace friends. We might have been a free and a great people together; but a communication of grandeur & of freedom it seems is below their dignity. Be it so, since they will have it. The road to happiness & to glory is open to us too. We will tread it apart from them, and «. We must therefore» acquiesce in the Necessity which denounces our eternal Separation «, and hold them, as we hold the rest of Mankind, Enemies in War, in Peace, Friends!»

We, therefore, the Representatives of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA in General Congress Assembled,«appealing to the Supreme Judge of the World for the Rectitude of
our Intentions, do, in the name, & by the Authority of the good People of these states reject and renounce all allegiance and subjection to the kings of Great Britain and all others who may hearafter claim by, through or under them; we utterly dissolve all political connection which may heretofore have subsided between us and the people or parliament of Great Britain; and finally we do assert and declare these colonies to be free and independent states, «Colonies, solemnly Publish and Declare, That these United Colonies are, and are of Right to be, Free and Independent States; that they are absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political Connection between them and the State of Great-Britain is and ought to be totally dissolved;» & that as Free & Independent States, they have full Power to levy War, conclude Peace, contract Alliances, establish Commerce & to do all other Acts & Things which Independent States may of right do. And for the support of this declaration, «with a firm Reliance on the Protection of divine Providence,» we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our Fortunes, & our sacred Honor.
THE THIRTEEN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Unanimous Declaration

A DECLARATION

July 4, 1776

Pennsylvania State House | Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Declaration of Independence

BACKGROUND

The delegates from each colony at the Second Continental Congress announced their votes to form a new country separate from Great Britain in this statement to mankind that expounds both the principles on which this new country would be founded and the reasons they judged themselves justified to separate.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Why do the United States believe they need to release a statement about their decision to form a country separate from Great Britain?

2. How are all men equal?

3. From where comes their rights?

4. What is the reason why people create governments?

5. From where comes a government’s powers?

6. What may a people do if a government does not fulfill its ends?

7. Although governments should not be changed for small reasons, when should the people change them?

8. Against which person does the Declaration of Independence level its charges?

9. To whom do the representatives appeal for the justness of their intentions?

10. By whose authority do the representatives declare independence?

11. What do each of the representatives pledge to one another?
When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.—That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,—That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security.—Such has been the patient sufferance of these Colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former Systems of Government. The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. To prove this, let Facts be submitted to a candid world.

He has refused his Assent to Laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

He has forbidden his Governors to pass Laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his Assent should be obtained; and when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.
He has refused to pass other Laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless
those people would relinquish the right of Representation in the Legislature, a right inesti-
mable to them and formidable to tyrants only.

He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from
the depository of their public Records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compli-
ance with his measures.

He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly, for opposing with manly firmness his
invasions on the rights of the people.

He has refused for a long time, after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected;
whereby the Legislative powers, incapable of Annihilation, have returned to the People at
large for their exercise; the State remaining in the mean time exposed to all the dangers of
invasion from without, and convulsions within.

He has endeavored to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing
the Laws for Naturalization of Foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their mi-
grations hither, and raising the conditions of new Appropriations of Lands.

He has obstructed the Administration of Justice, by refusing his Assent to Laws for estab-
lishing Judiciary powers.

He has made Judges dependent on his Will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the
amount and payment of their salaries.

He has erected a multitude of New Offices, and sent hither swarms of Officers to harass our
people, and eat out their substance.

He has kept among us, in times of peace, Standing Armies without the Consent of our
legislatures.
He has affected to render the Military independent of and superior to the Civil power.

He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his Assent to their Acts of pretended Legislation:

For Quartering large bodies of armed troops among us:

For protecting them, by a mock Trial, from punishment for any Murders which they should commit on the Inhabitants of these States:

For cutting off our Trade with all parts of the world:

For imposing Taxes on us without our Consent:

For depriving us in many cases, of the benefits of Trial by Jury:

For transporting us beyond Seas to be tried for pretended offenses:

For abolishing the free System of English Laws in a neighboring Province, establishing therein an Arbitrary government, and enlarging its Boundaries so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these Colonies:

For taking away our Charters, abolishing our most valuable Laws, and altering fundamentally the Forms of our Governments:

For suspending our own Legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

He has abdicated Government here, by declaring us out of his Protection and waging War against us.
He has plundered our seas, ravaged our Coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people.

He is at this time transporting large Armies of foreign Mercenaries to complete the works of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of Cruelty and perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the Head of a civilized nation.

He has constrained our fellow Citizens taken Captive on the high Seas to bear Arms against their Country, to become the executioners of their friends and Brethren, or to fall themselves by their Hands.

He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavored to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian Savages, whose known rule of warfare, is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes and conditions.

In every stage of these Oppressions We have Petitioned for Redress in the most humble terms: Our repeated Petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A Prince whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a Tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.

Nor have We been wanting in attentions to our British brethren. We have warned them from time to time of attempts by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement here. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured them by the ties of our common kindred to disavow these usurpations, which, would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence. They too have been deaf to the voice of justice and of consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity, which denounces our Separation, and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind, Enemies in War, in Peace Friends.
The Declaration of Independence

We, therefore, the Representatives of the united States of America, in General Congress, Assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the Name, and by Authority of the good People of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, That these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be Free and Independent States; that they are Absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as Free and Independent States, they have full Power to levy War, conclude Peace, contract Alliances, establish Commerce, and to do all other Acts and Things which Independent States may of right do. And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor.

Georgia
Button Gwinnett, Lyman Hall, George Walton

North Carolina
William Hooper, Joseph Hewes, John Penn

South Carolina
Edward Rutledge, Thomas Heyward, Jr., Thomas Lynch, Jr., Arthur Middleton

Maryland
Samuel Chase, William Paca, Thomas Stone, Charles Carroll of Carrollton

Virginia
George Wythe, Richard Henry Lee, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Harrison, Thomas Nelson, Jr., Francis Lightfoot Lee, Carter Braxton

Pennsylvania
Robert Morris, Benjamin Rush, Benjamin Franklin, John Morton, George Clymer, James Smith, George Taylor, James Wilson, George Ross
Delaware
Caesar Rodney, George Read, Thomas McKean

New York
5  William Floyd, Philip Livingston, Francis Lewis, Lewis Morris

New Jersey
Richard Stockton, John Witherspoon, Francis Hopkinson, John Hart, Abraham Clark

10  New Hampshire
Josiah Bartlett, William Whipple, Matthew Thornton

Massachusetts
John Hancock, Samuel Adams, John Adams, Robert Treat Paine, Elbridge Gerry

15  Rhode Island
Stephen Hopkins, William Ellery

Connecticut
20  Roger Sherman, Samuel Huntington, William Williams, Oliver Wolcot
Background

George Washington delivered this message to Congress to resign his commission as Commander-in-Chief of the Continental Army.

Annotations

The great events on which my resignation depended having at length taken place; I have now the honor of offering my sincere Congratulations to Congress and of presenting myself before them to surrender into their hands the trust committed to me, and to claim the indulgence of retiring from the Service of my Country.

Happy in the confirmation of our Independence and Sovereignty, and pleased with the opportunity afforded the United States of becoming a respectable Nation, I resign with satisfaction the Appointment I accepted with diffidence. A diffidence in my abilities to accomplish so arduous a task, which however was superseded by a confidence in the rectitude of our Cause, the support of the Supreme Power of the Union, and the patronage of Heaven.

The Successful termination of the War has verified the most sanguine expectations, and my gratitude for the interposition of Providence, and the assistance I have received from my Countrymen, encreases with every review of the momentous Contest.

While I repeat my obligations to the Army in general, I should do injustice to my own feelings not to acknowledge in this place the peculiar Services and distinguished merits of

the Gentlemen who have been attached to my person during the War. It was impossible the choice of confidential Officers to compose my family should have been more fortunate. Permit me Sir, to recommend in particular those, who have continued in Service to the present moment, as worthy of the favorable notice and patronage of Congress.

I consider it an indispensable duty to close this last solemn act of my Official life, by commending the Interests of our dearest Country to the protection of Almighty God, and those who have the superintendence of them, to his holy keeping.

Having now finished the work assigned me, I retire from the great theatre of Action; and bidding an Affectionate farewell to this August body under whose orders I have so long acted, I here offer my Commission, and take my leave of all the employments of public life.
THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Constitution

LAW

March 4, 1789
United States of America

BACKGROUND

Delegates to the Constitutional Convention drafted and the states ratified this Constitution, forming the second national government for the United States of America.

ANNOTATIONS

Preamble

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

Article I

Section 1. All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Section 2. The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States, and the Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature.

No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the Age of twenty five Years, and been seven Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected,

be an Inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons, including those bound to Service for a Term of Years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three fifths of all other Persons. The actual Enumeration shall be made within three Years after the first Meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent Term of ten Years, in such Manner as they shall by Law direct. The Number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every thirty Thousand, but each State shall have at Least one Representative; and until such enumeration shall be made, the State of New Hampshire shall be entitled to choose three, Massachusetts eight, Rhode-Island and Providence Plantations one, Connecticut five, New-York six, New Jersey four, Pennsylvania eight, Delaware one, Maryland six, Virginia ten, North Carolina five, South Carolina five, and Georgia three.

When vacancies happen in the Representation from any State, the Executive Authority thereof shall issue Writs of Election to fill such Vacancies.

The House of Representatives shall choose their Speaker and other Officers; and shall have the sole Power of Impeachment.

Section 3. The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the Legislature thereof, for six Years; and each Senator shall have one Vote.

Immediately after they shall be assembled in Consequence of the first Election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three Classes. The Seats of the Senators of the first Class shall be vacated at the Expiration of the second Year, of the second Class at the Expiration of the fourth Year, and of the third Class at the Expiration of the sixth Year, so that one third may be chosen every second Year; and if Vacancies happen by Resignation, or otherwise, during the Recess of the Legislature of any State, the Executive thereof may make temporary Appointments until the next Meeting of the Legislature, which shall then fill such Vacancies.
No Person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty Years, and been nine Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen.

The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no Vote, unless they be equally divided.

The Senate shall choose their other Officers, and also a President pro tempore, in the Absence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the Office of President of the United States.

The Senate shall have the sole Power to try all Impeachments. When sitting for that Purpose, they shall be on Oath or Affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside: And no Person shall be convicted without the Concurrence of two thirds of the Members present.

Judgment in Cases of Impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from Office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any Office of honor, Trust or Profit under the United States: but the Party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to Indictment, Trial, Judgment and Punishment, according to Law.

Section 4. The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of choosing Senators.

The Congress shall assemble at least once in every Year, and such Meeting shall be on the first Monday in December, unless they shall by Law appoint a different Day.

Section 5. Each House shall be the Judge of the Elections, Returns and Qualifications of its own Members, and a Majority of each shall constitute a Quorum to do Business; but a smaller Number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the Attendance of absent Members, in such Manner, and under such Penalties as each House may provide.
Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behavior, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.

Each House shall keep a Journal of its Proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such Parts as may in their Judgment require Secrecy; and the Yeas and Nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the Desire of one fifth of those Present, be entered on the Journal.

Neither House, during the Session of Congress, shall, without the Consent of the other, adjourn for more than three days, nor to any other Place than that in which the two Houses shall be sitting.

Section 6. The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States. They shall in all Cases, except Treason, Felony and Breach of the Peace, be privileged from Arrest during their Attendance at the Session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any Speech or Debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other Place.

No Senator or Representative shall, during the Time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil Office under the Authority of the United States, which shall have been created, or the Emoluments whereof shall have been increased during such time; and no Person holding any Office under the United States, shall be a Member of either House during his Continuance in Office.

Section 7. All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills.

Every Bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a Law, be presented to the President of the United States; If he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his Objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the Objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If after such Reconsideration two thirds of that House shall agree to pass the Bill, it shall be sent, together with the Objections, to the other House, by which it shall
likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two thirds of that House, it shall become a Law. But in all such Cases the Votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and Nays, and the Names of the Persons voting for and against the Bill shall be entered on the Journal of each House respectively. If any Bill shall not be returned by the President within ten days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the Same shall be a Law, in like Manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress by their Adjournment prevent its Return in which Case it shall not be a Law.

Every Order, Resolution, or Vote to which the Concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of Adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the Same shall take Effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the Rules and Limitations prescribed in the Case of a Bill.

Section 8. The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States:

To borrow Money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and post Roads;
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To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;—And

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.
Section 9. The Migration or Importation of such Persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the Year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a Tax or duty may be imposed on such Importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each Person.

The Privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it.

No Bill of Attainder or ex post facto Law shall be passed.

No Capitation, or other direct, Tax shall be laid, unless in Proportion to the Census or Enumeration herein before directed to be taken.

No Tax or Duty shall be laid on Articles exported from any State.

No Preference shall be given by any Regulation of Commerce or Revenue to the Ports of one State over those of another: nor shall Vessels bound to, or from, one State, be obliged to enter, clear, or pay Duties in another.

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.

Section 10. No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts; pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, or Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts, or grant any Title of Nobility.

No State shall, without the Consent of the Congress, lay any Imposts or Duties on Imports or Exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection Laws: and
the net Produce of all Duties and Imposts, laid by any State on Imports or Exports, shall be for the Use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such Laws shall be subject to the Revision and Control of the Congress.

No State shall, without the Consent of Congress, lay any duty of Tonnage, keep Troops, or Ships of War in time of Peace, enter into any Agreement or Compact with another State, or with a foreign Power, or engage in War, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent Danger as will not admit of delay.

Article II

Section 1. The executive Power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his Office during the Term of four Years, and, together with the Vice-President chosen for the same Term, be elected as follows:

Each State shall appoint, in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors, equal to the whole Number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress: but no Senator or Representative, or Person holding an Office of Trust or Profit under the United States, shall be appointed an Elector. 15

The Electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by Ballot for two Persons, of whom one at least shall not be an Inhabitant of the same State with themselves. And they shall make a List of all the Persons voted for, and of the Number of Votes for each; which List they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the Seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall, in the Presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the Certificates, and the Votes shall then be counted. The Person having the greatest Number of Votes shall be the President, if such Number be a Majority of the whole Number of Electors appointed; and if there be more than one who have such Majority, and have an equal Number of Votes, then the House of Representatives shall immediately choose by Ballot one of them for President; and if no Person have a Majority, then from the five highest on the List the said House shall in like Manner choose the President. But in choosing the President, the Votes shall be taken by States, the Representation from each State having one Vote; a quorum for
this Purpose shall consist of a Member or Members from two thirds of the States, and a
Majority of all the States shall be necessary to a Choice. In every Case, after the Choice of
the President, the Person having the greatest Number of Votes of the Electors shall be the
Vice President. But if there should remain two or more who have equal Votes, the Senate
shall choose from them by Ballot the Vice President.

The Congress may determine the Time of choosing the Electors, and the Day on which
they shall give their Votes; which Day shall be the same throughout the United States.

No Person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of
the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President; neither shall
any Person be eligible to that Office who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty-five
Years, and been fourteen Years a Resident within the United States.

In Case of the Removal of the President from Office, or of his Death, Resignation, or Ina-
bility to discharge the Powers and Duties of the said Office, the Same shall devolve on the
Vice President, and the Congress may by Law provide for the Case of Removal, Death,
Resignation or Inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what Officer
shall then act as President, and such Officer shall act accordingly, until the Disability be
removed, or a President shall be elected.

The President shall, at stated Times, receive for his Services, a Compensation, which shall
neither be increased nor diminished during the Period for which he shall have been elected,
and he shall not receive within that Period any other Emolument from the United States,
or any of them.

Before he enter on the Execution of his Office, he shall take the following Oath or Affirma-
tion:—”I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President
of the United States, and will to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and defend the
Constitution of the United States.”

Section 2. The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United
States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the
United States; he may require the Opinion, in writing, of the principal Officer in each of
the executive Departments, upon any subject relating to the Duties of their respective Offices, and he shall have Power to grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offenses against the United States, except in Cases of Impeachment.

He shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law: but the Congress may by Law vest the Appointment of such inferior Officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the Courts of Law, or in the Heads of Departments.

The President shall have Power to fill up all Vacancies that may happen during the Recess of the Senate, by granting Commissions which shall expire at the End of their next Session.

Section 3. He shall from time to time give to the Congress Information of the State of the Union, and recommend to their Consideration such Measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient; he may, on extraordinary Occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them, and in Case of Disagreement between them, with Respect to the Time of Adjournment, he may adjourn them to such Time as he shall think proper; he shall receive Ambassadors and other public Ministers; he shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed, and shall Commission all the Officers of the United States.

Section 4. The President, Vice President and all civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.

Article III

Section 1. The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good
Behavior, and shall, at stated Times, receive for their Services a Compensation, which shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office.

Section 2. The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority;—to all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls;—to all Cases of admiralty and maritime Jurisdiction; —to Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party;—to Controversies between two or more States;—between a State and Citizens of another State;—between Citizens of different States;—between Citizens of the same State claiming Lands under Grants of different States, and between a State, or the Citizens thereof, and foreign States, Citizens or Subjects.

In all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, and those in which a State shall be Party, the supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction. In all the other Cases before mentioned, the supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make.

The Trial of all Crimes, except in Cases of Impeachment, shall be by Jury; and such Trial shall be held in the State where the said Crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State, the Trial shall be at such Place or Places as the Congress may by Law have directed.

Section 3. Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying War against them, or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort. No Person shall be convicted of Treason unless on the Testimony of two Witnesses to the same overt Act, or on Confession in open Court.

The Congress shall have Power to declare the Punishment of Treason, but no Attainer of Treason shall work Corruption of Blood, or Forfeiture except during the Life of the Person attainted.
Article IV

Section 1. Full Faith and Credit shall be given in each State to the public Acts, Records, and judicial Proceedings of every other State. And the Congress may by general Laws prescribe the Manner in which such Acts, Records and Proceedings shall be proved, and the Effect thereof.

Section 2. The Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of Citizens in the several States.

A Person charged in any State with Treason, Felony, or other Crime, who shall flee from Justice, and be found in another State, shall on Demand of the executive Authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having Jurisdiction of the Crime.

No Person held to Service or Labor in one State, under the Laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in Consequence of any Law or Regulation therein, be discharged from such Service or Labor, but shall be delivered up on Claim of the Party to whom such Service or Labor may be due.

Section 3. New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the Junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the Consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

Section 4. The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic Violence.
Article V

The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

Article VI

All Debts contracted and Engagements entered into, before the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation.

This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States.
Article VII

The Ratification of the Conventions of nine States, shall be sufficient for the Establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the Same.

Done in Convention by the Unanimous Consent of the States present the Seventeenth Day of September in the Year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and Eighty seven and of the Independence of the United States of America the Twelfth In witness whereof We have hereunto subscribed our Names.

George Washington—
President and deputy from Virginia

Delaware

George Read, Gunning Bedford, Jr., John Dickinson, Richard Bassett, Jacob Broom

Maryland

James McHenry, Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer, Daniel Carroll

Virginia

John Blair, James Madison, Jr.

North Carolina

William Blount, Richard Dobbs Spaight, Hugh Williamson

South Carolina

John Rutledge, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, Charles Pinckney, Pierce Butler
Georgia

William Few, Abraham Baldwin

New Hampshire

John Langdon, Nicholas Gilman

Massachusetts

Nathaniel Gorham, Rufus King

Connecticut

William Samuel Johnson, Roger Sherman

New York

Alexander Hamilton

New Jersey

William Livingston, David Brearley, William Paterson, Jonathan Dayton

Pennsylvania

Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Mifflin, Robert Morris, George Clymer, Thomas FitzSimmons, Jared Ingersoll, James Wilson, Gouverneur Morris

Attest William Jackson Secretary
Amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America

Amendment I
Ratified December 15, 1791

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Amendment II
Ratified December 15, 1791

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

Amendment III
Ratified December 15, 1791

No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

Amendment IV
Ratified December 15, 1791

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.
Amendment V

Ratified December 15, 1791

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Amendment VI

Ratified December 15, 1791

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defense.

Amendment VII

Ratified December 15, 1791

In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.
Amendment VIII
Ratified December 15, 1791
Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

Amendment IX
Ratified December 15, 1791
The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Amendment X
Ratified December 15, 1791
The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Amendment XI
Ratified February 7, 1795
The Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State.

Amendment XII
Ratified June 15, 1804
The Electors shall meet in their respective states and vote by ballot for President and Vice-President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same state with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice-President, and they shall make distinct lists of all per-
sons voted for as President, and of all persons voted for as Vice-President, and of the number of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of the government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate;—the President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted;—The person having the greatest number of votes for President, shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of Electors appointed; and if no person have such majority, then from the persons having the highest numbers not exceeding three on the list of those voted for as President, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. But in choosing the President, the votes shall be taken by states, the representation from each state having one vote; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or members from two-thirds of the states, and a majority of all the states shall be necessary to a choice. And if the House of Representatives shall not choose a President whenever the right of choice shall devolve upon them, before the fourth day of March next following, then the Vice-President shall act as President, as in the case of the death or other constitutional disability of the President.—The person having the greatest number of votes as Vice-President, shall be the Vice-President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of Electors appointed, and if no person have a majority, then from the two highest numbers on the list, the Senate shall choose the Vice-President; a quorum for the purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice. But no person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice-President of the United States.

Amendment XIII

Ratified December 6, 1865

Section 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

Section 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.
Amendment XIV

Ratified July 9, 1868

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

Section 3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice-President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.
Section 4. The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.

Section 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

Amendment XV

10 Ratified February 3, 1870

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment XVI

15 Ratified February 3, 1913

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

Amendment XVII

20 Ratified April 8, 1913

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.
When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: Provided, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.

This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.

Amendment XVIII

Ratified January 16, 1919

Section 1. After one year from the ratification of this article the manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof for beverage purposes is hereby prohibited.

Section 2. The Congress and the several States shall have concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Section 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress.

Amendment XIX

Ratified August 18, 1920

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.
Amendment XX

Ratified January 23, 1933

Section 1. The terms of the President and the Vice President shall end at noon on the 20th day of January, and the terms of Senators and Representatives at noon on the 3rd day of January, of the years in which such terms would have ended if this article had not been ratified; and the terms of their successors shall then begin.

Section 2. The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall begin at noon on the 3rd day of January, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.

Section 3. If, at the time fixed for the beginning of the term of the President, the President elect shall have died, the Vice President elect shall become President. If a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or if the President elect shall have failed to qualify, then the Vice President elect shall act as President until a President shall have qualified; and the Congress may by law provide for the case wherein neither a President elect nor a Vice President shall have qualified, declaring who shall then act as President, or the manner in which one who is to act shall be selected, and such person shall act accordingly until a President or Vice President shall have qualified.

Section 4. The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.

Section 5. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect on the 15th day of October following the ratification of this article.

Section 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission.
Amendment XXI

Ratified December 5, 1933

Section 1. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

Section 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited.

Section 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress.

Amendment XXII

Ratified February 27, 1951

Section 1. No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than two years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of President more than once. But this Article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President when this Article was proposed by the Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this Article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term.

Section 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.
Amendment XXIII

Ratified March 29, 1961

Section 1. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct:

A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the twelfth article of amendment.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment XXIV

Ratified January 23, 1964

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment XXV

Ratified February 10, 1967

Section 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

Section 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.
Section 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

Section 4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session.

If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office.
Amendment XXVI

Ratified July 1, 1971

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States, who are eighteen years of age or older, to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment XXVII

Ratified May 7, 1992

No law varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives shall take effect, until an election of Representatives shall have intervened.
FIRST CONGRESS
Proposed Amendments to the Constitution
JOIN RESOLUTION EXCERPT
September 25, 1789
Federal Hall | City of New-York, New York
Bill of Rights

BACKGROUND
As part of a compromise to secure the ratification of the Constitution, Federalists introduced in the first Congress a Bill of Rights as twelve amendments to the new Constitution. Below are the ten amendments that were ultimately ratified.

ANNOTATIONS

Amendment I
Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

5 Amendment II
A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms shall not be infringed.

10 Amendment III
No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

Amendment IV

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Amendment V

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Amendment VI

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.

Amendment VII

In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.
Amendment VIII

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

Amendment IX

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Amendment X

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.
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Why Teach the Early Republic

The United States of America is an “experiment in self-government.” None other than the Father of the Country, George Washington, said as much at his inauguration. The experiment had seemed to be on the verge of failure by 1787, but the Constitution gave it a second chance. This is the story of the beginning decades of that “second chance.” What is so remarkable about these decades is that the ideas and structures of the Constitution were put into action with real people, real challenges, and real opportunities. America’s first elected and appointed statesmen would set the precedents by which American representative democracy would operate. Indeed, much of American self-government still reflects the precedents established in those first decades. These acts were not performed in a vacuum, however. America’s leaders
had to face very real struggles, and the American people had to learn to trust the Constitution and one another. All the while, America also found before her opportunities rarely afforded to any nation. In navigating the challenges and seizing the opportunities, America matured into an increasingly, though still imperfect, democratic society. Living within the remnants of that “second chance” in the American experiment, students will learn much about the America of today by studying this first era of free self-government.

Enduring Ideas from This Unit

1. The presidency of George Washington was indispensable in establishing precedents conducive to free self-government and in keeping America free of what would have been a disastrous war.
2. The opportunities afforded to the United States were exceedingly rare in the history of nations.
3. Amidst the great strides in the practice of self-government and in taking advantage of opportunities, America’s treatment of Native Americans and the entrenching of slavery in the Southern states reveal the imperfections of the American regime and the injustices that were permitted.
4. American democracy expressed itself in a variety of unique ways and had a deep effect on the habits, thoughts, and character of Americans.
5. The idea of America’s “manifest destiny” to expand from coast to coast and spread its democratic ideas was a mixture of noble and material motivations which led to the Mexican-American War and a renewed debate over the expansion of slavery.

What Teachers Should Consider

The American founding was one of the most momentous—and dramatic—three decades in world history. How many times in history does a group of extraordinary individuals construct a novel government while winning a war against the world’s foremost power? The challenge in teaching the history of the early republic, therefore, is in trying to match the interest and excitement of the founding unit.

We are aided in this challenge by our having already met the cast of characters. The first four presidents were all founding fathers, and many cabinet members, diplomats, and justices were either present in Philadelphia in 1776 and 1787, fought in the War of Independence, or both. It proved consequential to the early national stability of America that these figures should have been the first to govern under the Constitution, George Washington above all others. Students should come to understand how much of the way American government functions and how many traditions of the American political order are owed to President Washington.

At the same time, students should understand the precarious situations into which the young country was drawn and learn how America’s first leaders managed these challenges. From maintaining a fragile unity to enduring buffets from Great Britain and Revolutionary France, these first four presidents had more than enough to handle, including a national existential crisis in the War of 1812.
And yet, America also had an abundance of opportunities during the first half of the 1800s. These began with the Louisiana Purchase and proceeded to include the acquisition of Florida, the Monroe Doctrine’s assertion of American authority in the Western Hemisphere, the annexation of Texas, and the Mexican Cession following the Mexican-American War. Alexander Hamilton’s financial efforts helped to calm and focus the American economy over the long term, while subsequent investments and inventions combined with the security of the rule of law to unleash a vibrant economy.

American representative democracy was thus put into action, and the experiment in self-government seemed to be succeeding. But how did democratic society affect its citizens? Considering this question with students gives them the opportunity to study life in a democratic republic, from its forms of religion to the kind of interests and leaders that it produces. Students should also study the ways in which America’s founding principles were not upheld, with respect to slavery and the treatment of Native Americans. They should understand the way that the institution of slavery changed during these initial decades and varied by region.

The study of America’s “manifest destiny” is an opportunity for students to enter the minds of Americans at the time and attempt to understand the spirit of the democratic age. Based on the circumstances, it seemed almost inevitable that America would spread many of its unique ideas and accomplishments throughout all of North America. Yet this sentiment was sometimes in tension with America’s founding principles. The culmination of this spirit in the Mexican-American War would gain for America an astonishing amount of new land, resources, and opportunity, but also bring closer the prospect of civil war.

How Teachers Can Learn More

**TEXTS**

*Empire of Liberty*, Gordon Wood  
*What Hath God Wrought*, Daniel Walker Howe  
*The Rise of American Democracy*, Sean Wilentz  
*An Empire of Wealth*, John Steele Gordon  
*Land of Promise*, Michael Lind  
*American Heritage: A Reader*, ed. Hillsdale College History Faculty

**ONLINE COURSES** | Online.Hillsdale.edu

*The Great American Story*  
*American Heritage*
Lesson Planning Resources

TEACHER RESOURCES

*Land of Hope*, Wilfred McClay
*A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope*, Wilfred McClay and John McBride
*A Student Workbook for Land of Hope*, Wilfred McClay and John McBride

STUDENT RESOURCES

*Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition*, Volume 1, Wilfred McClay

PRIMARY SOURCES

Thanksgiving Proclamation, George Washington
Letter to the Hebrew Congregation, George Washington
Farewell Address, George Washington
Monroe Doctrine, James Monroe
Address to the People of the United States, John Ross
Veto message on the Bank of the United States, Andrew Jackson
“The Great Nation of Futurity,” John Louis O’Sullivan
LESSON PLANS,
ASSIGNMENTS,
AND QUIZZES
Lesson 1 — The New Government

1789–1801

6–7 classes

**Lesson Objective**

Students learn about the first decades of American self-government under the Constitution, including the major events and developments during the presidencies of George Washington and John Adams.

**Teacher Preparation**

Create a note outline based on the following:

**Student Texts**
- *Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1* Pages 85–100
- Primary Sources See below.

**Teacher Texts**
- *Land of Hope* Pages 78–90
- *A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope* Pages 85–92, 121–123
- *A Student Workbook for Land of Hope* Pages 47–51

**Online.Hillsdale.edu**
- *The Great American Story* Lectures 5 and 6
- *American Heritage* Lecture 5

**Student Preparation**

**Assignment 1:** Students read *Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1*, pages 85–93, and prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

**Assignment 2:** Students read *Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1*, pages 93–100, and prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

**Core Content in This Lesson**

**Geography and Places**
- New York City
- Federal Hall
- Mount Vernon
- Philadelphia
- New Orleans
- Washington City in the Federal District of Columbia
- Executive Mansion
- Northwest Territory
Persons
George Washington
John Adams
Thomas Jefferson
Alexander Hamilton
James Madison
Eli Whitney
Citizen Genêt
John Jay

Terms and Topics
Bill of Rights
Father of Our Country
cabinet
bureaucracy
treasury
silver dollar
credit
tariff
national bank
Whiskey Rebellion
French Revolution
attorney general
original jurisdiction
appellate jurisdiction
Jay’s Treaty
Fugitive Slave Law
cotton gin
First Party System
Federalist Party
Democratic-Republician Party
XYZ Affair
Alien and Sedition Acts
Kentucky and Virginia
Resolutions
nullification

Primary Sources
Thanksgiving Proclamation, George Washington
Letter to the Hebrew Congregation, George Washington
Farewell Address, George Washington

To Know by Heart
“Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious People. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other.” —John Adams, To the Officers of the Militia of Massachusetts

Timeline
1787 Constitutional Convention
1789 Elections held; First Congress convened;
George Washington inaugurated; French Revolution begins
1800 Thomas Jefferson elected

Images
Historical figures and events
Depictions of Federal Hall and Washington’s inauguration
Diagram of a cotton gin
Early maps and designs for Washington, DC, and the Executive Mansion
Electoral maps
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Biographies and the roles of George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, and John Adams
- George Washington’s travels to New York City for his inauguration
- George Washington’s presidency, including the “coach and six” and Senator William Maclay’s criticisms of his policies and “monarchical” comportment
- The travels of Citizen Genêt in the United States
- The ebb and flow of the friendship between John Adams and Thomas Jefferson
- Stories of the building of Washington, DC
- Thomas Jefferson walking to his inauguration and riding bareback around Washington, DC
- The death of George Washington

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- Why would George Washington’s presidency prove to be so important for America’s future?
- What challenges did George Washington face at the start of and during his presidency?
- What were the competing visions for America’s future based on the views of Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson?
- What were Alexander Hamilton’s greatest contributions to the young nation?
- What were the stances of George Washington, John Adams, and Thomas Jefferson regarding the conflict between Great Britain and the French revolutionaries?
- How did George Washington navigate foreign policy concerning the French Revolution and Great Britain?
- How did Eli Whitney’s cotton gin change the course of slavery in America from what many during the founding generation had expected?
- How did the country expand during the 1790s? How did that expansion take place, and what did it look like?
- What were the three main points of Washington’s Farewell Address? Explain each.
- In what sense may it be said that George Washington was America’s “indispensable man”?
- What were the respective positions of the Federalists and the Democratic-Republicans on the issues facing the country by the late 1790s?
- How did John Adams navigate foreign policy concerning the French Revolution and Great Britain?
- What risks emerged as the result of the Alien and Sedition Acts and the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions?
- What was so consequential about the election of 1800 and the subsequent change in administrations?
- Questions from the US Civics Test:
  - Question 37: The president of the United States can serve only two terms. Why?
  - Question 47: What does the president’s cabinet do?
  - Question 48: What are two cabinet-level positions?
  - Question 50: What is one part of the judicial branch?
  - Question 51: What does the judicial branch do?
  - Question 52: What is the highest court in the United States?
  - Question 53: How many seats are on the Supreme Court?
  - Question 86: George Washington is famous for many things. Name one.
Question 89: Alexander Hamilton is famous for many things. Name one.

Question 119: What is the capital of the United States?

**KEYS TO THE LESSON**

With the Constitution ratified following robust debate, America embarked on the next phase of its experiment with self-government. Success was far from assured. The first statesmen to govern within this new system would play a decisive role in determining not only the immediate success of the fledgling republic but also its long-term well-being. Nearly every action would set a precedent, and there were very real threats to the country, both from without and from within. The statesmanship of George Washington and John Adams was indispensable for setting these precedents while steering the young nation through many trials, including deepening domestic division. When this division was ameliorated through a peaceful national election in 1800, followed by a transfer of power in 1801, the United States could mark a successful passage through its first dozen years of self-government under the Constitution, setting the stage for the next two hundred years of American government and history.

Teachers might best plan and teach The New Government with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Review with students the challenges facing the new nation. There was America’s disappointing first attempt at government under the Articles of Confederation, at the time still present in the minds of most Americans. Then there were the various problems that remained, such as sizeable war debts among the states, different currencies, tensions between borrowers and creditors, and the continued presence of British soldiers in American territory. And on top of these struggles was the undefined and untested work of actually governing through the structure of the new Constitution.

- Spend time teaching about the importance of George Washington in these first years under the Constitution, including his character and his example. Of special note is Washington’s setting of precedents for the presidency, his unifying example, his balancing of competing interests and views, and his efforts to prevent the young country from being dragged into a foreign war. To gain a sense of Washington’s teachings and the way in which his words and comportment established beneficial precedents, read with students some of his letters and addresses.

- Provide an overview of George Washington’s first cabinet, and outline the emerging debates over the kind of economy, workforce, and society the nation should have—debates represented by the disagreements between Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton.

- Review George Washington’s emphasis on learning, religious practice, and religious freedom as essential to America as a self-governing republic. Read with students in class parts of Washington’s Thanksgiving Proclamation and Letter to the Hebrew Congregation at Newport that manifest Washington’s arguments.

- Introduce Alexander Hamilton’s biography and the important and bold plans he developed for the nation, especially those related to the economy and finance. Explore with students Hamilton’s plans for the nation’s debt, protective tariffs, a national bank, and the effects of these programs.

- In foreign policy, the dominant issue facing America was navigating the conflict engulfing Europe during the French Revolution. More pointedly, the danger with respect to the French Revolution itself involved the conflicting sympathies that various Americans had toward Great Britain or France. This issue also forced Americans to think about their own revolution and its similarities to and differences from the French Revolution. George Washington was again vital in charting a
course of neutrality, which kept the fragile nation out of a conflict that might have ruined it and its experiment forever.

- Mark 1793 as the year in which Eli Whitney developed his cotton gin. Explain the ideal cotton-growing climate in the Southern states and yet the laborious and slow work of separating cotton seeds from the cotton. Then show how Whitney’s gin worked and how it revolutionized the cotton industry. Cotton plantations quickly began to expand and revitalized the demand for slave labor that had been in general decline through many of the founding years.

- Talk with students about the Fugitive Slave Law, which Congress passed to allow for the enforcement of Article IV, Section 2, of the Constitution, and about the laws many Northern legislatures passed in response, including those that allowed alleged fugitive slaves to defend themselves in court and sought to prevent the kidnapping of free African Americans.

- Explain how the plan for surveying and settling the Northwest Territory went into effect through the Northwest Ordinance. Highlight how the distribution of public lands through the township system along with an allotment for a public school were both unique in world history.

- Discuss Jay’s Treaty and Pinckney’s Treaty and how these two agreements better established the extent of the United States’ territory while also normalizing some trade expectations with European powers, such as the effects of the “right of deposit” in New Orleans.

- Emphasize for students the great growth in population and industry during this decade, including further settlement westward and new conflicts between Native Americans and settlers, such as the Northwest Indian War. Explore how disease, treaties, conflict, population density, and competing ideas of land and property factored into westward settlement and the reduction in the number and locations of Native Americans. Conflict, especially on the frontier, was still common—a combination of misunderstanding, outright dishonesty, and revenge. Where treaties were employed, their slightest violation usually gave the opposing side an excuse to act with force, thus undermining any kind of agreement. The distant and unsettled frontier left most nationally decreed restrictions on settlement unenforced.

- Consider how voting privileges expanded with the removal of property requirements, what was then a monumental development in self-government unique to America.

- Conclude the treatment of George Washington’s presidency with a close reading of his Farewell Address. Especially significant points to read and discuss with students include his warnings about party and the importance of union; his advocacy for remaining independent of other nations with respect to war and alliances; and his emphasis on religion, education, and upright moral conduct as essential to the success of the United States. Implied throughout is the necessity of reverence for the rule of law.

- Discuss John Adams’s presidency, beginning with a review of his contributions during the Revolution. Note with students how Adams had a hard act to follow and little of the respect, admiration, or mystique that Washington had possessed. Help students to understand Adams’s major accomplishments, including building a navy and navigating a neutral position with respect to the French wars of revolution, not to mention following the precedents set by Washington, thus lending them greater permanence.

- Based on previous conversation about the competing views for the country (as put forward by Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton), trace the development of political parties during the Washington and Adams administrations, culminating in the election of 1800, during which the American people were deeply divided. The threat of civil unrest was high, and Jefferson’s defeat of Adams posed a risk that such unrest would overflow during the first attempt to transfer power. That the transfer of power was, however, entirely peaceful after twelve years of rule by one regime.
seemed to confirm the sturdiness of the Constitution and the prudence of those who governed for that first decade. Students should appreciate how extraordinarily rare such transfers of power are in history and what allowed the Americans to avoid bloodshed—the all-too-common outcome in the history of nations.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Explain the main ideas in George Washington’s Farewell Address (1–2 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Explain how America navigated its relationships with Great Britain and France during the French Revolution (1–2 paragraphs).

**Assignment 3:** Explain the competing visions for the kind of economy and country America should become according to Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton (1–2 paragraphs).
Reading Quiz 3.1

**Directions:** Answer each question.

1. How long did George Washington expect the Constitution to last?

2. Who was America’s “indispensable man,” according to the text?

3. What role did Alexander Hamilton play in the Washington administration?

4. What was the major foreign policy issue that George Washington had to navigate?

5. What was one thing that the Jay Treaty with Great Britain did?
DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. What was one thing the texts says George Washington mentioned in his Farewell Address?

2. Who found it difficult to follow in the footsteps of George Washington?

3. What did the Alien and Sedition Acts do?


5. Who won the Election of 1800?
Unit 3 — Formative Quiz 1

Covering Lesson 1
10-15 minutes

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. Why would George Washington’s presidency prove to be so important for America’s future?

2. What were Alexander Hamilton’s greatest contributions to the young nation?

3. How did Eli Whitney’s cotton gin change the course of slavery in America from what many during the founding generation had expected?

4. What were the respective positions of the Federalists and the Democratic-Republicans on the issues facing the country by the late 1790s?

5. What risks emerged as the result of the Alien and Sedition Acts and the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions?
Lesson 2 — Prospects, Uncertainties, and War

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about events during the presidencies of Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, including Americans’ conflict with the British in the War of 1812.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts

Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1 Pages 100–118
Primary Sources See below.

Teacher Texts

Land of Hope Pages 90–104
A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope Pages 92, 106–111
A Student Workbook for Land of Hope Pages 51, 63–65

Online.Hillsdale.edu

The Great American Story Lecture 6
American Heritage Lectures 5 and 7

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students read Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1, pages 100–108, and prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).


CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography and Places

Virginia Missouri River
Monticello Lake Erie
Barbary Coast Lake Champlain
Tripoli Washington, DC
Louisiana Territory Louisiana
St. Louis
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### Persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thomas Jefferson</th>
<th>Sacagawea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Hamilton</td>
<td>James Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Burr</td>
<td>Tecumseh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Marshall</td>
<td>Oliver Perry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napoleon Bonaparte</td>
<td>Francis Scott Key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meriwether Lewis</td>
<td>Andrew Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Clark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Terms and Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federalists</th>
<th>impressment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic-Republicans</td>
<td>Embargo Act of 1807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Marbury v. Madison</em></td>
<td>Battle of Tippecanoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>judicial review</td>
<td>War of 1812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“unconstitutional”</td>
<td>Thames Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Purchase</td>
<td>USS Constitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napoleonic Wars</td>
<td>Battle of Lake Erie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corps of Discovery</td>
<td>Burning of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbary Pirates</td>
<td>Hartford Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Marine Corps</td>
<td>Battle of Horseshoe Bend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act Prohibiting Importation</td>
<td>Battle of New Orleans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Slaves of 1807</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### To Know by Heart

“The Defense of Ft. McHenry,” first stanza

### Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>Thomas Jefferson elected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>US purchases the Louisiana Territory from Napoleonic France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812–15</td>
<td>War of 1812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815</td>
<td>Battle of New Orleans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Images

- Historical figures and events
- Landscape pictures of geographic places featured in this lesson
- Executive Mansion
- Washington, DC, depictions
- Statue of Thomas Jefferson (Hillsdale College campus)
- Jefferson Memorial
- Images and uniforms of British and American officers and soldiers
- Depictions of figures at various scenes and moments in battle
- Maps: overall strategies; specific battles
- Relevant forts
- USS *Constitution* in Boston Harbor
- Medical equipment
Reenactment photos
Depictions of the Executive Mansion on fire
Depictions of the defense of Fort McHenry
Scenes from the Battle of New Orleans
Statue of James Madison (Hillsdale College campus)

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Biographies and the roles of Thomas Jefferson, John Marshall, and James Madison
- Thomas Jefferson’s walk to and from his inauguration
- Entries from the diaries of Meriwether Lewis and William Clark
- Aaron Burr killing Alexander Hamilton in a duel
- William Henry Harrison’s account of Tecumseh
- News of the US declaration of war and the British decision to stop interfering with American shipping as they passed each other on the Atlantic
- Dolley Madison fleeing the British with the portrait of George Washington
- The burning of Washington, DC, including the Executive Mansion
- The defense of Fort McHenry and the writing of “The Star-Spangled Banner”
- Andrew Jackson’s various duels and adventures
- The Battle of New Orleans and how it occurred after a peace treaty had been signed—unknownst to the battle participants

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What were the major actions and characteristics of Thomas Jefferson’s presidency?
- What was the impact of the Louisiana Purchase on America’s future?
- In what ways did Thomas Jefferson depart from his Democratic-Republican views as president?
- What did Congress and Thomas Jefferson outlaw in 1808?
- What were Thomas Jefferson’s views and actions, both personal and public, regarding slavery?
- What did the Supreme Court establish in Marbury v. Madison?
- What were the main characteristics of James Madison’s presidency?
- What were the causes of the War of 1812? How was war actually declared?
- What were the major moments during the War of 1812? How can we characterize America’s degree of success during this war?
- Why was the Battle of New Orleans important for America’s future, even though it was unwittingly fought after a peace treaty had been signed?
- What were the terms of the Treaty of Ghent?
- Questions from the US Civics Test:
  - Question 87: Thomas Jefferson is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 88: James Madison is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 90: What territory did the United States buy from France in 1803?
  - Question 91: Name one war fought by the United States in the 1800s.
  - Question 117: Name one American Indian tribe in the United States.
  - Question 123: What is the name of the national anthem?
KEYS TO THE LESSON

Changes in power have historically been among the most tumultuous moments in a nation’s history. America’s first transition from Federalist to Democratic-Republican control not only avoided much tumult but was perfectly peaceful. But how would the nation cope with new policies? And perhaps even more importantly, how would those making those changes behave? It turned out that Thomas Jefferson the president ended up being far less revolutionary than Thomas Jefferson the thinker and party leader. His policies were relatively conservative and even tended in the direction of Federalist positions. Jefferson was also checked by a federal judiciary under the leadership of Chief Justice John Marshall and a host of Federalist judges, securing the coequality of the branch. Yet challenges remained, particularly during the years of the Napoleonic Wars, culminating with the War of 1812 under James Madison. But even when the young nation made serious mistakes, somehow America seemed to emerge the better for it.

Teachers might best plan and teach Prospects, Uncertainties, and War with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Begin the lesson with a review of Thomas Jefferson’s childhood and biography. Like so many of his contemporary American Founders and statesmen, Jefferson had an exceptional mind with many interests and plenty of practical political skill. Of particular note is his storied career as a political thinker and statesman, his devotion to education, and the contradiction between his private efforts and statements against slavery and his continued ownership of slaves at Monticello.

- Treat Thomas Jefferson’s presidency chronologically, including events that do not directly relate to him. Within his presidency, be sure to include instruction on the many ways that Jefferson preserved the Federalist economic policies and the ways that he exerted national authority more forcefully than would have been anticipated. The almost unilateral (and of questionable constitutionality) Louisiana Purchase and the military expedition against the Barbary pirates in the Mediterranean are two examples of Jefferson’s use of presidential power.

- Teach students about Marbury v. Madison. The assertion of its coequality with the other branches in Marbury ensured that power was equally distributed and equally accountable to the people.

- Note for students the kind of federal government the Federalist courts and John Marshall himself molded through their cases. In brief, the national government was strengthened, ties of union were deepened, the interpretation of what was “necessary and proper” was expanded, and the federal government’s primacy over the states in regulation of commerce was defended.

- Tell students the stories of the Corps of Discovery Expedition through the Louisiana Territory. Be sure to show plenty of drawings and maps from Meriwether Lewis and William Clark’s sketchbooks. Use this opportunity to review geography material as the Corps traveled westward.

- Discuss the continued menace of the Napoleonic Wars and Americans’ attempts to trade with both the French and the British. Illustrate clearly for students why impressment of American sailors was such an affront, why the British considered it just, and how British and American conceptions of citizenship were at the heart of the issue. Outline Thomas Jefferson’s struggles (like Washington and Adams before him) with the British, including his Embargo Act that led to talks of secession within New England.

- Conclude the Jefferson administration by noting how Thomas Jefferson cemented the two-term limit tradition for presidents by following Washington’s example. In the last year of his presidency, Jefferson also signed into law in 1808 the abolition of the international slave trade, the earliest moment the Constitution allowed for it to be abolished.
Introduce James Madison with a review of his biography and his role in the Constitutional Convention and ratification debates. From this background students should not be surprised that he had become president, just as many Americans at the time had likewise been unsurprised. Madison is an interesting case study in history, since he was now governing within a Constitutional system much of which he himself had designed. The entirety of Madison’s presidency, however, would be absorbed with British aggression and an outright war.

Tell the stories of Tecumseh’s attempts to unite Native Americans east of the Mississippi River against American settlers and Tecumseh’s defeat at the Battle of Tippecanoe by forces under William Henry Harrison. The internal divisions over whether to defy a more powerful enemy or to capitulate were present within many Native American tribes in their responses to settlers and the United States government.

Ask students to identify and compare the various advantages and disadvantages of each side at the outset of the War of 1812 and how these shifted over the years. Having students take simple notes as a “T-Chart” can be effective for this part of the lesson.

Introduce students to the contemporary style of warfare by using images, maps, and artifacts. This approach will provide a foundation for their subsequent study of battles, help them to understand what happens in battle, and allow them to appreciate the bravery of soldiers fighting on both sides.

Explain each side’s strategy at various stages of the war and the tactics and battle plans employed in specific battles.

Teach major battles in detail. Students should understand how the battles came to be, the key stories, factors, and moments from the battles themselves, and the significance of their various outcomes on subsequent events. Employ battle maps often. As with any conflict, draw attention to the key contributions of both leaders and common soldiers in the war.

Note the great division between New England and the rest of the country in the War of 1812. In addition to secession talks, some New England states and New York actively supplied the British through trade for much of the war.

Of particular note in the War of 1812 are the frontier nature of fighting around the Great Lakes, the brutality of this warfare, the Americans’ actual attempt to conquer Canada, the American naval victories on inland lakes such as that of Commodore Oliver Perry in the Battle of Lake Erie as well as the Battle of Plattsburgh Bay on Lake Champlain, the half-hearted British fighting in the early years of the war due to their preoccupation with Napoleon, atrocities by both sides on the frontier and during the Thames Campaign, the British invasions of Washington, Baltimore, New York, and New Orleans, and the writing of “The Star-Spangled Banner.”

Introduce Andrew Jackson, the soldier and frontier lawyer-statesman. Consider the warfare of the day and the understandings each side held as to the means and purpose of combat. Explore with students accounts of Jackson as a military commander by both those in his command and his Native American opponents. Jackson will, of course, be covered again in future lessons, but this is an opportunity to introduce and tell some of the early stories that show the different sides to Andrew Jackson.

Conclude this lesson with the Battle of New Orleans, which technically occurred after peace had been agreed to. Note the diverse and ragtag army under Andrew Jackson’s command and their utter decimation of the regular British forces, including three generals. The Battle of New Orleans left Americans with a sense of triumph and pride from a war that had largely lacked such decisive victories, and which had included several embarrassing defeats and policy failures. The Treaty of Ghent did little to formally rectify American grievances. In reality, however, the treaty’s failure to
address the maritime legal questions that had caused the war meant little in the wake of
Napoleon’s final defeat at Waterloo. Similarly, the treaty’s reaffirmation of the prewar geopolitical
status quo in North America actually favored Americans, thanks to Harrison’s and Jackson’s
triumphs over native tribes allied with Great Britain. The war would be the last major conflict
with a foreign power that America would fight on its own soil.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Explain the main policy accomplishments of the Jefferson administration (1–2
paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Retell the story of the War of 1812 (1–2 paragraphs).
DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. What was the “revolution of 1800”?

2. In what city did Thomas Jefferson deliver his first inaugural address?

3. Which president was the first to embrace his role as the leader of his party?

4. What Supreme Court decision established the power of judicial review?

5. Which party dominated the judicial system during much of America’s early history under the Constitution?
Reading Quiz 3.4

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. What territory did Thomas Jefferson purchase from Napoleon?

2. What was the Corps of Discovery Expedition?

3. Whom did Thomas Jefferson send the Navy to fight during his administration?

4. What war began near the end of James Madison’s first term in office?

5. Which political party collapsed by 1824?
Lesson 3 — The American Way

1815–1829

6–7 classes

Lesson Objective

Students learn about the Era of Good Feelings under James Monroe, the rivalry between John Quincy Adams and Andrew Jackson, continued American expansion, and observations on the nature and practice of American democracy.

Teacher Preparation

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts

Primary Sources See below.

Teacher Texts
Land of Hope Pages 104–112, 117–126, 139–146
A Student Workbook for Land of Hope Pages 64–66, 74–75, 86–87

Online.Hillsdale.edu
The Great American Story Lectures 7 and 8
American Heritage Lecture 5

Student Preparation

Assignment 1: Students read Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1, pages 118–127, and prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).


Assignment 3: Students read Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1, pages 151–158, and prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Core Content in This Lesson

Geography and Places
Florida Territory Mexico
New Spain Tejas
Deep South  
Maine  
Missouri

Persons
James Monroe  
Henry Clay  
John C. Calhoun  
John Quincy Adams  
Andrew Jackson  
Daniel Webster  
Alexis de Tocqueville  
Stephen F. Austin  
Joseph Smith  
William Lloyd Garrison

Terms and Topics
The Virginia Dynasty  
“Era of Good Feelings”  
49th Parallel  
immigration  
Erie Canal  
railroad  
steamship  
steel-cast plow  
mechanical reaper  
Second Great Awakening  
Evangelism  
Catholics  
Mormonism  
American System  
McCulloch v. Maryland  
slave trade  
cotton gin  
King Cotton  
Missouri Compromise  
36° 30’ line  
Monroe Doctrine  
Corrupt Bargain  
populist  
Democratic Party

Primary Sources
Monroe Doctrine, James Monroe

To Know by Heart
“America is great because America is good, and if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great.” —Alexis de Tocqueville

Timeline
1816  
James Monroe elected  
1820  
Missouri Compromise  
1828  
Andrew Jackson elected

Images
Historical figures and events  
Landscape pictures of geographic places featured in this lesson  
First versions of inventions from this time period, such as steamboats, rail, and telegraph  
The Erie Canal  
Photos of cotton plantations today
Depictions of life as a slave
Depictions of the Second Great Awakening gatherings and revival scenes
Political cartoons, especially surrounding the Adams-Jackson campaigns
“Old Hickory” campaign paraphernalia
Maps of Mexico and Texas

**STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART**

- Biographies and the roles of James Monroe, John Quincy Adams, and Andrew Jackson
- Andrew Jackson in the South after the War of 1812 and in Spanish Florida, acting largely autonomously from the authority of the United States government
- The deaths of Thomas Jefferson and John Adams on July 4, 1826
- Andrew Jackson’s many duels, rivalries, feats, and accomplishments, before he became president
- Andrew Jackson’s decimation of a Native American village, and then taking in a Native American baby whose mother had been killed
- Margaret Bayard Smith’s account of the inauguration of Andrew Jackson

**QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND**

- How was America changing during the 1820s and 1830s, particularly concerning immigration, transportation, and the prospects for both business and the common man?
- What kind of religious and reform movements emerged during the 1820s and 1830s?
- What was society and life like in the South compared to the North and West?
- What was life like for slaves during the early nineteenth century?
- How did the status of slavery change following the invention of the cotton gin? How was this similar to and different from the status of slavery in the founding generation—before 1789?
- In what ways did the division over slavery manifest itself, and how was this division usually addressed by politicians?
- Why was there disagreement over the admission of Missouri into the Union, especially compared to the admittance of other slave states previously? How did the Missouri Compromise resolve the issue for the time being?
- How did Henry Clay change American politics?
- What was Henry Clay’s “American System”?
- How were parts of Texas first settled by Americans?
- What did the Monroe Doctrine state?
- How may the Adams-Jackson campaigns be characterized?
- What was the “Corrupt Bargain,” and how did it affect John Quincy Adams’s presidency?
- What did Andrew Jackson mean by “democracy”?
- Why did Andrew Jackson promote the common man?
- What were Alexis de Tocqueville’s major observations about democracy in America?
- Question from the US Civics Test:
  - Question 118: Name one example of an American innovation.
KEYS TO THE LESSON

The surprisingly equable outcome of the War of 1812 and the settling of lingering issues with world powers allowed America finally to “gain its footing.” The “Era of Good Feelings” that followed—complete with prosperity at home and peace abroad—permitted America to come into its own, to further develop the potential of its distinctly American character. As America underwent this maturation and as Americans grew more established in the free practice of business enterprise and self-reliance, the democratic nature of the nation was made even more clear. Perhaps no individual channeled or seemed to embody this democratic spirit of the time and the stake of the common man more fully than Andrew Jackson. And perhaps no one has articulated the nature of democratic self-government in America as well as the French observer Alexis de Tocqueville did in his book *Democracy in America*. From statesmen like Jackson to observers like Tocqueville, students can find an excellent window into the nature and practice of representative democracy as it developed in the early years of the United States. Early nineteenth-century America was the setting of a unique phenomenon on the world stage and formed much of what we consider to be the American way of self-government.

Teachers might best plan and teach *The American Way* with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Teach students about the background and biography of James Monroe, whose accomplishments prior to his becoming president were already storied and remarkable, and the impressive streak of Virginian presidents—sometimes called the “Virginia Dynasty.”
- Review with students the terms of the Treaty of Ghent and the other agreements with nations to secure America’s frontiers, including Florida. Also note the beginning of one of the first great immigration waves of the nineteenth century. With Europe in shambles following the Napoleonic Wars, European immigrants found new security, personal ownership of land, and opportunity in America, with half settling in New York and Philadelphia, while the other half settled in what is now the Midwest.
- Describe for students the great changes in technology and transportation during the 1820s and 1830s, including canals, the railroad, the steamboat, and advances in agriculture.
- Survey the emergence of new religious ideas and groups during the Second Great Awakening and originating from the Burned-Over District of upstate New York.
- Review the effects of the cotton gin on the practice of slavery in slaveholding states, and the economic value of slavery and the domestic slave trade. Greater percentages of slaves were also shifted decisively into manual field work while new justifications for slavery were often created based on religious interpretation and outright prejudice. Note the years in which different states were admitted as free states or outlawed slavery themselves. Nevertheless, even as the free-state/slave-state balance was maintained, the country was gradually losing the argument of many antislavery Founders, in whose view slavery was to be kept on the path to extinction as a temporary evil destined for its own ruin.
- Provide students with insights into Southern culture and society. Give an overview of Southern socioeconomic demography. Be sure to address the planter class—including the variety of estate sizes within the planter class—the free subsistence farmers, enslaved African Americans, etc. Spend some time on the life of slaves and the culture that emerged among slaves; include reading specific slave narratives. *Land of Hope*’s treatment of these themes on pages 139–145 is an excellent aid in these discussions.
Discuss with students the major factors that have produced the great wealth and prosperity of America, namely the freedom to innovate and invest, property rights, a peaceful daily life governed by the rule of law and consent of the governed, and the ability to patent ideas and inventions. Discuss also the extent to which many Southerners and even Northerners and Englishmen made considerable fortunes off of slavery and cotton textiles during the nineteenth century.

Present the question over Missouri’s admission as a state as the first major reemergence of the slavery issue after the founding and a mark of the growing divide in America in the post-cotton gin era. It was clear from this fierce debate, which involved talks of secession, that the hopes of many Founders that slavery would resolve itself organically were no longer tenable with the invention of the cotton gin, and that the deepest of America’s divisions could not be ignored forever. As the elderly Thomas Jefferson noted at the time, the crisis over Missouri could be the death knell of the Union. Even though conflict would be postponed forty years, the temporary peace acquired by the Missouri Compromise would leave the problem of slavery to haunt America for those four decades.

Use this opportunity to introduce major statesmen of the period, such as Henry Clay (the Great Compromiser), John Quincy Adams, John C. Calhoun, and Daniel Webster. On Clay in particular, explore his political maneuverings; note that the way he empowered the position of Speaker of the House of Representatives would be legendary and would mark a new chapter in American politics. On a policy matter, explain for students Clay’s “American System,” which paired well with the growth and technological change America was experiencing.

Discuss the settlement of Texas by Stephen Austin and other Americans during the 1820s, for the emergence of this American outpost within New Spain and then in Mexico would be consequential for events of subsequent decades.

Note the importance of the Monroe Doctrine and how unrealistically ambitious it was. Nonetheless, it did secure George Washington’s view of foreign policy as America’s default position and, combined with good timing, was efficacious in fulfilling what it said. Read and discuss its text with the class.

Review with students Andrew Jackson’s biography, full of impressive triumphs and controversial actions, particularly with respect to Native American tribes and Jackson’s thwarting of civilian authority over the military.

In order to encourage student understanding of America as she was coming into her own during the 1820s and 1830s, discuss with students the main ideas of Alexis de Tocqueville’s Democracy in America. For many students, these discussions should reveal how unique America was and is when it comes to self-government and freedom, slavery notwithstanding (as Tocqueville underscores). They should also come to understand the promises and risks involved in a society of and by the people, and how to preserve the promises and mitigate the risks therein.

**Strengthening Understanding: Post-Lesson Assignments**

**Assignment 1:** Explain the different factors that led to America’s economic growth and westward expansion in the first half of the nineteenth century (1–2 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Explain how slavery changed and expanded during the early nineteenth century and how this shaped debates over slavery (1–2 paragraphs).
Reading Quiz 3.5

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. What was one agreement reached between the British and the Americans in the treaty to end the War of 1812?

2. Name one “internal improvement” to transportation—besides railroads—mentioned by the text.

3. Name one invention mentioned by the text.

4. What was the Missouri Compromise about?

5. Who defeated John Quincy Adams in a rematch election in 1828?
Reading Quiz 3.6
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**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question.

1. Unitarianism was the dominant religion of the elites in which New England state?

2. What was the Second Great Awakening?

3. Why was upstate New York called the “burned-over district”?

4. Who was Charles Grandison Finney?

5. What religion did Joseph Smith found?
DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. What was one climate or environmental factor that made the South conducive to farming?

2. What was one reason the South did not enjoy the kind of population expansion witnessed in the North?

3. About what percentage of southerners owned slaves?

4. What does the text say was at the center of slaves’ communal life?

5. What was one way in which slaves discreetly resisted their bondage?
Unit 3 — Formative Quiz 2

Covering Lesson 3
10-15 minutes

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. What kind of religious and reform movements emerged during the 1820s and 1830s?

2. What was life like for slaves during the early nineteenth century?

3. How did Henry Clay change American politics?

4. What did the Monroe Doctrine state?

5. What was the “Corrupt Bargain,” and how did it affect John Quincy Adams’s presidency?
Lesson 4 — Manifest Destiny

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the presidency of Andrew Jackson, the Mexican-American War, and expansion to the Pacific Ocean under the banner of “manifest destiny,” along with the issues associated with such expansion.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts

*Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1*

Pages 127–131, 138–150, 158–168

Primary Sources

See below.

Teacher Texts

*Land of Hope*


*A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope*


*A Student Workbook for Land of Hope*

Pages 67, 75–77, 87–88, 94–95

Online.Hillsdale.edu

*The Great American Story*

Lectures 7, 8, and 9

*American Heritage*

Lectures 5, 6, and 7

STUDENT PREPARATION


CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography and Places
Texas                                        Rio Grande
Goliad                                        Seneca Falls
Republic of Texas                            California Territory
Oklahoma Territory                           New Mexico Territory
Oregon Country

Persons
Henry Clay                                    Henry David Thoreau
John C. Calhoun                               Elizabeth Cady Stanton
Sam Houston                                   Sojourner Truth
Antonio López de Santa Anna                   William Lloyd Garrison
Davy Crockett                                 Frederick Douglass
Jim Bowie                                     Levi and Catharine Coffin
Sequoyah                                      Harriet Tubman
Martin Van Buren                              James Polk
William Henry Harrison                        Zachary Taylor
John Tyler                                    Abraham Lincoln
Brigham Young                                 Winfield Scott
Ralph Waldo Emerson                           John Frémont

Terms and Topics
spoils system                                 immigration
Nat Turner Rebellion                          temperance
gag rule                                      abolitionism
“positive good”                               Underground Railroad
compact theory                               personal liberty laws
“state sovereignty”                           Transcendentalism
“We the People”                               manifest destiny
Nullification Crisis                          pioneer
Bank of the United States                    49th Parallel
Worcester v. Georgia                          Aroostook War
Indian Removal Act                            Morse code
Cherokee                                      annexation
Trail of Tears                                Spot Resolutions
The Alamo                                     Mexican-American War
Texas Revolution                              Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo
Second Party System                          Mexican Cession

Primary Sources
Address to the People of the United States, John Ross
Veto message on the Bank of the United States, Andrew Jackson
“The Great Nation of Futurity,” John Louis O’Sullivan
To Know by Heart

“Fifty-Four Forty or Fight!” —1844 Democratic slogan

“Marines’ Hymn”

Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>Texas independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>US annexes Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846–48</td>
<td>Mexican-American War</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Images

- Historical figures and events
- First flags of Texas
- Uniforms and munitions of soldiers in the Mexican-American War
- Depictions of battles and battlefields, including strategy and tactics
- Depictions of figures at various scenes and moments in battle
- Maps: overall strategies, specific battles
- Relevant forts
- Medical equipment
- Reenactment photos

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Biographies and the roles of Andrew Jackson, Sam Houston, Frederick Douglass, Harriet Tubman, William Henry Harrison, John Tyler, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and James Polk
- The 1831–32 slavery debate in the Virginia General Assembly
- Frederick Douglass’s account of his experience with a slave breaker
- Toasts between Andrew Jackson and John C. Calhoun regarding nullification at a Democratic Party dinner
- The passage of the Force Act and Henry Clay’s deal-making to resolve the Nullification Crisis
- Andrew Jackson’s many quotes and stories as he railed against nullification and the National Bank
- Accounts of the Battle of the Alamo
- William Coodey’s account of the start of the Trail of Tears
- Accounts of traveling the Oregon Trail
- The sudden illness and death of William Henry Harrison
- The feud between John Tyler and Henry Clay
- The US Marines entering the “Halls of Montezuma” during the Mexican-American War
- John Quincy Adams suffering a stroke at his desk in the House of Representatives, and subsequent death in the Speaker’s Room
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What were the arguments concerning slavery that delegates debated during the 1831–32 meeting of the Virginia General Assembly?
- How did the South’s stance toward slavery change in response to the Nat Turner Rebellion?
- Which of Andrew Jackson’s actions as president demonstrated his democratic ideas?
- How did the “state sovereignty” and “We the people” views of union differ from each other?
- What was at issue during the Nullification Crisis?
- What policies were adopted concerning Native Americans during the 1820s and 1830s?
- How did Andrew Jackson respond to decisions of the Supreme Court with which he disagreed? Why did he believe he was justified to act in these ways?
- How did the Texas Revolution come about?
- What was the Whig Party platform?
- What were the main ideas of Transcendentalism?
- What was the idea of “manifest destiny”? Why were many Americans confident in this assumption?
- How did the Mexican-American War begin? What were James Polk’s motivations for the war?
- Why did the Americans win the Mexican-American War?
- Questions from the US Civics Test:
  - Question 4: The US Constitution starts with the words “We the People.” What does “We the People” mean?
  - Question 91: Name one war fought by the United States in the 1800s.
  - Question 117: Name one American Indian tribe in the United States.

KEYS TO THE LESSON

With Andrew Jackson’s background and Alexis de Tocqueville’s insights fresh in mind, students can learn about the increasing democratization of America during the Jackson administration. In each of Jackson’s major policy decisions, students should be able to draw out both the ways in which these policies benefited the common man and how they cemented the power of the presidency. At the same time, a spirit of optimistic expansion imbued American politics, eventually termed America’s “manifest destiny” to settle from coast to coast. Confidence in the benefits of American freedom and self-government, coupled with other motivations and seemingly endless opportunities for expansion, fueled this spirit. Expansion, however, often involved displacing Native Americans in ways that lacked honor or justice. At America’s then-southwestern border, Americans who had settled in Texas were fighting their own revolution against Mexico. The resulting Republic of Texas and its potential admission to the Union stalked the next decade of American politics, as the slavery question lurked over all other debates. Since the Nat Turner Rebellion, the Southern position on slavery had ossified, and the stakes in the “balance of power” struggle in the US Senate became even greater. The Texas question came to a head with the Mexican-American War, the consequences of which would re-ignite the slavery debate and drive the nation toward civil strife.

Teachers might best plan and teach Manifest Destiny with emphasis on the following approaches:

- When teaching about Andrew Jackson and his presidency, consider with students the theme of his democratic appeal, namely in favor of the common man. At its heart, this meant a faith in the rightness of the views of the common man and the defense of his station in life against
commercial elites and wealthier coastal and urban interests. Note also this democratic view that
government was too often corrupted by these elite interests, that the larger the size of
government, the greater the likelihood of corruption and tyranny, and that a permanent
bureaucracy created a monopoly on information and power that corrupt politicians and self-
interested elites curried for their own benefit. Jackson brought nearly all of these positions to bear
on a presidency in which he largely reduced the size of the government and rejected expansion, all
the while embodying the ethos of the commoner. Consider with students the extent to which
Jackson marked a revitalization and fulfillment of self-government as articulated in the founding
view of limited government and the sovereignty of the people.

- As the epitome of Andrew Jackson’s political philosophy and policies, teach about his tour de
  force against the National Bank of the United States. Jackson left no tactic unused and threw his
  entire personality and popularity against the bank and, in his eyes, in defense of the common
  man. Read and discuss with students Jackson’s veto message.
- Teach about Nat Turner’s revolt, the debate over slavery in the Virginia General Assembly of
  1831–32 that followed, the series of tightening restrictions on slaves, and the hardening of the
  slaveholding position during the 1830s and 1840s.
- Explain to students how the growth in population in the North compared to the South would
  eventually allow Northern states to restrict slavery further and perhaps even abolish it with a
  constitutional amendment. Slaveholders recognized that they had to expand the number of slave
  states if they were to prohibit such actions by Northerners. The challenge, however, was that they
  needed Northern states to acquiesce to such expansion. To do so, they appealed to the argument
  that slavery was a positive good, as articulated in the writings of John C. Calhoun. Calhoun
  explicitly rejected the American founding principles as captured in the Declaration of
  Independence.
- Note the continued North-South divide manifesting itself in the Nullification Crisis of 1833, and
  Andrew Jackson’s somewhat surprising position against the idea of nullification. Some at the time
  saw the tariff issue as merely a front for slaveholding states to preserve their power to protect
  slavery.
- Take the opportunity when discussing the Indian Removal Act to recap the history of relations
  between American settlers and Native Americans. Land of Hope’s treatment of this topic on pages
  115–117 is very good. When it comes to a settled policy, few were ever solidified, and those that
  were formalized were rarely enforced or openly broken, by settlers or governments or sometimes
  by tribes. Some frontier settlements were lawless places where the presence of greed, dishonesty,
  and brutality were unmistakable. When teaching the resettlement chapter of American and
  Native American history in particular, it is important to capture the diversity of thoughts,
  motivations, and actions by the different parties: bad, good, and mixed. The general treatment of
  Native Americans is a bitter and sad part of America’s history, and unfortunately one that may
  have been better if a more deliberate and imaginative policy were devised, and if the view of the
  human person laid out in the Declaration of Independence had been more consistently referenced
  in relationships with the indigenous population. Read and discuss with students John Ross’s
  address regarding the Indian Removal Bill. Additionally, spend time teaching about efforts to
  maintain Native American heritage, such as how Sequoyah and the Cherokee sought to preserve
  their culture.
- Share the stories of the Texas Revolution, including the Alamo, Texas’s subsequent efforts to join
  the United States, and the effects of the Texas question on American politics.
Discuss the immigration waves from Ireland and Germany during the 1840s, where most of the people settled first in New York and New England. Also discuss the growing reform efforts in the areas of temperance, women’s political participation, and abolitionism.

Outline for students the emerging American literary tradition, spending time especially with the romantics and Transcendentalists of New England. Ask students to think about these figures and their ideas in light of the new religious movements and the democratic spirit they learned about in the last lesson.

Introduce and discuss the idea of “manifest destiny” with students. Land of Hope’s treatment of this topic on pages 154–155 is especially helpful. In brief, manifest destiny involved many different dimensions, some of which were noble; others less so. Even then, the meaning of this expression in the minds of different people varied greatly. The common point is that many Americans believed—based on the situation at the time—that America was destined to reach from coast to coast across a comparably sparsely populated wilderness, and to do great things for freedom, human flourishing, and individuals in the process. This was the sentiment that influenced many decisions during the 1830s and 1840s. Read with students the parts of John Louis O'Sullivan’s “The Great Nation of Futurity,” in which he uses the phrase “manifest destiny” and attempts to explain what it means.

Present the less-than-honorable origins and intentions behind the Mexican-American War within the contexts of the annexation of Texas, manifest destiny, the consequences of expansion for the slave-state/free-state balance of power, and the resistance to the war by figures such as Abraham Lincoln and Henry David Thoreau.

Ask students to identify and compare the various advantages and disadvantages of each side at the outset of the war and how these shifted over the years. Having students take simple notes as a “T-Chart” can be effective for this part of the lesson.

Introduce students to the contemporary style of warfare by using images, maps, and artifacts. This approach will provide a foundation for their subsequent study of battles, help them to understand what happens in battle, and allow them to appreciate the bravery of soldiers fighting on both sides.

Teach the Mexican-American War with a pace that captures the swiftness with which it was fought and concluded. Explain each side’s strategy at various stages of the war, tactics and battle plans, and the battles themselves in more general terms compared to the War of Independence and the War of 1812. Employ battle maps often. As with any conflict, draw attention to the key contributions of both leaders and common soldiers in the war. Of special interest in teaching this war is foreshadowing the many soldiers who would rise to famous generalships during the Civil War a dozen years later.

Emphasize with students the terms of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo and its effects on American territory and politics.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Explain the way ways in which Andrew Jackson sought to champion the interests of the common man (1–2 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Explain the causes of the Mexican-American War, why the United States won, and the effects of the peace treaty (1–2 paragraphs).
DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. Describe Andrew Jackson’s inauguration.

2. What did the Indian Removal Act do?

3. What did Alexis de Tocqueville do?

4. What happened in the Nat Turner Rebellion?

5. How did the Virginia Assembly respond to the Nat Turner Rebellion?
Reading Quiz 3.9
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DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. What was the temperance movement?

2. What was the Liberator, and what role did it play with respect to slavery?

3. What was Uncle Tom’s Cabin, and what role did it play with respect to slavery?

4. What was Stephen F. Austin’s role in the settlement of Texas in Mexico?

5. What was Andrew Jackson’s response to Texas’s request for annexation?

Name_________________________ Date_________________
Reading Quiz 3.10

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question.

1. What was one main idea in Transcendentalism?

2. What was one literary author or book mentioned by the text?

3. What was meant by the phrase “manifest destiny”?

4. To what did the phrase “Oregon fever” refer?

5. How did the Mexican War begin?
APPENDIX A

Study Guides

Tests

Writing Assignment
Unit 3 | Test 1 — Study Guide

Lesson 1 | The New Government
Lesson 2 | Prospects, Uncertainties, and War

Test on ____________

TIMELINE

When given chronological dates, match events from a list to the years or dates that they happened.

1787  Constitutional Convention
1789  Elections held; First Congress convened; George Washington inaugurated;
      French Revolution begins
1800  Thomas Jefferson elected
1803  US purchases the Louisiana Territory from Napoleonic France
1812–15  War of 1812
1815  Battle of New Orleans

GEOGRAPHY AND PLACES

Identify each on a map and/or tell where it is and explain its significance.

New York City  Washington, DC  Louisiana Territory
Federal Hall  Executive Mansion  St. Louis
Philadelphia  Northwest Territory  Missouri River
New Orleans  Barbary Coast

PERSONS

Identify each, provide biographical details, and explain what he or she thought or did in specific periods or events.

George Washington  Eli Whitney  Sacagawea
John Adams  Aaron Burr  Tecumseh
Thomas Jefferson  John Marshall  Oliver Perry
Alexander Hamilton  Meriwether Lewis  Francis Scott Key
James Madison  William Clark  Andrew Jackson

TERMS AND TOPICS

Identify each and explain its significance to the period of history studied.

Federalists  Louisiana Purchase  impressment
Democratic-Republicans  Corps of Discovery  Embargo Act of 1807
Marbury v. Madison  Barbary Pirates  USS Constitution
judicial review  international slave trade  Burning of Washington
Hartford Convention

Treaty of Ghent

MAJOR CONFLICTS

Explain how each battle began, narrate what happened in it and how, and explain the significance of the battle’s outcome.

Battle of Tippecanoe

Thames Campaign

Battle of Lake Erie

Battle of Horseshoe Bend

Battle of New Orleans

PRIMARY SOURCES

Based on annotations and notes from seminar conversations, be able to answer questions on each primary source. While you will not necessarily be asked why each primary source was created, what it did or argued, and what its effects were, being able to answer these kinds of questions will make you well prepared.

Letter to the Hebrew Congregation, George Washington

Farewell Address, George Washington

TO KNOW BY HEART

Be prepared to fill in missing words and/or identify the speaker and context.

“Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious People. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other.” —John Adams, To the Officers of the Militia of Massachusetts

“The Marines' Hymn”

“The Defense of Ft. McHenry,” first stanza

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be 3rd grade students.

- The travels of Citizen Genêt in the United States
- The death of George Washington
- Biographies and the roles of Thomas Jefferson, John Marshall, and James Madison
- Aaron Burr killing Alexander Hamilton in a duel
- William Henry Harrison’s account of Tecumseh
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.

Lesson 1 | The New Government

☐ What challenges did George Washington face at the start of and during his presidency?
☐ What were the competing visions for America’s future based on the views of Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson?
☐ What were Alexander Hamilton’s greatest contributions to the young nation?
☐ What were the stances of George Washington, John Adams, and Thomas Jefferson regarding the conflict between Great Britain and the French revolutionaries?
☐ How did George Washington navigate foreign policy concerning the French Revolution and Great Britain?
☐ How did Eli Whitney’s cotton gin change the course of slavery in America from what many during the founding generation had expected?
☐ What were the three main points of Washington’s Farewell Address? Explain each.
☐ What were the respective positions of the Federalists and the Democratic-Republicans on the issues facing the country by the late 1790s?
☐ What risks emerged as the result of the Alien and Sedition Acts and the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions?

Lesson 2 | Prospects, Uncertainties, and War

☐ What were the major actions and characteristics of Thomas Jefferson’s presidency?
☐ What was the impact of the Louisiana Purchase on America’s future?
☐ What did Congress and Thomas Jefferson outlaw in 1808?
☐ What were Thomas Jefferson’s views and actions, both personal and public, regarding slavery?
☐ What did the Supreme Court establish in Marbury v. Madison?
☐ What were the causes of the War of 1812? How was war actually declared?
☐ What were the major moments during the War of 1812? How can we characterize America’s degree of success during this war?
☐ Why was the Battle of New Orleans important for America’s future, even though it was unwittingly fought after a peace treaty had been signed?
☐ What were the terms of the Treaty of Ghent?
Unit 3 | Test 1 — The Early Republic

Lesson 1 | The New Government
Lesson 2 | Prospects, Uncertainties, and War

**TIMELINE**

Write the letter of each event next to the date or years it took place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1787</td>
<td>A. Battle of New Orleans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1789</td>
<td>B. Constitutional Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>C. Elections held; First Congress convened; George Washington inaugurated; French Revolution begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>D. Thomas Jefferson elected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812–15</td>
<td>E. US purchases the Louisiana Territory from Napoleonic France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815</td>
<td>F. War of 1812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GEOGRAPHY AND PLACES**

1. Mark the location of each place on the map using dots, circling, and the corresponding letters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Territory</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Territory</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PERSONS, TERMS, AND TOPICS

Fill in the blank with the letter of the correct answer.

A. Alexander Hamilton  
B. Barbary Pirates  
C. Democratic-Republicans  
D. Embargo Act  
E. Federalists  
F. Ghent  
G. international slave trade  
H. judicial review  
I. Meriwether Lewis  
J. New York City  
K. Philadelphia  
L. Sacagawea  
M. Washington

2. __________________________ was instrumental in setting out an economic plan to restore the credit of the United States and spur its industrial potential. He was killed in a duel with Aaron Burr in 1804.

3. The first party system in American history pitted the more democratic, agrarian, and pro-French __________________________ against the more nationally-focused, industry-friendly, and pro-British __________________________.

4. America’s three capitals under the Constitution were, in order, __________________________, __________________________, and the new capital carved from land donated by Virginia and Maryland along the Potomac River and whose architecture was meant to model the ancient Roman Republic: the city of __________________________ in the federal District of Columbia.

5. Under President Thomas Jefferson, the US Navy that John Adams had commissioned was used to fight the __________________________ in the Mediterranean Sea, putting an end to tribute payments by the United States.

6. Outlined in the decision *Marbury v. Madison*, the power for the judicial branch to judge the constitutionality of an act of the Congress, the President, or a state is called __________________________.

7. Having completed the purchase of the Louisiana Territory from France, Thomas Jefferson sent his secretary __________________________ and his army friend William Clark on a surveying and scientific trip through the vast new lands, aided by the Native American guide, __________________________.

8. In 1807 Congress passed and President Thomas Jefferson signed into law an act to ban the __________________________, thus banning the practice at the first opportunity provided by the US Constitution.

9. The __________________________ was passed to cut off trade with Great Britain, in an effort to stop British impressment of US sailors. The economic harm from the measure diminished Thomas Jefferson’s popularity in the final year of his presidency.
10. During the War of 1812, leaders in New England met at the ________________ to discuss the possibility of seceding from the United States over its conflict with Great Britain.

11. The Treaty of __________ largely restored pre-war boundaries while solidifying America’s claims to western territories, allowing the United States to focus on domestic issues in the coming decades.

**MAJOR CONFLICTS**

*Explain how each battle began, narrate what happened in it and how, and explain the significance of the battle’s outcome.*

12. Battle of Lake Erie

13. Battle of New Orleans
KNOWN BY HEART

Fill in missing words using the correct letters and identify the source.

A. country  D. Marine  G. sea
B. freedom  E. Montezuma  H. title
C. honor  F. right  I. Tripoli

“From the Halls of _____________
To the shores of _____________;
We fight our _____________’s battles
In the air, on land, and _____________;
First to fight for ________ and _____________
And to keep our ________ clean;
We are proud to claim the ________
Of United States ________.

Source:______________________________

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be 3rd grade students.

14. The death of George Washington

15. William Henry Harrison’s account of Tecumseh
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and writing should be employed and responses must fully answer each question.

16. What were the competing visions for America’s future based on the views of Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson?

17. What were Alexander Hamilton’s greatest contributions to the young nation?

18. How did Eli Whitney’s cotton gin change the course of slavery in America from what many during the founding generation had expected?

19. What were the three main points of Washington’s Farewell Address? Explain each.

20. What were Thomas Jefferson’s views and actions, both personal and public, regarding slavery?

21. What did the Supreme Court establish in Marbury v. Madison?

22. Why was the Battle of New Orleans important for America’s future, even though it was unwittingly fought after a peace treaty had been signed?
Unit 3 | Test 2 — Study Guide

Lesson 3 | The American Way
Lesson 4 | Manifest Destiny

Test on _______________

TIMELINE

When given chronological dates, match events from a list to the years or dates that they happened.

1816  James Monroe elected
1820  Missouri Compromise
1828  Andrew Jackson elected
1836  Texas independence
1845  US annexes Texas
1846–48 Mexican-American War

GEOGRAPHY AND PLACES

Identify each on a map and/or tell where it is and explain its significance.

Florida Territory  Missouri  Rio Grande
Mexico  Goliad  California Territory
Tejas  Republic of Texas  New Mexico Territory
Deep South  Oklahoma Territory
Maine  Oregon Country

PERSONS

Identify each, provide biographical details, and explain what he or she thought or did in specific periods or events.

James Monroe  Sam Houston  Frederick Douglass
Henry Clay  Antonio López  Levi and Catharine Coffin
John C. Calhoun  de Santa Anna  Harriet Tubman
John Quincy Adams  Davy Crockett  James Polk
Andrew Jackson  Sequoyah  Abraham Lincoln
Alexis de Tocqueville  William Henry Harrison  John Frémont
Stephen F. Austin  John Tyler
William Lloyd Garrison  Elizabeth Cady Stanton
Terms and Topics

Identify each and explain its significance to the period of history studied.

- The Virginia Dynasty
- “Era of Good Feelings”
- 49th Parallel
- immigration
- Second Great Awakening
- Missouri Compromise
- 36° 30’ line
- Monroe Doctrine
- Democratic Party
- spoils system
- Nat Turner Rebellion
- “state sovereignty”
- “We the People”
- Nullification Crisis
- Bank of the United States
- The Alamo
- Texas Revolution
- Second Party System
- temperance
- abolitionism
- Underground Railroad
- personal liberty laws
- Transcendentalism
- manifest destiny
- annexation
- Spot Resolutions
- Mexican-American War
- Mexican Cession

Primary Sources

Based on annotations and notes from seminar conversations, be able to answer questions on each primary source. While you will not necessarily be asked why each primary source was created, what it did or argued, and what its effects were, being able to answer these kinds of questions will make you well prepared.

- Monroe Doctrine, James Monroe
- Veto message on the Bank of the United States, Andrew Jackson

To Know By Heart

Be prepared to fill in missing words and/or identify the speaker and context.

- “America is great because America is good, and if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great.” —Alexis de Tocqueville
- “Fifty-Four Forty or Fight!” —1844 Democratic slogan

Stories for the American Heart

In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be 3rd grade students.

- Biographies and the roles of Andrew Jackson, Sam Houston, Frederick Douglass, Harriet Tubman, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton
- Accounts of the inauguration of Andrew Jackson
- The 1831–32 slavery debate in the Virginia General Assembly
- Frederick Douglass’s account of his experience with a slave breaker
- Accounts of the Battle of the Alamo
- Accounts of the start of the Trail of Tears
- Accounts of traveling the Oregon Trail
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.

Lesson 3 | The American Way

☐ What kind of religious and reform movements emerged during the 1820s and 1830s?
☐ What was life like for slaves during the early nineteenth century?
☐ How did the status of slavery change following the invention of the cotton gin? How was this similar to and different from the status of slavery in the founding generation—before 1789?
☐ In what ways did the division over slavery manifest itself, and how was this division usually addressed by politicians?
☐ Why was there disagreement over the admission of Missouri into the Union, especially compared to the admittance of other slave states previously? How did the Missouri Compromise resolve the issue for the time being?
☐ How did Henry Clay change American politics?
☐ What did the Monroe Doctrine state?
☐ What did Andrew Jackson mean by “democracy”?
☐ Why did Andrew Jackson promote the common man?
☐ What were Alexis de Tocqueville’s major observations about democracy in America?

Lesson 4 | Manifest Destiny

☐ How did the South’s stance toward slavery change in response to the Nat Turner Rebellion?
☐ Which of Andrew Jackson’s actions as president demonstrated his democratic ideas?
☐ How did the “state sovereignty” and “We the people” views of union differ from each other?
☐ What was at issue during the Nullification Crisis?
☐ What policies were adopted concerning Native Americans during the 1820s and 1830s?
☐ How did Andrew Jackson respond to decisions of the Supreme Court with which he disagreed? Why did he believe he was justified to act in these ways?
☐ How did the Texas Revolution come about?
☐ What was the Whig Party platform?
☐ What was the idea of “manifest destiny”? Why were many Americans confident in this assumption?
☐ How did the Mexican-American War begin? What were James Polk’s motivations for the war?
Unit 3 | Test 2 — The Early Republic

Lesson 3 | The American Way
Lesson 4 | Manifest Destiny

**TIMELINE**

Write the letter of each event next to the date or years it took place.

1816 _______  A. Andrew Jackson elected
1820 _______  B. James Monroe elected
1828 _______  C. Mexican-American War
1836 _______  D. Missouri Compromise
1845 _______  E. Texas independence
1846–48 _______  F. US annexes Texas

**GEOGRAPHY AND PLACES**

1. Mark the location of each place on the map using dots, circling, and the corresponding letters:

   A. Mexico  
   B. Deep South  
   C. Missouri  
   D. Republic of Texas  
   E. Oklahoma Territory  
   F. Oregon Country  
   G. Rio Grande  
   H. California Territory

Map courtesy of A Student Workbook for Land of Hope.
**PERSONS, TERMS, AND TOPICS**

*Fill in the blank with the letter of the correct answer.*

A. Abraham Lincoln  
B. Alamo  
C. Bank of the United States  
D. Era of Good Feeling  
E. Henry Clay  
F. John Quincy Adams  
G. Manifest Destiny  
H. Mexican Cession  
I. Monroe Doctrine  
J. Nat Turner Rebellion  
K. Second Great Awakening  
L. Stephen F. Austin  
M. Trail of Tears  
N. Underground Railroad  
O. William Henry Harrison

2. The years immediately following the War of 1812 under the new president James Monroe were known as the ____________________ since peace returned and it looked as though America could focus on developing further economically and settling westward.

3. The most significant cultural development during the early 1800s, especially on the frontier, was the ____________________, which saw the emergence of new Christian zeal and denominations.

4. The ____________________ warned European powers not to begin new colonies in the Western Hemisphere. Though in practice unenforceable, good timing gave the policy a semblance of success.

5. The US Congress was in essence governed by the leadership of ____________________, “The “Great Compromiser,” who helped work out three agreements that would preserve the Union, beginning with the Missouri Compromise.

6. Out of vitriol regarding the result of the Election of 1824, Andrew Jackson and the new Democratic Party relentlessly undermined and attacked every action of President ____________________, who up to that point had been revered for his service to his nation.

7. After the slave uprising known as ____________________, many Southern states hardened their position on slavery, thus intensifying the divisions in the country.

8. The most notable action of Jackson’s presidency was his battle against the ____________________, during which he defied both Congress and the Supreme Court in his belief of its unconstitutionality.

9. Following treaties made under the Indian Removal Act, US troops forced Native Americans to western reservations in horrid conditions, resulting in widespread death in what is known as the ____________________.

10. The part of New Spain and then Mexico known as Texas was settled by Americans led by ____________________ and the Old Three Hundred group of settlers.
11. The defeat of holdout Texans at the Battle of the ______________ under Mexican leader Antonio López de Santa Anna became a rallying cry in the Texas Revolution and elicited the public support of many Americans.

12. Running with the slogan “Old Tippecanoe and Tyler Too”, the frontier general ______________ died only a month into office, leaving John Tyler as president, who frequently clashed with his fellow Whigs in Congress.

13. The network of escape routes, safe houses, and abolitionist conductors known as the ______________ was one of the courageous ways in which escaped slaves and abolitionists freed African Americans from slavery.

14. The belief that the United States was destined to spread throughout North America, bringing her democratic ideas with her while taking advantage of economic opportunities, was labeled ______________ by a newspaper in the 1840s.

15. Asserting that the president purposefully provoked Mexican aggression, the first-year Whig Congressman ______________ introduced demands that the president explain on exactly which spot in American territory the attack by Mexicans on American troops took place. Due to these “Spot Resolutions,” this Congressman lost his seat in the House of Representatives in the next election.

16. The Mexican-American War resulted in the ______________, in which America received much of what is now the western United States.

**Known By Heart**

*Fill in missing words using the correct letters and identify the source.*

A. America  
B. ceases  
C. good  
D. great

17. “America is great because ______________ is ______________, and if America ever ______________ to be good, America will cease to be ______________.”  

Source: ____________________________________
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be 3rd grade students.

18. Tell the biography of Andrew Jackson

19. Tell the biography of Frederick Douglass

20. Tell the story of the 1831–32 slavery debate in the Virginia General Assembly
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and writing should be employed and responses must fully answer each question.

21. What was life like for slaves during the early nineteenth century?

22. Why was there disagreement over the admission of Missouri into the Union, especially compared to the admittance of other slave states previously? How did the Missouri Compromise resolve the issue for the time being?

23. Why did Andrew Jackson promote the common man?

24. What were Alexis de Tocqueville’s major observations about democracy in America?

25. How did the “state sovereignty” and “We the people” views of union differ from each other?

26. What was the Whig Party platform?

27. What was the idea of “manifest destiny”? Why were many Americans confident in this assumption?
Unit 3 | Writing Assignment — The Early Republic

DIRECTIONS

Citing events and primary sources in your argument, write a 4–5 paragraph essay answering the question:

Which events and policies were most significant for helping the United States grow in prosperity, size, and opportunity between 1791 and 1848?
APPENDIX B

Primary Sources

George Washington
James Monroe
John Ross
Andrew Jackson
John Louis O'Sullivan
A Proclamation

PROCLAMATION

October 3, 1789

Federal Hall | New York City, New York

Thanksgiving Proclamation

BACKGROUND

In response to a joint resolution of Congress, President George Washington issued this proclamation.

ANNOTATIONS

By the President of the United States of America, a Proclamation.

Whereas it is the duty of all Nations to acknowledge the providence of Almighty God, to obey his will, to be grateful for his benefits, and humbly to implore his protection and favor—and whereas both Houses of Congress have by their joint Committee requested me “to recommend to the People of the United States a day of public thanksgiving and prayer to be observed by acknowledging with grateful hearts the many signal favors of Almighty God especially by affording them an opportunity peaceably to establish a form of government for their safety and happiness.”

Now therefore I do recommend and assign Thursday the 26th day of November next to be devoted by the People of these States to the service of that great and glorious Being, who is the beneficent Author of all the good that was, that is, or that will be—That we may then all unite in rendering unto him our sincere and humble thanks—for his kind care and protection of the People of this Country previous to their becoming a Nation—for the signal and manifold mercies, and the favorable interpositions of his Providence which we experienced in the course and conclusion of the late war—for the great degree of tranquility,

___

union, and plenty, which we have since enjoyed—for the peaceable and rational manner, in which we have been enabled to establish constitutions of government for our safety and happiness, and particularly the national One now lately instituted—for the civil and religious liberty with which we are blessed; and the means we have of acquiring and diffusing useful knowledge; and in general for all the great and various favors which he hath been pleased to confer upon us.

And also that we may then unite in most humbly offering our prayers and supplications to the great Lord and Ruler of Nations and beseech him to pardon our national and other transgressions—to enable us all, whether in public or private stations, to perform our several and relative duties properly and punctually—to render our national government a blessing to all the people, by constantly being a Government of wise, just, and constitutional laws, discreetly and faithfully executed and obeyed—to protect and guide all Sovereigns and Nations (especially such as have shewn kindness unto us) and to bless them with good government, peace, and concord—To promote the knowledge and practice of true religion and virtue, and the increase of science among them and us—and generally to grant unto all Mankind such a degree of temporal prosperity as he alone knows to be best.

Given under my hand at the City of New-York the third day of October in the year of our Lord 1789.

George Washington
PRESIDENT GEORGE WASHINGTON

To the Hebrew Congregation in Newport, Rhode Island

LETTER

August 21, 1790

BACKGROUND

During President George Washington’s goodwill visit to Newport following Rhode Island’s ratification of the Constitution, Moses Seixas—a leading official in Newport and a member of the local Jewish synagogue—publicly read a letter to Washington. Washington responded three days later in a letter of his own.

ANNOTATIONS

Gentlemen:

While I receive, with much satisfaction, your Address replete with expressions of esteem; I rejoice in the opportunity of assuring you, that I shall always retain grateful remembrance of the cordial welcome I experienced in my visit to Newport, from all classes of Citizens.

The reflection on the days of difficulty and danger which are past is rendered the more sweet, from a consciousness that they are succeeded by days of uncommon prosperity and security. If we have wisdom to make the best use of the advantages with which we are now favored, we cannot fail, under the just administration of a good Government, to become a great and happy people.

The Citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy; a policy worthy of

imitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that toleration is spoken of, as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people, that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural rights. For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support.

It would be inconsistent with the frankness of my character not to avow that I am pleased with your favorable opinion of my Administration and fervent wishes for my felicity. May the Children of the Stock of Abraham, who dwell in this land, continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other Inhabitants; while every one shall sit in safety under his own vine and fig tree, and there shall be none to make him afraid. May the father of all mercies scatter light and not darkness in our paths, and make us all in our several vocations useful here, and in his own due time and way everlastingly happy.
PRESIDENT GEORGE WASHINGTON
To the People of America
LETTER EXCERPTS

September 19, 1796
American Daily Advertiser | Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Farewell Address

BACKGROUND

George Washington wrote this letter to the American people announcing his retirement from the Presidency after his second term. At the time, there were no term limits on the presidency.

ANNOTATIONS

...For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to You, in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of Patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same Religion, Manners, Habits and political Principles. You have in a common cause fought and triumphed together. The independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint councils, and joint efforts; of common dangers, sufferings and successes....

...[Y]ou have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a Constitution of Government, better calculated than your former for an intimate Union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its Laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true Liberty. The

basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their Constitu-
tions of Government. But the Constitution which at any time exists, ’til changed by an ex-

plicit and authentic act of the whole People, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the People to establish Government presupposes the duty of every Individual to obey the established Government….  

I have already intimated to you the danger of Parties in the State, with particular reference to the founding of them on Geographical discriminations. Let me now take a more com-
prehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the Spirit of Party, generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human Mind. It exists under different shapes in all Governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but, in those of the popular form, it is seen in its greatest rankness and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissention, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries, which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an Individual; and sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation, on the ruins of Public Liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of Party are suffi-
cient to make it the interest and the duty of a wise People to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the Public Councils and enfeeble the Public administration. It agitates the Community with ill-founded jealousies and false alarms, kindles the animosity of one part against another, foments occasionally riot and insurrection. It opens the door
to foreign influence and corruption, which find a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country, are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the Administration of the government and serve to keep alive the spirit of Liberty. This within certain limits is probably true, and in Governments of a Monarchical cast Patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in Governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched; it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent its bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free Country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective Constitutional spheres; avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power, and proneness to abuse it, which predominates in the human heart is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power; by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the Guardian of the Public Weal against invasions by the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern, some of them in our country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If in the opinion of the People, the distribution or modification of the Constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.
Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, Religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of Patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great Pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of Men and citizens. The mere Politician, equally with the pious man ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in Courts of Justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that National morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

"Tis substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free Government. Who that is a sincere friend to it, can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric.

Promote then as an object of primary importance, Institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened....
PRESIDENT JAMES MONROE (DEMOCRATIC-REPUBLICAN)

Annual Message to Congress

LETTER EXCERPTS

December 2, 1823
Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

President James Monroe sent his seventh Annual Message to Congress in 1823, as required by the Constitution.

ANNOTATIONS

Fellow-Citizens of the Senate and House of Representatives:…

A precise knowledge of our relations with foreign powers as respects our negotiations and transactions with each is thought to be particularly necessary. Equally necessary is it that we should form a just estimate of our resources, revenue, and progress in every kind of improvement connected with the national prosperity and public defense. It is by rendering justice to other nations that we may expect it from them. It is by our ability to resent injuries and redress wrongs that we may avoid them…. 

The citizens of the United States cherish sentiments the most friendly in favor of the liberty and happiness of their fellow men on that side of the Atlantic. In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do.

It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense. With the movements in this hemisphere we are of

necessity more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers.

The political system of the allied powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. This difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective Governments; and to the defense of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure, and matured by the wisdom of their most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity, this whole nation is devoted.

We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere, but with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

In the war between those new Governments and Spain we declared our neutrality at the time of their recognition, and to this we have adhered, and shall continue to adhere, provided no change shall occur which, in the judgment of the competent authorities of this Government, shall make a corresponding change on the part of the United States indispensable to their security….

Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, nevertheless remains the same, which is, not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the government de facto as the legitimate government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it, and to
preserve those relations by a frank, firm, and manly policy, meeting in all instances the just claims of every power, submitting to injuries from none.

But in regard to those continents circumstances are eminently and conspicuously different. It is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness; nor can anyone believe that our southern brethren, if left to themselves, would adopt it of their own accord. It is equally impossible, therefore, that we should behold such interposition in any form with indifference. If we look to the comparative strength and resources of Spain and those new Governments, and their distance from each other, it must be obvious that she can never subdue them. It is still the true policy of the United States to leave the parties to themselves, in the hope that other powers will pursue the same course....
GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHEROKEE NATION

Address to the People of the United States

ADDRESS EXcerPTS

July 1830

BACKGROUND

The General Council of the Cherokee Nation made this appeal to the American people and its representatives, written primarily, it is believed, by Cherokee Chief John Ross.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

. . . When the federal Constitution was adopted the Treaty of Hopewell was contained, with all other treaties, as the supreme law of the land. In 1791, the Treaty of Holston was made, by which the sovereignty of the Cherokees was qualified as follows: The Cherokees acknowledged themselves to be under the protection of the United States, and of no other sovereign. They engaged that they would not hold any treaty with a foreign power, with any separate state of the Union, or with individuals. They agreed that the United States should have the exclusive right of regulating their trade; that the citizens of the United States have a right of way in one direction through the Cherokee country; and that if an Indian should do injury to a citizen of the United States, he should be delivered up to be tried and punished. A cession of lands was also made to the United States. On the other hand, the United States paid a sum of money; offered protection; engaged to punish citizens of the United States who should do any injury to the Cherokees; abandoned white settlers on Cherokee lands to the discretion of the Cherokees, stipulated that white men should not hunt on these lands, nor even enter the country without a passport; and gave a solemn guaranty of all Cherokees lands not ceded. This treaty is the basis of all subsequent compacts; and in none of them are the relations of the parties at all changed.

E.C. Tracy, Memoir of the Life of Jeremiah Evarts, Late Corresponding Secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (Boston: Crocker and Brewster, 1845): 444-448.
Address to the People of the United States
John Ross

The Cherokees have always fulfilled their engagements. . . .

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

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

It is under a sense of the most pungent feelings that we make this, perhaps our last appeal to the good people of the United States. . . . Shall we be compelled by a civilized and Christian people, with whom we have lived in perfect peace for the last forty years, and for whom we have willingly bled in war, to bid a final adieu to our homes, our farms, our streams, and our beautiful forests? No. We are still firm. We intend still to cling with our wonted affection to the land which gave us birth and which every day of our lives brings to us new and stronger ties of attachment. . . . On the soil which contains the ashes of our beloved men we wish to live—on this soil we wish to die.
We entreat those to whom the preceding paragraphs are addressed to remember the great law of love, “Do to others as ye would that others should do to you.” Let them remember that of all nations on the earth, they are under the greatest obligations to obey this law. We pray them to remember that, for the sake of principle, their forefathers were compelled to leave, therefore driven from the old world, and that the winds of persecution wafted them over the great waters and landed them on the shores of the new world, when the Indian was the sole lord and proprietor of these extensive domains. Let them remember in what way they were received by the savage of America, when power was in his hand, and his ferocity could not be restrained by any human arm. We urge them to bear in mind that those who would now ask of them a cup of cold water, and a spot of earth, a portion of their own patrimonial possessions on which to live and die in peace, are the descendants of those, whose origin as inhabitants of North America history and tradition are alike insufficient to reveal. Let them bring to remembrance all these facts, and they cannot, and we are sure they will not, fail to remember and sympathize with us in these our trials and sufferings.
**PRESIDENT ANDREW JACKSON (D-TN)**

Veto Message from the President of the United States, returning the Bank Bill, with his objections, &c.

**LETTER EXCERPTS**

July 10, 1832
Washington, D.C.

**BACKGROUND**

President Andrew Jackson sent this message to the Senate accompany his veto of a bill passed to re-charter the Bank of the United States.

**ANNOTATIONS**

It is to be regretted that the rich and powerful too often bend the acts of government to their selfish purposes. Distinctions in society will always exist under every just government. Equality of talents, of education, or of wealth cannot be produced by human institutions. In the full enjoyment of the gifts of Heaven and the fruits of superior industry, economy, and virtue, every man is equally entitled to protection by law; but when the laws undertake to add to these natural and just advantages artificial distinctions, to grant titles, gratuities, and exclusive privileges, to make the rich richer and the potent more powerful, the humble members of society—the farmers, mechanics, and laborers—who have neither the time nor the means of securing like favors to themselves, have a right to complain of the injustice of their government. There are no necessary evils in government. Its evils exist only in its abuses. If it would confine itself to equal protection, and, as Heaven does its rains, shower its favors alike on the high and the low, the rich and the poor, it would be an unqualified blessing. In the act before me there seems to be a wide and unnecessary departure from

---

Andrew Jackson, “Veto message from the President of the United States, returning the bank bill, with his objections, &c. To the Senate . . .” Washington, Herald Office, 1832.
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Nor is our government to be maintained or our Union preserved by invasions of the rights and powers of the several states. In thus attempting to make our general government strong we make it weak. Its true strength consists in leaving individuals and states as much as possible to themselves—in making itself felt not in its power, but in its beneficence; not in its control, but in its protection; not in binding the states more closely to the center, but leaving each to move unobstructed in its proper orbit.

Experience should teach us wisdom. Most of the difficulties our government now encounters and most of the dangers which impend over our Union have sprung from an abandonment of the legitimate objects of government by our national legislation, and the adoption of such principles as are embodied in this act. Many of our rich men have not been content with equal protection and equal benefits, but have besought us to make them richer by act of Congress. By attempting to gratify their desires we have in the results of our legislation arrayed section against section, interest against interest, and man against man, in a fearful commotion which threatens to shake the foundations of our Union. It is time to pause in our career to review our principles, and if possible revive that devoted patriotism and spirit of compromise which distinguished the sages of the Revolution and the fathers of our Union. If we cannot at once, in justice to interests vested under improvident legislation, make our government what it ought to be, we can at least take a stand against all new grants of monopolies and exclusive privileges, against any prostitution of our government to the advancement of the few at the expense of the many, and in favor of compromise and gradual reform in our code of laws and system of political economy.

I have now done my duty to my country. If sustained by my fellow citizens, I shall be grateful and happy; if not, I shall find in the motives which impel me ample grounds for contentment and peace. In the difficulties which surround us and the dangers which threaten our institutions there is cause for neither dismay nor alarm. For relief and deliverance let us firmly rely on that kind Providence which I am sure watches with peculiar care over the destinies of our Republic, and on the intelligence and wisdom of our
countrymen. Through His abundant goodness and heir patriotic devotion our liberty and Union will be preserved.
JOHN LOUIS O’SULLIVAN
“The Great Nation of Futurity”
EDITORIAL EXCERPTS
November 6, 1839
The United States Democratic Review

BACKGROUND

The United States Democratic Review's founder and editor, John Louis O’Sullivan, published this editorial in 1839.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

We have no interest in the scenes of antiquity, only as lessons of avoidance of nearly all their examples. The expansive future is our arena, and for our history. We are entering on its untrodden space, with the truths of God in our minds, beneficent objects in our hearts, and with a clear conscience unsullied by the past. We are the nation of human progress, and who will, what can, set limits to our onward march? Providence is with us, and no earthly power can. We point to the everlasting truth on the first page of our national declaration, and we proclaim to the millions of other lands, that "the gates of hell"—the powers of aristocracy and monarchy—"shall not prevail against it."

The far-reaching, the boundless future will be the era of American greatness. In its magnificent domain of space and time, the nation of many nations is destined to manifest to mankind the excellence of divine principles; to establish on earth the noblest temple ever dedicated to the worship of the Most High—the Sacred and the True. Its floor shall be a hemisphere—its roof the firmament of the star-studded heavens, and its congregation an Union of many Republics, comprising hundreds of happy millions, calling, owning no man master, but governed by God’s natural and moral law of equality, the law of brotherhood—

of "peace and good will amongst men." . . .

Yes, we are the nation of progress, of individual freedom, of universal enfranchisement. Equality of rights is the cynosure of our union of States, the grand exemplar of the correlative equality of individuals; and while truth sheds its effulgence, we cannot retrograde, without dissolving the one and subverting the other. We must onward to the fulfilment of our mission—to the entire development of the principle of our organization—freedom of conscience, freedom of person, freedom of trade and business pursuits, universality of freedom and equality. This is our high destiny, and in nature’s eternal, inevitable decree of cause and effect we must accomplish it. All this will be our future history, to establish on earth the moral dignity and salvation of man—the immutable truth and beneficence of God. For this blessed mission to the nations of the world, which are shut out from the life-giving light of truth, has America been chosen; and her high example shall smite unto death the tyranny of kings, hierarchs, and oligarchs, and carry the glad tidings of peace and good will where myriads now endure an existence scarcely more enviable than that of beasts of the field. Who, then, can doubt that our country is destined to be the great nation of futurity?
UNIT 4
The American Civil War

1848–1877

UNIT PREVIEW

Structure

| LESSON 1 | 1848–1854 | The Expansion of Slavery | 6-7 classes | p. 7 |
| LESSON 2 | 1854–1861 | Toward Civil War | 6-7 classes | p. 15 |
| LESSON 3 | 1861–1865 | The Civil War | 9-10 classes | p. 20 |
| LESSON 4 | 1865–1877 | Reconstruction | 4-5 classes | p. 30 |
| APPENDIX A | Study Guides, Tests, and Writing Assignment | | | p. 37 |
| APPENDIX B | Primary Sources | | | p. 59 |

Why Teach the American Civil War

“Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent, a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure.”

These famous opening lines from President Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg express why the Civil War was fought. Whether America, founded in liberty and equality, could long endure depended on whether the nation’s original contradiction, slavery, could be abolished while still preserving the country’s existence as a union. American students must know how the ideas at the heart of their country were undermined by slavery; but they must also learn how heroic Americans committed to America’s founding ideas made
great sacrifices and sometimes gave their lives, so that these ideas of liberty and equality might prevail over the dehumanizing tyranny of slavery. And students must learn that, like those in Lincoln’s audience, it is up to each American to oppose tyranny and dehumanization to ensure that “government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.”

Enduring Ideas from this Unit

1. That slavery was the original contradiction in America, and that slavery is immoral, unjust, dehumanizing, and in violation of the inherent dignity and equal possession of natural rights of each person, as are any ways in which one person or group of people is favored over another due to the color of their skin.

2. That at its heart, the Civil War was fought over the issue of slavery: first, whether slavery would expand in America; next, whether it would be permitted at all; and last, whether the half of the country that opposed slavery would let the country be divided and the injustice to continue elsewhere, instead of fighting to preserve a union that would guarantee liberty and abolish slavery.

3. That President Abraham Lincoln exemplified American statesmanship as he piloted the nation toward fulfillment of its founding ideas, ended the barbarous and tyrannical institution of slavery, and nevertheless abided by the rule of law in doing so.

4. That the period of Reconstruction following the Civil War witnessed a realization of civil rights for freedmen, producing greater degrees of justice and equality that would nevertheless be challenged both during Reconstruction and in following decades.

What Teachers Should Consider

The American Civil War is one of the most important events in American history if only for its attempt to prove, with the blood of hundreds of thousands of Americans, that a people may freely govern themselves and organize themselves to preserve the liberty and equal natural rights of all.

Many students may not know that America was founded on these ideas. Fewer, perhaps, know that America even succeeded in proving these ideas true, striving to live up to them for twenty years, before such progress was eclipsed after Reconstruction. Although subsequent decades would manifest different kinds of failures to guarantee the equal protection of natural rights in certain parts of the country, the Civil War demonstrated that some statesmen and a considerable portion of Americans were committed to carrying out America’s founding promise to the point of bloodshed.

Teachers will greatly benefit from studying not only the war itself but also the thoughts, words, and deeds of the statesman who conducted the war for the Union: President Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln’s ideas and speeches, and his political actions, should constitute for students a model of prudence, both in the public arena and in their own lives. His understanding of the issue of slavery, not merely in the abstract but as it existed in America, can teach students much about their country and its history.
This unit should begin, therefore, with an understanding of slavery as it was found in America in 1848. The teacher should especially emphasize the changes in the status and practice of slavery since the founding in 1776. The teacher should also emphasize changes in legal and public opinion toward the institution since the Constitution went into effect in 1789. In brief, both had entrenched slavery instead of keeping it on the gradual path to extinction, where the founding generation had arguably placed it.

Abraham Lincoln saw these legal and public opinion shifts most clearly, and he saw that such changes struck directly at the ideas on which America was founded. In brief, his entire public career as well as the founding of the Republican Party were devoted to checking this change, to returning slavery to the path of extinction, and to fulfilling the founding ideas of constitutional self-government. Lincoln’s arguments to these ends dominate the crescendo leading to war in spring of 1861. At its heart, this is what the Civil War was about.

The teacher will be able to enrich his or her students by cultivating their imaginations with the events, battles, and images of the Civil War, the bloodiest conflict in which Americans have ever been involved. Strategy, battles, and the general history of the war should be taught in detail. The teacher should learn and share accounts and images of the important moments and figures who contributed to Union victory in 1865. Meanwhile, Lincoln’s careful yet effective maneuverings—both to preserve the Union and to seize the constitutional opportunity afforded him to emancipate the slaves—should be followed in detail.

The unit best concludes with a study of the period known as Reconstruction. Perhaps never in history was so much hoped for, achieved, and mismanaged in so short a period of time with respect to liberty and equality under the law. Students should learn to appreciate both the sacrifices of the Civil War and its immediate achievements during Reconstruction. Nevertheless, students should also learn about the emergence of different kinds of injustice, especially for African Americans living in the former rebel states: injustices that would be perpetuated for a century.

How Teachers Can Learn More

TEXTS

No Property in Man, Sean Wilentz
Battle Cry of Freedom, James McPherson
Abraham Lincoln, Lord Charnwood
Lincoln and the American Founding, Lucas Morel
The Essential Douglass: Selected Writings and Speeches, Frederick Douglass
The Columbian Orator, ed. David Blight
Crisis of the House Divided, Harry Jaffa
A New Birth of Freedom, Harry Jaffa
Reconstruction, Allen Guelzo
The American Heritage: A Reader, ed. Hillsdale College History Faculty
The U.S. Constitution: A Reader, ed. Hillsdale College Politics Faculty (ConstitutionReader.com)
ONLINE COURSES | Online.Hillsdale.edu

The Great American Story
Civil Rights in American History
Constitution 101

Lesson Planning Resources

TEACHER RESOURCES

Land of Hope, Wilfred McClay
A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope, Wilfred McClay and John McBride
The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic, H.A. Guerber
A Short History of the Civil War, James Stokesbury

STUDENT RESOURCES

Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 1, Wilfred McClay

PRIMARY SOURCES

Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, Frederick Douglass
Peoria Speech on the Kansas–Nebraska Act, Abraham Lincoln
“House Divided” speech, Abraham Lincoln
Fragment on the Constitution and Union, Abraham Lincoln
First inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln
Emancipation Proclamation, Abraham Lincoln
Gettysburg Address, Abraham Lincoln
Second inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln
13th Amendment
14th Amendment
15th Amendment
Black Code from Opelousas, Louisiana
LESSON PLANS, ASSIGNMENTS, AND FORMATIVE QUIZZES
Lesson 1 — The Expansion of Slavery

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn how the defenders of slavery began to assert that slavery was a “positive good” that ought to be expanded throughout the country instead of an existing evil that should be contained and kept on the path to extinction.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts

Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition Chapters 19 and 20
Primary Sources See below.

Teacher Texts

Land of Hope Pages 156–162
The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic Pages 150–159
A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope Pages 157–162

Online.Hillsdale.edu

The Great American Story Lecture 9
Civil Rights in American History Lecture 3
Constitution 101 Lecture 6

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students read Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, chapters 19 (second half) and 20, and prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 2: Students read and annotate excerpts from Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places

Mason–Dixon Line California
Mexico Kansas–Nebraska Territory
Persons

Henry Clay       Sojourner Truth
John C. Calhoun  Harriet Beecher Stowe
Abraham Lincoln  Harriet Tubman
Zachary Taylor   William Lloyd Garrison
Millard Fillmore Franklin Pierce
Frederick Douglass Stephen Douglas

Terms and Topics

“positive good”     Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass
King Cotton          Uncle Tom’s Cabin
antebellum            Underground Railroad
Gold Rush             Kansas–Nebraska Act
secession         popular sovereignty
Compromise of 1850
Fugitive Slave Law
abolitionism

Primary Sources

Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, Frederick Douglass
Peoria speech on the Kansas-Nebraska Act, Abraham Lincoln

To Know by Heart

“Knowledge makes a man unfit to be a slave.” — Frederick Douglass
"So you're the little woman who wrote the book that started this great war.” — Abraham Lincoln to Harriet Beecher Stowe upon their meeting

Timeline

1846–48               Mexican–American War
1849                  California Gold Rush
1850                  Compromise of 1850
1854                  Kansas–Nebraska Act

Images

Historical figures and events
Photographs and depictions of the life of slaves and the horrors of slavery
Maps of the free versus slave-state breakdown when changes occur
Pictures of first–edition copies of Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass and Uncle Tom’s Cabin
Statue of Frederick Douglass (on the Hillsdale College campus)
Copy of newspaper in which Lincoln’s Peoria speech was first printed
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Biographies and the roles of Frederick Douglass, Harriet Tubman, and Abraham Lincoln prior to the Civil War
- Childhood biography of Abraham Lincoln
- Scenes from *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass* and *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*
- Frederick Douglass’s letter to his former master, Thomas Auld, 1848
- Actions of Harriet Tubman and the Underground Railroad
- Frederick Douglass’s letter to Harriet Tubman, 1868

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What general prediction about the future of slavery did the Framers of the Constitution make?
- What technology invented in 1793, four years after the Constitution went into effect, revolutionized the cotton industry, resulting in a revived demand for slave labor and undermining the Founders’ predictions regarding slavery?
- What was life like for slaves in the South? What was a slave auction like?
- What was John C. Calhoun’s idea that slavery was a “positive good”?
- How would Frederick Douglass have replied to John C. Calhoun’s assertions?
- How did the idea of slavery as a “positive good” challenge the Constitution’s stance on slavery and the path on which the Founding generation had set slavery?
- How did John C. Calhoun reject the ideas of the Declaration of Independence in arguing for slavery?
- Why, politically, did the question of the expansion of slavery become so important for southern states?
- What were the terms of the Compromise of 1850? Was it really a “compromise”? Why or why not?
- What were the various kinds of abolitionist activities engaged in by Northern abolitionists?
- What roles did Frederick Douglass, William Lloyd Garrison, Harriet Tubman, and Harriet Beecher Stowe play in the abolitionist movement?
- How did the Underground Railroad work?
- What did the Kansas–Nebraska Act do?
- What was the idea of “popular sovereignty”? Where did the idea come from and why?
- Question from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 75: What group of people was taken and sold as slaves?

KEYS TO THE LESSON

The status of slavery in 1848 was markedly different than it was when the Founders crafted the Constitution in 1787. The gradual decline in the profitability of slavery, evident during the founding, was forecast to continue—but this trend reversed direction upon the invention of the cotton gin in 1793. From then on, the demand for slave labor in the Southern states rapidly compounded. But the free population in the South was vastly outstripped by the burgeoning population of the North. If nothing changed, demographics and geography would eventually give Americans living in the North the power to limit slavery through law and perhaps even abolish it entirely through a constitutional amendment. Slaveholders in the South needed to change this trajectory by expanding slavery westward into the territories. Students need to understand that
to justify such expansion, slavery advocates in the South had to change the opinion of Northerners: either to believe slavery to be morally beneficial or, at the very least, to view slavery as merely another option to be decided by the majority, what Stephen Douglas called “popular sovereignty.” Moral relativism, the idea that “might makes right,” and a belief in unfettered democracy through the vote of the majority were the slaveholders’ pillars in arguing to preserve slavery. Students should understand that Abraham Lincoln favored government “of the people, and for the people” but also saw how popular sovereignty’s neutrality concerning slavery violated both equality and consent, as well as liberty itself. Lincoln went about waging an oratorical war in defense of objective standards of truth and justice, of good and evil. They should also learn how abolitionists, of both African and European descent, continued to publicize the horrors of slavery for Americans in Northern states far removed from witnessing slavery firsthand. Abolitionists also shepherded escaped slaves to freedom in the Northern states and Canada.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Expansion of Slavery with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Have students consider the status of slavery over the initial decades of the country’s history. At the founding, slavery was generally either openly condemned by those in the North or defended by those in the South. Its toleration by northern delegates and others who were opposed to slavery at the time of the founding was for the sake of a unity that even many abolitionists believed was the only eventual path toward abolition. The Declaration of Independence established the country on principles of equality that could and would be cited to demand the end of slavery, the Northwest Ordinance had prohibited the expansion of slavery, the Constitution refused to give legal standing to the institution, and many states had restricted or abolished slavery outright. Lastly, many leading Founders, including those who held slaves, believed that the profitability of slavery was gradually but decisively waning and that slavery would die out on its own in a relatively short period of time. However, the invention of the cotton gin by Eli Whitney four years after the adoption of the Constitution greatly increased the profitability of slavery in the cotton-growing states of the South and thereby create a significant (and regional) interest in perpetuating the institution of slavery. The new economics of slavery that would grow out of the cotton gin and the vast cotton industry questioned the assumption and changed the projection of the founding generation concerning the viability and eventual demise of slavery.

- Help students to imagine and understand the dehumanizing and brutal tyranny of slavery. Although students should understand that the ways in which various slaveholders treated their slaves varied, from the downright barbaric to more familial—in order to see how many slavery apologists tried to justify slavery—they must nevertheless understand that the sheer fact that some people owned other human beings is and always will be morally reprehensible. Moreover, as Frederick Douglass argued, slavery actually dehumanized the master as well as the slave.

- Teach students that despite this attempted defense of slavery, the institution almost certainly weakened the South as a whole while supporting the lifestyle of the elite few. For all other Southerners, slavery depreciated the value and wages of labor by non-slaves, limited innovation, and thwarted economic development in the South. The Civil War would reveal the weakness of the position in which Southerners’ insistence on slavery had placed them.

- Likewise, consider with students the contributions to America’s tremendous wealth and prosperity throughout its history. There were the Southern plantation owners and many businesses and individuals in the North who profited handsomely from slavery, even as the degree of prosperity generated by slavery was dwarfed by other factors. These factors included Americans’ unprecedented freedom to innovate and invest, the ability to patent ideas and
inventions, the protection of private property rights, and above all the productive work of citizens within a free marketplace governed by the rule of law and consent of the governed. The great achievements of individual families through the Homestead Act of 1862 demonstrates the point, both for immigrants to America and for the freedmen who would also take advantage of such freedom and opportunity after the Civil War. In brief, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution are the catalysts for allowing human beings to unleash the most prosperous and technologically advanced economy in history. A simple comparison of the Northern to the Southern economy, infrastructure, and society before and during the Civil War illustrates the case.

- Teach students how the slavery issue nearly resulted in civil war over the question of expanding slavery into the territories acquired from Mexico after the Mexican-American War, brought to a head when California, after a population surge during the California Gold Rush, applied to become a state without slavery. California’s lone admission as a free state would have increased Northern power in Congress and the Electoral College against Southern states on the issue of slavery.

- Spend some time discussing the Compromise of 1850, which was not really a “compromise” in the real sense of the word. A “compromise” would involve all parties sacrificing something of their position to achieve a common outcome. The Compromise of 1850, however, was not one bill but five separate bills that had five separate lines of voting. Students should understand what each of these acts did, especially the Fugitive Slave Law. This orchestration begun by Henry Clay but completed by Stephen Douglas may have avoided war in the short term, but it only deepened and delayed the divisions tearing at the country over the next ten years.

- Ask students about the effects of the Fugitive Slave Law, which compelled Northerners to assist in capturing escaped slaves and encouraged the practice of abducting free African Americans living in the North and forcing them into slavery.

- Teach students about the various parts of the abolitionist movement and its major figures. Students should learn that there was great diversity among abolitionists, especially in their underlying views about America’s governing principles and the best way to abolish slavery. For instance, William Lloyd Garrison actually agreed with the slaveholder reading of the Constitution while Frederick Douglass moved from this view to that of Abraham Lincoln that the Constitution was pro-freedom. One might read aloud with students some portions of Douglass’s Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass and discuss Harriet Beecher Stowe’s Uncle Tom’s Cabin, important works in making Northerners, most of whom had never seen slavery in practice, aware of its moral evil. Other abolitionists, such as Harriet Tubman and those running the Underground Railroad, heroically worked to lead escaped slaves to freedom. In general, most abolitionists appealed to the principles of equality stated in the Declaration of Independence in justifying their cause.

- Tell students the childhood and political biography of Abraham Lincoln, to show how he rose from poverty and obscurity to become arguably America’s greatest president.

- Consider having students learn what the Kansas-Nebraska Act did. Focus specifically on the idea of popular sovereignty as used by Stephen Douglas, and the idea that right and wrong amount to the mere will of the majority opinion, which happens to be what many people today believe constitutes truth and the moral rightness of political decisions.

- Have students read and answer guiding questions on parts of Lincoln’s speech on the Kansas-Nebraska Act in response to the act of this name. Students should understand that Lincoln saw slavery to be, above all, a moral question, and one that every American ought to take seriously as
such. Lincoln also believed that moral relativism over the question of slavery, as conveyed in the idea of popular sovereignty, was antithetical to the ideas of the Declaration of Independence, and that slavery was simply a form of majority tyranny, the very danger latent in democracy that the Founders had warned against. Finally, Lincoln condemned the Kansas-Nebraska Act as achieving a complete reversal of the stance the Constitution, the Northwest Ordinance, and the founding generation had toward slavery: that it should be contained until it was abolished and by no means allowed to spread.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Explain how the expansion of slavery became a major political issue following the Mexican–American War (1–2 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Retell the biography of one of the following: Frederick Douglass, Harriet Tubman, or Abraham Lincoln (2–3 paragraphs).
Name__________________________ Date____________

Reading Quiz

_The American Civil War | Lesson 1_  
*Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Chapters 19 and 20*

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question.

1. The acquisition of western lands following the war with Mexico and the discovery of gold in which present-day state brought the issue of slavery’s expansion to a head in the late 1840s?

2. What was the name of the compromise bill regarding the expansion of slavery that Congress passed in 1850?

3. What happened in the Kansas Territory following the Kansas–Nebraska Act?

4. Which party was created to oppose the expansion of slavery into the territories?

5. Who reentered politics in order to oppose Stephen Douglas’ idea of letting voters decide about expanding slavery in the territories?
Unit 4 — Formative Quiz 1

Covering Lesson 1
10-15 minutes

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. What technology invented in 1793, four years after the Constitution was adopted, revolutionized the cotton industry, resulting in a revived demand for slave labor and undermining the Founders’ predictions regarding slavery?

2. What was John C. Calhoun’s idea that slavery was a “positive good”?

3. What were the terms of the Compromise of 1850? Was it really a “compromise”? Why or why not?

4. How did the Underground Railroad work?

5. What was the idea of “popular sovereignty”? Where did the idea come from and why?
Lesson 2 — Toward Civil War

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn how Abraham Lincoln and the new Republican Party’s opposition to the expansion of slavery led Southern states to secede from the Union, resulting in civil war.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts

Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition Chapter 20
Primary Sources See below.

Teacher Texts

Land of Hope Pages 162–173
The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic Pages 160–169
A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope Pages 163–181

Online.Hilldsdale.edu

The Great American Story Lecture 9
Civil Rights in American History Lecture 3
Constitution 101 Lecture 6

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students read and annotate Lincoln’s “House Divided” speech and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).

Assignment 2: Students read and annotate Lincoln’s First inaugural address and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places

Kansas–Nebraska Territory Fort Sumter
Harpers Ferry

Persons

Abraham Lincoln Stephen Douglas
Frederick Douglass James Buchanan
Franklin Pierce John Brown
Terms and Topics

- Kansas–Nebraska Act
- Bleeding Kansas
- a house divided
- popular sovereignty
- Democratic Party
- Republican Party
- Dred Scott v. Sandford
- Lincoln–Douglas Debates
- objective truth
- “don’t care,” “I care not”
- moral relativism
- majority tyranny
- “apple and frame” metaphor
- Wilberforce University

Primary Sources

- “House Divided” speech, Abraham Lincoln
- “Fragment on the Constitution and Union,” Abraham Lincoln
- First inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln

To Know by Heart

- “A house divided against itself cannot stand.” — Abraham Lincoln, paraphrasing from the words of Jesus of Nazareth in the Bible

Timeline

1854  Kansas–Nebraska Act; Republican Party founded
1860  Election of Abraham Lincoln; South Carolina secedes
April 12, 1861  Attack on Fort Sumter

Images

- Historical figures and events
- Depictions of the Lincoln–Douglas Debates
- Campaign materials
- Map of the 1860 election results
- Fort Sumter

Stories for the American Heart

- The breakdown of civil dialogue resulting in Preston Brooks’s attack on Charles Sumner
- What the Lincoln–Douglas Debates were like in terms of setting, format, length, etc., especially compared to civil dialogue and debate today
- The scenes at the nominating conventions for each party in 1860
- John Brown’s letter to his pastor, 1859, and last words before execution
- The young girl who suggested to Abraham Lincoln that he grow a beard
- The first shots fired on Fort Sumter and its surrender
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

▪ What was Bleeding Kansas, what was it like, and why did it happen?
▪ According to Abraham Lincoln, how does Roger Taney’s majority opinion in *Dred Scott v. Sandford* threaten to make slavery legal anywhere in the union?
▪ Why did Abraham Lincoln argue that Stephen Douglas’s personal stance of how he does not care (“I care not”) how a state or territory votes on slavery is dangerous and indefensible? How was this connected to Lincoln’s predictions regarding the *Dred Scott v. Sandford* decision?
▪ Why did Abraham Lincoln believe popular sovereignty without an argument on the morality of slavery amounted to majority tyranny?
▪ What question and answer did Abraham Lincoln consider to be the solution to the issue of the expansion of slavery?
▪ Why did Lincoln see the question of the morality of slavery to be at the heart of America’s founding?
▪ How did Abraham Lincoln end up winning the 1860 election?
▪ Explain Abraham Lincoln’s arguments about the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution as explained in his “apple of gold, frame of silver” metaphor.
▪ How did Abraham Lincoln navigate the period between his election and the first shots at Fort Sumter? How did the country descend into war during this period?
▪ How was slavery the true cause of the Civil War?
▪ What was the Southern states’ argument for the constitutionality of secession?
▪ What was Abraham Lincoln’s argument that secession was unconstitutional, especially as articulated in his First inaugural address?
▪ What was important about Virginia’s decision to secede? How did it come about?
▪ What were Abraham Lincoln’s goals with respect to the Union and slavery at the onset of the Civil War? What were his priorities and why?
▪ Why and how did Abraham Lincoln need to keep the Border States in the Union?
▪ Question from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 94: Abraham Lincoln is famous for many things. Name one.

KEYS TO THE LESSON

The passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act in 1854 sparked the little-known Abraham Lincoln to redouble his efforts to engage in the growing national debate over slavery in America. He saw a tremendous threat in the argument put forward by the bill’s sponsor, Stephen Douglas, that slavery was not a moral question but rather one that should simply be decided by the will of the majority. From 1854 to the outbreak of the Civil War in 1861, Lincoln would combat the idea that the morality of slavery was to be determined merely by majority opinion. Students should come to see this arc to Lincoln’s words and deeds. They should understand how he took up and articulated the heart of the matter regarding the morality of slavery and that slavery struck at America’s founding idea that all men are created equal. Roger Taney’s majority opinion in *Dred Scott v. Sandford* interpreted the Constitution to legitimate slavery, and Lincoln argued against both popular sovereignty and Taney’s position throughout his debates with Douglas. The moral question regarding slavery, manifesting itself in the practical questions of the expansion of slavery, is what a civil war would be fought over. After all, the formal move to secession—a constitutionally debatable claim also at issue in the approach to war—and the war itself was triggered in response to Lincoln being elected president on the position that slavery was wrong and should not be expanded.
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Teachers might best plan and teach Toward Civil War with emphasis on the following approaches:

- **Emphasize the breakdown in civil dialogue in the several violent episodes related to slavery preceding the Civil War:** Bleeding Kansas, Preston Brooks’s attack on Charles Sumner, and John Brown’s raid on the federal armory at Harpers Ferry. Go into some detail to bring these events alive for students. For example, it was Colonel Robert E. Lee who led federal troops to put down Brown’s uprising.

- **Clarify the party alignment that was emerging in 1854.** The Democratic Party was dividing between those who favored the principle of “popular sovereignty,” in which a state or territory could vote to allow slavery or not, and those who explicitly favored slavery. Meanwhile, the Republican Party was founded in 1854 in opposition to laws encouraging the spread of slavery. The split of the Democratic Party and the consolidation of the Republican Party in 1860 assured the election of Lincoln and significantly contributed to the coming of the Civil War.

- **Consider Abraham Lincoln’s arguments against Roger Taney’s majority opinion in *Dred Scott v. Sandford*** that asserted that slaves are not humans but only property, and that the Constitution protects their enslavement just as it does any other property. Lincoln points out that Taney’s ruling rejected the Founders’ view on slavery and would lead, in tandem with Stephen Douglas’s popular sovereignty, to the spread of slavery throughout the country. By extension, this reasoning would also allow for other forms of majority tyranny.

- **Help students think through Lincoln’s understanding of the morality of slavery and its relationship to the founding ideas of America:** that all men are created equal, have unalienable rights, and that legitimate government is based on the consent of the governed. Students should see that the practical question regarding the expansion of slavery ultimately turned on the moral status of slavery.

- **Teach students about the arguments in the Seventh Lincoln-Douglas Debate and discuss them alongside Lincoln’s “House Divided” speech in class.** Consider the apparently benign stance that Stephen Douglas takes in his position of popular sovereignty, that he does not care about what a group of people does regarding slavery, so long as the majority opinion decides it. Students should be asked why this is problematic.

- **Present the settings and atmosphere of the Lincoln-Douglas Debates as imaginatively as possible.**

- **Help students to understand the various pressures that were mounting on the Southern states during the 1850s, from increased abolitionist activities to the sheer industrial might of the Northern states to a burgeoning plantation debt as other countries produced more cotton and the price of cotton fell as a result.**

- **Tell students the stories of Lincoln’s speeches and his reception during these years, including the founding of the Republican Party and the various conventions in 1856 and especially 1860.** Students should sense the drama of the times.

- **Have students read Abraham Lincoln’s “Fragment on the Constitution and Union.”** Help students understand the arguments with respect to the American founding and slavery.

- **Provide a clear overview of events between Lincoln’s election and South Carolina’s attack on Fort Sumter in Charleston Harbor.** Students should learn both Lincoln and the South’s accounts of what happened.

- **There were, of course, other factors and dimensions that impelled each side to fight the Civil War.** Students should be familiar with these, as well as the view of most Southerners that the war was about defending what they saw as the rights of their states. This view and Lincoln’s counterview and incumbent duty to preserve the Union and Constitution may have been the...
occasion for the Civil War, but students should understand that the war was, at its heart, fought over whether slavery would be permitted to spread and so remain indefinitely, or be restricted and returned to the path to extinction on which the founding generation had left it. This question was, in turn, based on the morality of slavery, which Abraham Lincoln would later maintain in his Gettysburg Address was a question about the rejection or fulfillment of the ideas on which America was founded.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Explain how Abraham Lincoln believed Americans must defend the principles of America by preventing the spread of slavery (1 paragraph).

**Assignment 2:** Retell the story of how Abraham Lincoln successfully became president and how this led to the outbreak of the Civil War (1–2 paragraphs).
Lesson 3 — The Civil War 1861–1865

9-10 classes

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the major figures, common soldiers, strategy, and specific battles of the American Civil War, including a close study of the statesmanship of President Abraham Lincoln.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
- Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition
- Primary Sources
  - Chapters 21 and 22
  - See below.

Teacher Texts
- Land of Hope
  - Pages 173–189
- The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic
  - Pages 170–195
- A Short History of the Civil War
  - As helpful
- A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope
  - Pages 179–187

Online.Hillsdale.edu
- The Great American Story
  - Lecture 10
- Constitution 101
  - Lecture 7

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students read Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, chapter 21, and prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 2: Students read Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, chapter 22, and prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 3: Students read and annotate Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address and Second inaugural address and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places
- Fort Sumter
- Union
- Confederacy
- Richmond
West Virginia
Border States

Persons
Abraham Lincoln
Jefferson Davis
Robert E. Lee
George McClellan
Thomas "Stonewall" Jackson
Clara Barton

Ulysses S. Grant
William Tecumseh Sherman
Martin Delany
Robert Gould Shaw
John Wilkes Booth

Terms and Topics
secession
"states’ rights"
Confederate States of America
railroads
minié ball
Army of the Potomac
Army of Northern Virginia
American Red Cross
Anaconda Plan
Battle of First Manassas/Bull Run
ironclads
USS Monitor*
CSS Virginia
trench warfare
Peninsula Campaign
abolition
Battle of Antietam
Battle of Fort Wagner
Battle of Vicksburg
Battle of Gettysburg
Pickett’s Charge
54th Massachusetts Regiment
Peace Democrats
scorched earth warfare
Sherman’s “March to the Sea”
Siege of Richmond

Primary Sources
Emancipation Proclamation, Abraham Lincoln
Gettysburg Address, Abraham Lincoln
Second inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln

To Know by Heart
“Battle Hymn of the Republic,” first stanza — Julia Ward Howe
Gettysburg Address — Abraham Lincoln
"So Atlanta is ours, and fairly won." — William Tecumseh Sherman telegram announcing the fall of Atlanta to Abraham Lincoln
“O Captain! My Captain!” — Walt Whitman

*A previous version referred to the USS Merrimack instead of the USS Monitor.
Timeline

1860   Abraham Lincoln elected; South Carolina and six states secede
1861–65  Civil War
        April 12, 1861    Attack on Fort Sumter
        September 22, 1862 Abraham Lincoln announces
                        the Emancipation Proclamation
1863   Emancipation Proclamation takes effect
        July 1–3, 1863  Battle of Gettysburg
1864 (Fall)  Fall of Atlanta
1864   Abraham Lincoln reelected
        April 9, 1865  Robert E. Lee surrenders at Appomattox
        April 14–15, 1865 Abraham Lincoln assassinated;
                        Andrew Johnson becomes president

Images

Historical figures and events
Landscape pictures of geographic places featured in this lesson
Soldier uniforms, weaponry, flags
Depictions and photographs of figures at various scenes and moments and in battle
Maps: overall strategies, specific battles
Relevant forts
Battle scene depictions and photographs
Medical equipment
Reenactment photos
Pictures of the Emancipation Proclamation, Gettysburg Address, etc.
Robert Gould Shaw and the 54th Massachusetts Regiment Memorial
Lincoln Memorial
Statue of Abraham Lincoln (Hillsdale College campus)

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Biographies and roles of Abraham Lincoln, Jefferson Davis, Robert E. Lee, Ulysses S. Grant, and William Tecumseh Sherman in the Civil War
- Robert E. Lee’s denial of Abraham Lincoln’s offer to command the Union forces
- How Stonewall Jackson got his nickname
- Battle of the ironclads
- William Child’s letter to his wife after the Battle of Antietam, 1862
- Clara Barton’s letter to her cousin, Vira, December 1862
- The killing of Stonewall Jackson by friendly fire
- John Burrill’s letter from Gettysburg to his fiancée, Ell, 1863
- Fighting at Little Round Top and Pickett’s Charge
- George Pickett’s letter from Gettysburg to his fiancée, La Salle Corbell, 1863
- The writing and delivery of the Gettysburg Address
- Robert E. Lee’s surrender to Ulysses S. Grant at Appomattox Court House
- Robert E. Lee’s Farewell Address to his Army, General Order No. 9, 1865
- Abraham Lincoln’s cabinet meeting regarding healing with the South just hours before his assassination
- Assassination of Abraham Lincoln at Ford’s Theatre and subsequent hunt for John Wilkes Booth
- Abraham Lincoln’s funeral train

**QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND**

- What were the advantages and disadvantages that the Union and the Confederacy each faced at the outset of the war?
- What was the style of warfare in the Civil War, including battlefield strategy, weapons, ammunition, medical care, etc.?
- What were the overall strategies that each side pursued in the course of the war?
- How did each of the following battles begin, what happened in them, and what was their significance: Antietam, Vicksburg, Gettysburg, Sherman’s March to the Sea?
- What were the problems characteristic of most of the Union’s generals from 1861 until the Battle of Gettysburg in the Virginia and Maryland theater of war?
- How did Abraham Lincoln successfully approach his decision to issue the Emancipation Proclamation?
- What was General Lee’s strategic purpose for taking the war north, into Pennsylvania?
- In summary, what did Abraham Lincoln argue in the Gettysburg Address?
- Why were reelection prospects for Abraham Lincoln so poor for much of 1864?
- What were the most significant moments in the Civil War?
- What factors, figures, moments, etc., led the Union to victory?
- What were Abraham Lincoln’s plans for reconstruction following the Civil War, as outlined in his Second Inaugural Address and from what we know of his private meetings in the war’s final weeks?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 92: Name the U.S. war between the North and the South.
  - Question 93: The Civil War had many important events. Name one.
  - Question 94: Abraham Lincoln is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 95: What did the Emancipation Proclamation do?
  - Question 96: What U.S. war ended slavery?

**KEYS TO THE LESSON**

The American Civil War may be the defining event in American history. The outcome of the Civil War determined whether the nation would live according to the principles of liberty, equality under law, and self-government, or reject those truths in favor of slavery, inequality, and tyrannical rule. Students should appreciate this about the bloodiest conflict in their nation’s history. They should also know the stories of the heroic actions both leaders and of ordinary citizens in that war, understand the strategies employed in general and in specific battles, and consider the key moments and factors that led the Union to ultimate victory. Additionally, students have an unmatched opportunity to understand statesmanship through the careful study of Abraham Lincoln’s thoughts, speeches, and actions as he led the nation through the Civil War.
Teachers might best plan and teach the Civil War with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Have students consider the arguments by the South and by Abraham Lincoln regarding the idea of “states’ rights” and the constitutionality of secession, particularly by reading and discussing Abraham Lincoln’s first inaugural address. Students should understand that there is no such thing as a “state right,” since rights belong only to persons. States (as governments) possess powers (not rights), as outlined in their state and in the federal Constitution, which the states are to use to protect the rights and the common good of their citizens (including from encroachment by the federal government by appealing to the Constitution itself). Lincoln’s first inaugural address presents the case for how secession is unconstitutional and how he, having taken an oath in his office as president, can and must preserve the Constitution and Union.

- Help students to see how the decision by Southern states to secede was largely determined by a small elite or even merely by governors. In Virginia, for example, the governor himself made the decision to secede without consulting the legislature. Moreover, insofar as slavery was the chief interest the South wanted to preserve, only a minority of Southerners owned slaves and even a smaller minority owned a large number of slaves on plantations. The majority of Southerners were not slaveholders and while fighting for their states would preserve slavery, many common Southerners fought for the argument of states’ rights rather than to preserve the institution of slavery.

- Emphasize that the governing state known as the Confederacy was founded on the rejection of the principle of equality from the Declaration of Independence, and on an argument of the inequality of races, as asserted in Alexander Stephens’s “Cornerstone Speech.”

- Teach students about the delicacy with which Abraham Lincoln had to approach the border states (slave states that remained in the Union) and why this delicacy was needed. Have students work with Lincoln’s first inaugural address, one purpose of which was to keep wavering states in the Union.

- Explain that Abraham Lincoln’s first goal in fighting the Civil War was to preserve the Union. It is important that students understand Lincoln’s reasoning. He was against slavery and wanted it abolished, but his constitutional obligation was to preserve the Union. If he acted otherwise, he would violate the Constitution and the rule of law, becoming no better than the seceding states and forfeiting his moral authority as the defender of the rule of law. Students should also know that while Lincoln did not believe he could abolish slavery alone or that abolishing slavery was the purpose for fighting the war, he nonetheless believed, like many of the Founders, that the only way to abolish slavery would be if the Union were preserved.

- Have students think through and compare the various advantages and disadvantages each side had at the outset of the war and how these shifted during the war. Having students take simple notes, as a “T-Chart” can be effective for this part of the lesson.

- Build students’ familiarity with the style of warfare in the mid-19th century, and show them plenty of images to do so. Students need this foundation for their subsequent study of battles. This helps them to imagine and understand what happens in battle and to appreciate the bravery of soldiers fighting on both sides.

- Present to students explanations of each side’s strategy at various stages of the war and the tactics and battle plans employed in specific battles. Of special note are the Union’s Anaconda Plan, James Longstreet’s development of trench warfare, the Mississippi theater of war and the siege and battle of Vicksburg, and Robert E. Lee’s strategy preceding Gettysburg, among others.
As with any conflict, dwell on the key contributions of both leaders and common soldiers in the war, especially Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, George McClellan, George Meade, Ulysses S. Grant, and William Tecumseh Sherman.

Share with students the unity found within the Union ranks in the cause of the United States and eventually the abolition of slavery. 1.3 million Union men of European ancestry fought in the Civil War and 180,000 African American men volunteered for the Union forces, making up nearly 10 percent of the Union army. Of all Union soldiers, 600,000 were wounded and approximately 360,000 Union men were killed.

Teach the war, especially the major battles and military campaigns, in some detail. Students should understand how the battles came to be, the key stories, factors, and moments from the battle itself, and the significance of their various outcomes on subsequent events. Employ battle maps often and have students track battles and campaigns. *A Short History of the Civil War* is a great aid for teaching these battles; students may enjoy reading select accounts of these battles from this work, too.

Help students to note the major themes running through the early years of the war, namely how Confederate commanders carried the day repeatedly despite the North’s growing advantages, and how they exhibited military leadership and decisiveness. Students should also appreciate how unpopular Abraham Lincoln was in the North during much of the war.

Have students come to know Abraham Lincoln, in his personal life, interior thoughts and troubles, and his great love for his country. Students should also engage frequently with the reasoning and decision-making that marks Lincoln as being perhaps the greatest statesman in American history.

Based on his writings, words, and deeds, show students how Abraham Lincoln always believed in the equal human dignity of African Americans and grew over the course of his career to see that African Americans were equal socially as well, a growth in understanding that he knew more Americans would need to develop in order for African Americans to be treated truly as equals. As his own experience showed, he believed this would take some time, particularly in slave-holding states.

Note that Congress (with the support of Lincoln) outlawed slavery in Washington, DC, in 1862, an action made numerically possible with the absence of Southern congressmen.

Read aloud in class the Emancipation Proclamation and teach students the technicalities Abraham Lincoln navigated in thinking of it, drawing it up, and the timing of its promulgation. He had to retain the border states, abide by the Constitution, achieve victory, and earn the support of public opinion in order for slaves to be effectively freed—and he did it all. Students should understand that Lincoln’s justification for freeing the slaves involved exercising his executive powers as commander-in-chief of the armed forces during an armed rebellion. This is why Lincoln only had the authority to apply the Emancipation Proclamation to those states in actual rebellion, why it could not be applied to slave-holding border states not in rebellion, and why he knew that after the war, an amendment to the Constitution would be necessary to bring emancipation to all the states and make it permanent.

Have students read and hold a seminar conversation on the Gettysburg Address. It is a magnificent work of oratory, but it also gets at the heart of the American founding and the ideas that maintain the United States. It also shows the importance of defending and advancing those ideas, both in the Civil War and in our own day, as is incumbent on every American citizen. Questions on page 187 of *A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope* may be helpful.
• Note the importance of Abraham Lincoln’s choice of Ulysses S. Grant as General-in-Chief of the entire Union Army. Grant’s decisiveness combined with William Tecumseh Sherman’s boldness proved essential in prosecuting the war from late 1863 onward.

• Recap the war by considering major statistics, including the number of causalities and deaths on each side. Ask what stance Americans today should have towards those who fought in the Civil War, distinguishing between Northern soldiers and Southern soldiers. When considering Southern soldiers, be sure to note the tragic death of so many Americans, even if they were fighting for a confederate government dedicated to preserving slavery. As noted previously, most of those doing the actual fighting for the South did not own slaves and believed that they were fighting for their country as well.

• Read and have a seminar conversation about Abraham Lincoln’s second inaugural address. Lincoln addresses many topics within the speech, both reflecting on the war and outlining a plan for after the war. In some respects, this speech is “part two” of what Lincoln began to assert in the Gettysburg Address. One of the main ideas Lincoln suggests, however, is that the Civil War was a punishment for the whole nation. This punishment was not necessarily for the mere existence of slavery but because, unlike the founding generation, the nation had in the time since the founding not continued to work for the abolition of the evil of slavery. While no country will ever be perfect, a people should work to make sure its laws do not promote the perpetuation of a practice that violates the equal natural rights of its fellow citizens.

• To set up the following unit, outline for students Abraham Lincoln’s preliminary plans for reconstruction, and impress upon students the immense historical consequences of Lincoln’s assassination.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** By considering his speeches and the Emancipation Proclamation, explain how Abraham Lincoln expanded the purposes of the Civil War from preserving the Union and preventing the spread of slavery to abolishing slavery itself (1–2 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Recite by heart the Gettysburg Address.

**Assignment 3:** Retell the history of the Civil War (3–4 paragraphs).
DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. Why was it important that the South fired the first shots of the Civil War?

2. For which reasons did the Union have the overall advantage at the beginning of the war?

3. What was the “Anaconda plan” that Union General Winfield Scott developed (named after the tropical snake that strangled its prey to death)?

4. Name one Confederate general you read about and one Union general you read about (besides Winfield Scott).

5. What was the name of the order given by President Lincoln that freed the slaves in the rebelling states?
Reading Quiz

The American Civil War | Lesson 3
Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Chapter 22

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. Which Confederate general was killed by his own soldiers when they mistook him for an enemy?

2. Which famous and bloody battle in Pennsylvania marked a defeat for the Confederacy that stopped their incursion into Union territory?

3. Who was the key Union general Lincoln found to lead successfully the Union armies from 1864 onward?

4. What did General William Tecumseh Sherman do in Georgia?

5. What happened on April 14, 1865 (Good Friday), at Ford’s Theatre in Washington, DC?
DIRECTIONS: Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. What was the style of warfare in the Civil War, including battlefield strategy, weapons, ammunition, medical care, etc.?

2. What were the problems characteristic of most of the Union’s generals from 1861 until the Battle of Gettysburg in the Virginia and Maryland theatre of war?

3. How did Abraham Lincoln successfully approach his decision to issue the Emancipation Proclamation?

4. Why were reelection prospects for Abraham Lincoln so poor for much of 1864?

5. What were Abraham Lincoln’s plans for reconstruction following the Civil War, as outlined in his Second inaugural address and from what we know of his private meetings in the war’s final weeks?
Lesson 4 — Reconstruction
1865–1877
4–5 classes

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the remarkable fulfillment of civil rights for freedmen during Reconstruction despite the objections of some and then the reversal of many of those realizations in former Confederate states during Reconstruction and after its end in 1877.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
- Land of Hope Young Reader's Edition
- Primary Sources

Teacher Texts
- Land of Hope
- The Story of the Thirteen Colonies and the Great Republic
- A Teacher's Guide to Land of Hope
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- The Great American Story
- Civil Rights in American History

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students read Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, chapters 23 and 24, and prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places
- Former Confederacy

Persons
- Andrew Johnson
- Thaddeus Stevens
- Hiram Revels
- Ulysses S. Grant
- Elijah McCoy
- Lewis Howard Latimer
- Rutherford B. Hayes
Terms and Topics

- Reconstruction
- Radical Republicans
- freedmen
- 13th, 14th, 15th Amendments
- military districts
- Freedmen’s Bureau
- impeachment
- sharecropping
- black codes
- scalawags and carpetbaggers
- Ku Klux Klan
- lynching
- Ku Klux Klan Acts
- Transcontinental Railroad
- Seward’s Folly
- Crédit Mobilier Scandal
- Panic of 1873
- Jim Crow
- Compromise of 1877

Primary Sources

- 13th Amendment
- 14th Amendment
- 15th Amendment
- Black Code from Opelousas, Louisiana

To Know by Heart

First lines of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments

Timeline

1865–77 Reconstruction
1865 Abraham Lincoln assassinated; Andrew Johnson becomes president
1868 First African American elected to Congress
1877 Compromise of 1877; Rutherford B. Hayes becomes president

Images

- Historical figures and events
- Maps showing the gradual re-admittance of Southern states
- Photographs of African Americans in the South, both in freedom and with the heavy restrictions placed on their freedom

Stories for the American Heart

- Frederick Douglass reflecting on the Emancipation Proclamation taking effect
- The swearing in of Hiram Revels to the U.S. Senate
- Completion of the Transcontinental Railroad at Promontory Point, Utah

Questions for the American Mind

- What were the similarities and differences between Abraham Lincoln’s plan for Reconstruction and that of the Radical Republicans, especially concerning means, manner, and ends?
- What were the sources of tension between Andrew Johnson and the Radical Republicans especially?
- What did a Confederate state have to do in order to be readmitted fully into the Union?
Regarding the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments, what did each do?

What kinds of gains did African Americans attain during Reconstruction after slavery was explicitly abolished via the 13th Amendment?

In what ways did governments of the former Confederacy attempt to curtail the rights of freedmen during Reconstruction? How did they respond to the actions of Republicans in the North?

In what ways did Southern states attempt to curtail the rights of freedmen during Reconstruction? How did they respond to the actions of Republicans in the North?

What did the Freedmen’s Bureau do?

How can Ulysses S. Grant’s presidency be characterized?

What did the Ku Klux Klan Acts do?

What happened in the election of 1876 and subsequent compromise of 1877?

What were the immediate consequences, especially for African Americans living in the former confederacy, of the end to Reconstruction in 1877?

Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:

- Question 63: There are four amendments to the U.S. Constitution about who can vote. Describe one of them.
- Question 97: What amendment gives citizenship to all persons born in the United States?
- Question 98: When did all men get the right to vote?
- Question 126: Name three national U.S. holidays.
- Question 127: What is Memorial Day?

**Keys to the Lesson**

Even before the battlefield fighting was over, a new kind of struggle would emerge to determine the status of former slaves now made free. In decisive ways, Abraham Lincoln’s assassination was devastating for the prospects of healing the nation while effectively securing the equal rights of freedmen. Not only was the desire for vengeance that Lincoln attempted to abate unleashed against the South, but the Republicans controlling Congress themselves fought bitterly with President Andrew Johnson over the purpose and method of Reconstruction. While some remarkable gains were made for African Americans in the South, particularly in fulfilling in law the core ideas enunciated in the American founding and fought for by the Union, objections to such fulfillments remained, new injustices were established, and the management of Reconstruction was in disarray. The Compromise of 1877 ended the period of Reconstruction, leaving the protections African Americans had gained without federal protection, resulting in decades of restrictions on their rights and liberties.

Teachers might best plan and teach Reconstruction with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Have students consider the effect of Abraham Lincoln’s assassination on Reconstruction and the future of America, especially as regards civil rights for African Americans. Lincoln’s focus was healing the nation while simultaneously providing for the effective and long-term establishment of equal rights for African Americans. Lincoln was succeeded after his assassination by Vice President Andrew Johnson.

- The transformation of a society away from decades of slavery was no small task. Depict Reconstruction as being tragically undermined and strained by the conflicts between congressional Republicans (who strongly opposed slavery), President Andrew Johnson (a pro-
Union Democrat with little sympathy for former slaves), and lawmakers in the Southern states (who mostly wished to restrict the rights of the new freedmen), all of whom operated out of distrust following a painful and bloody Civil War.

- Have students read the three amendments to the Constitution and the laws passed during Reconstruction, especially the Civil Rights Act of 1866, related to the abolition of slavery and citizenship of freedmen. It is important to note the major and meaningful efforts Republicans made to guarantee the rights of African Americans. Questions on pages 197–199 of A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope may be helpful.

- Teach students about both the important gains and protections Republicans won for African Americans during Reconstruction as well as the ways in which these were undermined by actions in the former Confederate states and Johnson himself. Students should gain an appreciation of the remarkable speed and degrees to which former slaves were incorporated into the civil body early in Reconstruction, including the thousands of African Americans who would hold office at the local, state, and even federal level. But they should also understand the ways that Johnson resisted equal treatment of African Americans and in doing so encouraged and allowed certain bad policies (such as “black codes” passed by state legislatures and movements such as what would become the Ku Klux Klan) in the former Confederacy. In fact, many of the reversals of reconstruction began during the presidential reconstruction of Johnson, who was decidedly against secession but by no means opposed to slavery. Congress repeatedly had to override his vetoes and enact Constitutional amendments to prevent his defense of inequalities. Such Congressional action, however, also laid the groundwork for the expansion of federal power into and over state law, especially through the 14th Amendment and military government.

- Have students learn about the ways in which many civil rights achievements were thwarted or undone both during and after Reconstruction. For instance, spend time discussing how as Southerners were refranchised, African American officials were voted out of office and how “black codes” would eventually become Jim Crow laws. Discuss how “black codes” limited freedmen’s civil rights and imposed economic restrictions, including making being unemployed illegal, prohibiting landownership, requiring long-term labor contracts, prohibiting assemblies of freedmen only, prohibiting teaching freedmen to read or write, segregating public facilities, prohibiting freedmen from serving on juries, and carrying out corporal punishments for violators, among other restrictions and injustices. Read sample black codes aloud in class and discuss, such as the Black Code from Opelousas, Louisiana. Note also the use of poll taxes and literacy tests to prohibit African Americans from voting.

- Explain how sharecropping made it nearly impossible for freedmen to accumulate enough capital to purchase their own land or set-off on a different pursuit. Moreover, students should be aware of the struggle facing freedmen who were still in a society prejudiced against them, without capital, land, or even the ability to read.

- Explain the emergence of groups such as the Ku Klux Klan and the power that their intimidation of African Americans and Republicans had in diminishing the political participation of freedmen.

- Teach students how Republicans passed and President Ulysses S. Grant signed into law the Ku Klux Klan Acts to prohibit intimidation of freedmen exercising their civil rights. Grant also empowered the president to use the armed forces against those who tried to deny freedmen equal protection under the laws. Nonetheless, such measures were usually sloppily enforced.
At the same time, note the improvements during Reconstruction in building hospitals, creating a public school system, securing civil rights in principle, and fostering community within the freedmen community, especially in marital and family stability and through vibrant churches.

Explain that Reconstruction effectively ended with the Compromise of 1877 that settled the disputed election of 1876. Congress (now controlled by the Democratic Party) would allow Republican Rutherford B. Hayes to be declared president in exchange for his withdrawing federal troops in former confederate states. Point out that in the backdrop was both continuing Southern resistance and a gradual waning of Northern zeal for (and political interest in) reform within the South.

Ask students to consider the tragic nature of Reconstruction: a time of so much hoped for and achieved in applying the principle of equal natural rights was repeatedly undermined and mismanaged, then suddenly ended for political expediency, enabling new forms of injustice in certain areas of the country, after a war to end injustice had consumed the lives of hundreds of thousands of Americans.

Nevertheless, make sure students do not lose sight of the momentous achievements in liberty, equality, and self-government fulfilled because of the Civil War. Students should appreciate the very significant achievements of Lincoln and the Civil War while looking forward to future generations of Americans who would seek to live up to the fundamental principles of America in their own times.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Compared to Abraham Lincoln’s plans for Reconstruction, explain the ways in which Reconstruction was successful and the ways in which it was not successful (1–2 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Retell the civil rights realizations Republicans achieved for freedmen during Reconstruction and the injustices that they were subject to both during and after Reconstruction in the former confederate states (1–2 paragraphs).
Reading Quiz

The American Civil War | Lesson 4
Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Chapters 23 and 24

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question.

1. In general, what was Abraham Lincoln’s plan and tone for Reconstruction?

2. What was the relationship like between President Andrew Johnson and the Republicans? Why?

3. Name one of the things that the three Reconstruction amendments (13th, 14th, and 15th) did?

4. Which military hero was president during much of Reconstruction?

5. What kinds of unjust things happened during and after Reconstruction?
APPENDIX A

Study Guides

Tests

Writing Assignment
Study Guide — Unit 4, Test 1

Lesson 1 | The Expansion of Slavery
Lesson 2 | Toward Civil War

Test on ______________

**TIMELINE**

When given chronological dates, match events from a list to the years or dates that they happened.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1846–48</td>
<td>Mexican–American War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>California Gold Rush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Compromise of 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Kansas–Nebraska Act; Republican Party founded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Election of Abraham Lincoln; South Carolina secedes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 12, 1861</td>
<td>Attack on Fort Sumter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GEOGRAPHY AND PLACES**

*Identify each on a map and/or tell where it is and explain its significance.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Fort Sumter</td>
<td>Border States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas–Nebraska Territory</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harpers Ferry</td>
<td>Confederacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PERSONS**

*Identify each, provide biographical details, and explain what he or she thought or did in specific periods or events.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John C. Calhoun</td>
<td>Harriet Beecher Stowe</td>
<td>Stephen Douglas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Lincoln</td>
<td>Harriet Tubman</td>
<td>Dred Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Douglass</td>
<td>William Lloyd Garrison</td>
<td>James Buchanan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sojourner Truth</td>
<td>Franklin Pierce</td>
<td>John Brown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TERMS AND TOPICS**

*Identify each and explain its significance to the period of history studied.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“positive good”</td>
<td>Frederick Douglass</td>
<td>popular sovereignty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antebellum</td>
<td>Uncle Tom’s Cabin</td>
<td>Democratic Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secession</td>
<td>Underground Railroad</td>
<td>Republican Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromise of 1850</td>
<td>Kansas–Nebraska Act</td>
<td>Dred Scott v. Sandford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugitive Slave Law</td>
<td>popular sovereignty</td>
<td>Lincoln–Douglas Debates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abolitionism</td>
<td>Bleeding Kansas</td>
<td>“don’t care”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative of the Life of</td>
<td>“a house divided”</td>
<td>moral relativism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
majority tyranny
states’ rights
“apple and frame” Metaphor
Confederate States of America

PRIMARY SOURCES

Based on annotations and notes from seminar conversations, be able to answer questions on each primary source. While you will not necessarily be asked why each primary source was created, what it did or argued, and what its effects were, being able to answer these kinds of questions will make you well prepared.

Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, Frederick Douglass
“House Divided” speech, Abraham Lincoln
“Fragment on the Constitution and Union,” Abraham Lincoln
First inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln

TO KNOW BY HEART

Fill in missing words and/or identify the speaker and context.

“Knowledge makes a man unfit to be a slave.” — Frederick Douglass
“A house divided against itself cannot stand.” — Abraham Lincoln

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be 3rd grade students.

- Biographies and the roles of Frederick Douglass, Harriet Tubman, and Abraham Lincoln prior to the Civil War
- Childhood biography of Abraham Lincoln
- Scenes from Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass and Uncle Tom’s Cabin
- Actions of Harriet Tubman and the Underground Railroad
- The first shots fired on Fort Sumter and its surrender

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.

Lesson 1 | The Expansion of Slavery

□ What general prediction about the future of slavery did the Framers of the Constitution make?
□ What technology invented in 1793, four years after the Constitution went into effect, revolutionized the cotton industry, resulting in a revived demand for slave labor and undermining the Founders’ predictions regarding slavery?
□ What was life like for slaves in the Southern states? What was a slave auction like?
□ What was John C. Calhoun’s idea that slavery was a “positive good”? Why did he argue this, and how was this a change from previous arguments about slavery?
Compared to the north, how would the south’s society and economy suggest John C. Calhoun was wrong about the supposed economic and social benefits of slavery?

How did John C. Calhoun reject the ideas of the Declaration of Independence in arguing for slavery?

Why, politically, did the question of the expansion of slavery become so important for Southern states?

What were the two most controversial parts of the Compromise of 1850? What were their effects?

What roles did Frederick Douglass, William Lloyd Garrison, Harriet Tubman, and Harriet Beecher Stowe play in the abolitionist movement?

How did the Underground Railroad work?

What did the Kansas–Nebraska Act do?

What was the idea of “popular sovereignty”? Where did the idea come from and why?

Lesson 2 | Toward Civil War

According to Abraham Lincoln, how does Roger Taney’s majority opinion in Dred Scott v. Sandford recast the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the founding ideas of equality?

According to Abraham Lincoln, how does Roger Taney’s majority opinion in Dred Scott v. Sandford threaten to make slavery legal anywhere in the union?

Why did Abraham Lincoln argue that Stephen Douglas’s personal stance of how he does not care (“I care not”) how a state or territory votes on slavery is dangerous and indefensible? How was this connected to Lincoln’s predictions regarding the Dred Scott v. Sandford decision?

Why did Abraham Lincoln believe popular sovereignty without an argument on the morality of slavery amounted to majority tyranny?

Why did Lincoln see the question of the morality of slavery to be at the heart of America’s founding?

Explain Abraham Lincoln’s arguments about the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution as explained in his “apple of gold, frame of silver” metaphor.

How did Abraham Lincoln navigate the period between his election and the first shots at Fort Sumter? How did the country descend into war during this period?

How was slavery the true cause of the Civil War?
The American Civil War — Test 1

Lesson 1 | The Expansion of Slavery
Lesson 2 | Toward Civil War

TIMELINE

Write the letter of each event next to the date or years it took place.

1846–48 ______
1849 ______
1854 ______
1860 ______
April 12, 1861 ______

A. Attack on Fort Sumter
B. California Gold Rush
C. Election of Abraham Lincoln; South Carolina secedes
D. Kansas–Nebraska Act; Republican Party founded
E. Mexican–American War

GEOGRAPHY AND PLACES

1. Outline and label the Union states, border states, and Confederate states.
PERSONS, TERMS, AND TOPICS

Fill in the blank with the letter of the correct answer.

A. Border  E. Frederick Douglass  J. popular sovereignty
B. Compromise of 1850  F. Fugitive Slave Law  K. Republican Party
C. Dred Scott v. Sandford  G. Harriet Tubman  L. South Carolina
D. Fort Sumter  H. John Brown  M. Uncle Tom’s Cabin
I. Kansas–Nebraska

2. Henry Clay helped orchestrate the passage of the __________________________, a package of five separate bills which relieved tensions between the North and South over the slavery issue.

3. Included in this package was the __________________________ which required Northerners to actively assist in capturing runaway slaves, thus stirring the ire of many in the north.

4. In the years leading up to the Civil War, various abolitionists worked and wrote against slavery, such as the escaped slave turned writer __________________________, newspaperman William Lloyd Garrison, and Harriet Beecher Stowe whose book, __________________________, did much to reveal the horrors of slavery to Northerners and shift public opinion into action.

5. Escaped slave __________________________ was one of the main conductors on the Underground Railroad that led slaves to freedom in the North and Canada.

6. Congressman Stephen Douglas, who desired to be the new ‘Great Compromiser,’ pushed for a new approach to slavery in the West: __________________________. This approach regarded slavery as a morally neutral practice and allowed each state to decide for themselves if it was permissible within its borders.

7. The infamous __________________________ Act of 1854 contradicted the Missouri Compromise and set up Kansas as a real battleground over the issue of slavery in what became known as “Bleeding Kansas.” It was in response to this act that Abraham Lincoln returned to politics.

8. In 1854, former Whigs, Free Soilers, and abolitionists formed the new __________________________ with the purpose of actively standing against the expansion of slavery.

9. The Supreme Court asserted in the case __________________________ that slaves had no rights as written in the Constitution and that slavery could not be prevented from spreading throughout the Union.

10. In 1859, the abolitionist __________________________ attempted to lead a southern slave insurrection. His efforts were cut short when he was cornered and captured at Harpers Ferry, Virginia.

11. In response to the election of Abraham Lincoln in 1860, __________________________ decided to secede from the Union, followed by a host of southern states, though by the time Lincoln was inaugurated in March 1861, no violence had broken out.
12. Part of Lincoln’s First inaugural address was an attempt to keep Missouri, Kentucky, Maryland, and Delaware, called the ________________ States, loyal to the Union. If these states had seceded, it would have been likely that the South would have had enough strength to win the war.

13. The first shots of the war were fired on the federal fort in Charleston Harbor called _______________. Thus did war begin between the Union and the Confederacy.

**Known By Heart**

*Fill in missing words and/or identify the speaker.*

14. “______________ makes a man unfit to be a __________.” — Frederick Douglass

15. “A house divided against itself cannot stand.” — _________________

**Stories for the American Heart**

*In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be 3rd grade students.*

16. Childhood biography of Abraham Lincoln

17. The first shots fired on Fort Sumter and its surrender
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and writing should be employed and responses must fully answer each question.

18. What had been the Constitution’s framers’ general prediction about the future of slavery?

19. What technology invented in 1793, four years after the Constitution was adopted, revolutionized the cotton industry, resulting in a revived demand for slave labor and undermining the Founders’ predictions regarding slavery?

20. How did John C. Calhoun reject the ideas of the Declaration of Independence in arguing for slavery?

21. Why, politically, did the question of the expansion of slavery become so important for Southern states?

22. According to Abraham Lincoln, how does Roger Taney’s majority opinion in *Dred Scott v. Sandford* recast the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the founding ideas of equality?

23. Why did Abraham Lincoln argue that Stephen Douglas’s personal stance of how he does not care (“I care not”) how a state or territory votes on slavery is dangerous and indefensible? How was this connected to Lincoln’s predictions regarding the *Dred Scott v. Sandford* decision?

24. Explain Abraham Lincoln’s arguments about the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution as explained in his “apple of gold, frame of silver” metaphor.

25. What was Abraham Lincoln’s argument that secession was unconstitutional, especially as articulated in his First Inaugural Address?


Study Guide — Unit 4, Test 2

Lesson 3 | The Civil War
Lesson 4 | Reconstruction

Test on __________

TIMELINE

When given chronological dates, match events from a list to the years or dates that they happened.

1860  Election of Abraham Lincoln; South Carolina secedes
1861–65  Civil War
   April 12, 1861  Attack on Fort Sumter
   1863  Emancipation Proclamation takes effect
   July 1–3, 1863  Battle of Gettysburg
   1864  Abraham Lincoln reelected
April 14–15, 1865  Abraham Lincoln assassinated; Andrew Johnson becomes president
1865–77  Reconstruction
1877  Compromise of 1877; Rutherford B. Hayes president

GEOGRAPHY AND PLACES

Identify each on a map and/or tell where it is and explain its significance.

Fort Sumter  Richmond  Appomattox Court House
Union  West Virginia  Ford’s Theatre
Confederacy  Border States  Former Confederacy

PERSONS

Identify each, provide biographical details, and explain what he or she thought or did in specific periods or events.

Abraham Lincoln  Clara Barton  Andrew Johnson
Jefferson Davis  Ulysses S. Grant  Hiram Revels
Robert E. Lee  William Tecumseh Sherman  Ulysses S. Grant
George McClellan  Robert Gould Shaw  Rutherford B. Hayes
Thomas “Stonewall” Jackson  John Wilkes Booth

TERMS AND TOPICS

Identify each and explain its significance to the period of history studied.

states’ rights  minié ball  ironclads
Confederate States of America  Army of the Potomac  USS Monitor
America  Army of Northern Virginia  CSS Virginia
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abolition  Pickett’s Charge  54th Massachusetts  Sherman’s “March to the Sea”  Reconstruction  Radical Republicans  freedmen
Military Districts  Freedmen’s Bureau  sharecropping  black codes  scalawags and carpetbaggers  Ku Klux Klan  lynching
Ku Klux Klan Acts  Transcontinental Railroad  Crédit Mobilier Scandal  Jim Crow  Compromise of 1877

**MAJOR CONFLICTS**

*Explain how each battle began, narrate what happened in it and how, and explain the significance of the battle’s outcome.*

First Manassas/Bull Run  Shiloh  Peninsula Campaign  Antietam  Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville  Fort Wagner  Vicksburg  Gettysburg  Sherman’s “March to the Sea”

**PRIMARY SOURCES**

*Based on annotations and notes from seminar conversations, be able to answer questions on each primary source. While you will not necessarily be asked why each primary source was created, what it did or argued, and what its effects were, being able to answer these kinds of questions will make you well prepared.*

Emancipation Proclamation, Abraham Lincoln  Gettysburg Address, Abraham Lincoln  Second inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln  Black Code from Opelousas, Louisiana

**TO KNOW BY HEART**

*Be prepared to fill in missing words and/or identify the speaker and context.*

Gettysburg Address — Abraham Lincoln  "So Atlanta is ours, and fairly won." — William Tecumseh Sherman telegram announcing the fall of Atlanta to Abraham Lincoln  First lines of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments

**STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART**

*In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be 3rd grade students.*

Biographies and roles of Abraham Lincoln, Jefferson Davis, Robert E. Lee, Ulysses S. Grant, and William Tecumseh Sherman in the Civil War  Fighting at Little Round Top and Pickett’s Charge  Robert E. Lee’s surrender to Ulysses S. Grant at Appomattox Court House
Abraham Lincoln’s cabinet meeting regarding healing with the south just hours before his assassination
Assassination of Abraham Lincoln at Ford’s Theatre and subsequent killing of John Wilkes Booth
The swearing in of Hiram Revels to the US Senate

**QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND**

*Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.*

**Lesson 3 | The Civil War**

☐ What was Abraham Lincoln’s argument that secession was unconstitutional, especially as articulated in his First inaugural address?
☐ What were Jefferson Davis’s arguments on the morality and expansion of slavery, the North, and states’ rights and secession?
☐ What was important about Virginia’s decision to secede? How did it come about?
☐ What were Abraham Lincoln’s goals with respect to the Union and slavery at the onset of the Civil War? What were his priorities and why?
☐ Why and how did Abraham Lincoln need to keep the border states in the Union?
☐ What were the advantages and disadvantages that the Union and the Confederacy each faced at the outset of the war?
☐ What was the style of warfare in the Civil War, including battlefield strategy, weapons, ammunition, medical care, etc.?
☐ What were the overall strategies that each side pursued in the course of the war?
☐ What were the problems characteristic of most of the Union’s generals from 1861 until the Battle of Gettysburg in the Virginia and Maryland theater of war?
☐ How did Abraham Lincoln successfully approach his decision to issue the Emancipation Proclamation?
☐ In summary, what did Abraham Lincoln argue in the Gettysburg Address?
☐ Why were reelection prospects for Abraham Lincoln so poor for much of 1864?
☐ What were the most significant moments in the Civil War?
☐ What factors, figures, moments, etc., led the Union to victory?
☐ What were Abraham Lincoln’s plans for reconstruction following the Civil War, as outlined in his Second inaugural address and from what we know of his private meetings in the war’s final weeks?

**Lesson 4 | Reconstruction**

☐ What were the two major issues facing Andrew Johnson and Republicans in the North during the early years of Reconstruction?
☐ What were the similarities and differences between Abraham Lincoln’s plan for Reconstruction and that of the Radical Republicans, especially concerning means, manner, and ends?
☐ What were the sources of tension between Andrew Johnson and the Radical Republicans especially?
☐ What did a Confederate state have to do to be readmitted fully in to the Union?
☐ Regarding the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments, what did each do?
☐ What kinds of gains did African Americans attain during Reconstruction after slavery was explicitly abolished via the 13th Amendment?
In what ways did Southern states attempt to curtail the rights of freedmen during Reconstruction? How did they respond to the actions of Republicans in the North?

How can Ulysses S. Grant’s presidency be characterized?

What did the Ku Klux Klan Acts do?

What happened in the election of 1876 and the subsequent Compromise of 1877?

What were the immediate consequences, especially for African Americans living in the South, of the end to Reconstruction in 1877?
The American Civil War — Test 2

Lesson 3 | The Civil War
Lesson 4 | Reconstruction

**Timeline**

Write the letter of each event next to the date or years it took place.

1860  
1861–65  
   April 12, 1861  
   1863  
   July 1–3, 1863  
   1864  
   April 14–15, 1865  
1865–77  
1877  

A. Abraham Lincoln assassinated; Andrew Johnson becomes president  
B. Abraham Lincoln reelected  
C. Attack on Fort Sumter  
D. Battle of Gettysburg  
E. Civil War  
F. Compromise of 1877; Rutherford B. Hayes president  
G. Election of Abraham Lincoln; South Carolina secedes  
H. Emancipation Proclamation takes effect  
I. Reconstruction

**Geography and Places**

1. Label Fort Sumter, Washington, DC, Richmond, Vicksburg, and Gettysburg.
PERSONS, TERMS, AND TOPICS

Fill in the blank with the letter of the correct answer.

A. 54th Massachusetts  
B. Appomattox Court House  
C. black codes  
D. Ford’s Theatre  
E. ironclads  
F. Jim Crow  
G. minie ball  
H. Pickett’s Charge  
I. railroads  
J. Reconstruction  
K. Robert E. Lee  
L. sharecropping  
M. Ulysses S. Grant  
N. William Tecumseh Sherman

2. One great advantage to the North was in its number of ______________, which allowed for the faster deployment of soldiers, shipping of supplies, and industrial output.

3. Gunshot wounds were so gruesome and limb–endangering due to the ____________, a conical round that shattered bones and left a larger exit wound than entrance resulting in the Civil War’s high amputation rate.

4. The Civil War was the first war which not only saw widespread use of breech–loaded weapons but also the first _____________ ships, the first battle of which was fought between the USS Monitor and the CSS Virginia in the James River.

5. The bloodiest and most pointless attack of the Battle of Gettysburg was the last attack on July 3rd, called ________________ in which over 1,000 Confederate soldiers were killed as they attempted to take the Union position on Cemetery Ridge.

6. The most famous of the United States Colored Troops regiments was the ________________ Regiment, which fought bravely in their tragic attack on Fort Wagner in South Carolina.

7. Having graduated top of his class at West Point and having served the United States faithfully for thirty–two years, ________________’s care for, as he put it, “my relatives, my children, my home,” outweighed his belief that secession was unconstitutional.

8. Having graduated near the bottom of his class at West Point and having lived a tumultuous life of poverty and drinking, ________________’s repeated, bold, and well–executed successes in the Mississippi–Tennessee Theatre garnered him a promotion to General–in–Chief of the Union forces.

9. The colleague of Ulysses S. Grant, ________________ proved to be one of the Union’s most successful and controversial generals, especially after his “March to the Sea” campaign of scorched earth warfare. He justified it by saying, “War is hell.” Like Grant, he hated war, but wanted the citizens to feel the effects of war (short of hurting them physically) and so hasten peace. Nonetheless, his tactics through Georgia escalated the bitterness between the north and south.

10. The bloodiest conflict in American history ended after four years when General Lee surrendered the Army of Northern Virginia to General Grant’s Army of the Potomac at ________________ in Virginia on April, 9th, 1865.
11. On the night of April 14th at Ford’s Theatre in Washington, D.C., actor and Southern sympathizer _________________ shot Abraham Lincoln, who died the next morning, just six days after the war ended.

12. The era known as _________________ witnessed the realization of many civil rights for freedmen and the efforts and resources of Northern Republicans to protect them, such as through Constitutional Amendments, civil rights acts, and the Ku Klux Klan Act.

13. Although slaves were freed following the Civil War, many Southern governments tried to limit their rights through ________________.

14. Since there was so little non–agrarian work in the south, plantation owners often left freedmen no choice but to resort to _________________, where the plantation owner would lease the freedmen a share of his land to grow crops in exchange for a majority share of the crops that were grown.

15. With the sudden end of Reconstruction in 1877, injustices returned to African Americans in the South in an era characterized by segregation and discrimination in laws known as ________________.

**MAJOR CONFLICTS**

*Explain how each battle began, narrate what happened in it and how, and explain the significance of the battle’s outcome.*

16. Antietam

17. Gettysburg
**KNOWN BY HEART**

*Fill in missing words and/or identify the speaker.*

18. “...and that government of the ____________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

Source and Speaker – ________________________________

19. “Neither _____________ nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall _____________ within the United States, or any ______ subject to their jurisdiction.”

Source – ________________________________

**STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART**

*In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be 3rd grade students.*

20. Robert E. Lee’s surrender to Ulysses S. Grant at Appomattox Court House

21. Assassination of Abraham Lincoln at Ford’s Theatre and subsequent killing of his assassin
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and writing should be employed and responses must fully answer each question.

22. What were Abraham Lincoln’s goals with respect to the Union and slavery at the onset of the Civil War? What were his priorities and why?

23. What were the advantages and disadvantages that the Union and the Confederacy each faced at the outset of the war?

24. What was the style of warfare in the Civil War, including battlefield strategy, weapons, ammunition, medical care, etc.?

25. How did Abraham Lincoln successfully approach his decision to issue the Emancipation Proclamation?

26. What factors, figures, moments, etc., led the Union to victory?

27. Regarding the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments, what did each do?

28. What kinds of gains did African Americans attain during Reconstruction after slavery was explicitly abolished via the 13th Amendment?

29. What happened in the election of 1876 and subsequent compromise of 1877?

30. What were the immediate consequences, especially for African Americans living in the South, of the end to Reconstruction in 1877?
Writing Assignment — The American Civil War

Unit 4

Due on ___________

Directions: Citing events and primary sources in your argument, write a 4–5 paragraph essay answering the question:

What did President Abraham Lincoln argue about the principles of America, the practice of slavery, and the Civil War?
APPENDIX B

Primary Sources

Frederick Douglass

Abraham Lincoln

The American People

E.D. Estillette
Frederick Douglass

Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, An American Slave

Autobiography Excerpt

May 1, 1845

Anti-Slavery Office | Boston, Massachusetts

BACKGROUND

The former slave and abolitionist Frederick Douglass wrote this autobiography on his life as a slave and his eventual escape and life in freedom.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Who was Douglass' father?

2. What accounts does Douglass give of his childhood and life as a slave?

3. Why does Douglass go to Baltimore the first time?

4. What happens on Douglass's first escape attempt?

5. How does Douglass feel about being free in the North?

---

Frederick Douglass, Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, An American Slave (Boston: Anti-Slavery Office, 1845).
I WAS born in Tuckahoe, near Hillsborough, and about twelve miles from Easton, in Tal- 
bott county, Maryland. I have no accurate knowledge of my age, never having seen any au-
thentic record containing it. By far the larger part of the slaves know as little of their ages as horses know of theirs, and it is the wish of most masters within my knowledge to keep 
their slaves thus ignorant. I do not remember to have ever met a slave who could tell of his birthday. They seldom come nearer to it than planting-time, harvest-time, cherry-time, 
spring-time, or fall-time. A want of information concerning my own was a source of un-
happiness to me even during childhood. The white children could tell their ages. I could 
not tell why I ought to be deprived of the same privilege. I was not allowed to make any 
inquiries of my master concerning it. He deemed all such inquiries on the part of a slave 
improper and impertinent, and evidence of a restless spirit. The nearest estimate I can give makes me now between twenty-seven and twenty-eight years of age. I come to this, from 
hearing my master say, some time during 1835, I was about seventeen years old.

My mother was named Harriet Bailey. She was the daughter of Isaac and Betsey Bailey, 
both colored, and quite dark. My mother was of a darker complexion than either my grand-
mother or grandfather.

My father was a white man. He was admitted to be such by all I ever heard speak of my parentage. The opinion was also whispered that my master was my father; but of the cor-
rectness of this opinion, I know nothing; the means of knowing was withheld from me. My mother and I were separated when I was but an infant—before I knew her as my mother. 
It is a common custom, in the part of Maryland from which I ran away, to part children from their mothers at a very early age. Frequently, before the child has reached its twelfth month, its mother is taken from it, and hired out on some farm a considerable distance off, 
and the child is placed under the care of an old woman, too old for field labor. For what 
this separation is done, I do not know, unless it be to hinder the development of the child’s affection toward its mother, and to blunt and destroy the natural affection of the mother for the child. This is the inevitable result.
I never saw my mother, to know her as such, more than four or five times in my life; and each of these times was very short in duration, and at night. She was hired by a Mr. Stewart, who lived about twelve miles from my home. She made her journeys to see me in the night, travelling the whole distance on foot, after the performance of her day’s work. She was a field hand, and a whipping is the penalty of not being in the field at sunrise, unless a slave has special permission from his or her master to the contrary—a permission which they seldom get, and one that gives to him that gives it the proud name of being a kind master. I do not recollect of ever seeing my mother by the light of day. She was with me in the night. She would lie down with me, and get me to sleep, but long before I waked she was gone. Very little communication ever took place between us. Death soon ended what little we could have while she lived, and with it her hardships and suffering.

She died when I was about seven years old, on one of my master’s farms, near Lee’s Mill. I was not allowed to be present during her illness, at her death, or burial. She was gone long before I knew any thing about it. Never have enjoyed, to any considerable extent, her soothing presence, her tender and watchful care, I received the tidings of her death with much the same emotions I should have probably felt at the death of a stranger.

Called thus suddenly away, she left me without the slightest intimation of who my father was. The whisper that my master was my father, may or may not be true; and, true or false, it is of but little consequence to my purpose whilst the fact remains, in all its glaring odiousness, that slaveholders have ordained, and by law established, that the children of slave women shall in all cases follow the condition of their mothers; and this is done too obviously to administer to their own lusts, and make a gratification of their wicked desires profitable as well as pleasurable; for by this cunning arrangement, the slaveholder, in cases not a few, sustains to his slaves the double relation of master and father.

I know of such cases, and it is worthy, of remark that such slaves invariably suffer greater hardships, and have more to contend with, than others. They are, in the first place, a constant offence to their mistress. She is ever disposed to find fault with them; they can seldom do any thing to please her; she is never better pleased than when she sees them under the
lash, especially when she suspects her husband of showing to his mulatto children favors which he withholds from his black slaves. The master is frequently compelled to sell this class of his slaves, out of deference to the feelings of his white wife; and, cruel as the deed may strike any one to be, for a man to sell his own children to human flesh-mongers, it is often the dictate of humanity for him to do so; for, unless he does this, he must not only whip them himself, but must stand by and see one white son tie up his brother, of but few shades darker complexion than himself, and ply the gory lash to his naked back; and if he lisp one word of disapproval, “it is set down to his parental partiality, and only makes a bad matter worse, both for himself and the slave whom he would protect and defend.

Every year brings with it multitudes of this class of slaves. It was doubtless in consequence of a knowledge of this fact, that one great statesman of the south predicted the downfall of slavery by the inevitable laws of population. Whether this prophecy is ever fulfilled or not, it is nevertheless plain that a very different-looking class of people are springing up at the south, and are now held in slavery, from those originally brought to this country from Africa; and if their increase will do no other good, it will do away the force of the argument, that God cursed Ham, and therefore American slavery is right. If the lineal descendants of Ham are alone to be scripturally enslaved, it is certain that slavery at the south must soon become unscriptural; for thousands are ushered into the world, annually, who, like myself, owe their existence to white fathers, and those fathers most frequently their own masters.

I have had two masters. My first master’s name was Anthony. I do not remember his first name. He was generally called Captain Anthony—a title which, I presume, he acquired by sailing a craft on the Chesapeake Bay. He was not considered a rich slaveholder. He owned two or three farms, and about thirty slaves. His farms and slaves were under the care of an overseer. The overseer’s name was Plummer. Mr. Plummer was a miserable drunkard, a profane swearer, and a savage monster. He always went armed with a cowskin and a heavy cudgel. I have known him to cut and slash the women’s heads so horribly, that even master would be enraged at his cruelty, and would threaten to whip him if he did not mind himself. Master, however, was not a humane slaveholder. It required extraordinary barbarity on the part of an overseer to affect him. He was a cruel man, hardened by a long life of slave-
holding. He would at times seem to take great pleasure in whipping a slave. I have often been awakened at the dawn of day by the most heart-rending shrieks of an own aunt of mine, whom he used to tie up to a joist, and whip upon her naked back till she was literally covered with blood. No words, no tears, no prayers, from his gory victim, seemed to move his iron heart from its bloody purpose. The louder she screamed, the harder he whipped; and where the blood ran fastest, there he whipped longest. He would whip her to make her scream, and whip her to make her hush; and not until overcome by fatigue, would he cease to swing the blood-clotted cowskin. I remember the first time I ever witnessed this horrible exhibition. I was quite a child, but I well remember it. I never shall forget it whilst I remember any thing. It was the first of a long series of such outrages, of which I was doomed to be a witness and a participant. It struck me with awful force. It was the blood-stained gate, the entrance to the hell of slavery, through which I was about to pass. It was a most terrible spectacle. I wish I could commit to paper the feelings with which I beheld it….

It is partly in consequence of such facts, that slaves, when inquired of as to their condition and the character of their masters, almost universally say they are contented, and that their masters are kind. The slaveholders have been known to send in spies among their slaves, to ascertain their views and feelings in regard to their condition. The frequency of this has had the effect to establish among the slaves the maxim, that a still tongue makes a wise head. They suppress the truth rather than take the consequences of telling it, and in so doing prove themselves a part of the human family. If they have any thing to say of their masters, it is generally in their masters' favor, especially when speaking to an untried man. I have been frequently asked, when a slave, if I had a kind master, and do not remember ever to have given a negative answer; nor did I, in pursuing this course, consider myself as uttering what was absolutely false; for I always measured the kindness of my master by the standard of kindness set up among slaveholders around us. Moreover, slaves are like other people, and imbibe prejudices quite common to others. They think their own better than that of others. Many, under the influence of this prejudice, think their own masters are better than the masters of other slaves; and this, too, in some cases, when the very reverse is true. Indeed, it is not uncommon for slaves even to fall out and quarrel among themselves.
about the relative goodness of their masters, each contending for the superior goodness of
his own over that of the others. At the very same time, they mutually execrate their masters
when viewed separately. It was so on our plantation. When Colonel Lloyd’s slaves met the
slaves of Jacob Jepson, they seldom parted without a quarrel about their masters; Colonel
Lloyd’s slaves contending that he was the richest, and Mr. Jepson’s slaves that he was the
smartest, and most of a man. Colonel Lloyd’s slaves would boast his ability to buy and sell
Jacob Jepson. Mr. Jepson’s slaves would boast his ability to whip Colonel Lloyd. These quar-
rels would almost always end in a fight between the parties, and those that whipped were
supposed to have gained the point at issue. They seemed to think that the greatness of their
masters was transferable to themselves. It was considered as being bad enough to be a slave;
but to be a poor man’s slave was deemed a disgrace indeed!….

As to my own treatment while I lived on Colonel Lloyd’s plantation, it was very similar to
that of the other slave children. I was not old enough to work in the field, and there being
little else than field work to do, I had a great deal of leisure time. The most I had to do was
to drive up the cows at evening, keep the fowls out of the garden, keep the front yard clean,
and run of errands for my old master’s daughter, Mrs. Lucretia Auld. The most of my lei-
sure time I spent in helping Master Daniel Lloyd in finding his birds, after he had shot
them. My connection with Master Daniel was of some advantage to me. He became quite
attached to me, and was a sort of protector of me. He would not allow the older boys to
impose upon me, and would divide his cakes with me.

I was seldom whipped by my old master, and suffered little from any thing else than hunger
and cold. I suffered much from hunger, but much more from cold. In hottest summer and
coldest winter, I was kept almost naked—no shoes, no stockings, no jacket, no trousers,
nothing on but a coarse tow linen shirt, reaching only to my knees. I had no bed. I must
have perished with cold, but that, the coldest nights, I used to steal a bag which was used
for carrying corn to the mill. I would crawl into this bag, and there sleep on the cold, damp,
clay floor, with my head in and feet out. My feet have been so cracked with the frost, that
the pen with which I am writing might be laid in the gashes.
We were not regularly allowanced. Our food was coarse corn meal boiled. This was called mush. It was put into a large wooden tray or trough, and set down upon the ground. The children were then called, like so many pigs, and like so many pigs they would come and devour the mush; some with oyster shells, others with pieces of shingle, some with naked hands, and none with spoons. He that ate fastest got most; he that was strongest secured the best place; and few left the trough satisfied. I was probably between seven and eight years old when I left Colonel Lloyd’s plantation. I left it with joy. I shall never forget the ecstasy with which I received the intelligence that my old master (Anthony) had determined to let me go to Baltimore, to live with Mr. Hugh Auld, brother to my old master’s son-in-law, Captain Thomas Auld. I received this information about three days before my departure. They were three of the happiest days I ever enjoyed. I spent the most part of all these three days in the creek, washing off the plantation scurf, and preparing myself for my departure….

We arrived at Baltimore early on Sunday morning, landing at Smith’s Wharf, not far from Bowley’s Wharf. We had on board the sloop a large flock of sheep; and after aiding in driving them to the slaughter house of Mr. Curtis on Louden Slater’s Hill, I was conducted by Rich, one of the hands belonging on board of the sloop, to my new home in Alliciana Street, near Mr. Gardner’s ship-yard, on Fells Point.

Mr. and Mrs. Auld were both at home, and met me at the door with their little son Thomas, to take care of whom I had been given. And here I saw what I had never seen before; it was a white face beaming with the most kindly emotions; it was the face of my new mistress, Sophia Auld. I wish I could describe the rapture that flashed through my soul as I beheld it. It was a new and strange sight to me, brightening up my pathway with the light of happiness. Little Thomas was told, there was his Freddy, - and I was told to take care of little Thomas; and thus I entered upon the duties of my new home with the most cheering prospect ahead.

I look upon my departure from Colonel Lloyd’s plantation as one of the most interesting events of my life. It is possible, and even quite probable, that but for the mere circumstance
of being removed from that plantation to Baltimore, I should have to-day, instead of being here seated by my own table, in the enjoyment of freedom and the happiness of home, writing this Narrative, been confined in the galling chains of slavery. Going to live at Baltimore laid the foundation, and opened the gateway, to all my subsequent prosperity. I have ever regarded it as the first plain manifestation of that kind providence which ever since attended me, and marked my life with so many favors. I regarded the selection of myself as being somewhat remarkable. There were a number of slave children that might have been sent from the plantation to Baltimore. There were those younger, those older, and those of the same age. I was chosen from among them all, and was the first, last, and only choice.

I may be deemed superstitious, and even egotistical, in regarding this event as a special interposition of divine Providence in my favor. But I should be false to the earliest sentiments of my soul, if I suppressed the opinion. I prefer to be true to myself, even at the hazard of incurring the ridicule of others, rather than to be false, and incur my own abhorrence. From my earliest recollection, I date the entertainment of a deep conviction that slavery would not always be able to hold me within its foul embrace; and in the darkest hours of my career in slavery, this living word of faith and spirit of hope departed not from me, but remained like ministering angels to cheer me through the gloom. This good spirit was from God, and to him I offer thanksgiving and praise. . . .

I often found myself regretting my own existence, and wishing myself dead; and but for the hope of being free, I have no doubt but that I should have killed myself, or done something for which I should have been killed. While in this state of mind, I was eager to hear any one speak of slavery. I was a ready listener. Every little while, I could hear something about the abolitionists. It was some time before I found what the word meant. It was always used in such connections as to make it an interesting word to me. If a slave ran away and succeeded in getting clear, or if a slave killed his master, set fire to a barn, or did any thing very wrong in the mind of a slaveholder, it was spoken of as the fruit of abolition. Hearing the word in this connection very often, I set about learning what it meant. The dictionary afforded me little or no help. I found it was “the act of abolishing;” but then I did not know what was to be abolished. Here I was perplexed. I did not dare to ask any one about its meaning, for
I was satisfied that it was something they wanted me to know very little about. After a patient waiting, I got one of our city papers, containing an account of the number of petitions from the north, praying for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and of the slave trade between the States. From this time I understood the words *abolition* and *abolitionist*, and always drew near when that word was spoken, expecting to hear something of importance to myself and fellow-slaves. The light broke in upon me by degrees. I went one day down on the wharf of Mr. Waters; and seeing two Irishmen unloading a scow of stone, I went, unasked, and helped them. When we had finished, one of them came to me and asked me if I were a slave. I told him I was. He asked, “Are ye a slave for life?” I told him that I was. The good Irishman seemed to be deeply affected by the statement. He said to the other that it was a pity so fine a little fellow as myself should be a slave for life. He said it was a shame to hold me. They both advised me to run away to the north; that I should find friends there, and that I should be free. I pretended not to be interested in what they said, and treated them as if I did not understand them; for I feared they might be treacherous. White men have been known to encourage slaves to escape, and then, to get the reward, catch them and return them to their masters. I was afraid that these seemingly good men might use me so; but I nevertheless remembered their advice, and from that time I resolved to run away. I looked forward to a time at which it would be safe for me to escape. I was too young to think of doing so immediately; besides, I wished to learn how to write, as I might have occasion to write my own pass. I consoled myself with the hope that I should one day find a good chance. Meanwhile, I would learn to write.

The idea as to how I might learn to write was suggested to me by being in Durgin and Bailey’s ship yard, and frequently seeing the ship carpenters, after hewing, and getting a piece of timber ready for use, write on the timber the name of that part of the ship for which it was intended. When a piece of timber was intended for the larboard side, it would be marked thus—“L.” When a piece was for the starboard side, it would be marked thus—“S.” A piece for the larboard side forward, would be marked thus—“L. F.” When a piece was for starboard side forward, it would be marked thus—“S. F.” For larboard aft, it would be marked thus—“L. A.” For starboard aft, it would be marked thus—“S. A.” I soon learned
the names of these letters, and for what they were intended when placed upon a piece of timber in the ship-yard. I immediately commenced copying them, and in a short time was able to make the four letters named. After that, when I met with any boy who I knew could write, I would tell him I could write as well as he. The next word would be, “I don’t believe you. Let me see you try it.” I would then make the letters which I had been so fortunate as to learn, and ask him to beat that. In this way I got a good many lessons in writing, which it is quite possible I should never have gotten in any other way. During this time, my copy-book was the board fence, brick wall, and pavement; my pen and ink was a lump of chalk. With these, I learned mainly how to write. I then commenced and continued copying the Italics in Webster’s Spelling Book, until I could make them all without looking on the book. By the time, my little Master Thomas had gone to school, and learned how to write, and had written over a number of copy-books. These had been brought home, and shown to some of our near neighbors, and then laid aside. My mistress used to go to class meeting at the Wilk Street meeting-house every Monday afternoon, and leave me to take care of the house. When left thus, I used to spend the time in writing in the spaces left in Master Thomas’s copy-book, copying what he had written. I continued to do this until I could write a hand very similar to that of Master Thomas. Thus after a long tedious effort for years, I finally succeeded in learning to write….

At the close of the year 1834, Mr. Freeland again hired me of my master, for the year 1835. But, by this time, I began to want to live upon free land as well as with Freeland; and I was no longer content, there fore, to live with him or any other slaveholder. I began, with the commencement of the year, to prepare myself for a final struggle, which should decide my fate one way or the other. My tendency was upward. I was fast approaching manhood, and year after year had passed, and I was still a slave. These thoughts roused me —I must do something. I therefore re solved that 1835 should not pass without witnessing an attempt, on my part, to secure my liberty. But I was not willing to cherish this determination alone. My fellow-slaves were dear to me. I was anxious to have them participate with me in this, my life-giving deter mination. I therefore, though with great prudence, commenced early to ascertain their views and feelings in regard to their condition, and to imbue their minds
with thoughts of freedom. I bent myself to devising ways and means for our escape, and meanwhile strove, on all fitting occasions, to impress them with the gross fraud and inhumanity of slavery. I went first to Henry, next to John, then to the others. I found, in them all, warm hearts and noble spirits. They were ready to hear, and ready to act when a feasible plan should be proposed. This was what I wanted. I talked to them of our want of manhood, if we submitted to our enslavement without at least one noble effort to be free. We met often, and consulted frequently, and told our hopes and fears, recounted the difficulties, real and imagined, which we should be called on to meet. At times we were almost disposed to give up, and try to content ourselves with our wretched lot; at others, we were firm and unbending in our determination to go. Whenever we suggested any plan, there was shrinking—the odds were fearful. Our path was beset with the greatest obstacles; and if we succeeded in gaining the end of it, our right to be free was yet questionable—we were yet liable to be returned to bondage. We could see no spot, this side of the ocean, where we could be free. We knew nothing about Canada. Our knowledge of the north did not extend farther than New York; and to go there, and be forever harassed with the frightful liability of being returned to slavery—with the certainty of being treated tenfold worse than before—the thought was truly a horrible one, and one which it was not easy to overcome. The case sometimes stood thus: At every gate through which we were to pass, we saw a watchman—at every ferry a guard—on every bridge a sentinel—and in every wood a patrol. We were hemmed in upon every side. Here were the difficulties, real or imagined—the good to be sought, and the evil to be shunned. On the one hand, there stood slavery, a stern reality, glaring frightfully upon us, - its robes already crimsoned with the blood of millions, and even now feasting itself greedily upon our own flesh. On the other hand, away back in the dim distance, under the flickering light of the north star, behind some craggy hill or snow-covered mountain, stood a doubtful freedom—half frozen—beckoning us to come and share its hospitality. This in itself was sometimes enough to stagger us; but when we permitted ourselves to survey the road, we were frequently appalled. Upon either side we saw grim death, assuming the most horrid shapes. Now it was starvation, causing us to eat our own flesh;—now we were contending with the waves, and were drowned;—now we were over taken, and torn to pieces by the fangs of the terrible bloodhound. We were stung by
scorpions, chased by wild beasts, bitten by snakes, and finally, after having nearly reached
the desired spot, — after swimming rivers, encountering wild beasts, sleeping in the woods,
suffering hunger and nakedness, -we were overtaken by our pursuers, and, in our re-
sistance, we were shot dead upon the spot! I say, this picture sometimes appalled us, and
made us “rather bear those ills we had, Than fly to others, that we knew not of.” In coming
5 to a fixed determination to run away, we did more than Patrick Henry, when he resolved
upon liberty or death. With us it was a doubtful liberty at most, and almost certain death if
we failed. For my part, I should prefer death to hopeless bondage.

Sandy, one of our number, gave up the notion, but still encouraged us. Our company then
10 consisted of Henry Harris, John Harris, Henry Bailey, Charles Roberts, and myself. Henry
Bailey was my uncle, and belonged to my master. Charles married my aunt: he belonged to
my master’s father-in-law, Mr. William Hamilton.

The plan we finally concluded upon was, to get a large canoe belonging to Mr. Hamilton,
and upon the Saturday night previous to Easter holidays, paddle directly up the Chesapeake
15 Bay. On our arrival at the head of the bay, a distance of seventy or eighty miles from where
we lived, it was our purpose to turn our canoe adrift, and follow the guidance of the north
star till we got beyond the limits of Maryland. Our reason for taking the water route was,
that we were less liable to be suspected as runaways; we hoped to be regarded as fishermen;
whereas, if we should take the land route, we should be subjected to interruptions of almost
every kind. Any one having a white face, and being so disposed, could stop us, and subject
us to examination.

The week before our intended start, I wrote several protections, one for each of us. As well
as I can remember, they were in the following words, to wit: “THIS is to certify that I, the
undersigned, have given the bearer, my servant, full liberty to go to Baltimore, and spend
20 the Easter holidays. Written with mine own hand, &c., 1835. - “WILLIAM HAMILTON,
“Near St. Michael’s, in Talbot county, Maryland.”

We were not going to Baltimore; but, in going up the bay, we went toward Baltimore, and
these protections were only intended to protect us while on the bay.
As the time drew near for our departure, our anxiety became more and more intense. It was truly a matter of life and death with us. The strength of our determination was about to be fully tested. At this time, I was very active in explaining every difficulty, removing every doubt, dispelling every fear, and inspiring all with the firmness indispensable to success in our undertaking; assuring them that half was gained the instant we made the move; we had talked long enough; we were now ready to move; if not now, we never should be; and if we did not intend to move now, we had as well fold our arms, sit down, and acknowledge ourselves fit only to be slaves. This, none of us were prepared to acknowledge. Every man stood firm; and at our last meeting, we pledged our selves afresh, in the most solemn manner, that, at the time appointed, we would certainly start in pursuit of freedom.

This was in the middle of the week, at the end of which we were to be off. We went, as usual, to our several fields of labor, but with bosoms highly agitated with thoughts of our truly hazardous undertaking. We tried to conceal our feelings as much as possible; and I think we succeeded very well.

After a painful waiting, the Saturday morning, whose night was to witness our departure, came. I hailed it with joy, bring what of sadness it might. Friday night was a sleepless one for me. I probably felt more anxious than the rest, because I was, by common consent, at the head of the whole affair. The responsibility of success or failure lay heavily upon me. The glory of the one, and the confusion of the other, were alike mine. The first two hours of that morning were such as I never experienced before, and hope never to again. Early in the morning, we went, as usual, to the field. We were spreading manure; and all at once, while thus engaged, I was over whelmed with an indescribable feeling, in the fulness of which I turned to Sandy, who was near by, and said, “We are betrayed!” “Well,” said he, “that thought has this moment struck me.” We said no more. I was never more certain of any thing.

The horn was blown as usual, and we went up from the field to the house for breakfast. I went for the form, more than for want of any thing to eat that morning. Just as I got to the house, in looking out at the lane gate, I saw four white men, with two colored men. The white men were on horseback, and the colored ones were walking behind, as if tied.
watched them a few moments till they got up to our lane gate. Here they halted, and tied the colored men to the gate-post. I was not yet certain as to what the matter was. In a few moments, in rode Mr. Hamilton, with a speed betokening great excitement. He came to the door, and inquired if Master William was in. He was told he was at the barn. Mr. Hamilton, with out dismounting, rode up to the barn with extraordinary speed. In a few moments, he and Mr. Freeland returned to the house. By this time, the three constables rode up, and in great haste dismounted, tied their horses, and met Master William and Mr. Hamilton returning from the barn; and after talking awhile, they all walked up to the kitchen door. There was no one in the kitchen but myself and John. Henry and Sandy were up at the barn. Mr. Freeland put his head in at the door, and called me by name, saying, there were some gentlemen at the door who wished to see me. I stepped to the door, and inquired what they wanted. They at once seized me, and, without giving me any satisfaction, tied me — lashing my hands closely together. I insisted upon knowing what the matter was. They at length said, that they had learned I had been in a “scrape,” and that I was to be examined before my master; and if their information proved false, I should not be hurt.

In a few moments, they succeeded in tying John. They then turned to Henry, who had by this time returned, and commanded him to cross his hands. “I won’t!” said Henry, in a firm tone, indicating his readiness to meet the consequences of his refusal. “Won’t you?” said Tom Graham, the constable. “No, I won’t!” said Henry, in a still stronger tone. With this, two of the constables pulled out their shining pistols, and swore, by their Creator, that they would make him cross his hands or kill him. Each cocked his pistol, and, with fingers on the trigger, walked up to Henry, saying, at the same time, if he did not cross his hands, they would blow his damned heart out. “Shoot me, shoot me!” said Henry; “you can’t kill me but once. Shoot, shoot, — and be damned I won’t be tied!” This he said in a tone of loud defiance; and at the same time, with a motion as quick as lightning, he with one single stroke dashed the pistols from the hand of each constable. As he did this, all hands fell upon him, and, after beating him some time, they finally overpowered him, and got him tied.

During the scuffle, I managed, I know not how, to get my pass out, and, without being discovered, put it into the fire. We were all now tied; and just as we were to leave for Easton
jail, Betsy Freeland, mother of William Freeland, came to the door with her hands full of biscuits, and divided them between Henry and John. She then delivered herself of a speech, to the following effect:–addressing herself to me, she said, “You devil / You yellow devil it was you that put it into the heads of Henry and John to run away. But for you, you long-legged mulatto devil! Henry nor John would never have thought of such a thing.” I made no reply, and was immediately hurried off towards St. Michael’s. Just a moment previous to the scuffle with Henry, Mr. Hamilton suggested the propriety of making a search for the protections which he had understood Frederick had written for himself and the rest. But, just at the moment he was about carrying his proposal into effect, his aid was needed in helping to tie Henry; and the excitement attending the scuffle caused them either to forget, or to deem it unsafe, under the circumstances, to search. So we were not yet convicted of the intention to run away.

When we got about half way to St. Michael’s, while the constables having us in charge were looking ahead, Henry inquired of me what he should do with his pass. I told him to eat it with his biscuit, and own nothing; and we passed the word around, “Own nothing;” and “Own nothing!” said we all. Our confidence in each other was unshaken. We were resolved to succeed or fail together, after the calamity had befallen us as much as before. We were now prepared for any thing. We were to be dragged that morning fifteen miles behind horses, and then to be placed in the Easton jail. When we reached St. Michael’s, we underwent a sort of examination. We all denied that we ever intended to run away. We did this more to bring out the evidence against us, than from any hope of getting clear of being sold; for, as I have said, we were ready for that. The fact was, we cared but little where we went, so we went together. Our greatest concern was about separation. We dreaded that more than any thing this side of death. We found the evidence against us to be the testimony of one person; our master would not tell who it was; but we came to a unanimous decision among ourselves as to who their informant was. We were sent off to the jail at Easton. When we got there, we were delivered up to the sheriff, Mr. Joseph Graham, and by him placed in jail. Henry, John, and myself, were placed in one room together—Charles, and Henry Bailey, in another. Their object in separating us was to hinder concert.
We had been in jail scarcely twenty minutes, when a swarm of slave traders, and agents for slave traders, flocked into jail to look at us, and to ascertain if we were for sale. Such a set of beings I never saw before I felt myself surrounded by so many fiends from perdition. A band of pirates never looked more like their father, the devil. They laughed and grinned over us, saying, “Ah, my boys! we have got you, haven’t we?” And after taunting us in various ways, they one by one went into an examination of us, with intent to ascertain our value. They would impudently ask us if we would not like to have them for our masters. We would make them no answer, and leave them to find out as best they could. Then they would curse and swear at us, telling us that they could take the devil out of us in a very little while, if we were only in their hands…..

I now come to that part of my life during which planned, and finally succeeded in making, my escape from slavery. But before narrating any of the peculiar circumstances, I deem it proper to make known my intention not to state all the facts connected with the transaction. My reasons for pursuing this course may be understood from the following: First, were I to give a minute statement of all the facts, it is not only possible, but quite probable, that others would thereby be involved in the most embarrassing difficulties. Secondly, such a statement would most undoubtedly induce greater vigilance on the part of slave holders than has existed heretofore among them; which would, of course, be the means of guarding a door whereby some dear brother bondman might escape his galling chains. I deeply regret the necessity that impels me to suppress any thing of importance connected with my experience in slavery. It would afford me great pleasure indeed, as well as materially add to the interest of my narrative, were I at liberty to gratify a curiosity, which I know exists in the minds of many, by an accurate statement of all the facts pertaining to my most fortunate escape. But I must deprive myself of this pleasure, and the curious of the gratification which such a statement would afford. I would allow myself to suffer under the greatest imputations which evil-minded men might suggest, rather than exculpate myself, and thereby run the hazard of closing the slightest avenue by which a brother slave might clear himself of the chains and fetters of slavery.
I have never approved of the very public manner in which some of our western friends have conducted what they call the underground railroad, but which, I think, by their open declarations, has been made most emphatically the upperground railroad. I honor those good men and women for their noble daring, and applaud them for willingly subjecting themselves to bloody persecution, by openly avowing their participation in the escape of slaves. I, however, can see very little good resulting from such a course, either to themselves or the slaves escaping; while, upon the other hand, I see and feel assured that those open declarations are a positive evil to the slaves remaining, who are seeking to escape. They do nothing towards enlightening the slave, whilst they do much towards enlightening the master.

They stimulate him to greater watchfulness, and enhance his power to capture his slave. We owe something to the slaves south of the line as well as to those north of it; and in aiding the latter on their way to freedom, we should be careful to do nothing which would be likely to hinder the former from escaping from slavery. I would keep the merci less slaveholder profoundly ignorant of the means of flight adopted by the slave. I would leave him to imagine himself surrounded by myriads of invisible tormentors, ever ready to snatch from his infernal grasp his trembling prey. Let him be left to feel his way in the dark; let darkness commensurate with his crime hover over him; and let him feel that at every step he takes, in pursuit of the flying bondman, he is running the frightful risk of having his hot brains dashed out by an invisible agency. Let us render the tyrant no aid; let us not hold the light by which he can trace the footprints of our flying brother. But enough of this. I will now proceed to the statement of those facts, connected with my escape, for which I am alone responsible, and for which no one can be made to suffer but myself....

Things went on without very smoothly indeed, but within there was trouble. It is impossible for me to describe my feelings as the time of my contemplated start drew near. I had a number of warm-hearted friends in Baltimore, — friends that I loved almost as I did my life, — and the thought of being separated from them forever was painful beyond expression. It is my opinion that thousands would escape from slavery, who now remain, but for the strong cords of affection that bind them to their friends. The thought of leaving my friends was decidedly the most painful thought with which I had to contend. The love of them was
my tender point, and shook my decision more than all things else. Besides the pain of separation, the dread and apprehension of a failure exceeded what I had experienced at my first attempt. The appalling defeat I then sustained returned to torment me. I felt assured that, if I failed in this attempt, my case would be a hopeless one —it would seal my fate as a slave forever. I could not hope to get off with anything less than the severest punishment, and being placed beyond the means of escape. It required no very vivid imagination to depict the most frightful scenes through which I should have to pass, in case I failed. The wretchedness of slavery, and the blessedness of freedom, were perpetually before me. It was life and death with me. But I remained firm, and, according to my resolution, on the third day of September, 1838, I left my chains, and succeeded in reaching New York without the slightest interruption of any kind. How I did so, - what means I adopted, - what direction I travelled, and by what mode of conveyance, — I must leave unexplained, for the reasons before mentioned.

I have been frequently asked how I felt when I found myself in a free State. I have never been able to answer the question with any satisfaction to myself. It was a moment of the highest excitement I ever experienced. I suppose I felt as one may imagine the unarmed mariner to feel when he is rescued by a friendly man-of-war from the pursuit of a pirate. In writing to a dear friend, immediately after my arrival at New York, I said I felt like one who had escaped a den of hungry lions. This state of mind, however, very soon subsided; and I was again seized with a feeling of great insecurity and loneliness. I was yet liable to be taken back, and subjected to all the tortures of slavery. This in itself was enough to damp the ardor of my enthusiasm. But the loneliness overcame me. There I was in the midst of thousands, and yet a perfect stranger; without home and without friends, in the midst of thousands of my own brethren—children of a common Father, and yet I dared not to unfold to any one of them my sad condition. I was afraid to speak to any one for fear of speaking to the wrong one, and thereby falling into the hands of money-loving kidnappers, whose business it was to lie in wait for the panting fugitive, as the ferocious beasts of the forest lie in wait for their prey. The motto which I adopted when I started from slavery was this—“Trust no man!” I saw in every white man an enemy, and in almost every colored
man cause for distrust. It was a most painful situation; and, to understand it, one must
needs experience it, or imagine himself in similar circumstances. Let him be a fugitive slave
in a strange land—a land given up to be the hunting-ground for slaveholders—whose in-
habitants are legalized kidnappers—where he is every moment subjected to the terrible
liability of being seized upon by his fellow men, as the hideous crocodile seizes upon his
prey! I say, let him place himself in my situation—without home or friends—without money
or credit—wanting shelter, and no one to give it—wanting bread, and no money to buy it,
—and at the same time let him feel that he is pursued by merciless men-hunters, and in total
darkness as to what to do, where to go, or where to stay,—perfectly helpless both as to the
means of defence and means of escape,—in the midst of plenty, yet suffering the terrible
gnawings of hunger,—in the midst of houses, yet having no home,—among fellow-men,
yet feeling as if in the midst of wild beasts, whose greediness to swallow up the trembling
and half-famished fugitive is only equalled by that with which the monsters of the deep
swallow up the helpless fish upon which they subsist,—I say, let him be placed in this most
trying situation,—the situation in which I was placed,—then, and not till then, will he fully
appreciate the hardships of, and know how to sympathize with, the toil-worn and whip-
scarred fugitive slave.
ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Speech at Peoria

SPEECH EXCERPT

October 16, 1854
Lawn of the Peoria County Courthouse | Peoria, Illinois

On the Kansas-Nebraska Act

BACKGROUND

Abraham Lincoln responded to the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act and its principal proponent, Stephen A. Douglas, with this address at Peoria.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Is Lincoln in favor or against self-governance?

2. In what way can the right of self-governance be abused according to Lincoln?

3. What principles does Lincoln take to be more essential than the right to self-governance?

4. What are the results of the violation of the Missouri Compromise both in the north and in the south?

5. How does Lincoln think the founders viewed slavery?

...The repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and the propriety of its restoration, constitute the subject of what I am about to say....

I trust I understand, and truly estimate the right of self-government. My faith in the proposition that each man should do precisely as he pleases with all which is exclusively his own, lies at the foundation of the sense of justice there is in me. I extend the principles to communities of men, as well as to individuals. I so extend it, because it is politically wise, as well as naturally just; politically wise, in saving us from broils about matters which do not concern us. Here, or at Washington, I would not trouble myself with the oyster laws of Virginia, or the cranberry laws of Indiana.

The doctrine of self-government is right—absolutely and eternally right—but it has no just application, as here attempted. Or perhaps I should rather say that whether it has such just application depends upon whether a negro is not or is a man. If he is not a man, why in that case, he who is a man may, as a matter of self-government, do just as he pleases with him. But if the negro is a man, is it not to that extent, a total destruction of self-government, to say that he too shall not govern himself? When the white man governs himself that is self-government; but when he governs himself, and also governs another man, that is more than self-government—that is despotism. If the negro is a man, why then my ancient faith teaches me that “all men are created equal;” and that there can be no moral right in connection with one man’s making a slave of another....

What I do say is, that no man is good enough to govern another man, without that other’s consent. I say this is the leading principle—the sheet anchor of American republicanism. Our Declaration of Independence says:

“We hold these truths to be self evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.”
I have quoted so much at this time merely to show that according to our ancient faith, the
just powers of governments are derived from the consent of the governed. Now the relation
of masters and slaves is, pro tanto, a total violation of this principle. The master not only
governs the slave without his consent; but he governs him by a set of rules altogether dif-
f erent from those which he prescribes for himself. Allow all the governed an equal voice in
the government, and that, and that only is self-government....

This same generation of men, and mostly the same individuals of the generation, who de-
clared this principle—who declared independence—who fought the war of the revolution
through—who afterwards made the constitution under which we still live—these same men
passed the ordinance of '87, declaring that slavery should never go to the north-west terri-
tity. I have no doubt Judge Douglas thinks they were very inconsistent in this. It is a ques-
tion of discrimination between them and him. But there is not an inch of ground left for
his claiming that their opinions—their example—their authority—are on his side in this
controversy....

I have done with this mighty argument, of self-government. Go, sacred thing! Go in
peace....

The Missouri Compromise ought to be restored. For the sake of the Union, it ought to be
restored. We ought to elect a House of Representatives which will vote its restoration. If by
any means, we omit to do this, what follows? Slavery may or may not be established in
Nebraska. But whether it be or not, we shall have repudiated—discarded from the councils
of the Nation—the spirit of compromise; for who after this will ever trust in a national
compromise? The spirit of mutual concession—that spirit which first gave us the constitu-
tion, and which has thrice saved the Union—we shall have strangled and cast from us for-
ever. And what shall we have in lieu of it? The South flushed with triumph and tempted to
excesses; the North, betrayed, as they believe, brooding on wrong and burning for revenge.
One side will provoke; the other resent. The one will taunt, the other defy; one agrees, the
other retaliates. Already a few in the North, defy all constitutional restraints, resist the ex-
ecution of the fugitive slave law, and even menace the institution of slavery in the States 
where it exists.

Already a few in the South, claim the constitutional right to take to and hold slaves in the 
free states—demand the revival of the slave trade; and demand a treaty with Great Britain 
by which fugitive slaves may be reclaimed from Canada. As yet they are but few on either 
side. It is a grave question for the lovers of the Union, whether the final destruction of the 
Missouri Compromise, and with it the spirit of all compromise will or will not embolden 
and embitter each of these, and fatally increase the numbers of both....

I particularly object to the new position which the avowed principle of this Nebraska law 
gives to slavery in the body politic. I object to it because it assumes that there can be moral 
right in the enslaving of one man by another. I object to it as a dangerous dalliance for a 
few people—a sad evidence that, feeling prosperity we forget right—that liberty, as a prin-
ciple, we have ceased to revere. I object to it because the fathers of the republic eschewed, 
and rejected it. The argument of “Necessity” was the only argument they ever admitted in 
favor of slavery; and so far, and so far only as it carried them, did they ever go. They found 
the institution existing among us, which they could not help; and they cast blame upon the 
British King for having permitted its introduction. Before the constitution, they prohibited 
its introduction into the north-western Territory—the only country we owned, then free 
from it. At the framing and adoption of the constitution, they forbore to so much as men-
tion the word “slave” or “slavery” in the whole instrument. In the provision for the recovery 
of fugitives, the slave is spoken of as a “person held to service or labor.” In that prohibiting 
the abolition of the African slave trade for twenty years, that trade is spoken of as “The 
migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing, shall think 
proper to admit,” etc. These are the only provisions alluding to slavery. Thus, the thing is 
hid away, in the constitution, just as an afflicted man hides away a wen or a cancer, which 
he dares not cut out at once, lest he bleed to death; with the promise, nevertheless, that the 
cutting may begin at the end of a given time. Less than this our fathers could not do; and 
now they would not do. Necessity drove them so far, and farther, they would not go. But
this is not all. The earliest Congress, under the constitution, took the same view of slavery. They hedged and hemmed it in to the narrowest limits of necessity.

In 1794, they prohibited an out-going slave-trade—that is, the taking of slaves from the United States to sell.

In 1798, they prohibited the bringing of slaves from Africa, into the Mississippi Territory—this territory then comprising what are now the States of Mississippi and Alabama. This was ten years before they had the authority to do the same thing as to the States existing at the adoption of the constitution.

In 1800 they prohibited American citizens from trading in slaves between foreign countries—as, for instance, from Africa to Brazil.

In 1803 they passed a law in aid of one or two State laws, in restraint of the internal slave trade.

In 1807, in apparent hot haste, they passed the law, nearly a year in advance, to take effect the first day of 1808—the very first day the constitution would permit—prohibiting the African slave trade by heavy pecuniary and corporal penalties.

In 1820, finding these provisions ineffectual, they declared the trade piracy, and annexed to it, the extreme penalty of death. While all this was passing in the general government, five or six of the original slave States had adopted systems of gradual emancipation; and by which the institution was rapidly becoming extinct within these limits.

Thus we see, the plain unmistakable spirit of that age, towards slavery, was hostility to the principle, and toleration, only by necessity....

Our republican robe is soiled, and trailed in the dust. Let us repurify it. Let us turn and wash it white, in the spirit, if not the blood, of the Revolution. Let us turn slavery from its claims of “moral right,” back upon its existing legal rights, and its arguments of “necessity.”

Let us return it to the position our fathers gave it; and there let it rest in peace. Let us re-
adopt the Declaration of Independence, and with it, the practices, and policy, which harmonize with it. Let north and south—let all Americans—let all lovers of liberty everywhere—join in the great and good work. If we do this, we shall not only have saved the Union; but we shall have so saved it, as to make, and to keep it, forever worthy of the saving.

We shall have so saved it, that the succeeding millions of free happy people, the world over, shall rise up, and call us blessed, to the latest generations....
ABRAHAM LINCOLN (R-IL)

To the Illinois Republican Party Convention

SPEECH EXCERPTS

June 16, 1858

House of Representatives Chamber at the Illinois State Capitol | Springfield, Illinois

A House Divided

BACKGROUND

Abraham Lincoln delivered this speech upon his nomination by the Illinois Republican Party to be its candidate for U.S. Senate in Illinois.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. To what, in particular, is Lincoln referring when he quotes the Gospel of Matthew, "A house divided against itself cannot stand"?

2. What are the three "working points" of "machinery" resulting from Dred Scott and Stephen Douglas's policy, and why does Lincoln think they are constitutionally problematic?

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Convention:

If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could then better judge what to do, and how to do it.

We are now far into the fifth year, since a policy was initiated, with the avowed object, and confident promise, of putting an end to slavery agitation.

Under the operation of that policy, that agitation has not only, not ceased, but has constantly augmented.

In my opinion, it will not cease, until a crisis shall have been reached, and passed.

"A house divided against itself cannot stand."

I believe this government cannot endure, permanently half slave and half free.

I do not expect the Union to be dissolved—I do not expect the house to fall—but I do expect it will cease to be divided.

It will become all one thing, or all the other.

Either the opponents of slavery, will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction; or its advocates will push it forward, till it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new—North as well as South….

The several points of the Dred Scott decision, in connection with Senator Douglas' "care not" policy, constitute the piece of machinery, in its present state of advancement. This was the third point gained.

The working points of that machinery are:
First, that no negro slave, imported as such from Africa, and no descendant of such slave can ever be a citizen of any State, in the sense of that term as used in the Constitution of the United States.

This point is made in order to deprive the negro, in every possible event, of the benefit of this provision of the United States Constitution, which declares that—

"The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States."

Secondly, that "subject to the Constitution of the United States," neither Congress nor a Territorial Legislature can exclude slavery from any United States territory.

This point is made in order that individual men may fill up the territories with slaves, without danger of losing them as property, and thus to enhance the chances of permanency to the institution through all the future.

Thirdly, that whether the holding a negro in actual slavery in a free State, makes him free, as against the holder, the United States courts will not decide, but will leave to be decided by the courts of any slave State the negro may be forced into by the master.

This point is made, not to be pressed immediately; but, if acquiesced in for a while, and apparently endorsed by the people at an election, then to sustain the logical conclusion that what Dred Scott's master might lawfully do with Dred Scott, in the free State of Illinois, every other master may lawfully do with any other one, or one thousand slaves, in Illinois, or in any other free State.

Auxiliary to all this, and working hand in hand with it, the Nebraska doctrine, or what is left of it, is to educate and mold public opinion, at least Northern public opinion, not to care whether slavery is voted down or voted up.

This shows exactly where we now are; and partially also, whither we are tending....
We can not absolutely know that all these exact adaptations are the result of preconcert. But when we see a lot of framed timbers, different portions of which we know have been gotten out at different times and places and by different workmen—Stephen, Franklin, Roger and James, for instance—and when we see these timbers joined together, and see they exactly make the frame of a house or a mill, all the tenons and mortices exactly fitting, and all the lengths and proportions of the different pieces exactly adapted to their respective places, and not a piece too many or too few—not omitting even scaffolding—or, if a single piece be lacking, we can see the place in the frame exactly fitted and prepared to yet bring such piece in—in such a case, we find it impossible to not believe that Stephen and Franklin and Roger and James all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked upon a common plan or draft drawn up before the first lick was struck....
PRESIDENT-ELECT ABRAHAM LINCOLN (R-IL)
On the Constitution and Union
UNPUBLISHED WRITING FRAGMENT

January 1861

BACKGROUND

Abraham Lincoln scrawled these words on the relationship between the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, potentially as part of his drafts for his First Inaugural Address, though they were not used in the final speech nor in any other public comments.

ANNOTATIONS

All this is not the result of accident. It has a philosophical cause. Without the Constitution and the Union, we could not have attained the result; but even these, are not the primary cause of our great prosperity. There is something back of these, entwining itself more closely about the human heart. That something, is the principle of "Liberty to all"—the principle that clears the path for all—gives hope to all—and, by consequence, enterprise, and industry to all.

The expression of that principle, in our Declaration of Independence, was most happy, and fortunate. Without this, as well as with it, we could have declared our independence of Great Britain; but without it, we could not, I think, have secured our free government, and consequent prosperity. No oppressed, people will fight, and endure, as our fathers did, without the promise of something better, than a mere change of masters.

The assertion of that principle, at that time, was the word, "fitly spoken" which has proved an "apple of gold" to us. The Union, and the Constitution, are the picture of silver, subsequently framed around it. The picture was made, not to conceal, or destroy the apple; but

____________________
to adorn, and preserve it. The picture was made for the apple—not the apple for the picture.

So let us act, that neither picture, or apple shall ever be blurred, or bruised or broken.

That we may so act, we must study, and understand the points of danger.
**PRESIDENT ABRAHAM LINCOLN (R)**

First Inaugural Address

**SPEECH EXCERPTS**

March 4, 1861

U.S. Capitol | Washington, D.C.

**BACKGROUND**

Abraham Lincoln delivered this speech at his inauguration amidst declarations of secession by southern states.

**GUIDING QUESTIONS**

1. How does Lincoln try to assuage the fears of Southerners?
2. Why does Lincoln believe that the Union is perpetual?
3. What is "the only substantial dispute," and what are its possible resolutions as Lincoln sees them?

---

Fellow citizens of the United States:

In compliance with a custom as old as the government itself, I appear before you to address you briefly, and to take, in your presence, the oath prescribed by the Constitution of the United States, to be taken by the President "before he enters on the execution of his office."

I do not consider it necessary, at present for me to discuss those matters of administration about which there is no special anxiety, or excitement.

Apprehension seems to exist among the people of the Southern States, that by the accession of a Republican Administration, their property, and their peace, and personal security, are to be endangered. There has never been any reasonable cause for such apprehension. Indeed, the most ample evidence to the contrary has all the while existed, and been open to their inspection. It is found in nearly all the published speeches of him who now addresses you. I do but quote from one of those speeches when I declare that "I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so." Those who nominated and elected me did so with full knowledge that I had made this, and many similar declarations, and had never recanted them. And more than this, they placed in the platform, for my acceptance, and as a law to themselves, and to me, the clear and emphatic resolution which I now read:

"Resolved, That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depend; and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force of the soil of any State or Territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes."
I now reiterate these sentiments: and in doing so, I only press upon the public attention the most conclusive evidence of which the case is susceptible, that the property, peace and security of no section are to be in anywise endangered by the now incoming Administration. I add too, that all the protection which, consistently with the Constitution and the laws, can be given, will be cheerfully given to all the States when lawfully demanded, for whatever cause—as cheerfully to one section, as to another.

There is much controversy about the delivering up of fugitives from service or labor. The clause I now read is as plainly written in the Constitution as any other of its provisions:

"No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."

It is scarcely questioned that this provision was intended by those who made it, for the reclaiming of what we call fugitive slaves; and the intention of the law-giver is the law. All members of Congress swear their support to the whole Constitution—to this provision as much as to any other. To the proposition, then, that slaves whose cases come within the terms of this clause, "shall be delivered up," their oaths are unanimous. Now, if they would make the effort in good temper, could they not, with nearly equal unanimity, frame and pass a law, by means of which to keep good that unanimous oath?

There is some difference of opinion whether this clause should be enforced by national or by state authority; but surely that difference is not a very material one. If the slave is to be surrendered, it can be of but little consequence to him, or to others, by which authority it is done. And should any one, in any case, be content that his oath shall go unkept, on a merely unsubstantial controversy as to how it shall be kept?

Again, in any law upon this subject, ought not all the safeguards of liberty known in civilized and humane jurisprudence to be introduced, so that a free man be not, in any case,
surrendered as a slave? And might it not be well, at the same time, to provide by law for the enforcement of that clause in the Constitution which guarantees that "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States?"

5 I take the official oath today, with no mental reservations, and with no purpose to construe the Constitution or laws, by any hypercritical rules. And while I do not choose now to specify particular acts of Congress as proper to be enforced, I do suggest, that it will be much safer for all, both in official and private stations, to conform to, and abide by, all those acts which stand unrepealed, than to violate any of them, trusting to find impunity in having them held to be unconstitutional.

10 It is seventy-two years since the first inauguration of a President under our national Constitution. During that period fifteen different and greatly distinguished citizens, have, in succession, administered the executive branch of the government. They have conducted it through many perils; and, generally, with great success. Yet, with all this scope for precedent, I now enter upon the same task for the brief constitutional term of four years, under great and peculiar difficulty. A disruption of the Federal Union heretofore only menaced, is now formidably attempted.

15 I hold, that in contemplation of universal law, and of the Constitution, the Union of these States is perpetual. Perpetuity is implied, if not expressed, in the fundamental law of all national governments. It is safe to assert that no government proper, ever had a provision in its organic law for its own termination. Continue to execute all the express provisions of our national Constitution, and the Union will endure forever—it being impossible to destroy it, except by some action not provided for in the instrument itself.

20 Again, if the United States be not a government proper, but an association of States in the nature of contract merely, can it, as a contract, be peaceably unmade, by less than all the parties who made it? One party to a contract may violate it—break it, so to speak; but does it not require all to lawfully rescind it?
Descending from these general principles, we find the proposition that, in legal contemplation, the Union is perpetual, confirmed by the history of the Union itself. The Union is much older than the Constitution. It was formed in fact, by the Articles of Association in 1774. It was matured and continued by the Declaration of Independence in 1776. It was further matured and the faith of all the then thirteen States expressly plighted and engaged that it should be perpetual, by the Articles of Confederation in 1778. And finally, in 1787, one of the declared objects for ordaining and establishing the Constitution, was "to form a more perfect union."

But if destruction of the Union, by one, or by a part only, of the States, be lawfully possible, the Union is less perfect than before the Constitution, having lost the vital element of perpetuity.

It follows from these views that no State, upon its own mere motion, can lawfully get out of the Union,—that resolves and ordinances to that effect are legally void; and that acts of violence, within any State or States, against the authority of the United States, are insurrectionary or revolutionary, according to circumstances.

I therefore consider that, in view of the Constitution and the laws, the Union is unbroken; and, to the extent of my ability, I shall take care, as the Constitution itself expressly enjoins upon me, that the laws of the Union be faithfully executed in all the States. Doing this I deem to be only a simple duty on my part; and I shall perform it, so far as practicable, unless my rightful masters, the American people, shall withhold the requisite means, or, in some authoritative manner, direct the contrary. I trust this will not be regarded as a menace, but only as the declared purpose of the Union that it will constitutionally defend, and maintain itself.

In doing this there needs to be no bloodshed or violence; and there shall be none, unless it be forced upon the national authority. The power confided to me, will be used to hold, occupy, and possess the property, and places belonging to the government, and to collect
the duties and imposts; but beyond what may be necessary for these objects, there will be no invasion—no using of force against, or among the people anywhere. Where hostility to the United States, in any interior locality, shall be so great and so universal, as to prevent competent resident citizens from holding the Federal offices, there will be no attempt to force obnoxious strangers among the people for that object. While the strict legal right may exist in the government to enforce the exercise of these offices, the attempt to do so would be so irritating, and so nearly impracticable with all, that I deem it better to forego, for the time, the uses of such offices.

The mails, unless repelled, will continue to be furnished in all parts of the Union. So far as possible, the people everywhere shall have that sense of perfect security which is most favorable to calm thought and reflection. The course here indicated will be followed, unless current events, and experience, shall show a modification, or change, to be proper; and in every case and exigency, my best discretion will be exercised, according to circumstances actually existing, and with a view and a hope of a peaceful solution of the national troubles, and the restoration of fraternal sympathies and affections.…

One section of our country believes slavery is right, and ought to be extended, while the other believes it is wrong, and ought not to be extended. This is the only substantial dispute. The fugitive slave clause of the Constitution, and the law for the suppression of the foreign slave trade, are each as well enforced, perhaps, as any law can ever be in a community where the moral sense of the people imperfectly supports the law itself. The great body of the people abide by the dry legal obligation in both cases, and a few break over in each. This, I think, cannot be perfectly cured; and it would be worse in both cases after the separation of the sections, than before. The foreign slave trade, now imperfectly suppressed, would be ultimately revived without restriction, in one section; while fugitive slaves, now only partially surrendered, would not be surrendered at all, by the other.
Physically speaking, we cannot separate. We cannot remove our respective sections from each other, nor build an impassable wall between them. A husband and wife may be divorced, and go out of the presence, and beyond the reach of each other; but the different parts of our country cannot do this. They cannot but remain face to face; and intercourse, either amicable or hostile, must continue between them. Is it possible then to make that intercourse more advantageous, or more satisfactory, after separation than before? Can aliens make treaties easier than friends can make laws? Can treaties be more faithfully enforced between aliens, than laws can among friends? Suppose you go to war, you cannot fight always; and when, after much loss on both sides, and no gain on either, you cease fighting, the identical old questions, as to terms of intercourse, are again upon you.

This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember, or overthrow it. I can not be ignorant of the fact that many worthy, and patriotic citizens are desirous of having the national constitution amended. While I make no recommendation of amendments, I fully recognize the rightful authority of the people over the whole subject, to be exercised in either of the modes prescribed in the instrument itself; and I should, under existing circumstances, favor, rather than oppose, a fair opportunity being afforded the people to act upon it.

My countrymen, one and all, think calmly and well, upon this whole subject. Nothing valuable can be lost by taking time. If there be an object to hurry any of you, in hot haste, to a step which you would never take deliberately, that object will be frustrated by taking time; but no good object can be frustrated by it. Such of you as are now dissatisfied, still have the old Constitution unimpaired, and, on the sensitive point, the laws of your own framing under it; while the new administration will have no immediate power, if it would, to change either. If it were admitted that you who are dissatisfied, hold the right side in the dispute, there still is no single good reason for precipitate action. Intelligence, patriotism, Christianity, and a firm reliance on Him, who has never yet forsaken this favored land, are still competent to adjust, in the best way, all our present difficulty.
In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The government will not assail you. You can have no conflict, without being yourselves the aggressors. You have no oath registered in Heaven to destroy the government, while I shall have the most solemn one to "preserve, protect and defend it."

I am loath to close. We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battle-field, and patriot grave, to every living heart and hearthstone, all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.
PRESIDENT ABRAHAM LINCOLN (R-IL)
A Proclamation
AN ORDER

January 1, 1863
Executive Mansion | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

On September 22, 1862 after the Union victory in the Battle of Antietam, Abraham Lincoln announced this order concerning property in slaves in the rebelling states, which took effect January 1, 1863.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Whom did the proclamation free?
2. In which places did this order apply?
3. By what authority did Lincoln issue this order?
4. What military purpose did the order serve?
5. What did Lincoln implore of slaves freed by the order?

The Emancipation Proclamation
Abraham Lincoln

By the President of the United States of America: A Proclamation.

Whereas, on the twenty-second day of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-two, a proclamation was issued by the President of the United States, containing, among other things, the following, to wit:

"That on the first day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, all persons held as slaves within any State or designated part of a State, the people whereof shall then be in rebellion against the United States, shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free; and the Executive Government of the United States, including the military and naval authority thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of such persons, and will do no act or acts to repress such persons, or any of them, in any efforts they may make for their actual freedom."

"That the Executive will, on the first day of January aforesaid, by proclamation, designate the States and parts of States, if any, in which the people thereof, respectively, shall then be in rebellion against the United States; and the fact that any State, or the people thereof, shall on that day be, in good faith, represented in the Congress of the United States by members chosen thereto at elections wherein a majority of the qualified voters of such State shall have participated, shall, in the absence of strong countervailing testimony, be deemed conclusive evidence that such State, and the people thereof, are not then in rebellion against the United States."

Now, therefore I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, by virtue of the power in me vested as Commander-in-Chief, of the Army and Navy of the United States in time of actual armed rebellion against authority and government of the United States, and as a fit and necessary war measure for suppressing said rebellion, do, on this first day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, and in accordance with my purpose so to do publicly proclaimed for the full period of one hundred days, from the day first above mentioned, order and designate as the States and parts of States wherein
The people thereof respectively, are this day in rebellion against the United States, the following, to wit:

Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana, (except the Parishes of St. Bernard, Plaquemines, Jefferson, St. Johns, St. Charles, St. James, Ascension, Assumption, Terrebonne, Lafourche, St. Mary, St. Martin, and Orleans, including the City of New Orleans) Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South-Carolina, North-Carolina, and Virginia, (except the forty-eight counties designated as West Virginia, and also the counties of Berkley, Accomac, Northampton, Elizabeth-City, York, Princess Ann, and Norfolk, including the cities of Norfolk and Portsmouth); and which excepted parts are, for the present, left precisely as if this proclamation were not issued.

And by virtue of the power, and for the purpose aforesaid, I do order and declare that all persons held as slaves within said designated States, and parts of States, are, and henceforward shall be free; and that the Executive government of the United States, including the military and naval authorities thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of said persons.

And I hereby enjoin upon the people so declared to be free to abstain from all violence, unless in necessary self-defense; and I recommend to them that, in all cases when allowed, they labor faithfully for reasonable wages.

And I further declare and make known, that such persons of suitable condition, will be received into the armed service of the United States to garrison forts, positions, stations, and other places, and to man vessels of all sorts in said service.

And upon this act, sincerely believed to be an act of justice, warranted by the Constitution, upon military necessity, I invoke the considerate judgment of mankind, and the gracious favor of Almighty God.
In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington, this first day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the eighty-seventh.

By the President:

Abraham Lincoln

William H. Seward, Secretary of State.
PRESIDENT ABRAHAM LINCOLN (R)

On the Consecration of the
Soldiers’ National Cemetery

SPEECH

November 19, 1863

Soldiers’ National Cemetery | Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

Gettysburg Address

BACKGROUND

Abraham Lincoln delivered these remarks at the dedication of the Union cemetery for those soldiers killed in the Battle of Gettysburg in the summer of 1863.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. For Lincoln, what is the central idea of the American Founding?
2. For what cause did the soldiers buried in Gettysburg give their lives?
3. What were they fighting to defend?
4. To what cause does Lincoln wish for listeners to dedicate themselves?

Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth, on this continent, a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived, and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battle-field of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting-place for those who here gave their lives, that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But, in a larger sense, we can not dedicate—we can not consecrate—we can not hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they here gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.
President Abraham Lincoln (R)
Second Inaugural Address

March 4, 1865
U.S. Capitol | Washington, D.C.

Background

Having been reelected and with the end of the Civil War in sight, Abraham Lincoln delivered this speech at his inauguration to a second term as president.

Guiding Questions

1. According to Lincoln, who caused the Civil War?

2. What role in the war does Lincoln ascribe to God?

3. How does Lincoln think the North should treat the South when the war ends?

Fellow Countrymen:

At this second appearing to take the oath of the presidential office, there is less occasion for
an extended address than there was at the first. Then a statement, somewhat in detail, of a
course to be pursued, seemed fitting and proper. Now, at the expiration of four years, dur-
ing which public declarations have been constantly called forth on every point and phase
of the great contest which still absorbs the attention, and engrosses the energies of the na-
tion, little that is new could be presented. The progress of our arms, upon which all else
chiefly depends, is as well known to the public as to myself; and it is, I trust, reasonably
satisfactory and encouraging to all. With high hope for the future, no prediction in regard
to it is ventured.

On the occasion corresponding to this four years ago, all thoughts were anxiously directed
to an impending civil-war. All dreaded it—all sought to avert it. While the inaugural ad-
dress was being delivered from this place, devoted altogether to saving the Union without
war, insurgent agents were in the city seeking to destroy it without war—seeking to dissolve
the Union, and divide effects, by negotiation. Both parties deprecated war; but one of them
would make war rather than let the nation survive; and the other would accept war rather
than let it perish. And the war came.

One eighth of the whole population were colored slaves, not distributed generally over the
Union, but localized in the Southern part of it. These slaves constituted a peculiar and pow-
erful interest. All knew that this interest was, somehow, the cause of the war. To strengthen,
perpetuate, and extend this interest was the object for which the insurgents would rend the
Union, even by war; while the government claimed no right to do more than to restrict the
territorial enlargement of it. Neither party expected for the war, the magnitude, or the du-
ration, which it has already attained. Neither anticipated that the cause of the conflict might
cease with, or even before, the conflict itself should cease. Each looked for an easier tri-
umph, and a result less fundamental and astounding. Both read the same Bible, and pray
to the same God; and each invokes His aid against the other. It may seem strange that any
men should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of
other men’s faces; but let us judge not that we be not judged. The prayers of both could not be answered; that of neither has been answered fully. The Almighty has His own purposes. "Woe unto the world because of offenses! for it must needs be that offenses come; but woe to that man by whom the offense cometh!" If we shall suppose that American Slavery is one of those offenses which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which, having continued through His appointed time, He now wills to remove, and that He gives to both North and South, this terrible war, as the woe due to those by whom the offense came, shall we discern therein any departure from those divine attributes which the believers in a Living God always ascribe to Him? Fondly do we hope—fervently do we pray—that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue, until all the wealth piled by the bond-man’s two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash, shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so still it must be said "the judgments of the Lord, are true and righteous altogether."

With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation’s wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just, and a lasting peace, among ourselves, and with all nations.
U.S. CONGRESS AND STATES

Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution

December 18, 1865

United States of America

BACKGROUND

The U.S. Congress passed and three-quarters of states ratified the Thirteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution by December 6, 1865, and the amendment was acknowledged as effective by Secretary of State William Seward on December 18, 1865.

ANNOTATIONS

Section 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

Section 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

The House Joint Resolution proposing the 13th amendment to the Constitution, January 31, 1865; Enrolled Acts and Resolutions of Congress, 1789-1999; General Records of the United States Government; Record Group 11; National Archives.
**Background**

The U.S. Congress passed and three-quarters of states ratified the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution by July 21, 1868, and the amendment was acknowledged as effective by Secretary of State William Seward on July 28, 1868.

**Annotations**

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of

---

The House Joint Resolution proposing the 14th amendment to the Constitution, June 16, 1866; Enrolled Acts and Resolutions of Congress, 1789-1999; General Records of the United States Government; Record Group 11; National Archives.
The Fourteenth Amendment

such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

Section 3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice-President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

Section 4. The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.

Section 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.
**U.S. Congress and States**

**Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution**

**Amendment**  
March 30, 1870  
United States of America

**Background**

The U.S. Congress passed and three-quarters of states ratified the Fifteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution by February 3, 1870, and the amendment was acknowledged as effective by Secretary of State Hamilton Fish on March 30, 1870.

**Annotations**  
Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

**Notes & Questions**

---

The House Joint Resolution proposing the 15th amendment to the Constitution, December 7, 1868; Enrolled Acts and Resolutions of Congress, 1789-1999; General Records of the United States Government; Record Group 11; National Archives.
E.D. ESTILLETTE, PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF POLICE

To the Police of Recently Emancipated Negroes

ORDINANCE

July 3, 1865
Opelousas, Louisiana

BACKGROUND

As slavery was outlawed and African Americans were freed in southern states, many communities created new laws and regulations to infringe upon the newfound freedom of former slaves. This is one example of such a “black code” from a town in Louisiana in the first months after the Civil War.

ANNOTATIONS

RELATIVE TO THE POLICE OF RECENTLY EMANCIPATED NEGROES OR FREEDMEN, WITHIN THE CORPORATE LIMITS OF THE TOWN OF OPELOUSAS.

Whereas the relations formerly subsisting between master and slave have become changed by the action of the controlling authorities; and whereas it is necessary to provide for the proper police and government of the recently emancipated negroes or freedmen, in their new relations to the municipal authorities;

Sect. 1. Be it therefore ordained by the Board of Police of the Town of Opelousas: That no negro or freedman shall be allowed to come within the limits of the Town of Opelousas, without special permission from his employer, specifying the object of his visit, and the time necessary for the accomplishment of the same. Whoever shall violate this provision, shall suffer imprisonment and two days work on the public streets, or shall pay a fine of two dollars and fifty cents.

Sect. 2. Be it further ordained that every negro or freedman who shall be found on the streets of Opelousas, after 10 o’clock at night, without a written pass or permit from his

employer, shall be imprisoned and compelled to work five days on the public streets, or pay a fine of five dollars.

Sect. 3. No negro or freedman shall be permitted to rent or keep a house within the limits of the town under any circumstances, and any one thus offending, shall be ejected and compelled to find an employer, or leave the town within twenty-four hours. The lessor or furnisher of the house leased or kept as above, shall pay a fine of ten dollars for each offense.

Sect. 4. No negro or freedman shall reside within the limits of the Town of Opelousas, who is not in the regular service of some white person or former owner, who shall be held responsible for the conduct of said freedman. But said employer or former owner may permit said freedman to hire his time, by special permission in writing, which permission shall not extend over twenty-four hours at any one time. Any one violating the provisions of this section, shall be imprisoned and forced to work for two days on the public streets.

Sect. 5. No negro meetings or congregations of negroes or freedmen, shall be allowed within the limits of the Town of Opelousas, under any circumstances or for any purpose, without the permission of the Mayor or President of the Board. This prohibition is not intended, however, to prevent freedmen from attending the usual Church services conducted by established ministers of religion. Every freedman violating this law shall be imprisoned and made to work five days on the public streets.

Sect. 6. No negro or freedman shall be permitted to preach, exhort or otherwise declaim, to congregations of colored people, without a special permission from the Mayor or President of the Board of Police, under the penalty of a fine of ten dollars or twenty days work on the public streets.

Sect. 7. No freedman, who is not in the military service, shall be allowed to carry fire-arms or any kind of weapons, within the limits of the Town of Opelousas, without the special permission of his employer in writing, and approved by the Mayor or President of the Board of Police. Any one thus offending shall forfeit his weapons and shall be imprisoned and made to work five days on the public streets, or pay a fine of five dollars in lieu of said work.
Sect. 8. No freedman shall sell, barter or exchange any articles of merchandise or traffic, within the limits of Opelousas, without permission in writing from his employer or the Mayor or President of the Board, under the penalty of the forfeiture of said articles, and imprisonment and one day's labor, or a fine of one dollar in lieu of said work.

Sect. 9. Any freedman found drunk within the limits of the town shall be imprisoned and made to labor five days on the public streets, or pay five dollars in lieu of said labor.

Sect. 10. Any freedman not residing in Opelousas, who shall be found within its corporate limits after the hour of 3 o'clock P.M. on Sunday, without a special written permission from his employer or the Mayor, shall be arrested and imprisoned and made to work two days on the public streets, or pay two dollars in lieu of said work.

Sect. 11. All the foregoing provisions apply to freed men and freed women, or both sexes.

Sect. 12. It shall be the special duty of the Mayor or President of the Board, to see that all the provisions of this ordinance are faithfully executed.

Sect. 13. Be it further ordained, That this ordinance to take effect from [and] after its first publication.

Ordained the 3d day of July, 1865,

E. D. ESTILLETTE

President of the Board of Police.

JOS. D. RICHARD, Clerk.
UNIT 5
The Turn of the Century
1877–1919

UNIT PREVIEW

Structure

| LESSON 1    | 1877–1901 | The Gilded Age | 7-8 classes | p. 6  |
| LESSON 2    | 1901–1914 | The Progressive Era | 6-7 classes | p. 18 |
| LESSON 3    | 1914–1919 | The Great War | 6-7 classes | p. 28 |
| APPENDIX A  | Study Guides, Tests, and Writing Assignment | | | p. 38 |
| APPENDIX B  | Primary Sources | | | p. 58 |

Why Teach the Turn of the Century

There perhaps has never been a period of more dramatic transformation in America than the final decades of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth. The ways of life for tens of millions of Americans and immigrants changed frequently and rapidly in but a single lifetime. And amid all that was gained, some things were lost, and new challenges arose. Most poignantly, these years put to the test the country’s faith that the ideas and legacy of the American Founding could still be fruitfully applied in a modern age of industrialization and mass markets.
Enduring Ideas from This Unit

1. The Gilded Age brought a great transformation to the American economy, society, and way of life—a transformation that included unparalleled benefits to the lives of millions of Americans, along with unprecedented challenges.

2. The closing of the frontier in the West marked the end of an era in American history; the pioneering character of American society began to diminish, or shift its focus, as American energies became redirected to overseas interests.

3. A group of reformers and political thinkers known as the Progressives sought to answer challenges associated with the Gilded Age through new ideas about the purpose and structure of government—ideas they themselves considered to be a critique of the American Founding.

4. The Great War was one of the greatest disasters in the history of mankind, and it forever changed America’s place on the world stage.

What Teachers Should Consider

The chief experience students should take away from the study of this unit is the great transformation that Americans living at the turn of the 20th century experienced. In a single lifetime, countless Americans went from a quiet, agrarian nation of dispersed small communities to an industrial and urban giant and world power. The texture of American life, especially for those in cities or near them, changed dramatically.

Students should recognize the great benefits most Americans enjoyed from such changes, especially in their material standard of living. These changes did not “just happen”; entrepreneurial individuals made them happen. We should acknowledge, alongside these advantages, that there were disadvantages that some unskilled workers, small businesses, and new immigrants had to endure.

Students should be directed toward aspects of the American past beyond its urban centers, particularly those of the Eastern Seaboard. There is much to be learned from the histories of the Old West, the frontier, and the American South during these decades, especially regarding U.S. government policy toward Native Americans and the status of African American civil rights.

The challenges of the “Gilded Age” gave rise to new ways of thinking and a new generation of social and political thinkers who sought to solve the problems of the day through a more active government. The Progressives rethought the very concept of government, basing it on a new view of human nature and a “scientific” understanding of government as an activity that should be based on the application of expert knowledge. The changes that Progressives brought to the Constitution and government in the United States in many respects endure to the present day.

Finally, the Great War is of paramount importance in the history of the 20th century, both for the world and for America. So many observers had begun the new century believing that the world was entering a century of peace and enlightenment, but their expectations were cruelly dashed, as the war’s unprecedented destruction left much of Europe in ruins. But at the same time, the power and responsibility the United States assumed in fighting the war established its essential place of leadership in the world order.
How Teachers Can Learn More

**TEXTS**

*A Fierce Discontent*, Michael McGerr  
*The Myth of the Robber Barons*, Burton Folsom  
*The Guns of August*, Barbara Tuchman  
*The First World War*, John Keegan  
*World War I and America*, A. Scott Berg  
*American Heritage: A Reader*, ed. Hillsdale College History Faculty

**ONLINE COURSES** | Online.Hillsdale.edu

*The Great American Story*  
*American Heritage*  
*Civil Rights in American History*  
*Introduction to the Constitution*  
*Constitution 101*  
*Constitution 201*

**Lesson Planning Resources**

**TEACHER RESOURCES**

*Land of Hope*, Wilfred McClay  
*A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope*, Wilfred McClay and John McBride  
*A Student Workbook for Land of Hope*, Wilfred McClay and John McBride  
*A Short History of World War I*, James Stokesbury  
*Fighting the Great War*, Michael Neiberg

**STUDENT RESOURCES**

*Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition*, Wilfred McClay

**PRIMARY SOURCES**

“Surrender,“ Chief Joseph  
“Wealth,” Andrew Carnegie  
“The Triumph of America,” Andrew Carnegie  
“The Cross of Gold,” William Jennings Bryan  
“The March of the Flag,” Albert J. Beveridge  
Platform, American Anti-Imperialist League  
Atlanta Exposition Address, Booker T. Washington  
“The Significance of the Frontier in American History,” Frederick Jackson Turner  
“What Is Progress?”, Woodrow Wilson
“The Presidency,” Theodore Roosevelt
War Message to Congress, Woodrow Wilson
Fourteen Points, Woodrow Wilson
League of Nations Speech, Henry Cabot Lodge
LESSON PLANS, ASSIGNMENTS, AND FORMATIVE QUIZ
Lesson 1 — The Gilded Age

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the rapid changes America underwent in the decades following the Civil War, especially in the realms of industrialization, technology, economics, and foreign policy.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

**Student Texts**
- Primary Sources See below.

**Teacher Texts**
- *Land of Hope* Pages 205–239
- *A Student Workbook for Land of Hope* Pages 120–123, 125–127, 142–143

**Online.Hillsdale.edu**
- *The Great American Story* Lectures 12-13
- *Civil Rights in American History* Lectures 5-6

STUDENT PREPARATION

**Assignment 1:** Students read *Land of Hope (YRE)*, Chapter 1, and prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

**Assignment 2:** Students read *Land of Hope (YRE)*, Chapter 2, and prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

**Assignment 3:** Students read *Land of Hope (YRE)*, Chapters 3-4, and prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

**Geography & Places**
- Pittsburgh
- Great Lakes
- Ellis Island
- Alaska
- North Dakota
- South Dakota
- Montana
- Washington
- Idaho
- Wyoming
- Utah
- Hawaiian Islands
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spain</th>
<th>San Juan Hill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>Manila Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santiago Bay</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Persons**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark Twain</th>
<th>George Armstrong Custer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Edison</td>
<td>Sitting Bull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelius Vanderbilt</td>
<td>Rutherford B. Hayes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Carnegie</td>
<td>James A. Garfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John D. Rockefeller</td>
<td>Grover Cleveland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Pierpont Morgan</td>
<td>William Jennings Bryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Gompers</td>
<td>William McKinley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booker T. Washington</td>
<td>Theodore Roosevelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Washington Carver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Terms and Topics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homestead Act</th>
<th>Tuskegee Institute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>railroads</td>
<td>Plessy v. Ferguson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcontinental Railroad</td>
<td>frontier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industrialization</td>
<td>Battle of Little Bighorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patent</td>
<td>political boss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>steel</td>
<td>labor unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-made man</td>
<td>Populist Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coal</td>
<td>bimetallism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oil refining</td>
<td>Cross of Gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Oil Co.</td>
<td>social gospel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mass production</td>
<td>The Influence of Sea Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>division of labor</td>
<td>upon History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monopoly</td>
<td>USS Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“captains of industry”</td>
<td>yellow journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“robber barons”</td>
<td>Spanish-American War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>philanthropy</td>
<td>Rough Riders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urbanization</td>
<td>Philippine-American War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immigration</td>
<td>Open Door Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pollution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Primary Sources**

| “Surrender,” Chief Joseph |
| “Wealth,” Andrew Carnegie |
| “The Triumph of America,” Andrew Carnegie |
| “The Cross of Gold,” William Jennings Bryan |
| “The March of the Flag,” Albert J. Beveridge |
| Platform, American Anti-Imperialist League |
| Atlanta Exposition Address, Booker T. Washington |
| “The Significance of the Frontier in American History,” Frederick Jackson Turner |
To Know by Heart

“The New Colossus” — Emma Lazarus
“Pledge of Allegiance” — Francis Bellamy
“America the Beautiful” — Katharine Lee Bates

Timeline

1869  Transcontinental Railroad completed
1898  Spanish-American War
1901  Oil discovered in Beaumont, Texas

Images

Historical figures and events
New inventions
The “Golden spike” picture
First professional sports teams
Western settlement under the Homestead Act
Maps of railroad lines over time
Mansions of industrial leaders
Philanthropic buildings
Brooklyn Bridge
First skyscrapers
Cityscapes
Factories and workers
Life in tenement buildings
Immigrants on boats and at Ellis Island
Statue of Liberty construction
First greenbacks
Electoral maps
American battleships
Images and uniforms of Spanish and American officers and soldiers
Depictions of figures at various scenes and moments in battle
Maps: overall strategies, specific battles
Medical equipment
Reenactment photos

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Grenville Dodge’s account of the completion of the Transcontinental Railroad at Promontory Point, Utah
- Thomas Edison’s account of the first successful lightbulb
- Albert Goodwill Spalding’s account of innovations in baseball
James Naismith’s account of inventing basketball
J. P. Morgan’s bailouts of the federal government
Frank Lloyd Wright on first seeing a city
Accounts of the Great Chicago Fire
Jacob Riis photographing life of the poor in the cities
Barton Simonson’s account of the Haymarket Square riot
Immigrant stories
Edward Steiner’s account from Ellis Island
Robert Louis Stevenson’s travel with immigrants on a train from New York to California
Chief White Bull’s account of Custer’s Last Stand at Little Bighorn
The exploits of Jesse James
Hamilton Wick’s account of the Oklahoma Land Rush
Black Elk’s account of the massacre at Wounded Knee
Rutherford B. Hayes’s promotion of Frederick Douglass to marshal in Washington, D.C.
The assassination of James Garfield
William Jennings Bryan’s “Cross of Gold” speech
The explosion of the USS Maine
The surrender of Guam
Theodore Roosevelt and the Rough Riders in the Spanish-American War
Richard Harding Davis’s account of the Battle of San Juan Hill

Questions for the American Mind

- How did America change after the Civil War with respect to the agrarian makeup of its economy, workforce, and population distribution?
- What sorts of technological changes were developed in the late 19th century? Which were the most important and why?
- Why were the railroads so significant to the transformation of the American economy?
- What are some of the beneficial developments produced during the Gilded Age?
- What were some of the characteristics of America’s most successful companies and businessmen? In what ways were they similar and in what ways different?
- What challenges emerged from the technological and economic changes during the Gilded Age?
- What problems did farmers face during the Gilded Age?
- Why did so many people immigrate to the United States in the late 19th century?
- To what extent did immigrants assimilate into the American populace? What are the advantages and disadvantages of this situation?
- How did the relationship between the employer and employee change relative to the size of a business?
- How did labor unions organize, and how did businesses and government officials sometimes respond?
- What was life like for African Americans in the late 19th century?
- What were Booker T. Washington’s ideas for improving conditions for African Americans?
- What did the U.S. Supreme Court rule in *Plessy v. Ferguson*
- What happened in the western United States with respect to relations between Native Americans and the U.S. government?
- What was the nature of the gold standard–bimetallism debates? What groups preferred which standard, and why?
- Who belonged to the Populist Party, and what was its platform?
What was the significance of the frontier in American history? What effects might its “closing” have on America?

How did the idea of a more active foreign policy and imperialism contend with the American Founding and foreign policy precedent?

Where did America expand during the McKinley administration, and why?

How did the Spanish-American War begin, and why was it fought?

For what reasons did the Americans soundly defeat the Spanish in the Spanish-American War?

What issues did America face in the Philippines and Cuba following the Spanish-American War?

How did America’s imperial ventures compare to those of the nations of Europe and of Japan at the time?

Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
- Question 67: Name two promises that new citizens make in the Oath of Allegiance.
- Question 68: How can people become United States citizens?
- Question 117: Name one American Indian tribe in the United States.
- Question 118: Name one example of an American innovation.
- Question 120: Where is the Statue of Liberty?
The lives of Americans underwent an unprecedented transformation in the decades following Reconstruction. Many of the policies and practices of centralized action forged during the Civil War continued and expanded into other parts of the American economy and society. Simultaneously, the entire developed world was undergoing a period of remarkable and rapid technological development. The benefits from these changes were immense, but they also presented a number of new challenges to the lives of ordinary Americans. Students should come to appreciate the great extent of this upheaval and transformation of daily life that Americans experienced within a single lifetime. They should also understand the many benefits of these changes and be asked to consider the balance between those benefits and their costs.

Teachers might best plan and teach The Gilded Age with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Introduce students to Mark Twain and his branding of the final decades of the 19th century as a “gilded age.” Ask students what “gilded” means, then have them think throughout the lesson about why Mark Twain applied this term to these decades—and whether he was right to do so.
- The Gilded Age is one period in teaching American history where the narrative form is more difficult to employ, simply because so much was changing all at once, while isolatable events of great historical import were less common. Because the Gilded Age is a period for which a conventional chronological narrative form is difficult to employ, consider dividing this lesson into halves. First, teach about the major changes in American life, the economy, and society from Reconstruction to 1900, giving students an experience of the rapid and rather disorienting pace of change that defined the period. Then move on to a more chronological treatment of political history during the same years. The political events of the era will remain more muted than in other periods, reflecting the primacy of large structural forces over politics.
- Help students to recognize and understand two critical causes of the great changes America experienced after the Civil War: the use of mass organization and the development of mass production—both derived from fighting and supplying the war. With many of the institutions, policies, skills, and even equipment still in place following the war, it was natural to apply these practices and knowledge to peacetime endeavors, especially in manufacturing. At the same time, a series of new inventions worked together within the mass production mechanisms from wartime America to expand at a breakneck pace the capacity of production, as well as the size of markets.
- In general, help students to understand the significant shift away from agrarianism and toward urban living and working, and how this shift marked a major change in most Americans’ way of life.
- Highlight for students the most significant inventions created or significantly improved during the mid- to late 19th century. These would include, among others: improved railroads (including standard gauges, time zones, the automatic lubricator, and the air brake); the steel cast plow; the mechanical reaper; the light bulb; the flush toilet and sewer system; the elevator brake; the Bessemer process; steel cable; and the telephone. Most such inventions were developed or at least monetized in America. Ask students to imagine life without these things. Also include the inventions that responded to the growing capacity for leisure in the life of the middle class: the gramophone, professional sports, department stores, mail-order retail, amusement parks, etc. With each major invention, explain briefly how it worked, the need it met, and the impact it had. Students should especially appreciate America’s revolutionary patent system, which vigorously protected inventions and innovations—including intellectual property rights—all under the banner of private property.
Above all, spend time on the foundational inventions that made most of the others possible and drove the many changes American life was undergoing. If iron, coal, and textiles undergirded the First Industrial Revolution, then steel, oil, and electricity drove the Second Industrial Revolution. Take the time to explain the importance of these inventions and industries, including the major figures associated with them, such as Andrew Carnegie, John D. Rockefeller, and Thomas Edison.

Review with students the main tenets of the American economic system: free-market capitalism, private property, the rule of law, contract enforcement, and patents. Remind students that this system had largely defined America from colonial times through the Gilded Age and was responsible for much of America’s prosperity, upward mobility, and economic opportunity afforded to its people.

In the course of teaching about these industries, walk students through some of the major economic and business practices that allowed for the tremendous rate of change and the scale of production, such as economies of scale, mass production, and the division of labor. Alongside these practices were general incorporation laws that continued from emergency measures enacted during the Civil War. Thanks to such instruments, capital was easier to raise than ever before, allowing entrepreneurs to take full advantage of the possibilities new technology afforded them.

In discussing the major business leaders of the Gilded Age, present the two disparate ways these leaders are sometimes described: “captains of industry” and “robber barons.” As with all historical figures, teach these figures as the facts lead you. The accomplishments and benefits these men provided are impossible to ignore, while there are also broader questions that might be raised about certain specific business practices. Specificity is key, as in all historical controversies. Discourage your students from making sweeping generalizations, either favorable or unfavorable.

From the conversation on business practices, pivot to other underlying challenges that economic changes brought to American life. This conversation should include the livelihood of small businesses and farmers, working conditions for unskilled laborers, and general life in America’s growing cities. Accompanying these changes and challenges was a massive immigration wave—“nearly 12 million immigrants …[arrived] between 1870 and 1900” (link). Students should understand the many reasons why these immigrants came to America, especially its positive attraction compared to their status in the Old World. Students should appreciate the effects of so many immigrants all at once settling in already crowded cities and joining the urban workforce. They should also learn about the various reasons for ethnic and religious resistance of the native-born to the Catholic, Jewish, and Orthodox immigrants of eastern and southern Europe, and how the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 was the only law in American history to outlaw immigration based solely on national origin. Students should also consider the importance of citizenship education with so many new people added to the country.

Discuss the emergence of some labor unions to advocate for better working conditions and wages. Note also the several major strikes and sometimes violence that accompanied these efforts, such as the Molly Maguires, the Great Railroad Strike, the Haymarket Square riot, the Homestead Strike, and the Pullman Strike.

Teach about the political machines and bosses that emerged in the cities in this period of rapid urban growth.

Consider changes in life outside of America’s major cities. Include in these conversations the status of African Americans, who faced continued discrimination, literacy tests, poll taxes, Jim Crow, convict leasing, and violence, particularly (but not exclusively) in the states of the former Confederacy. Many of these practices were led by members of the Ku Klux Klan as it terrorized
African Americans, immigrants, Catholics, Jews, and Republicans. At the same time, discuss the response of Anna Julia Cooper, Booker T. Washington, and the Tuskegee Institute to these circumstances, and record the successes African Americans achieved in other places in America. Teach also about the U.S. Supreme Court’s declaration in *Plessy v. Ferguson* that discrimination that was “separate, but equal” was constitutional. Students should consider the extent to which such a ruling is consistent with the principles they studied about the American Founding.

- Teach about the American West, from cowboys and cattle drives to the Plains Indians and U.S. government policy toward them. As with the other lessons on relationships between Native Americans, settlers, and the U.S. government, important questions of justice and prudence should be directed toward the actions of all parties.

- Finally, while teaching about the West, briefly share with students the developing art of the American West; the gradual development of an American culture in music; and the literary output of Louisa May Alcott, Mark Twain, Emily Dickinson, Stephen Crane, and Laura Ingalls Wilder.

- Review with students the Compromise of 1877 that put Rutherford B. Hayes in the White House. As for his administration itself, show how it was a welcomed reprieve from the corruption of the Grant administration. In his otherwise uneventful term, Hayes is noteworthy for vetoing legislation against Chinese immigrants and African Americans.

- With the Benjamin Harrison administration, introduce the growing debate over the gold standard vs. bimetallism, which should be viewed along with trusts and tariffs as the defining economic issues of the late 19th century. Students should be made to understand that, although this subject seems a bit esoteric, it was of great importance for ordinary American families.

- Against this backdrop, discuss the rise of the Populist Party and William Jennings Bryan, including his 1896 campaign against William McKinley, during which he delivered his “Cross of Gold” speech at the Democratic National Convention.

- Discuss the new military technology that had been developed since the Civil War, the growing U.S. Navy, the “closing” of the Western frontier, the “social gospel,” and shifts in the European balance of power that further fueled colonization and imperialism among those powers, especially in Africa and Asia. Pages 225-231 of *Land of Hope* are helpful for highlighting America’s first forays into overseas possessions and the inherent tension between this policy and the principles of the American Founding—a tension evident in the debates of the time.

- Teach the Spanish-American War with brevity, in accordance with the way it was fought. Give proper attention to the role of yellow journalism leading up to the war, the tales of Theodore Roosevelt and the Rough Riders, America’s resounding victory, and the challenges that followed the war.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Explain how America changed in the decades following Reconstruction and what accounted for those changes (1-2 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Explain the extent to which American foreign policy under William McKinley both departed from and held to America’s traditional stance toward international affairs (1 paragraph).
Section 1, Quiz #1

Land of Hope, Young Reader’s Edition Vol. 2, Chapter 1

**Directions:** Answer each question.

1. According to the book, what was the purpose of the Grand Review of the Union Armies in 1865?

2. What was America’s first “big business?”

3. In 1879, who had control of 90% of the nation’s oil refining capacity?

4. Who was the man so powerful that even the American economy was dependent on him during the turn of the century?

5. What was a consequence of the standardization of time zones in post-Civil War America?
Reading Quiz

Directions: Answer each question.

1. Name two elements of the daily life of American citizens that deteriorated with the growth of cities.

2. Where did unskilled workers and disoriented immigrants turn to in place of labor unions?

3. By 1890, where was the bulk of American immigration coming from?

4. What kind of neighborhoods did most immigrants live in upon arriving in American cities?

5. What was the shocking declaration made by the 1890 U.S. Census?
DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. What was the style of journalism responsible for inflaming American public opinion in favor of Cuba’s independence from Spain?

2. Who was the U.S. president who declared war against Spain in 1898 over the independence of Cuba?

3. How long did the Spanish-American War last?

4. Whom did President McKinley appoint as the civil governor of the Philippines after the War?

5. What was the Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine?
Lesson 2 — The Progressive Era

1901–1914

6-7 classes

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the issues the Progressive movement sought to address, how its political philosophy compared to that of the American Founding, and how Progressive policy changed American government, politics, and economics.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

**Student Texts**
*Land of Hope, Young Reader’s Edition, Vol. 2* Chapters 5-6
Primary Sources See below.

**Teacher Texts**
*Land of Hope* Pages 240-258
*A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope* Pages 232–239
*A Student Workbook for Land of Hope* Pages 142–145

**Online.Hillsdale.edu**
*The Great American Story* Lectures 14-15
*American Heritage* Lecture 8
*Introduction to the Constitution* Lecture 12
*Constitution 101* Lecture 8
*Constitution 201* Lectures 1-4
*Civil Rights in American History* Lecture 6

**STUDENT PREPARATION**

**Assignment 1:** Students read *Land of Hope (YRE)*, Chapter 5, and prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

**Assignment 2:** Students read *Land of Hope (YRE)*, Chapter 6, and prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

**Geography & Places**
- Panama Canal
- New Mexico
- Oklahoma
- Arizona

**Persons**
- Eugene V. Debs
- W. E. B. DuBois
- Woodrow Wilson
- William Howard Taft
Terms and Topics

- muckrakers
- The Jungle
- The Communist Manifesto
- social Darwinism
- socialism
- Progressivism
- Sherman Antitrust Act
- trust-busting
- Interstate Commerce Act
- The Square Deal
- conservationism

- Roosevelt Corollary
- Bull Moose Party
- The New Freedom
- Election of 1912
- National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)
- Black Wall Street
- eugenics
- San Francisco Earthquake
- 16th Amendment
- 17th Amendment

Primary Sources

- “What Is Progress?”, Woodrow Wilson
- “The Presidency,” Theodore Roosevelt

To Know by Heart

- “I aimed for the public’s heart, and … hit it in the stomach.” — Upton Sinclair
- “Speak softly and carry a big stick.” — Theodore Roosevelt
- “The Road Not Taken” — Robert Frost

Timeline

1901  William McKinley assassinated
       Theodore Roosevelt becomes president
1908  William Howard Taft elected
1912  Woodrow Wilson defeats Taft and Roosevelt
       Flag Day

Images

- Historical figures and events
- Muckraker newspapers and cartoons
- Building the Panama Canal
- National Parks
- Eugenics propaganda

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Biographies and the roles of Woodrow Wilson, Theodore Roosevelt, and William Howard Taft
- Stories of working conditions within various industries
- Pauline Cuiope Pepe’s account of the Triangle Shirtwaist Company fire
- Stories from Theodore Roosevelt’s life
- Jack London’s account of the San Francisco earthquake of 1906
- Theodore Roosevelt’s account of building the Panama Canal
**Questions for the American Mind**

- How did journalists, churches, and charitable organizations seek to address the social challenges that came with a society of mass production, rapid industrialization, and urbanization?
- What were early 20th-century socialists’ main suggestions for controlling what they perceived as the dangers of private businesses, and what counterarguments were offered to their ideas?
- What contributions did Woodrow Wilson make to Progressivism, both as a thinker and as president?
- How did Progressives come to view human nature, history, and government in “Darwinian” terms, as a continual process of evolutionary improvement?
- What did Progressives mean by equality, and why did they believe equality of opportunity and dignity for ordinary citizens necessitated a powerfully activist government?
- How did Progressives critique individualism and the power of special interests, monopolies, and the wealthy in politics?
- In what ways did Progressives critique the Constitution as being too slow, mechanical, and at odds with itself, as presented in their critique of the separation of powers and of checks and balances?
- Why did Progressives believe that many of the Founders’ worries over the dangers of tyranny (especially majority tyranny) and constitutional limits on governmental power were outdated?
- What was “government by expertise,” and why did the Progressives argue for it?
- What were the problems some argued would arise through centralized decisions made by knowledgeable yet unelected experts? How did they compare to problems arising through dispersed decisions made by elected and accountable officials?
- In foreign policy, why did Progressives believe the world would become freer and more peaceful with the spread of democracy and international institutions?
- How did Progressives reframe the president as a visionary and rhetorical leader who sets the legislative agenda and guides general legislation through Congress?
- How did Theodore Roosevelt embrace Progressivism in his politics, in his presidential actions addressing the issues of the day, and in his foreign policy positions?
- What were the main ideas of W. E. B. DuBois? How were they both alike and different from those of other commentators on improving the condition of African Americans?
- How did the practice of eugenics fit with Progressives’ ideas on human improvement, government, and rights?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 5: How are changes made to the U.S. Constitution?
  - Question 32: Who elects U.S. senators?

**Keys to the Lesson**

As America entered the 20th century, economic and social changes moved reformers toward new ideas, particularly about human nature, the purpose of government, and consequently the form of government institutions. Those who developed and adopted these beliefs worked to change American government. Their loosely coordinated social, political, and intellectual movement became known as Progressivism. Adherents to this new political philosophy explicitly critiqued in their own words some of the fundamental presumptions of the American Founders’ political theory. Students should understand what
challenges the Progressives sought to address, the substance of their new philosophy, and how they ultimately changed American government.

Teachers might best plan and teach The Progressive Era with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Review from the previous lesson the challenges that came with industrialization and urbanization during the Gilded Age. Many of these challenges were not new, but were, like so many other things, multiplied on a mass scale as the American economy rapidly grew and changed.
- Highlight those Progressives who did investigative and advocacy work, including muckraker journalists and those who served the poor, workers, and immigrants in charity.
- Briefly talk about the Progressive idea of Christianity as primarily a movement for social reform, especially through government action—a view best expressed by the term “the social gospel,” which shaped public debate over religion for much of the 20th century.
- Clarify with students that many of the issues highlighted by Progressives—such as child labor, workplace and consumer safety, problems of conservation, and monopolies—were issues that many Founders also recognized as inappropriate or unjust in their own time. Progressives, however, believed the federal government should address these issues, instead of only state and local governments, or private institutions (such as individuals, charities, businesses, consumers, churches, and civic associations), as many of the Founders generally maintained.
- Consider with students the similarities between the ideas of the French Revolution, Marxism, Hegelianism, and social Darwinism. As they themselves acknowledged, Progressives were influenced by certain elements of each of these political philosophies, either in their critiques of the Founding and the issues of the day or in their confidence in changing government and society. Included in this conversation should be the work of socialist and anarchist groups in the United States, which were distinct from Progressivism but shared many critiques of modern America and some ideas on how to address them.
- Introduce Woodrow Wilson as a key Progressive theorist. Include his biography and his writings during the 1880s and 1890s on these topics.
- Help students consider Progressivism’s general critique of the Founders’ theory of rights. The Progressives generally argued against the insistence that rights were natural, that they were part of what made one human, and that they existed only at the individual level. Instead, leading Progressive thinkers maintained that rights were conditioned on social circumstances and belonged to groups of people, usually organized by class. They feared that the Founding system of equally protected natural rights seemed to favor the wealthy and powerful. Progressives believed that government should redefine rights according to class or group, and should not necessarily protect rights equally when it came to the wealthy and other “special interests” if equality required it. Indeed, since rights were not based on natural personhood, they were instead derived from elsewhere, as determined, distributed, secured, and—if necessary—revoked by government. Students should consider the extent to which this position aligned or contrasted with leading Founders’ understanding of unalienable rights grounded in human nature.
- Review with students the American Founders’ understanding of human nature. In brief, leading Founders understood human nature to be fixed and unchanging, good but also flawed, and thus tending toward becoming corrupted by power. In response to these tendencies of human nature, government must guard against the opposite dangers of lawlessness and tyranny, accounting for the realities of human nature and rejecting the possibility of utopia. The Constitution, therefore, did not deny, demonize, or elevate human nature, but rather tried to channel human energy and interests into constructive institutions while mitigating man’s
baser tendencies. The Constitution was constructed on a deep understanding of fixed human nature and was born from the Founders’ prudence, experience, and knowledge of history.

- Share with students that while both the Founders and Progressives believed in a moral foundation to politics, Progressives viewed the above-mentioned understanding of human nature and government as overly pessimistic and simplistic. Progressives generally thought of human nature not as fixed but as evolving toward betterment—the core idea from which the movement’s name is derived. When looking at technological gains, improvements in the standard of living, and the general pace of scientific discovery, Progressives believed that these factors demonstrated that human beings, and even human nature itself, would also improve. Moreover, government ought to be a key agent in that improvement and perfection. Progressives, however, resisted the Founders’ argument that government’s primary purpose was to secure unchanging rights and maintain a framework for self-government. Instead, they held that the purpose of government was to keep up with evolving rights and constant social change.

- Explain to students how the Progressives departed from what they considered the negative understanding of rights and equality, i.e., that justice and morality require that the natural rights of individuals be equally protected. Instead, the Progressives viewed government as a positive force not only to protect rights but also to empower people and grant groups of people special advantages in order to fulfill the potential outcomes of having certain rights. For example, it was not enough to be free to earn a living if there was no job by which to earn it. Government must not only preserve the right to have a job, but also supply the job itself if necessary.

- Emphasize for students how such a relatively idealistic philosophy and view of human nature might lead one to assume that the bad qualities of human nature (such as a desire for political power or human fallibility) are not a permanent problem, and that one thus need not worry as the Founders did about the accumulation of power in any one place. James Madison’s concern that “[t]he accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hands, whether of one, a few, or many, and whether hereditary, self[-]appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny” (link) therefore becomes far less of a concern to Progressives than it was to the Founders. Were the Progressives right to see matters in this way?

- Make sure students appreciate the shift in the purpose and operation of government under such a view: government is no longer [1] the defender of certain fundamental rights, rights that exist prior to government itself; [2] limited in size to basic functions (lawmaking, executing law, and adjudicating law); and [3] limited in core responsibilities (such as maintaining courts of law and the nation’s security). Rather, government is to be a central active force for change in America, bringing about personal fulfillment of individuals and progress for society. Moreover, these ends were meant to be attained not merely in domestic matters, but also on the world stage in foreign affairs.

- Talk about the Progressive vision for practical politics. A more optimistic view of human nature made them supportive of direct democratic rule. A prime example of this change was the 17th Amendment, which implemented the direct election of senators by the people. The use of initiative, referendum, and recall at the state level are other examples.

- Help students to understand the role of elected officials in this new paradigm. Elected officials were not merely to reflect consent and refine the views of the people, but rather to show (or convince) the people of what they should truly want through the effective use of rhetoric. Progressives were especially interested in making the president the national leader of popular opinion.

- Consider with students how this emphasis on direct democracy could be undermined by actual experience. “Politics” became about expressing general ideas and establishing popular support
to get those ideas codified into law. Separate from the democratic process is the difficult task of turning these general ideas into actual governance. The Progressives (particularly Woodrow Wilson) called this task “administration.”

- Explain how the Progressives argued that the technical and time-consuming work of actually carrying out the broad, general ideas of the law—detailing how it is to be done, implementing the laws, and making sure those laws are enforced to achieve their objectives—is not the work of Congress or even the president. Rather, a new body of experts and bureaucrats do the real work of governing (i.e., administration) apart from the realm of politics. Congress would delegate some of its lawmaking power to these bureaucrats, most of whom would exist under the executive branch and could thus execute the “laws” or regulations they made (for example, clean air and water experts would create the specific details of the respective laws). The president can also delegate his power to enforce the laws. The bureaucrats may also assume quasi-judicial powers and have their own courts to adjudicate claims against their own laws and regulations. This shift of legislative, executive, and judicial powers away from the branches in which these powers had been separately vested by the people through the Constitution, as well as the accumulation of unelected officials in various departments and agencies, both amounted to the second great shift in the Progressive worldview: government needed to be rearranged through the creation of the administrative state in order to circumvent the Constitution’s political checks and bring about “progress.”

- Stress for students the importance of this shift away from government by representatives of the people to government by bureaucratic expertise. Ask them to consider the extent to which it is compatible with the principle of representative and limited self-government on which the Founders established the United States.

- Emphasize how the advent of the administrative state changed the Founders’ careful arrangement in which powers were separated and dispersed through checks and balances and federalism. All three types of government power (legislative, executive, and judicial) are instead consolidated into bureaucratic agencies that are, in fact, removed from the people. This is done in the name of efficiency—trusting in improved human nature and scientific expertise to achieve higher aims via government than the Founding generation ever thought possible. The Progressives’ confidence in expert knowledge, centralized planning, and improved human nature ensured that only just and effective regulations would be made, without the risk of corruption, incompetence, or tyranny.

- Teach students about the several pieces of Progressive legislation that were enacted at the federal level even before government institutions were adjusted, especially the Pendleton Civil Service Act that ushered in the permanent bureaucracy after the assassination of President James Garfield, the Sherman Antitrust Act, and the Interstate Commerce Act.

- With Theodore Roosevelt’s presidency, note for students that the Progressive movement had adherents in both political parties. As for Roosevelt himself, discuss his colorful biography and captivating personality. When teaching his presidency, highlight his embrace of the Progressive view of “politics,” his desire to use the power of government to regulate business, his efforts in conservation, and his keen interest in a more active foreign policy, including his “Roosevelt Corollary” to the Monroe Doctrine.

- Discuss certain famous regulations and busted trusts, such as the Pure Food and Drug Act, the Meat Inspection Act, and the breakups of the Standard Oil Company and the Northern Securities railroad trust.

- Explain the administration of William Howard Taft and the subsequently contentious election of 1912, in which Woodrow Wilson—a Progressive “mastermind,” as it were—was elected president. After Republican critics of Progressivism blocked Theodore Roosevelt’s nomination
for the party, Roosevelt’s formation of the Bull Moose third party split the Republican vote and allowed Wilson to win the election as a Democrat.

- Discuss the Niagara Movement and the work of W. E. B. DuBois: his appeal to a liberal education as part of the uplift of African Americans; his concept of the “talented tenth”; and the creation of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Compare these efforts and ideas to those of other African American leaders, such as Booker T. Washington.
- Have students explore the extent to which early Progressives, and especially Progressive leaders, sought to advance or hinder civil rights for African Americans and women.
- Mention how an aspect of Progressivism was its support for eugenics, based on its confidence that science and government could help society evolve past criminality and the need to support those whom they considered to be “undesirable.” This movement was later partially backed by the Supreme Court, especially by Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr. in Buck v. Bell (1927), and led to the creation of groups such as the American Eugenics Society.
- Help students to understand the various changes the Progressives made to the functioning of the government. Include in this treatment the 16th and 17th Amendments, as well as the creation of the Federal Reserve System.

STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS

**Assignment 1:** Compare and contrast Progressive ideas with those of the American Founding (1-2 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Describe examples of Progressive ideas being implemented during the Progressive era. Explain how these changes impacted American society (1-2 paragraphs).
Reading Quiz

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. Who was the political reformer and powerful public speaker who almost won the 1896 presidential election?

2. What dramatic reforms did Mayor Tom Johnson make in the city of Cleveland?

3. What Progressive form of government had been adopted by 300 cities by 1923?

4. What was the “Wisconsin Idea?”

5. What are the two different Progressive approaches to reforming modern industry for the benefit of the public interest, as noted in the book?
Reading Quiz

The Turn of the Century | Lesson 2, Quiz #2
Land of Hope, Young Reader’s Edition Vol.2, Chapter 6

**Directions:** Answer each question.

1. What was Theodore Roosevelt’s theory of the presidency called?

2. What two acts were passed in response to the public outrage about the meatpacking industry incited by Upton Sinclair’s book *The Jungle*?

3. Of his many acts as President, which one was Theodore Roosevelt most proud of?

4. Who were the three high-profile presidential candidates in the election of 1912?

5. What were the two troubling problems with Progressivism made apparent early in Woodrow Wilson’s presidency?
DIRECTIONS: Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. What sorts of technological changes were developed in the late 19th century? Which were the most important and why?

2. What were some of the characteristics of America’s most successful companies and businessmen? In what ways were they similar and in what ways different?

3. What happened in the western United States with respect to relations between Native Americans and the U.S. government?

4. What were early 20th-century socialists’ main suggestions for controlling what they perceived as the dangers of private businesses? What counterarguments were offered to their ideas?

5. What legal reforms did Progressives pursue to deal with problems of urbanization and industrialization?
Lesson 3 — The Great War

1914–1919

6-7 classes

Lesson Objective

Students learn about the start of the Great War, America’s neutrality and eventual declaration of war, the history of the war, and the Treaty of Versailles.

Teacher Preparation

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts

Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Vol. 2 Chapters 7-8
Primary Sources See below.

Teacher Texts

Land of Hope Pages 259-275
A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope Pages 249-257
A Student Workbook for Land of Hope Pages 155-159
A Short History of World War I Fighting the Great War

Online.Hillsdale.edu

The Great American Story Lectures 16-17
American Heritage Lecture 9

Student Preparation

Assignment 1: Students read Land of Hope (YRE), Chapter 7, and prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 2: Students read Land of Hope (YRE), Chapter 8, and prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Core Content in This Lesson

Geography & Places

Austria-Hungary Ardennes Forest
Ottoman Empire Soviet Union
Balkans Argonne Forest
Serbia

Persons

Orville and Wilbur Wright Franz Ferdinand
Henry Ford Wilhelm II
Nicholas II  
Winston Churchill  
John Pershing  
Vladimir Lenin  
Susan B. Anthony

**Terms and Topics**
- airplane
- assembly line
- nationalism
- militarism
- balance of power
- Eastern Question
- reserve system
- industrial warfare
- automobile
- ultimatum
- Allied Powers
- Central Powers
- two-front war
- Schlieffen Plan
- trench warfare
- machine gun
- barbed wire
- No Man’s Land
- war of attrition
- unrestricted submarine warfare
- *Lusitania*
- Battle of Gallipoli
- Battle of Verdun
- Battle of the Somme
- Armenian genocide
- Zimmerman Telegram
- Bolshevik Revolution
- Sedition Act
- tank
- Second Battle of the Marne
- Meuse-Argonne Offensive
- Fourteen Points
- Treaty of Versailles
- League of Nations

**Primary Sources**
- War Message to Congress, Woodrow Wilson
- Fourteen Points, Woodrow Wilson
- League of Nations Speech, Henry Cabot Lodge

**To Know by Heart**
- “The Soldier” —Rupert Brooke
- “The world must be made safe for democracy.” —Woodrow Wilson
- “Over There” —George Cohan
- “In Flanders Fields” —John McCrae

**Timeline**
- 1914–1918  The Great War
- June 28, 1914  Archduke Franz Ferdinand assassinated
- 1915  Battle of Gallipoli
- 1916  Battles of Verdun and the Somme; Woodrow Wilson reelected
- 1917  U.S. declaration of war; Bolshevik Revolution
- 1918  Hundred Days Offensive
- November 11 (1918) Veterans Day (Armistice Day)

**Images**
- Historical figures and events
- First flight and airplanes
- First assembly lines
- Union and Confederate veterans at Gettysburg in 1913
- Images and uniforms of Allied and Central Powers officers and soldiers
- Depictions and photographs of figures at various scenes and moments in battle
Video footage of soldiers
Trench warfare
Maps: alliances, overall strategies, specific battles
Military equipment and weaponry
War propaganda
Medical equipment
Reenactment photos
Facsimiles of documents and letters
Home front and factory production
Wounded veterans
Depictions of the sinking of the *Lusitania*
Destruction from the war
Postwar maps

**STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART**

- Orville Wright’s account of the first flight
- Henry Ford’s description of the first assembly line
- Borijove Jevtic’s account of the assassination of Austria-Hungary Archduke Franz Ferdinand by the Serbian terrorist organization, the Black Hand
- Nicholas II’s exaggerated support for Serbia against Austria-Hungary’s ultimatum
- The Willy-Nicky Telegrams
- Helmuth von Moltke’s deceptions of Wilhelm II regarding mobilization against France
- German atrocities in Belgium
- The French capture of a map of the Schlieffen Plan
- Alexander von Kluck’s erroneous turn to the east of Paris
- Paris taxis taking reinforcements to the First Battle of the Marne
- Life in trenches and trench warfare, including firsthand accounts from any of the following figures: Leonard Thompson, Hugh Walpole, Oskar Kokoschka, Robert Graves, John Walker, H. H. Munro, William Pressey, Edwin Vaughan, et al.
- Enduring machine gun fire, artillery bombardments, and gas attacks
- The Christmas Truce
- Walther Schwieger’s account of the sinking of the *Lusitania*
- The zeppelin bombing of London
- The Red Baron
- Eddie Rickenbacker’s accounts of his dogfights
- Ernest Francis’ account of the Battle of Jutland
- Grigori Rasputin and the Romanovs
- The February and Bolshevik Revolutions
- Bert Chaney’s account of the first tanks at the Somme
- Pavel Medvedev’s account of the assassination of the Romanovs
- The Lost Battalion
- Sergeant Alvin York
- Ambulance driver James McConnell
- Harry Truman’s service commanding a field gun battery
- Elmer Sherwood’s account of Americans in battle in 1918
- The Fighting Eighth Army Infantry and the Harlem Hellfighters
- Harold Nicolson’s account of the signing of the Treaty of Versailles
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- How did Germany’s unification and military production affect the balance of power in Europe?
- What was the Eastern Question and its significance to Europe?
- What military and nationalist ideas emerged during the late 19th century in Europe?
- How did European alliances change after the ascension of Kaiser Wilhelm II in Germany?
- Why was Franz Ferdinand assassinated?
- What were the key decisions that led from Franz Ferdinand’s assassination to war a month later?
- What did the initial predictions about the war entail?
- Why did the Germans want to avoid a two-front war?
- How were the Americans, though neutral, really only helping the Allies?
- What three elements of trench warfare made attacking a position so deadly?
- Why did German U-boat U-20 sink the British luxury liner Lusitania?
- Why did the Allies launch the Dardanelles Campaign? Why did it fail?
- For which reasons did generals continue the fight at Verdun and the Somme for months on end?
- Why did the leaders of European nations and armies fight and continue to fight the Great War?
- What is unrestricted submarine warfare, and why did the Germans resume it in February 1917?
- For what two main reasons did the United States declare war on Germany in 1917?
- How did the February Revolution come about in Russia?
- What tactical innovations did the Allies test out in 1917?
- How did the tank eventually solve the problems of trench warfare?
- How did the October or Bolshevik Revolution come about?
- Who won the first half of 1918, and who won the second half?
- How did the Allies stop the German U-boat threat?
- For what reasons was the Allies’ Hundred Days Offensive so successful?
- What were Woodrow Wilson’s main ideas as outlined in his Fourteen Points?
- What were the negotiations like at the Versailles Peace Conference?
- Why did Woodrow Wilson struggle to gain American support for his League of Nations?
- What were three main ways that the Treaty of Versailles changed the map of Europe?
- In what ways did the Treaty of Versailles punish Germany?
- Why might it be said that Germany was “forced” to sign the Treaty of Versailles?
- Compare and contrast Europe before and after the Great War, politically, geographically, culturally, and philosophically.
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 100: Name one war fought by the United States in the 1900s.
  - Question 101: Why did the United States enter World War I?
  - Question 118: Name one example of an American innovation.

KEYS TO THE LESSON

The Great War (later known as the First World War or World War I) is one of the greatest tragedies of the 20th century, even in all of human history. It has been eclipsed in the collective memory of the world by World War II. But at the time it was fought, the Great War’s beginnings, rate of slaughter, and lasting effects had no parallel (as that name implies), and these would prove arguably more senseless than that which followed it. The fact that the Great War appeared almost out of nowhere at a time when much of the Western world believed mankind was on the verge of a kind of utopian 20th century makes the war
all the more remarkable to study. For the purposes of American history, the war would catapult the United States onto the world stage, forever changing its history and its role in the world. While this study focuses especially on American actions toward the belligerent powers and then its own fighting in the conflict, there is plenty for students to learn about Europe and the broader war to give the proper context to understand America and the Great War.

Teachers might best plan and teach The Great War with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Provide a brief background to European political history since the unifications of Italy and then, especially, Germany. In short, the unification of Germany following Prussia’s resounding military defeat of France in 1871 upset Europe’s post-Napoleonic balance of power. It meant that a sizeable German industrial powerhouse with a strong Prussian military organization was now anchored in the middle of Europe. Traditional rivalries with Russia and a vengeful France made for an uneasy peace across Europe. Meanwhile, the waning of the Ottoman Empire left a power vacuum in the Balkans, amid which Slavic nationalists appealed to their fellow Slavs in Russia against the encroachments of Germanic Austria-Hungary. Both Russia and Austria-Hungary sought ethnic influence in the Balkans, partly to stave off their own declines and internal troubles. Meanwhile, the industrialization of Europe was directed not only to peaceful goods but also to new industrial weapons by the millions, including a German navy that was racing to match the traditional top naval power, the United Kingdom. New military war colleges and generals believed this new technology and the proliferation of the Napoleonic reserve system would demand decisive, quick, and total war in order to achieve victory. Against the backdrop of decades of distrust among European leaders, alliances were discreetly made behind the scenes. In the end, these alliances wove Europe into one great tripwire with a very short fuse and plenty of powder. Contrary to the “great illusion” that war was impossible and a utopia was coming, we see in retrospect that all that was needed was one misstep in a seemingly isolated incident to unleash a war the likes of which the world had never experienced before.

- Review the achievements of the Gilded Age, especially those that improved the material standard of living of Americans and, in this case, Europeans. This should include new instruction on the Wright Brothers’ invention of the airplane in 1903 and Henry Ford’s assembly line system for mass-producing the automobile, begun in 1908. Add to this review Progressive ideas of ever-improving human nature, human knowledge, and government administration—ideas that were widely shared among elite ruling classes around the Western world. Many European and American thinkers believed the world was on the cusp of a utopian future, in which government power would not go astray and war was essentially impossible.

- Begin the war discussion with a careful account of the assassination of Franz Ferdinand, as well as the events from his death to the United Kingdom’s eventual declaration of war almost two months later. Pay special attention to the roles of figures such as Kaiser Wilhelm II of Germany, the Russian General Staff, and German General Helmuth von Moltke. Dwell also on key decisions such as Germany’s “blank check” to their fellow Germans in Austria-Hungary, Russia’s mobilization of its army, and von Moltke’s missteps—willful and otherwise—regarding German mobilization against France.

- Have students think through and compare the various advantages and disadvantages each side had at the outset of the war and how these shifted during it. Having students record simple notes in a “T-Chart” can be effective for this part of the lesson.

- Build students’ familiarity with the style of warfare in 1914, and show them plenty of images to do so. Students need this foundation for their subsequent study of battles. This helps them to imagine and understand what happens in battle and to appreciate the courage of soldiers fighting on both sides.
Present to students explanations of each side’s strategy at various stages of the war and the tactics and battle plans employed in specific battles. Have students track strategic changes on a map of Europe during the Great War. Spend time especially covering the first presumptions and strategies of the war, including the beliefs that the war would be one of rapid movement, that artillery the offensive would be keys to victory, and that the fighting itself would be over relatively quickly. This would change into a defensive war of attrition made possible by trenches, barbed wire, and machine guns. Students should understand why these three modern features of warfare combined to form almost impregnable lines of defense.

As with any conflict, dwell on the key contributions of both leaders and common soldiers in the war, especially Helmuth von Moltke, Wilhelm II, Nicholas II, Paul von Hindenburg, Douglas Haig, Winston Churchill, Woodrow Wilson, and John Pershing.

Teach the war in some detail, especially the major battles and military campaigns. Students should understand how the battles came to be, the key stories, factors, and moments from the battle itself, and the significance of their various outcomes to subsequent events. Employ battle maps often, and have students track battles and campaigns on a map of Europe during the Great War. *A Short History of World War I* and *Fighting the Great War* are both great aids for teaching these battles; students may enjoy reading select accounts of battles from these works, too.

Help students to note major themes that might loosely describe each year of the war: opening salvos, the near capture of Paris, and the race to the sea in 1914; stalemate in 1915; fruitless efforts to break the stalemate in 1916, constituting a war of attrition; the Russian upheaval and Allied experimentation in 1917; and the German offensive followed by American- and tank-led counterattacks in 1918 that ultimately led to the armistice.

As the war devolved into trench warfare, consider with students the American position. As with the War of 1812, the Americans sought to trade with all parties possible while remaining neutral. The British blockade of largely landlocked Germany made this trading impossible for the Germans; as a result, American trade overwhelmingly benefited the British and the Allies. The Germans believed they were forced to disrupt this trade by sinking neutral ships sailing to the United Kingdom. After the sinking of the *Lusitania* in 1915, the ensuing outcry nearly led America to declare war, but Woodrow Wilson was able to convince Germany to halt “unrestricted submarine warfare.” Wilson was committed to staying out of the war and campaigned on that pledge in 1916, winning reelection. But the resumption of unrestricted submarine warfare in early 1917, along with the intercepted Zimmerman Telegram, eventually brought the United States into the war. Despite his initial reluctance, Wilson saw America’s entry into the war as an opportunity to apply his Progressive ideas to foreign policy and the world order. Study with students Wilson’s stated reasons for going to war in his War Message to Congress, especially as reflecting his Progressive thought and echoing the opening characterization of the war as a “war to end all wars.”

While discussing America’s entry into the war, be sure to distinguish between the February Revolution in Russia— in which democratic forces forced out the Russian monarchy— and the October/Bolshevik Revolution— in which Bolshevik communists overthrew the new democratic government via military coup. Abetted by Germany— who enabled Vladimir Lenin to return to Russia to seize power— the latter event removed Russia from the war, casting it into a multiyear civil war, while Germany was finally free to fight a one-front war just as American troops were arriving in meaningful numbers. Taking some time to study communism in action in Russia will be fruitful for teaching the rest of American history in subsequent units, especially noting that the Communists immediately looked to expand their revolution into the rest of Europe and beyond.
• Note with students how the first months of 1918 saw impressive German advances with Russia now absent, but the presence of tanks *en masse*, the perfection of the rolling barrage, and most importantly the American troops—with their freshness, daring, innovative form of fighting, and industrial backing—turned the war for the Allies.

• Read with students Woodrow Wilson’s Fourteen Points and discuss his vision for a world after the “war to end all wars.” Students should be asked to identify the Progressive tenets intrinsic to the Points, but also the paradoxical encouragement of nationalism through the idea of “self-determination.” Point out that the promises of the Fourteen Points were key to convincing the Germans to sign the armistice.

• Describe the Versailles peace negotiations, especially the vindictive desire of the United Kingdom and France to punish Germany, while Woodrow Wilson was largely sidelined. Back in the United States, discuss Wilson’s campaign to attract support for the League of Nations, his unorthodox methods for doing so, and his ultimate failure and eventual debilitating stroke. In covering the terms of the Treaty of Versailles—which Germany was effectively forced to sign—discuss whether the terms accurately reflected the facts of the war’s beginning or the extent to which Germany was actually defeated at its end. Note also the absence of many of Wilson’s Fourteen Points—which the Germans had originally requested as a condition of halting the fighting—and the ongoing blockade of Germany. Does this raise questions of how free the Germans really were in signing a treaty that treated them as the clearly defeated and guilty power?

• Recap the war by considering major statistics, including the vast number of casualties and fatalities on each side, and how it transformed Europe and America in opposite ways. Overall, note the tremendous disillusionment with the idea of inevitable human progress, as well as with Europe’s traditional heritage and institutions.

• Conclude the lesson with a conversation on why the war began and, perhaps more importantly, why it continued, focusing especially on the ideas of European leaders in light of the recent changes in philosophical thought.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1**: Explain how the Great War began, from the circumstances in Europe prior to the assassination of Franz Ferdinand through the United Kingdom’s declaration of war (1-2 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2**: Tell the story of the United States’ involvement in the Great War and the Treaty of Versailles (1-2 paragraphs).
Reading Quiz

The Turn of the Century | Lesson 3, Quiz #1
Land of Hope, Young Reader’s Edition Vol. 2, Chapter 7

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question.

1. When World War I began, what solemn declaration did President Wilson issue on August 4, 1914?

2. To whom did President Wilson boldly address his speech on January 22, 1917?

3. What risky German decision made President Wilson finally decide to pursue a declaration of war in 1917?

4. What did the Creel Committee attempt to accomplish?

5. What two laws did Congress and President Wilson pass in response to public opposition of America’s war effort?
Reading Quiz

The Turn of the Century | Lesson 3, Quiz #2
Land of Hope, Young Reader’s Edition Vol.2, Chapter 8

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. Who served as the commander of the American Expeditionary Forces in World War I?

2. On what date did the Germans sign an armistice?

3. What was the total number of military and civilian casualties at the end of the war?

4. What was stated in Article 231 of the Treaty of Versailles?

5. President Wilson arguably lost the election of 1920 by focusing all of his energy on which element of his “Fourteen Points”?
APPENDIX A

Study Guides

Tests

Writing Assignment
Study Guide A—Unit 5, Test #1
Lesson 1 | The Gilded Age

Test on __________

**Timeline**

*When given chronological dates, match events from a list to the years or dates that they happened.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>Transcontinental Railroad completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Spanish-American War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Oil discovered in Beaumont, TX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Geography and Places**

*Identify each on a map and/or tell where it is and explain its significance.*

- Pittsburgh
- Great Lakes
- Ellis Island
- Alaska
- North Dakota
- South Dakota
- Montana
- Washington
- Idaho
- Wyoming
- Utah
- Hawaiian Islands
- Spain
- Cuba
- Puerto Rico
- Santiago Bay
- San Juan Hill
- Philippines
- Manila Bay
- China

**Persons**

*Identify each, provide biographical details, and explain what he or she thought or did in specific periods or events.*

- Mark Twain
- Thomas Edison
- Cornelius Vanderbilt
- Andrew Carnegie
- John D. Rockefeller
- J. Pierpont Morgan
- Samuel Gompers
- Booker T. Washington
- George Washington Carver
- George Armstrong Custer
- Sitting Bull
- Rutherford B. Hayes
- James A. Garfield
- Grover Cleveland
- William Jennings Bryan
- William McKinley
- Theodore Roosevelt

**Terms and Topics**
Identify each and explain its significance to the period of history studied.

Homestead Act
railroads
Transcontinental Railroad
industrialization
patent
steel
self-made man
coal
oil refining
Standard Oil Co.
mass production
division of labor
monopoly
“captains of industry”
“robber barons”
philanthropy
urbanization
immigration
pollution
Tuskegee Institute
Plessy v. Ferguson
frontier
Battle of Little Bighorn
political boss
labor unions
Populist Party

bimetallism
Cross of Gold
social gospel
The Influence of Sea Power upon History
USS Maine
yellow journalism
Spanish-American War
Rough Riders
Philippine-American War
Open Door Policy

Primary Sources

Based on annotations and notes from seminar conversations, be able to answer questions on each primary source. While you will not necessarily be asked why each primary source was created, what it did or argued, and what its effects were, being able to answer these kinds of questions will make you well prepared.

“Surrender,” Chief Joseph
“Wealth,” Andrew Carnegie
“The Triumph of America,” Andrew Carnegie
“The Cross of Gold,” William Jennings Bryan
“The March of the Flag,” Albert Beveridge
Platform, American Anti-Imperialist League
Atlanta Exposition Address, Booker T. Washington
“The Significance of the Frontier in American History,” Frederick Jackson Turner

To Know by Heart

Fill in missing words and/or identify the speaker and context.

“The New Colossus” — Emma Lazarus
“Pledge of Allegiance” — Francis Bellamy
“America the Beautiful” — Katharine Lee Bates
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be 3rd grade students.

- Grenville Dodge’s account of the completion of the Transcontinental Railroad at Promontory Point, Utah
- Accounts of the Great Chicago Fire
- Jacob Riis photographing life of the poor in the cities
- Immigrant stories
- Edward Steiner’s account from Ellis Island
- Chief White Bull’s account of Custer’s Last Stand at Little Bighorn
- Black Elk’s account of the massacre at Wounded Knee
- William Jennings Bryan’s “Cross of Gold” speech
- The explosion of the USS Maine
- Theodore Roosevelt and the Rough Riders in the Spanish-American War
- Richard Harding Davis’s account of the Battle of San Juan Hill

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.

- How did America change after the Civil War with respect to the agrarian makeup of its economy, workforce, and population distribution?
- What sorts of technological changes were developed in the late 19th century? Which were the most important and why?
- Why were the railroads so significant to the transformation of the American economy?
- What are some of the beneficial developments produced during the Gilded Age?
- What were some of the characteristics of America’s most successful companies and businessmen? In what ways were they similar and in what ways different?
- What challenges emerged from the technological and economic changes during the Gilded Age?
- What problems did farmers face during the Gilded Age?
- Why did so many people immigrate to the United States in the late 19th century?
- To what extent did immigrants assimilate into the American populace? What are the advantages and disadvantages of this situation?
- How did the relationship between the employer and employee change relative to the size of a business?
- How did labor unions organize, and how did businesses and government officials sometimes respond?
- What was life like for African Americans in the late 19th century?
- What were Booker T. Washington’s ideas for improving conditions for African Americans?
- What did the U.S. Supreme Court rule in Plessy v. Ferguson?
- What happened in the western United States with respect to relations between Native Americans and the U.S. government?
- What was the nature of the gold standard–bimetallism debates? What groups preferred which standard, and why?
☐ Who belonged to the Populist Party, and what was its platform?
☐ What was the significance of the frontier in American history? What effects might its “closing” have on America?
☐ How did the idea of a more active foreign policy and imperialism contend with the American Founding and foreign policy precedent?
☐ What was Alfred Thayer Mahan’s thesis in *The Influence of Sea Power upon History*? How did this book influence the American military?
☐ Where did America expand during the McKinley administration, and why?
☐ How did the Spanish-American War begin, and why was it fought?
☐ For what reasons did the Americans soundly defeat the Spanish in the Spanish-American War?
☐ What issues did America face in the Philippines and Cuba following the Spanish-American War?
☐ How did America’s imperial ventures compare to those of the nations of Europe and of Japan at the time?
The Turn of the Century—Test #1
Lesson 1 | The Gilded Age

**Timeline**

Write the letter of each event next to the date or years it took place.

- 1869  ______  A. Spanish-American War
- 1898  ______  B. Oil discovered in Beaumont, Texas
- 1901  ______  C. Transcontinental Railroad completed

**Geography & Places**

Answer the following question based on the map below.

1. Label Alaska, Cuba, and the Philippines.
PERSONS, TERMS, AND TOPICS

Fill in the blanks with the letter of the correct answer.

A. robber barons
B. Philippine-American War
C. Mark Twain
D. Booker T. Washington
E. William McKinley
F. frontier
G. transcontinental railroad
H. USS Maine
I. Sitting Bull
J. immigrants
K. Andrew Carnegie

5. In 1890, the U.S. Census shockingly announced that the ________________ no longer existed.

6. The explosion of the ________________ triggered the start of the Spanish-American War.

7. The famous American author ________________ coined the term “Gilded Age” to describe the decades of economic boom following the Civil War.

8. ________________oversaw the beginning of the United States’ emergence as a major world power.

9. ________________defeated George Armstrong Custer at the Battle of Little Bighorn.

10. ________________was the first president of the Tuskegee Institute.

11. The ________________ was a massive project that transformed the national transportation system and facilitated the overall growth of the national economy.

12. The size of American cities rapidly increased during the turn of the century, largely because of the increasing number of ________________ from Eastern and Southern Europe.
13. _______________________ led the expansion of the American steel industry during the late 19th century.

14. The _________________________ was one of the international consequences of America’s victory in the Spanish-American War.

15. During the economic boom of the late 19th century, the wealthy and powerful leaders of big businesses were nicknamed “______________________.”

**Know by Heart**

*Fill in missing words and/or identify the speaker/author.*

16. “‘Give me __________________________, ____________________________, ____________________________yearning to breathe free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these the __________________________, ____________________________ to me, I lift my lamp beside the golden door!’” —_____________________________, ____________________________

17. “America! America!
______________________________ And crown thy good with brotherhood
_________________________________________________________!” —_____________________________, ____________________________
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be 3rd grade students.

18. William Jennings Bryan’s “Cross of Gold” speech

19. Theodore Roosevelt and the Rough Riders in the Spanish-American War
Questions for the American Mind

Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and writing should be employed, and responses must fully answer each question.

20. What are some of the beneficial developments produced during the Gilded Age?

21. What challenges emerged from the technological and economic changes during the Gilded Age?

22. What happened in the western United States with respect to relations between Native Americans and the U.S. government?

23. What were Booker T. Washington’s ideas for improving conditions for African Americans?

24. How did the idea of a more active foreign policy and imperialism contend with the American Founding and foreign policy precedent?

25. Where did America expand during the McKinley administration and why?
Study Guide B—Unit 5, Test #2

Lesson 2 | The Progressive Era
Lesson 3 | The Great War

Test on __________

**Timeline**

When given chronological dates, match events from a list to the years or dates that they happened.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>William McKinley assassinated; Theodore Roosevelt becomes president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>William Howard Taft elected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Woodrow Wilson defeats Taft and Roosevelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914–1918</td>
<td>The Great War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 28, 1914</td>
<td>Archduke Franz Ferdinand assassinated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Battle of Gallipoli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Battles of Verdun and the Somme; Woodrow Wilson reelected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>U.S. declaration of war; Bolshevik Revolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Hundred Days Offensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 11 (1918)</td>
<td>Veterans Day (Armistice Day)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Geography and Places**

Identify each on a map and/or tell where it is and explain its significance.

- Panama Canal
- Oklahoma
- New Mexico
- Arizona
- Austria-Hungary
- Ottoman Empire
- Balkans
- Serbia
- Ardennes Forest
- Soviet Union
- Argonne Forest

**Persons**

Identify each, provide biographical details, and explain what he or she thought or did in specific periods or events.

- Eugene V. Debs
- Woodrow Wilson
- John Muir
- W. E. B. DuBois
- William Howard Taft
- Orville and Wilbur Wright
- Henry Ford
- Franz Ferdinand
- Wilhelm II
- Nicholas II
- Winston Churchill
- John Pershing
- Vladimir Lenin
- Susan B. Anthony
TERMS AND TOPICS

Identify each and explain its significance to the period of history studied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms and Topics</th>
<th>Black Wall Street</th>
<th>unrestricted submarine warfare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Jungle</td>
<td>Black Wall Street</td>
<td>The Lusitania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Communist Manifesto</td>
<td>eugenics</td>
<td>Battle of Gallipoli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social Darwinism</td>
<td>San Francisco Earthquake</td>
<td>Battle of Verdun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>socialism</td>
<td>16th Amendment</td>
<td>Battle of the Somme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressivism</td>
<td>17th Amendment</td>
<td>Armenian genocide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman Antitrust Act</td>
<td>airplane</td>
<td>Bolshevik Revolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trust-busting</td>
<td>assembly line</td>
<td>Sedition Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Commerce Act</td>
<td>nationalism</td>
<td>Schenck v. United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Square Deal</td>
<td>automobile</td>
<td>tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conservationism</td>
<td>Allied Powers</td>
<td>Second Battle of the Marne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>national parks</td>
<td>Central Powers</td>
<td>Meuse-Argonne Offensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt Corollary</td>
<td>two-front war</td>
<td>Fourteen Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bull Moose Party</td>
<td>trench warfare</td>
<td>Treaty of Versailles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Freedom</td>
<td>machine gun</td>
<td>League of Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election of 1912</td>
<td>barbed wire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association for the</td>
<td>No Man’s Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td> Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)</td>
<td>war of attrition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRIMARY SOURCES

Based on annotations and notes from seminar conversations, be able to answer questions on each primary source. While you will not necessarily be asked why each primary source was created, what it did or argued, and what its effects were, being able to answer these kinds of questions will make you well prepared.

“What Is Progress?”, Woodrow Wilson
“The Presidency,” Theodore Roosevelt
War Message to Congress, Woodrow Wilson
Fourteen Points, Woodrow Wilson
League of Nations Speech, Henry Cabot Lodge

TO KNOW BY HEART

Fill in missing words and/or identify the speaker and context.

“I aimed for the public’s heart, and … hit it in the stomach.” —Upton Sinclair
“Speak softly and carry a big stick.” —Theodore Roosevelt
“The Road Not Taken” —Robert Frost
“The Soldier” —Rupert Brooke
“The world must be made safe for democracy.” —Woodrow Wilson
“Over There” —George Cohan
“In Flanders Fields” —John McCrae
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

*In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be 3rd grade students.*

- Biographies and the roles of Woodrow Wilson, Theodore Roosevelt, and William Howard Taft
- Theodore Roosevelt’s account of building the Panama Canal
- Orville Wright’s account of the first flight
- Henry Ford’s description of the first assembly line
- Life in trenches and trench warfare
- The Christmas Truce
- Walther Schwieger’s account of the sinking of the *Lusitania*
- The zeppelin bombing of London
- The Red Baron
- Grigori Rasputin and the Romanovs
- The February and Bolshevik Revolutions
- Bert Chaney’s account of the first tanks at the Somme
- Pavel Medvedev’s account of the assassination of the Romanovs
- Harold Nicolson’s account of the signing of the Treaty of Versailles

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

*Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.*

Lesson 2 | The Progressive Era

☐ How did journalists, churches, and charitable organizations seek to address the social challenges that came with a society of mass production, rapid industrialization, and urbanization?
☐ What contributions did Woodrow Wilson make to Progressivism, both as a thinker and as president?
☐ How did Progressives come to view human nature, history, and government in “Darwinian” terms, as a continual process of evolutionary improvement?
☐ What did Progressives mean by *equality*, and why did they believe equality of opportunity and dignity for ordinary citizens necessitated a powerfully activist government?
☐ In what ways did Progressives critique the Constitution as being too slow, mechanical, and at odds with itself, as presented in their critique of the separation of powers and of checks and balances?
☐ Why did Progressives believe that many of the Founders’ worries over the dangers of tyranny, and majority tyranny, and thus also constitutional limits on governmental power, were outdated?
☐ What was “government by expertise,” and why did the Progressives argue for it?
☐ How did Theodore Roosevelt embrace Progressivism in his politics, in his presidential actions addressing the issues of the day, and in his foreign policy positions?
☐ What were the main ideas of W. E. B. DuBois? How were they both alike and different from those of other commentators on improving the condition of African Americans?
☐ How did the practice of eugenics fit with Progressives’ ideas on human improvement, government, and rights?
Lesson 3 | The Great War

- What military and nationalist ideas emerged during the late 19th century in Europe?
- Why was Franz Ferdinand assassinated?
- What were the key decisions that led from Franz Ferdinand’s assassination to war a month later?
- Why did the Germans want to avoid a two-front war?
- How were the Americans, though neutral, really only helping the Allies?
- What three elements of trench warfare made attacking a position so deadly?
- Why did German U-boat U-20 sink the British luxury liner Lusitania?
- Why did the leaders of European nations and armies fight and continue to fight the Great War?
- What is unrestricted submarine warfare, and why did the Germans resume it in February 1917?
- For what two main reasons did the United States declare war on Germany in 1917?
- How did the February Revolution come about in Russia?
- How did the tank eventually solve the problems of trench warfare?
- How did the October or Bolshevik Revolution come about?
- What were Woodrow Wilson’s main ideas as outlined in his Fourteen Points?
- What were the negotiations like at the Versailles Peace Conference?
- Why did Woodrow Wilson struggle to gain international support for his League of Nations?
- What were three main ways that the Treaty of Versailles changed the map of Europe?
- In what ways did the Treaty of Versailles punish Germany?
- Why might it be said that Germany was “forced” to sign the Treaty of Versailles?
- Compare and contrast Europe before and after the Great War, politically, geographically, culturally, and philosophically.
The Turn of the Century—Test #2

Lesson 2 | The Progressive Era
Lesson 3 | The Great War

**TIMELINE**

Write the letter of each event next to the date or years it took place.

1901  ________  A. Woodrow Wilson reelected
1908  ________  B. Wilson defeats William Howard Taft and Theodore Roosevelt
1912  ________  C. U.S. declaration of war; Bolshevik Revolution
June 28, 1914  ________  D. Battle of Gallipoli
1915  ________  E. Taft elected
1916  ________  F. Hundred Days Offensive
1917  ________  G. William McKinley assassinated; Roosevelt becomes president
1918  ________  H. Archduke Franz Ferdinand assassinated

**GEOGRAPHY & PLACES**

1. Mark and label (approximately) where the following events took place: the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand, the Bolshevik Revolution, and the Treaty of Versailles.

(Map from the Delaware Division of Historical and Cultural Affairs)
PERSONS, TERMS, AND TOPICS

*Fill in the blanks.*

A. Sedition Act of 1918  
B. The Square Deal  
C. war of attrition  
D. Woodrow Wilson  
E. unrestricted submarine warfare  
F. William Howard Taft  
G. no man’s land  
H. Roosevelt Corollary  
I. League of Nations  
J. eugenics  
K. airplane  
L. two-front war  
M. W. E. B. DuBois

2. The area in between two opposing trenches in World War I was referred to as ___________________________ because it was not controlled by either side.

3. ___________________________ won the 1912 American presidential election.

4. Germany wanted to avoid letting World War I become a ___________________________.

5. Theodore Roosevelt’s three-point domestic policy plan was called the ___________________________.

6. Woodrow Wilson’s World War I peace plan, known as the “Fourteen Points,” idealistically included the formation of a ___________________________.

7. ___________________________ was an African-American civil rights activist during the turn of the 20th century.

8. The ___________________________ made it illegal for American citizens to publish false and scandalous information about the U.S. government and armed forces.

9. ___________________________ is a controversial scientific theory that appealed to Progressives in the early 20th century.
10. Due to defensive elements of modern warfare, such as trenches, barbed wire, and machine guns, World War I is often described as a __________________________.

11. The __________________________ added a more active stance on foreign policy to the Monroe Doctrine.

12. The invention of the __________________________ in the early 20th century had a significant impact on the development of modern warfare.

13. President ______________________________ succeeded President Theodore Roosevelt.

14. Germany’s resumption of __________________________ in early 1917 finally prompted the United States to join World War I.

**Know by Heart**

*Fill in missing words and/or identify the speaker/author.*

15. “I aimed for the public’s heart … and hit it in the stomach.” —________________________

16. “Speak __________ and carry a __________________________.” —Theodore Roosevelt

17. “The world must be made safe for democracy.” —______________________________
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be 3rd grade students.

18. Theodore Roosevelt’s account of the building of the Panama Canal

19. The Christmas Truce
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and writing should be employed, and responses must fully answer each question.

20. How did Progressives come to view human nature, history, and government, in “Darwinian” terms?

21. How did Theodore Roosevelt embrace Progressivism in his politics, in his presidential actions addressing the issues of the day, and in his foreign policy positions?

22. What contributions did Woodrow Wilson make to Progressivism, both as a thinker and as a president?

23. Why was Archduke Franz Ferdinand assassinated?

24. Why did German U-boat U-20 sink the British luxury liner Lusitania?

25. How did the tank eventually solve the problems of trench warfare?

26. What were the three main ways that the Treaty of Versailles changed the map of Europe?
Writing Assignment — The Turn of the Century

Directions

Citing events and primary sources in your argument, write a 4-5 paragraph essay answering the following question:

How did American foreign policy develop from after the Civil War to the Treaty of Versailles?
APPENDIX B

Primary Sources

Chief Joseph
Andrew Carnegie
William A. Peffer
William Jennings Bryan
Albert J. Beveridge
American Anti-Imperialist League
Booker T. Washington
Frederick Jackson Turner
Woodrow Wilson
Theodore Roosevelt
W. E. B. DuBois
Henry Cabot Lodge
CHIEF JOSEPH

SURRENDER

DOCUMENT

October 5, 1877
Bears Paw Mountains | Montana

BACKGROUND

American westward expansion in the mid-19th century often brought settlers into contact with the native Indian tribes. Hin-mah-too-yah-lat-kekt, also known as Chief Joseph, was a leader of the Nez Percé tribe during this period. When the U.S. government attempted to remove the tribe forcibly from their ancestral lands in the late 19th century, Chief Joseph and his tribe resisted in what became known as the Nez Percé War in 1877. After months of violent conflict, Chief Joseph finally delivered this surrender speech to his fellow chiefs and United States General Nelson A. Miles.

GUIDING QUESTION

Who was Chief Joseph primarily concerned with as indicated in his surrender, and why?

… I am tired of fighting. Our chiefs are killed; Looking-glass is dead. Too-hul-hul-suit is dead. The old men are all dead. It is the young men, now, who say ‘yes’ or ‘no’ [that is, vote in council]. He who led on the young men [Joseph’s brother, Ollicut] is dead. It is cold, and we have no blankets. The little children are freezing to death. My people—some of them—have run away to the hills, and have no blankets, no food. No one knows where they are—perhaps freezing to death. I want to have time to look for my children, and see how many of them I can find; maybe I shall find them among the dead. Hear me, my chiefs; my heart is sick and sad. From where the sun now stands, I will fight no more forever!
The problem of our age is the proper administration of wealth, so that the ties of brotherhood may still bind together the rich and poor in harmonious relationship. The conditions of human life have not only been changed, but revolutionized, within the past few hundred years. In former days there was little difference between the dwelling, dress, food, and environment of the chief and those of his retainers. The Indians are to-day where civilized man then was. When visiting the Sioux, I was led to the wigwam of the chief. It was just like the others in external appearance, and even within the difference was trifling between it and those of the poorest of his braves. The contrast between the palace of the millionaire and the cottage of the laborer with us to-day measures the change which has come with civilization.

This change, however, is not to be deplored, but welcomed as highly beneficial. It is well, nay, essential for the progress of the race, that the houses of some should be homes for all that is highest and best in literature and the arts, and for all the refinements of civilization, rather than that none should be so. Much better this great irregularity than universal squalor. Without wealth there can be no Mæcenas. The "good old times" were not good old times. Neither master nor servant was as well situated then as to-day. A relapse to old conditions would be disastrous to both—not the least so to him who serves—and would sweep away civilization with it. But whether the change be for good or ill, it is upon us, beyond our power to alter, and therefore to be accepted and made the best of. It is a waste of time to criticise the inevitable.

It is easy to see how the change has come. One illustration will serve for almost every phase of the cause. In the manufacture of products we have the whole story. It applies to all combinations of human industry, as stimulated and enlarged by the inventions of this scientific age. Formerly articles were manufactured at the domestic hearth or in small shops which formed part of the household. The master and his apprentices worked side by side, the latter living with the master, and therefore subject to the same conditions. When these apprentices rose to be masters, there was little or no change in their mode of life, and they, in turn, educated in the same routine succeeding apprentices. There was, substantially
Wealth
Andrew Carnegie

social equality, and even political equality, for those engaged in industrial pursuits had then little or no political voice in the State.

But the inevitable result of such a mode of manufacture was crude articles at high prices. Today the world obtains commodities of excellent quality at prices which even the generation preceding this would have deemed incredible. In the commercial world similar causes have produced similar results, and the race is benefited thereby. The poor enjoy what the rich could not before afford. What were the luxuries have become the necessaries of life. The laborer has now more comforts than the landlord had a few generations ago. The farmer has more luxuries than the landlord had, and is more richly clad and better housed. The landlord has books and pictures rarer, and appointments more artistic, than the King could then obtain.

The price we pay for this salutary change is, no doubt, great. We assemble thousands of operatives in the factory, in the mine, and in the counting-house, of whom the employer can know little or nothing, and to whom the employer is little better than a myth. All intercourse between them is at an end. Rigid Castes are formed, and, as usual, mutual ignorance breeds mutual distrust. Each Caste is without sympathy for the other, and ready to credit anything disparaging in regard to it. Under the law of competition, the employer of thousands is forced into the strictest economies, among which the rates paid to labor figure prominently, and often there is friction between the employer and the employed, between capital and labor, between rich and poor. Human society loses homogeneity.

The price which society pays for the law of competition, like the price it pays for cheap comforts and luxuries, is also great; but the advantage of this law are {sic} also greater still, for it is to this law that we owe our wonderful material development, which brings improved conditions in its train. But, whether the law be benign or not, we must say of it, as we say of the change in the conditions of men to which we have referred: It is here; we cannot evade it; no substitutes for it have been found; and while the law may be sometimes hard for the individual, it is best for the race, because it ensures the survival of the fittest in every department. We accept and welcome therefore, as conditions to which we must accommodate ourselves, great inequality of environment, the concentration of business,
industrial and commercial, in the hands of a few, and the law of competition between these, as being not only beneficial, but essential for the future progress of the race. Having accepted these, it follows that there must be great scope for the exercise of special ability in the merchant and in the manufacturer who has to conduct affairs upon a great scale. That this talent for organization and management is rare among men is proved by the fact that it invariably secures for its possessor enormous rewards, no matter where or under what laws or conditions. The experienced in affairs always rate the MAN whose services can be obtained as a partner as not only the first consideration, but such as to render the question of his capital scarcely worth considering, for such men soon create capital; while, without the special talent required, capital soon takes wings. Such men become interested in firms or corporations using millions; and estimating only simple interest to be made upon the capital invested, it is inevitable that their income must exceed their expenditures, and that they must accumulate wealth. Nor is there any middle ground which such men can occupy, because the great manufacturing or commercial concern which does not earn at least interest upon its capital soon becomes bankrupt. It, must either go forward or fall behind: to stand still is impossible. It is a condition essential for its successful operation that it should be thus far profitable, and even that, in addition to interest on capital, it should make profit. It is a law, as certain as any of the others named, that men possessed of this peculiar talent for affair, under the free play of economic forces, must, of necessity, soon be in receipt of more revenue than can be judiciously expended upon themselves; and this law is as beneficial for the race as the others.

Objections to the foundations upon which society is based are not in order, because the condition of the race is better with these than it has been with any others which have been tried. Of the effect of any new substitutes proposed we cannot be sure. The Socialist or Anarchist who seeks to overturn present conditions is to be regarded as attacking the foundation upon which civilization itself rests, for civilization took its start from the day that the capable, industrious workman said to his incompetent and lazy fellow, “If thou dost [not] sow, thou shalt [not] reap,” and thus ended primitive Communism by separating the drones from the bees. One who studies this subject will soon be brought face to face with the conclusion that upon the sacredness of property civilization itself depends—the right of the laborer to his hundred dollars in the savings bank, and equally the legal right
of the millionaire to his millions. To these who propose to substitute Communism for this intense Individualism the answer, therefore, is: The race has tried that. All progress from that barbarous day to the present time has resulted from its displacement. Not evil, but good, has come to the race from the accumulation of wealth by those who have the ability and energy that produce it. But even if we admit for a moment that it might be better for the race to discard its present foundation, Individualism,--that it is a nobler ideal that man should labor, not for himself alone, but in and for a brotherhood of his fellows, and share with them all in common, realizing Swedenborg's idea of Heaven, where, as he says, the angels derive their happiness, not from laboring for self, but for each other,--even admit all this, and a sufficient answer is, this is not evolution, but revolution. It necessitates the changing of human nature itself a work of oeons, even if it were good to change it, which we cannot know. It is not practicable in our day or in our age. Even if desirable theoretically, it belongs to another and long-succeeding sociological stratum. Our duty is with what is practicable now; with the next step possible in our day and generation. It is criminal to waste our energies in endeavoring to uproot, when all we can profitably or possibly accomplish is to bend the universal tree of humanity a little in the direction most favorable to the production of good fruit under existing circumstances. We might as well urge the destruction of the highest existing type of man because he failed to reach our ideal as favor the destruction of Individualism, Private Property, the Law of Accumulation of Wealth, and the Law of Competition; for these are the highest results of human experience, the soil in which society so far has produced the best fruit. Unequally or unjustly, perhaps, as these laws sometimes operate, and imperfect as they appear to the Idealist, they are, nevertheless, like the highest type of man, the best and most valuable of all that humanity has yet accomplished.

We start, then, with a condition of affairs under which the best interests of the race are promoted, but which inevitably gives wealth to the few. Thus far, accepting conditions as they exist, the situation can be surveyed and pronounced good. The question then arises, - -and, if the foregoing be correct, it is the only question with which we have to deal, --What is the proper mode of administering wealth after the laws upon which civilization is founded have thrown it into the hands of the few? And it is of this great question that I believe I offer the true solution. It will be understood that fortunes are here spoken of, not moderate sums saved by many years of effort, the returns on which are required for the
comfortable maintenance and education of families. This is not wealth, but only competence which it should be the aim of all to acquire.

There are but three modes in which surplus wealth can be disposed of. It can be left to the families of the decedents; or it can be bequeathed for public purposes; or, finally, it can be administered during their lives by its possessors. Under the first and second modes most of the wealth of the world that has reached the few has hitherto been applied. Let us in turn consider each of these modes. The first is the most injudicious. In monarchical countries, the estates and the greatest portion of the wealth are left to the first son, that the vanity of the parent may be gratified by the thought that his name and title are to descend to succeeding generations unimpaired. The condition of this class in Europe to-day teaches the futility of such hopes or ambitions. The successors have become impoverished through their follies or from the fall in the value of land. Even in Great Britain the strict law of entail has been found inadequate to maintain the status of an hereditary class. Its soil is rapidly passing into the hands of the stranger. Under republican institutions the division of property among the children is much fairer, but the question which forces itself upon thoughtful men in all lands is: Why should men leave great fortunes to their children? If this is done from affection, is it not misguided affection? Observation teaches that, generally speaking, it is not well for the children that they should be so burdened. Neither is it well for the state. Beyond providing for the wife and daughters moderate sources of income, and very moderate allowances indeed, if any, for the sons, men may well hesitate, for it is no longer questionable that great sums bequeathed oftener work more for the injury than for the good of the recipients. Wise men will soon conclude that, for the best interests of the members of their families and of the state, such bequests are an improper use of their means.

It is not suggested that men who have failed to educate their sons to earn a livelihood shall cast them adrift in poverty. If any man has seen fit to rear his sons with a view to their living idle lives, or, what is highly commendable, has instilled in them the sentiment that they are in a position to labor for public ends without reference to pecuniary considerations, then, of course, the duty of the parent is to see that such are provided for moderation. There are instances of millionaires’ sons unspoiled by wealth, who, being rich, still perform great
services in the community. Such are the very salt of the earth, as valuable as, unfortunately, they are rare; still it is not the exception, but the rule, that men must regard, and, looking at the usual result of enormous sums conferred upon legatees, the thoughtful man must shortly say, “I would as soon leave to my son a curse as the almighty dollar,” and admit to himself that it is not the welfare of the children, but family pride, which inspires these enormous legacies.

As to the second mode, that of leaving wealth at death for public uses, it may be said that this is only a means for the disposal of wealth, provided a man is content to wait until he is dead before it becomes of much good in the world. Knowledge of the results of legacies bequeathed is not calculated to inspire the brightest hopes of much posthumous good being accomplished. The cases are not few in which the real object sought by the testator is not attained, nor are they few in which his real wishes are thwarted. In many cases the bequests are so used as to become only monuments of his folly. It is well to remember that it requires the exercise of not less ability than that which acquired the wealth to use it so as to be really beneficial to the community. Besides this, it may fairly be said that no man is to be extolled for doing what he cannot help doing, nor is he to be thanked by the community to which he only leaves wealth at death. Men who leave vast sums in this way may fairly be thought men who would not have left it at all, had they been able to take it with them. The memories of such cannot be held in grateful remembrance, for there is no grace in their gifts. It is not to be wondered at that such bequests seem so generally to lack the blessing. –

The growing disposition to tax more and more heavily large estates left at death is a cheering indication of the growth of a salutary change in public opinion. The State of Pennsylvania now takes--subject to some exceptions--one-tenth of the property left by its citizens. The budget presented in the British Parliament the other day proposes to increase the death-duties; and, most significant of all, the new tax is to be a graduated one. Of all forms of taxation, this seems the wisest. Men who continue hoarding great sums all their lives, the proper use of which for - public ends would work good to the community, should be made to feel that the community, in the form of the state, cannot thus be deprived of its proper share. By taxing estates heavily at death the state marks its condemnation of the selfish millionaire’s unworthy life.
It is desirable; that nations should go much further in this direction. Indeed, it is difficult to set bounds to the share of a rich man’s estate which should go at his death to the public through the agency of the state, and by all means such taxes should be graduated, beginning at nothing upon moderate sums to dependents, and increasing rapidly as the amounts swell, until of the millionaire’s hoard, as of Shylock’s, at least

“The other half
Comes to the privy coffer of the state.”

This policy would work powerfully to induce the rich man to attend to the administration of wealth during his life, which is the end that society should always have in view, as being that by far most fruitful for the people. Nor need it be feared that this policy would sap the root of enterprise and render men less anxious to accumulate, for to the class whose ambition it is to leave great fortunes and be talked about after their death, it will attract even more attention, and, indeed, be a somewhat nobler ambition to have enormous sums paid over to the state from their fortunes.

There remains, then, only one mode of using great fortunes; but in this we have the true antidote for the temporary unequal distribution of wealth, the reconciliation of the rich and the poor--a reign of harmony--another ideal, differing, indeed, from that of the Communist in requiring only the further evolution of existing conditions, not the total overthrow of our civilization. It is founded upon the present most intense individualism, and the race is projected to put it in practice by degree whenever it pleases. Under its sway we shall have an ideal state, in which the surplus wealth of the few will become, in the best sense the property of the many, because administered for the common good, and this wealth, passing through the hands of the few, can be made a much more potent force for the elevation of our race than if it had been distributed in small sums to the people themselves. Even the poorest can be made to see this, and to agree that great sums gathered by some of their fellow-citizens and spent for public purposes, from which the masses reap the principal benefit, are more valuable to them than if scattered among them through the course of many years in trifling amounts.
If we consider what results flow from the Cooper Institute, for instance, to the best portion of the race in New York not possessed of means, and compare these with those which would have arisen for the good of the masses from an equal sum distributed by Mr. Cooper in his lifetime in the form of wages, which is the highest form of distribution, being for work done and not for charity, we can form some estimate of the possibilities for the improvement of the race which lie embedded in the present law of the accumulation of wealth. Much of this sum if distributed in small quantities among the people, would have been wasted in the indulgence of appetite, some of it in excess, and it may be doubted whether even the part put to the best use, that of adding to the comforts of the home, would have yielded results for the race, as a race, at all comparable to those which are flowing and are to flow from the Cooper Institute from generation to generation. Let the advocate of violent or radical change ponder well this thought.

We might even go so far as to take another instance, that of Mr. Tilden's bequest of five millions of dollars for a free library in the city of New York, but in referring to this one cannot help saying involuntarily, how much better if Mr. Tilden had devoted the last years of his own life to the proper administration of this immense sum; in which case neither legal contest nor any other cause of delay could have interfered with his aims. But let us assume that Mr. Tilden's millions finally become the means of giving to this city a noble public library, where the treasures of the world contained in books will be open to all forever, without money and without price. Considering the good of that part of the race which congregates in and around Manhattan Island, would its permanent benefit have been better promoted had these millions been allowed to circulate in small sums through the hands of the masses? Even the most strenuous advocate of Communism must entertain a doubt upon this subject. Most of those who think will probably entertain no doubt whatever.

Poor and restricted are our opportunities in this life; narrow our horizon; our best work most imperfect; but rich men should be thankful for one inestimable boon. They have it in their power during their lives to busy themselves in organizing benefactions from which the masses of their fellows will derive lasting advantage, and thus dignify their own lives. The highest life is probably to be reached, not by such imitation of the life of Christ as
Count Tolstoi gives us, but, while animated by Christ's spirit, by recognizing the changed conditions of this age, and adopting modes of expressing this spirit suitable to the changed conditions under which we live; still laboring for the good of our fellows, which was the essence of his life and teaching, but laboring in a different manner.

This, then, is held to be the duty of the man of Wealth: First, to set an example of modest, unostentatious living, shunning display or extravagance; to provide moderately for the legitimate wants of those dependent upon him; and after doing so to consider all surplus revenues which come to him simply as trust funds, which he is called upon to administer, and strictly bound as a matter of duty to administer in the manner which, in his judgment, is best calculated to produce the most beneficial results for the community—the man of wealth thus becoming the mere agent and trustee for his poorer brethren, bringing to their service his superior wisdom, experience and ability to administer, doing for them better than they would or could do for themselves.

We are met here with the difficulty of determining what are moderate sums to leave to members of the family; what is modest, unostentatious living; what is the test of extravagance. There must be different standards for different conditions. The answer is that it is as impossible to name exact amounts or actions as it is to define good manners, good taste, or the rules of propriety; but, nevertheless, these are verities, well known although undefinable. Public sentiment is quick to know and to feel what offends these. So in the case of wealth. The rule in regard to good taste in the dress of men or women applies here. Whatever makes one conspicuous offends the canon. If any family be chiefly known for display, for extravagance in home, table, equipage, for enormous sums ostentatiously spent in any form upon itself, if these be its chief distinctions, we have no difficulty in estimating its nature or culture. So likewise in regard to the use or abuse of its surplus wealth, or to generous, freehanded cooperation in good public uses, or to unabated efforts to accumulate and hoard to the last, whether they administer or bequeath. The verdict rests with the best and most enlightened public sentiment. The community will surely judge and its judgments will not often be wrong.
The best uses to which surplus wealth can be put have already been indicated. These who, would administer wisely must, indeed, be wise, for one of the serious obstacles to the improvement of our race is indiscriminate charity. It were better for mankind that the millions of the rich were thrown into the sea than so spent as to encourage the slothful, the drunken, the unworthy. Of every thousand dollars spent in so-called charity to-day, it is probable that $950 is unwisely spent; so spent, indeed, as to produce the very evils which it proposes to mitigate or cure. A well-known writer of philosophic books admitted the other day that he had given a quarter of a dollar to a man who approached him as he was coming to visit the house of his friend. He knew nothing of the habits of this beggar; knew not the use that would be made of this money, although he had every reason to suspect that it would be spent improperly. This man professed to be a disciple of Herbert Spencer; yet the quarter-dollar given that night will probably work more injury than all the money which its thoughtless donor will ever be able to give in true charity will do good. He only gratified his own feelings, saved himself from annoyance, and this was probably one of the most selfish and very worst actions of his life, for in all respects he is most worthy.

In bestowing charity, the main consideration should be to help those who will help themselves; to provide part of the means by which those who desire to improve may do so; to give those who desire to use the aids by which they may rise; to assist, but rarely or never to do all. Neither the individual nor the race is improved by alms-giving. Those worthy of assistance, except in rare cases, seldom require assistance. The really valuable men of the race never do, except in cases of accident or sudden change. Every one has, of course, cases of individuals brought to his own knowledge where temporary assistance can do genuine good, and these he will not overlook. But the amount which can be wisely given by the individual for individuals is necessarily limited by his lack of knowledge of the circumstances connected with each. He is the only true reformer who is as careful and as anxious not to aid the unworthy as he is to aid the worthy, and, perhaps, even more so, for in alms-giving more injury is probably done by rewarding vice than by relieving virtue.

The rich man is thus almost restricted to following the examples of Peter Cooper, Enoch Pratt of Baltimore, Mr. Pratt of Brooklyn, Senator Stanford, and others, who know that the best means of benefiting the community is to place within its reach the ladders upon which
the aspiring can rise--parks, and means of recreation, by which men are helped in body and
mind; works of art, certain to give pleasure and improve the public taste, and public
institutions of various kinds, which will improve the general condition of the people; --in
this manner returning their surplus wealth to the mass of their fellows in the forms best
calculated to do them lasting good. –

Thus is the problem of Rich and Poor to be solved. The laws of accumulation will be left
free; the laws of distribution free. Individualism will continue, but the millionaire will be
but a trustee for the poor; {entrusted} for a season with a great part of the increased wealth
of the community, but administering it for the community far better than it could or would
have done for itself. The best minds will thus have reached a stage in the development of
the race which it is clearly seen that there is no mode of disposing of surplus wealth
creditable to thoughtful and earnest men into whose hands it flows save by using it year by
year for the general good. This day already dawns. But a little while, and although, without
incurring the pity of their fellows, men may die sharers in great business enterprises from
which their capital cannot be or has not been withdrawn, and is left chiefly at death for
public uses, yet the man who dies leaving behind many millions of available wealth, which
was his to administer during life, will pass away “unwept, unhonored, and unsung,” no
matter to what uses he leaves the dross which he cannot take with him. Of such as these the
public verdict will then be: “The man who dies thus rich dies disgraced.”

Such, in my opinion, is the true Gospel concerning Wealth, obedience to which is destined
some day to solve the problem of the Rich and the Poor, and to bring “Peace on earth,
among men Good-Will.”
The old nations of the earth creep on at a snail’s pace; the Republic thunders past with the rush of the express. The United States, the growth of a single century, has already reached the foremost rank among nations, and is destined soon to out-distance all others in the race. In population, in wealth, in annual savings, and in public credit; in freedom from debt, in agriculture, and in manufactures, America already leads the civilized world... 

Into the distant future of this giant nation we need not seek to peer; but if we cast a glance forward, as we have done backward, for only fifty years, and assume that in that short interval no serious change will occur, the astounding fact startles us that in 1935, fifty years from now, when many in manhood will still be living, one hundred and eighty millions of English-speaking republicans will exist under one flag and possess more than two hundred and fifty thousand millions of dollars, or fifty thousand millions sterling of national wealth. Eighty years ago the whole of America and Europe did not contain so many people; and, if Europe and America continue their normal growth, it will be little more than another eighty years ere the mighty Republic may boast as many loyal citizens as all the rulers of Europe combined, for before the year 1980 Europe and America will each have a population of about six hundred millions.

The causes which have led to the rapid growth and aggrandizement of this latest addition to the family of nations constitute one of the most interesting problems in the social history of mankind. What has brought about such stupendous results — so unparalleled a development of a nation within so ethnic character of the people, the topographical and climatic conditions under which they developed, and the influence of political institutions founded upon the equality of the citizen.

Certain writers in the past have maintained that the ethnic type of a people has less influence upon its growth as a nation than the conditions of life under which it is developing. The modern ethnologist knows better. We have only to imagine what America would be today if she had fallen, in the beginning, into the hands of any other people than the colonizing British, to see how vitally important is this question of race.
America was indeed fortunate in the seed planted upon her soil. With the exception of a few Dutch and French it was wholly British; and … the American of today remains true to this noble strain and is four-fifths British. The special aptitude of this race for colonization, its vigor and enterprise, and its capacity for governing, although brilliantly manifested in all parts of the world, have never been shown to such advantage as in American. Freed here from the pressure of feudal institutions no longer fitted to their present development, and freed also from the dominion of the upper classes, which have kept the people at home from effective management of affairs and sacrificed the nation’s interest for their own, as is the nature of classes, these masses of the lower ranks of Britons, called upon to found a new state, have proved themselves possessors of a positive genius for political administration.

The second, and perhaps equally important factor in the problem of the rapid advancement of this branch of the British race, is the superiority of the conditions under which it has developed. The home which has fallen to its lot, a domain more magnificent than has cradled any other race in the history of the world, presents no obstructions to unity — to the thorough amalgamation of its dwellers, North, South, East, and West, into one homogeneous mass — for the conformation of the American continent differs in important respects from that of every other great division of the globe. In Europe the Alps occupy a central position, forming on each side watersheds of rivers which flow into opposite seas. In Asia the Himalaya, the Hindu Kush, and the Altai Mountains divide the continent, rolling from their sides many great rivers which pour their floods into widely separated oceans. But in North America the mountains rise up on each coast, and from them the land slopes gradually together in one valley, offering to commerce many thousand miles of navigable streams. The map thus proclaims the unity of North America, for in this great central basin, three million square miles in extent, free from impassable rivers or mountain barriers great enough to hinder free intercourse, political integration is a necessity and consolidation a certainty …

The unity of the American people is further powerfully promoted by the foundation upon which the political structure rests, the equality of the citizen. There is not one shred of privilege to be met with anywhere in all the laws. One man’s right is every man’s right.
The flag is the guarantor and symbol of equality. The people are not emasculated by being made to feel that their own country decrees their inferiority, and holds them unworthy of privileges accorded to others. No ranks, no titles, no hereditary dignities, and therefore no classes. Suffrage is universal, and votes are of equal weight. Representatives are paid, and political life and usefulness thereby thrown open to all. Thus there is brought about a community of interests and aims which a Briton, accustomed to monarchical and aristocratic institutions, dividing the people into classes with separate interests, aims, thoughts, and feelings, can only with difficulty understand.

The free common school system of the land is probably, after all, the greatest single power in the unifying process which is producing the new American race. Through the crucible of a good common English education, furnished free by the State, pass the various racial elements — children of Irishmen, Germans, Italians, Spaniards, and Swedes, side by side with the native American, all to be fused into one, in language, in thought, in feeling, and in patriotism. The Irish boy loses his brogue, and the German child learns English. The sympathies suited to the feudal systems of Europe, which they inherit from their fathers, pass off as dross, leaving behind the pure gold of the only noble political creed: “All men are created free and equal.” Taught now to live and work for the common weal, and not for the maintenance of a royal family or an overbearing aristocracy, not for the continuance of a social system which ranks them beneath an arrogant class of drones, children of Russian and German serfs, of Irish evicted tenants, Scotch crofters, and other victims of feudal tyranny, are translated into republican Americans, and are made in one love for a country which provides equal rights and privileges for all her children. There is no class so intensely patriotic, so wildly devoted to the Republic as the naturalized citizen and his child, for little does the native-born citizen know of the value of rights which have never been denied. Only the man born abroad, like myself, under institutions which insult him at his birth, can know the full meaning of Republicanism …

It is these causes which render possible the growth of a great homogeneous nation, alike in race, language, literature, interest, patriotism — an empire of such overwhelming
power and proportions as to require neither army nor navy to ensure its safety, and a people so educated and advanced as to value the victories of peace.

The student of American affairs today sees no influences at work save those which make for closer and closer union. The Republic has solved the problem of governing large areas by adopting the federal, or home-rule system, and has proved to the world that the freest self-government of the parts produces the strongest government of the whole.
The rapid changes caused by the Gilded Age produced negative as well as positive benefits for American society. The American people responded to the drawbacks of this advancement by calling for many reforms, especially in the economic sphere. One manifestation of this reform spirit was the creation of the People’s (or Populist) Party, which sought to fight the economic corruption of the Gilded Age by calling for the dismantling of monopolies, the regulation of railroads, and the granting of legislative power to the people via electoral initiative and referendum. In 1890, William Peffer of Kansas was the first Populist Party member elected to the Senate (there would eventually be 6), and wrote this article three years later explaining the principles behind the Party.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What is the purpose of government, according to Peffer?
2. What does Peffer say about the Party’s views on monetary policy?
3. What is the Party’s view of American railroads?
4. According to Peffer, how do banks and excessive wealth undermine American government?

The Populist Party is an organized demand that the functions of government shall be exercised only for the mutual benefit of all the people. It asserts that government is useful only to the extent that it serves to advance the common weal. Believing that the public good is paramount to private interests, it protests against the delegation of sovereign powers to private agencies. Its motto is: “Equal rights to all; special privileges to none.”

Its creed is written in a single line of the Declaration of Independence—“All men are created equal.” Devoted to the objects for which the Constitution of the United States was adopted, it proposes to “form a more perfect union” by cultivating a national sentiment among the people; to “insure domestic tranquility” by securing to every man and woman what they earn; to “establish justice” by procuring an equitable distribution of the products and profits of labor; to “provide for the common defence” by interesting every citizen in the ownership of his home; to “promote the general welfare” by abolishing class legislation and limiting the government to its proper functions; and to “secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity” by protecting the producing masses against the spoliation of speculators and usurers.

The Populist claims that the mission of his party is to emancipate labor. He believes that men are not only created equal, but that they are equally entitled to the use of natural resources in procuring means of subsistence and comfort. He believes that an equitable distribution of the products and profits of labor is essential to the highest form of civilization; that taxation should only be for public purposes, and that all moneys raised by taxes should go into the public treasury; that public needs should be supplied by public agencies, and that the people should be served equally and alike.

The party believes in popular government. Its demands may be summarized fairly to be—

1. An exclusively national currency in amount amply sufficient for all the uses for which money is needed by the people, to consist of gold and silver coined on equal terms, and government paper, each and all legal tender in payment of debts of whatever nature or amount, receivable for taxes and all public dues.
2. That rates of interest for the use of money be reduced to the level of average net profits in productive industries.

3. That the means of public transportation be brought under public control, to the end that carriage shall not cost more than it is reasonably worth, and that charges may be made uniform.

4. That large private land-holdings be discouraged by law. …

The Populist Party is the only party that honestly favors good money. … We have seven different kinds of money, and only one of them is good, according to the determination of the Treasury officials. Bank notes are not legal tender, neither are silver certificates, nor gold certificates. Treasury notes are not legal tender in cases where another kind of money is expressed in the contract, and United States notes (greenbacks) will not pay either principal or interest on any government bond. None of our paper money is taxable. Silver dollars are by law full legal tender in payment of debts to any amount whatever, but the Treasury does not pay them out on any obligation unless they are specially requested. In practice, we have but one full legal tender money—gold coin; and Republicans and Democrats are agreed on continuing that policy; while Populists demand gold, silver, and paper money, all equally full legal tender.

The fact that we have now out about $700,000,000 in paper is proof that our stock of coin is utterly inadequate to perform all the money duty required in the people’s business transactions. The discontinuance of silver coinage stops the supply from that source. It is believed by men best informed on the subject that the gold used in the arts has reached an amount about equal to the annual output of the mines. Then the world’s stock of gold coin will not be increased unless the arts are drawn upon, and that can be done successfully only at a price above the money value of the coin. Russia, Austria, Italy, and the United States all want more gold. Where is it to come from? And what will it cost the purchaser? Are we to drop back to Roman methods of procuring treasure? When all the nations set out on gold-hunting expeditions, who will be the victor and what will become of the spoils?
It is evident that we must have more money, and Congress alone is authorized to prepare it. States are prohibited by the Constitution of the United States from making anything but gold and silver coin a legal tender in payment of debts, and nothing is money that is not a tender. The people can rely only on Congress for a safe circulating medium.

Populists demand not only a sufficiency of money, but a reduction of interest rates at least as low as the general level of the people’s savings. They aver that with interest at present legal and actual rates, an increase in the volume of money in the country would be of little permanent benefit, for bankers and brokers would control its circulation, just as they do now. But with interest charges reduced to 3 or 2 percent, the business of the money-lender would be no more profitable than that of the farmer—and why should it be? …

… The rate of interest ought to be what, with prudent management through a reasonable number of average seasons, he [the farmer] can pay yearly, with part of the principal, until he has paid out and has the farm left.

Three percent, compounded annually is a fair average the world over for labor’s saving. It has been a little more in the United States, but a gold basis will soon bring us to the general level, and that will settle lower as population and trade increase.

While the Populist Party favors government ownership and control of railroads, it wisely leaves for future consideration the means by which such ownership and control can best be brought about. The conditions which seem to make necessary such a change in our transportation system preclude all probability of its ever being practicable, if it were desirable, to purchase existing railway lines. The total capitalization of railroads in the United States in 1890 was put at $9,871,378,389—nearly ten thousand million dollars. It would be putting the figures high to say that the roads are worth one-half the amount of their capital stock. This leaves a fictitious value of $5,000,000,000 which the people must maintain for the roads by transportation charges twice as high as they would be if the capitalization were only half as much. It is the excessive capitalization which the people have to maintain that they complain about. It would be an unbusinesslike proceeding for
the people to purchase roads when they could build better ones just where and when they are needed for less than half the money that would be required to clear these companies’ books. It is conceded that none of the highly capitalized railroad corporations expect to pay their debts. If they can keep even on interest account, they do well, and that is all they are trying to do. While charges have been greatly reduced, they are still based on capitalization, and courts have held that the companies are entitled to reasonable profits on their investment. The people have but one safe remedy—to construct their own roads as needed, and then they will “own and control” them.

This is not a new doctrine. A select committee of the Senate of the United States, at the head of which was Hon. William Windom, then a senator and afterward secretary of the Treasury appointed in December 1872, reported among other recommendations one proposing the construction of a “government freight railway,” for the purpose of effectively regulating interstate commerce. A government freight railway would have no capitalization, no debt, bonded or otherwise; its charges would be only what it would cost to handle the traffic and keep the road in repair. That would reduce cost of carriage to a minimum, and nothing else will.

Populists complain of legislation in the interest of favored classes. At the very time when the homestead law was passed a scheme was hatching to absorb the public lands by railway corporations. Scarcely had the great war begun when a plan was laid to establish a system of national banking based on the people’s debts; and while customs duties were raised to increase the public revenues, cheap foreign labor was brought in under contract to man the factories. Banks have been specially favored.

When it was to their interest to withdraw their notes it was done with impunity. They have been permitted to openly violate the law that authorizes their existence, and this without rebuke.

The U.S. Senate shields them from exposure. When the Treasury was flush, public moneys were lavishly left with the banks to use without interest, and when the great banks in New York City needed funds to relieve the stringency in the “money market” there,
they had only to ask and they received. And now that the Treasury is running short in gold reserves, there is a demand for more bonds to purchase more gold to be used in redeeming Treasury notes which the law requires to be redeemed in silver, thus again reducing the reserves, making another bond issue necessary to procure more gold; and so on, as the “money market” may require. These “Napoleons of Finance” are playing a bold game. …

Rapid accumulation of wealth by a few citizens, as we have seen it in the United States during the last thirty years, is evidence of morbidly abnormal conditions. It is inconsistent with free institutions. It is breeding anarchy and trouble. No man can honestly take to himself what he does not earn; and if he does no more than that, riches will come to him slowly. It is only when he gets what he does not earn that his “success” attracts attention. Fortunes running into millions of dollars must be made up of property and profits mostly produced and earned by persons other than those who claim them.

No man ever earned a million dollars. If he was moved to great undertakings, nature’s God inspired him. And if, in the play of his ambition he marshaled effective forces, his equipment cost him little. To a great mind success is compensation. The value of its labor cannot be measured with money. A strong man’s intellect moves as easily as a blacksmith’s arm. Both are gifts.

The best men are content with little. Vast enterprises that move the world are maintained by contributions from the labor of the poor. Leaders do but organize and direct; the rank and file do all the rest. Apply the “iron law of wages” equally to all that work and you scale down the salaries of many useless people. If the Republic is to endure we must encourage the average man.
WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN
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BACKGROUND

The spirit of reform championed by the Populist Party found moderate success in the last quarter of the 19th century. However, their greatest triumph would occur in the 1896 presidential election, albeit under the auspices of the Democratic Party. Former Nebraska Congressman William Jennings Bryan, the Democrat (as well as Populist) nominee, was a firm advocate for retaining silver as well as gold for the monetary standard in America, rather than using gold alone. At the Democratic National Convention that year, Bryan gave this speech which garnered massive support for his campaign, but he ultimately lost to William McKinley.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What is the “paramount issue,” according to Bryan?
2. Does he agree that the government should be able to impose an income tax?
3. How does Bryan explain the relationship between banks and government?
4. Why does he object to the gold standard?
5. What are the “two ideas of government” that Bryan describes?
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I would be presumptuous, indeed, to present myself against the distinguished gentlemen to whom you have listened if this were but a measuring of ability; but this is not a contest among persons. The humblest citizen in all the land when clad in the armor of a righteous cause is stronger than all the whole hosts of error that they can bring. I come to speak to you in defense of a cause as holy as the cause of liberty—the cause of humanity. When this debate is concluded, a motion will be made to lay upon the table the resolution offered in commendation of the administration and also the resolution in condemnation of the administration. I shall object to bringing this question down to a level of persons. The individual is but an atom; he is born, he acts, he dies; but principles are eternal; and this has been a contest of principle.

Never before in the history of this country has there been witnessed such a contest as that through which we have passed. Never before in the history of American politics has a great issue been fought out as this issue has been by the voters themselves.

On the 4th of March, 1895, a few Democrats, most of them members of Congress, issued an address to the Democrats of the nation asserting that the money question was the paramount issue of the hour; asserting also the right of a majority of the Democratic Party to control the position of the party on this paramount issue; concluding with the request that all believers in free coinage of silver in the Democratic Party should organize and take charge of and control the policy of the Democratic Party. Three months later, at Memphis, an organization was perfected, and the silver Democrats went forth openly and boldly and courageously proclaiming their belief and declaring that if successful they would crystallize in a platform the declaration which they had made; and then began the conflict with a zeal approaching the zeal which inspired the crusaders who followed Peter the Hermit. Our silver Democrats went forth from victory unto victory, until they are assembled now, not to discuss, not to debate, but to enter up the judgment rendered by the plain people of this country.

But in this contest, brother has been arrayed against brother, and father against son. The warmest ties of love and acquaintance and association have been disregarded. Old leaders
have been cast aside when they refused to give expression to the sentiments of those whom they would lead, and new leaders have sprung up to give direction to this cause of freedom. Thus has the contest been waged, and we have assembled here under as binding and solemn instructions as were ever fastened upon the representatives of a people.

We do not come as individuals. Why, as individuals we might have been glad to compliment the gentleman from New York [Senator Hill], but we knew that the people for whom we speak would never be willing to put him in a position where he could thwart the will of the Democratic Party. I say it was not a question of persons; it was a question of principle; and it is not with gladness, my friends, that we find ourselves brought into conflict with those who are now arrayed on the other side. The gentleman who just preceded me [Governor Russell] spoke of the old state of Massachusetts. Let me assure him that not one person in all this convention entertains the least hostility to the people of the state of Massachusetts.

But we stand here representing people who are the equals before the law of the largest cities in the state of Massachusetts. When you come before us and tell us that we shall disturb your business interests, we reply that you have disturbed our business interests by your action. We say to you that you have made too limited in its application the definition of a businessman. The man who is employed for wages is as much a businessman as his employer. The attorney in a country town is as much a businessman as the corporation counsel in a great metropolis. The merchant at the crossroads store is as much a businessman as the merchant of New York. The farmer who goes forth in the morning and toils all day, begins in the spring and toils all summer, and by the application of brain and muscle to the natural resources of this country creates wealth, is as much a businessman as the man who goes upon the Board of Trade and bets upon the price of grain. The miners who go 1,000 feet into the earth or climb 2,000 feet upon the cliffs and bring forth from their hiding places the precious metals to be poured in the channels of trade are as much businessmen as the few financial magnates who in a backroom corner the money of the world.
We come to speak for this broader class of businessmen. Ah, my friends, we say not one word against those who live upon the Atlantic Coast; but those hardy pioneers who braved all the dangers of the wilderness, who have made the desert to blossom as the rose—those pioneers away out there, rearing their children near to nature's heart, where they can mingle their voices with the voices of the birds—out there where they have erected schoolhouses for the education of their children and churches where they praise their Creator, and the cemeteries where sleep the ashes of their dead—are as deserving of the consideration of this party as any people in this country.

It is for these that we speak. We do not come as aggressors. Our war is not a war of conquest. We are fighting in the defense of our homes, our families, and posterity. We have petitioned, and our petitions have been scorned. We have entreated, and our entreaties have been disregarded. We have begged, and they have mocked when our calamity came.

We beg no longer; we entreat no more; we petition no more. We defy them!

The gentleman from Wisconsin has said he fears a Robespierre. My friend, in this land of the free you need fear no tyrant who will spring up from among the people. What we need is an Andrew Jackson to stand as Jackson stood, against the encroachments of aggregated wealth.

They tell us that this platform was made to catch votes. We reply to them that changing conditions make new issues; that the principles upon which rest Democracy are as everlasting as the hills; but that they must be applied to new conditions as they arise. Conditions have arisen and we are attempting to meet those conditions. They tell us that the income tax ought not to be brought in here; that is not a new idea. They criticize us for our criticism of the Supreme Court of the United States. My friends, we have made no criticism. We have simply called attention to what you know. If you want criticisms, read the dissenting opinions of the Court. That will give you criticisms.
They say we passed an unconstitutional law. I deny it. The income tax was not unconstitutional when it was passed. It was not unconstitutional when it went before the Supreme Court for the first time. It did not become unconstitutional until one judge changed his mind; and we cannot be expected to know when a judge will change his mind.

The income tax is a just law. It simply intends to put the burdens of government justly upon the backs of the people. I am in favor of an income tax. When I find a man who is not willing to pay his share of the burden of the government which protects him, I find a man who is unworthy to enjoy the blessings of a government like ours.

He says that we are opposing the national bank currency. It is true. If you will read what Thomas Benton said, you will find that he said that in searching history he could find but one parallel to Andrew Jackson. That was Cicero, who destroyed the conspiracies of Cataline and saved Rome. He did for Rome what Jackson did when he destroyed the bank conspiracy and saved America.

We say in our platform that we believe that the right to coin money and issue money is a function of government. We believe it. We believe it is a part of sovereignty and can no more with safety be delegated to private individuals than can the power to make penal statutes or levy laws for taxation.

Mr. Jefferson, who was once regarded as good Democratic authority, seems to have a different opinion from the gentleman who has addressed us on the part of the minority. Those who are opposed to this proposition tell us that the issue of paper money is a function of the bank and that the government ought to go out of the banking business. I stand with Jefferson rather than with them, and tell them, as he did, that the issue of money is a function of the government and that the banks should go out of the governing business.
They complain about the plank which declares against the life tenure in office. They have tried to strain it to mean that which it does not mean. What we oppose in that plank is the life tenure that is being built up in Washington which establishes an office-holding class and excludes from participation in the benefits the humbler members of our society.

Let me call attention to two or three great things. The gentleman from New York says that he will propose an amendment providing that this change in our law shall not affect contracts which, according to the present laws, are made payable in gold. But if he means to say that we cannot change our monetary system without protecting those who have loaned money before the change was made, I want to ask him where, in law or in morals, he can find authority for not protecting the debtors when the act of 1873 was passed when he now insists that we must protect the creditor. He says he also wants to amend this platform so as to provide that if we fail to maintain the parity within a year that we will then suspend the coinage of silver. We reply that when we advocate a thing which we believe will be successful we are not compelled to raise a doubt as to our own sincerity by trying to show what we will do if we are wrong.

I ask him, if he will apply his logic to us, why he does not apply it to himself. He says that he wants this country to try to secure an international agreement. Why doesn’t he tell us what he is going to do if they fail to secure an international agreement. There is more reason for him to do that than for us to expect to fail to maintain the parity. They have tried for thirty years—thirty years—to secure an international agreement, and those are waiting for it most patiently who don’t want it at all.

Now, my friends, let me come to the great paramount issue. If they ask us here why it is we say more on the money question than we say upon the tariff question, I reply that if protection has slain its thousands the gold standard has slain its tens of thousands. If they ask us why we did not embody all these things in our platform which we believe, we reply to them that when we have restored the money of the Constitution, all other necessary
reforms will be possible, and that until that is done there is no reform that can be accomplished.

Why is it that within three months such a change has come over the sentiments of the country? Three months ago, when it was confidently asserted that those who believed in the gold standard would frame our platforms and nominate our candidates, even the advocates of the gold standard did not think that we could elect a President; but they had good reasons for the suspicion, because there is scarcely a state here today asking for the gold standard that is not within the absolute control of the Republican Party.

But note the change. Mr. McKinley was nominated at St. Louis upon a platform that declared for the maintenance of the gold standard until it should be changed into bimetallism by an international agreement. Mr. McKinley was the most popular man among the Republicans; and everybody three months ago in the Republican Party prophesied his election. How is it today? Why, that man who used to boast that he looked like Napoleon, that man shudders today when he thinks that he was nominated on the anniversary of the Battle of Waterloo. Not only that, but as he listens he can hear with ever increasing distinctness the sound of the waves as they beat upon the lonely shores of St. Helena.

Why this change? Ah, my friends. is not the change evident to anyone who will look at the matter? It is because no private character, however pure, no personal popularity, however great, can protect from the avenging wrath of an indignant people the man who will either declare that he is in favor of fastening the gold standard upon this people, or who is willing to surrender the right of self-government and place legislative control in the hands of foreign potentates and powers. …

We go forth confident that we shall win. Why? Because upon the paramount issue in this campaign there is not a spot of ground upon which the enemy will dare to challenge battle. Why, if they tell us that the gold standard is a good thing, we point to their platform and tell them that their platform pledges the party to get rid of a gold standard
and substitute bimetallism. If the gold standard is a good thing, why try to get rid of it? If the gold standard, and I might call your attention to the fact that some of the very people who are in this convention today and who tell you that we ought to declare in favor of international bimetallism and thereby declare that the gold standard is wrong and that the principles of bimetallism are better—these very people four months ago were open and avowed advocates of the gold standard and telling us that we could not legislate two metals together even with all the world.

I want to suggest this truth, that if the gold standard is a good thing we ought to declare in favor of its retention and not in favor of abandoning it; and if the gold standard is a bad thing, why should we wait until some other nations are willing to help us to let it go?

Here is the line of battle. We care not upon which issue they force the fight. We are prepared to meet them on either issue or on both. If they tell us that the gold standard is the standard of civilization, we reply to them that this, the most enlightened of all nations of the earth, has never declared for a gold standard, and both the parties this year are declaring against it. If the gold standard is the standard of civilization, why, my friends, should we not have it? So if they come to meet us on that, we can present the history of our nation. More than that, we can tell them this, that they will search the pages of history in vain to find a single instance in which the common people of any land ever declared themselves in favor of a gold standard. They can find where the holders of fixed investments have.

Mr. Carlisle said in 1878 that this was a struggle between the idle holders of idle capital and the struggling masses who produce the wealth and pay the taxes of the country; and my friends, it is simply a question that we shall decide upon which side shall the Democratic Party fight. Upon the side of the idle holders of idle capital, or upon the side of the struggling masses? That is the question that the party must answer first; and then it must be answered by each individual hereafter. The sympathies of the Democratic Party, as described by the platform, are on the side of the struggling masses, who have ever been the foundation of the Democratic Party.
There are two ideas of government. There are those who believe that if you just legislate to make the well-to-do prosperous, that their prosperity will leak through on those below. The Democratic idea has been that if you legislate to make the masses prosperous their prosperity will find its way up and through every class that rests upon it.

You come to us and tell us that the great cities are in favor of the gold standard. I tell you that the great cities rest upon these broad and fertile prairies. Burn down your cities and leave our farms, and your cities will spring up again as if by magic. But destroy our farms and the grass will grow in the streets of every city in the country.

My friends, we shall declare that this nation is able to legislate for its own people on every question without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation on earth, and upon that issue we expect to carry every single state in the Union.

I shall not slander the fair state of Massachusetts nor the state of New York by saying that when citizens are confronted with the proposition, “Is this nation able to attend to its own business?”—I will not slander either one by saying that the people of those states will declare our helpless impotency as a nation to attend to our own business. It is the issue of 1776 over again. Our ancestors, when but 3 million, had the courage to declare their political independence of every other nation upon earth. Shall we, their descendants, when we have grown to 70 million, declare that we are less independent than our forefathers? No, my friends, it will never be the judgment of this people. Therefore, we care not upon what lines the battle is fought. If they say bimetallism is good but we cannot have it till some nation helps us, we reply that, instead of having a gold standard because England has, we shall restore bimetallism, and then let England have bimetallism because the United States have.

If they dare to come out in the open field and defend the gold standard as a good thing, we shall fight them to the uttermost, having behind us the producing masses of the nation and the world. Having behind us the commercial interests and the laboring interests and
all the toiling masses, we shall answer their demands for a gold standard by saying to them, you shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns. You shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold.
ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE

The March of the Flag

SPEECH EXCERPTS

September 16, 1898

Indianapolis, IN

BACKGROUND

Following the conclusion of the Spanish-American War in 1898, Spain handed over its territories of Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines to the United States. Having these new lands under American control raised many questions among the people, many of whom were unsure if the United States should be so involved abroad. Senator Albert Beveridge, running for reelection in Indiana, argued in this speech that it was indeed America’s mission to expand itself to those islands—perhaps even beyond—and to spread its principles across the world.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. How does Beveridge describe America?
2. What is America’s mission to the world?
3. What is the “march of the flag”?
4. What opposition does Beveridge face?
5. What is the “greatest fact of the future”?

Fellow citizens, it is a noble land that God has given us; a land that can feed and clothe the world; a land whose coastlines would enclose half the countries of Europe; a land set like a sentinel between the two imperial oceans of the globe, a greater England with a nobler destiny. It is a mighty people that He has planted on this soil; a people sprung from the most masterful blood of history; a people perpetually revitalized by the virile, man-producing working-folk of all the earth; a people imperial by virtue of their power, by right of their institutions, by authority of their heaven-directed purposes—the propagandists and not the misers of liberty. It is a glorious history our God has bestowed upon His chosen people; a history whose keynote was struck by [the] Liberty Bell; a history heroic with faith in our mission and our future; a history of statesmen who flung the boundaries of the Republic out into unexplored lands and savage wildernesses; a history of soldiers who carried the flag across the blazing deserts and through the ranks of hostile mountains, even to the gates of sunset; a history of a multiplying people who overran a continent in half a century; a history of prophets who saw the consequences of evils inherited from the past and of martyrs who died to save us from them; a history divinely logical, in the process of whose tremendous reasoning we find ourselves today.

Therefore, in this campaign, the question is larger than a party question. It is an American question. It is a world question. Shall the American people continue their resistless march toward the commercial supremacy of the world? Shall free institutions broaden their blessed reign as the children of liberty wax in strength, until the empire of our principles is established over the hearts of all mankind?

Have we no mission to perform, no duty to discharge to our fellow man? Has God endowed us with gifts beyond our deserts and marked us as the people of His peculiar favor, merely to rot in our own selfishness, as men and nations must, who take cowardice for their companion and self for their deity as China has, as India has, as Egypt has? Shall we be as the man who had one talent and hid it, or as he who had ten talents and used them until they grew to riches? And shall we reap the reward that waits on the discharge of our high duty as the sovereign power of earth; shall we occupy new markets for what our farmers raise, new markets for what our factories make, new markets for what our
merchants sell—aye, and, please God, new markets for what our ships shall carry? Shall we avail ourselves of new sources of supply of what we do not raise or make, so that what are luxuries today will be necessities to-morrow? …

... For William McKinley is continuing the policy that Jefferson began, Monroe continued, Seward advanced, Grant promoted, Harrison championed, and the growth of the Republic has demanded. Hawaii is ours; Puerto Rico is to be ours; at the prayer of the people Cuba will finally be ours; in the islands of the east, even to the gates of Asia, coaling stations are to be ours; at the very least the flag of a liberal government is to float over the Philippines, and it will be the stars and stripes of glory. And the burning question of this campaign is, whether the American people will accept the gifts of events; whether they will rise, as lifts their soaring destiny; whether they will proceed upon the lines of national development surveyed by the statesmen of our past; or whether, for the first time, the American people doubt their mission, question fate, prove apostate to the spirit of their race, and halt the ceaseless march of free institutions?

The opposition tells us that we ought not to govern a people without their consent. I answer, the rule of liberty that all just government derives its authority from the consent of the governed, applies only to those who are capable of self-government. We govern the Indians without their consent, we govern our territories without their consent, we govern our children without their consent. How do they know what our government would be without their consent? Would not the people of the Philippines prefer the just, humane, civilizing government of this Republic to the savage, bloody rule of pillage and extortion from which we have rescued them? Do not the blazing fires of joy and the ringing bells of gladness in Puerto Rico prove the welcome of our flag? And, regardless of this formula of words made only for enlightened, self-governing peoples, do we owe no duty to the world? Shall we turn these peoples back to the reeking hands from which we have taken them? Shall we abandon them to their fate with the wolves of conquest all about them? Shall we save them from those nations, to give them a self-rule of tragedy?

It would be like giving a razor to a babe and telling it to shave itself. It would be like giving a typewriter to an Eskimo and telling him to publish one of the great dailies of the world.
They ask us how we will govern these new possessions. I answer: out of local conditions and the necessities of the case methods of government will grow. If England can govern foreign lands so can America. If Germany can govern foreign lands so can America. If they can supervise protectorates so can America. Why is it more difficult to administer Hawaii than New Mexico or California? Both had a savage and an alien population; both were more remote from the seat of government when they came under our dominion than Hawaii is today. Will you say by your vote that American ability to govern has decayed, that you are an infidel to American vigor and practical sense? Or that we are of the ruling race of the world; that ours is the blood of government; ours the heart of dominion; ours the brain and the genius of administration? We do but what our fathers did—but pitch the tents of liberty farther westward, farther southward—we only continue the march of the flag.

The march of the flag! In 1789 the flag of the Republic waved over 4 million souls in thirteen States, and their savage territory which stretched to the Mississippi, to Canada, to the Floridas. The timid minds of that day said that no new territory was needed, and, for the hour, they were right. But Jefferson … acquired the territory which swept from the Mississippi to the mountains, from Texas to the British possessions, and the march of the flag began. The infidels to the gospel of liberty raved, but the flag swept on. The title to that noble land out of which Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana have been carved was uncertain; Jefferson … obeyed the Anglo-Saxon impulse within him … and another empire was added to the Republic and the march of the flag went on. Those who deny the power of free institutions to expand urged every argument, and more, that we hear today, but the march of the flag went on. A screen of land from New Orleans to Florida shut us from the gulf, and over this and the Everglade Peninsula waved the saffron flag of Spain. Andrew Jackson seized both, the American people stood at his back, and under Monroe the Floridas came under the dominion of the Republic, and the march of the flag went on. The Cassandras prophesied every prophecy of despair we hear today, but the march of the flag went on. Then Texas responded to the bugle calls of liberty and the march of the flag went on. And at last we waged war with Mexico and the flag swept
over the Southwest, over peerless California, past the Gate of Gold to Oregon on the north, and from ocean to ocean its folds of glory blazed. And now, obeying the same voice that Jefferson heard and obeyed, that Jackson heard and obeyed, that Seward heard and obeyed, that Grant and Harrison heard and obeyed, William McKinley plants the flag over the islands of the sea, outposts of commerce, citadels of national security, and the march of the flag goes on. …

Distance and oceans are no arguments. The fact that all the territory our fathers bought and seized is contiguous is no argument. In 1819 Florida was farther from New York than Puerto Rico is from Chicago today; Texas farther from Washington in 1845 than Hawaii is from Boston in 1898; California more inaccessible in 1847 than the Philippines are now. Gibraltar is farther from London than Havana is from Washington; Melbourne is farther from Liverpool than Manila is from San Francisco. The ocean does not separate us from the lands of our duty and desire—the ocean joins us, a river never to be dredged, a canal never to be repaired. Steam joins us; electricity joins us—the very elements are in league with our destiny. Cuba not contiguous! Puerto Rico not contiguous! Hawaii and the Philippines not contiguous! Our navy will make them contiguous. Dewey and Sampson and Schley have made them contiguous and American speed, American guns, American heart and brain and nerve will keep them contiguous forever.

But the opposition is right—there is a difference. We did not need the western Mississippi Valley when we acquired it, nor Florida, nor Texas, nor California, nor the royal provinces of the far Northwest. We had no emigrants to people this imperial wilderness, no money to develop it, even no highways to cover it. No trade awaited us in its savage fastnesses. Our productions were not greater than our internal trade. There was not one reason for the land lust of our statesmen from Jefferson to Grant, other than the prophet and the Saxon within them. But, today, we are raising more than we can consume. Today, we are making more than we can use. … Therefore, we must find new markets for our produce, new occupation for our capital, new work for our labor. And so, while we did not need the territory taken during the past century at the time it was acquired, we do need what we have taken in 1898, and we need it now. Think of the thousands of
Americans who will pour into Hawaii and Puerto Rico when the Republic’s laws cover those islands with justice and safety. Think of the tens of thousands of Americans who will invade the Philippines when a liberal government, protected and controlled by this Republic, if not the government of the Republic itself, shall establish order and equity there. Think of the hundreds of thousands of Americans who will build a soap-and-water, common school civilization of energy and industry in Cuba, when a government of law replaces the double reign of anarchy and tyranny. Think of the prosperous millions that empress of islands will support when, obedient to the law of political gravitation, her people ask for the highest honor liberty can bestow—the sacred order of the stars and stripes, the citizenship of the great Republic!

What does all this mean for every one of us? It means opportunity for all the glorious young manhood of the Republic. … It means that the resources and the commerce of these immensely rich dominions will be increased as much as American energy is greater than Spanish sloth; for Americans, henceforth, will monopolize those resources and that commerce. In Cuba, alone, there are 15 million acres of forest unacquainted with the ax. There are exhaustless mines of iron. There are priceless deposits of manganese. … There are millions of acres yet unexplored. The resources of Puerto Rico have only been trifled with. The riches of the Philippines have hardly been touched by the fingertips of modern methods. And they produce what we cannot, and they consume what we produce—the very predestination of reciprocity. … And William McKinley intends that their trade shall be ours. … It means … an opportunity for the rich man to do something with his money, besides hoarding it or lending it. It means occupation for every workingman in the country at wages which the development of new resources, the launching of new enterprises, the monopoly of new markets always brings. Cuba is as large as Pennsylvania, and is the richest spot on all the globe. Hawaii is as large as New Jersey; Puerto Rico half as large as Hawaii; the Philippines larger than all New England, New York, New Jersey, and Delaware. All these are larger than the British Isles, larger than France, larger than Germany, larger than Japan. The trade of these islands, developed as we will develop it, … monopolized as we will monopolize it, will set every reaper in this Republic singing, every spindle whirling, every furnace spouting the flames of industry. …
... The commercial empire of the Republic! That is the greatest fact of the future. And that is why these islands involve considerations larger than their own commerce. The commercial supremacy of the Republic means that this nation is to be the sovereign factor in the peace of the world. For the conflicts of the future are to be conflicts of trade—struggles for markets—commercial wars for existence. And the golden rule of peace is impregnability of position and invincibility of preparation. So we see England, the greatest strategist of history, plant her flag and her cannon on Gibraltar, at Quebec, the Bermudas, Vancouver—everywhere—until from every point of vantage her royal banner flashes in the sun. So Hawaii furnishes us a naval base in the heart of the Pacific; the Ladrones another, a voyage further into the region of sunset and commerce; Manila, another, at the gates of Asia—Asia, to the trade of whose hundreds of millions American merchants, American manufacturers, American farmers have as good a right as those of Germany, or France, or Russia, or England; Asia, whose commerce with England alone amounts to billions of dollars every year; Asia, to whom Germany looks to take the surplus of her factories, and foundries, and mills; Asia, whose doors shall not be shut against American trade!

Within two decades the bulk of Oriental commerce will be ours—the richest commerce in the world. In the light of that golden future our chain of new-won stations rise like ocean sentinels from the night of waters—Puerto Rico, a nobler Gibraltar; the Isthmian canal, a greater Suez; Hawaii, the Ladrones, the Philippines, commanding the Pacific! Ah! as our commerce spreads, the flag of liberty will circle the globe and the highways of the ocean-carrying trade of all mankind be guarded by the guns of the Republic. And, as their thunders salute the flag, benighted peoples will know that the voice of Liberty is speaking, at last, for them; that civilization is dawning, at last for them—Liberty and Civilization, those children of Christ’s gospel, who follow and never precede the preparing march of commerce! It is the tide of God’s great purposes made manifest in the instincts of our race, whose present phase is our personal profit, but whose far-off end is the redemption of the world and the Christianization of mankind. [...]
… Shall this future of the race be left with those who, under God, began this career of sacred duty and immortal glory; or, shall we risk it to those who would build a dam in the current of destiny’s large designs. …

5 Fellow Americans, we are God’s chosen people. Yonder at Bunker Hill and Yorktown His providence was above us. At New Orleans and on ensanguined seas His hand sustained us. Abraham Lincoln was His minister; and His was the altar of freedom, the boys in blue set on a hundred smoking battlefields. His power directed Dewey in the East, and He delivered the Spanish fleet into our hands on the eve of Liberty’s natal day as He delivered the elder Armada into the hands of our English sires two centuries ago. His great purposes are revealed in the progress of the flag, which surpasses the intentions of Congresses and cabinets, and leads us, like a holier pillar of cloud by day and pillar of fire by night, into situations unforeseen by finite wisdom and duties unexpected by the unprophetic heart of selfishness. The American people cannot use a dishonest medium of exchange; it is ours to set the world its example of right and honor. We cannot fly from our world duties; it is ours to execute the purpose of a fate that has driven us to be greater than our small intentions. We cannot retreat from any soil where Providence has unfurled our banner; it is ours to save that soil for liberty and civilization. For liberty and civilization and God’s promises fulfilled, the flag must henceforth be the symbol and the sign to all mankind. …
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THE AMERICAN ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE

Platform of the American Anti-Imperialist League

PARTY PLATFORM

BACKGROUND

Founded in 1899 by Andrew Carnegie and William James, the American Anti-Imperialist League was a response to the United States' occupation of Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippine Islands following the Spanish-American War. This platform expressed their fundamental differences with American expansion. (Note the contrasts to the previous speech of Sen. Beveridge defending the islands' possession by the United States.)

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Where does the League say imperialism often leads a nation?
2. How does 1899 compare to 1861, according to the League?
3. Does it say citizens should always support their government?
4. What does the League say about self-government?
We hold that the policy known as imperialism is hostile to liberty and tends toward militarism, an evil from which it has been our glory to be free. We regret that it has become necessary in the land of Washington and Lincoln to reaffirm that all men, of whatever race or color, are entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. We maintain that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. We insist that the subjugation of any people is “criminal aggression” and open disloyalty to the distinctive principles of our Government.

We earnestly condemn the policy of the present National Administration in the Philippines. It seeks to extinguish the spirit of 1776 in those islands. We deplore the sacrifice of our soldiers and sailors, whose bravery deserves admiration even in an unjust war. We denounce the slaughter of the Filipinos as a needless horror. We protest against the extension of American sovereignty by Spanish methods.

We demand the immediate cessation of the war against liberty, begun by Spain and continued by us. We urge that Congress be promptly convened to announce to the Filipinos our purpose to concede to them the independence for which they have so long fought and which of right is theirs.

The United States have always protested against the doctrine of international law which permits the subjugation of the weak by the strong. A self-governing state cannot accept sovereignty over an unwilling people. The United States cannot act upon the ancient heresy that might makes right.

Imperialists assume that with the destruction of self-government in the Philippines by American hands, all opposition here will cease. This is a grievous error. Much as we abhor the war of “criminal aggression” in the Philippines, greatly as we regret that the blood of the Filipinos is on American hands, we more deeply resent the betrayal of American institutions at home. The real firing line is not in the suburbs of Manila. The foe is of our own household. The attempt of 1861 was to divide the country. That of 1899 is to destroy its fundamental principles and noblest ideals.
Whether the ruthless slaughter of the Filipinos shall end next month or next year is but an incident in a contest that must go on until the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States are rescued from the hands of their betrayers. Those who dispute about standards of value while the foundation of the Republic is undermined will be listened to as little as those who would wrangle about the small economies of the household while the house is on fire. The training of a great people for a century, the aspiration for liberty of a vast immigration are forces that will hurl aside those who in the delirium of conquest seek to destroy the character of our institutions.

We deny that the obligation of all citizens to support their Government in times of grave National peril applies to the present situation. If an Administration may with impunity ignore the issues upon which it was chosen, deliberately create a condition of war anywhere on the face of the globe, debase the civil service for spoils to promote the adventure, organize a truth suppressing censorship and demand of all citizens a suspension of judgment and their unanimous support while it chooses to continue the fighting, representative government itself is imperiled.

We propose to contribute to the defeat of any person or party that stands for the forcible subjugation of any people. We shall oppose for reelection all who in the White House or in Congress betray American liberty in pursuit of un-American ends. We still hope that both of our great political parties will support and defend the Declaration of Independence in the closing campaign of the century.

We hold, with Abraham Lincoln, that "no man is good enough to govern another man without that other's consent. When the white man governs himself, that is self-government, but when he governs himself and also governs another man, that is more than self-government-that is despotism." "Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men in all lands. Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and under a just God cannot long retain it."
We cordially invite the cooperation of all men and women who remain loyal to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.
BOOKER T. WASHINGTON

Atlanta Exposition Address

SPEECH

Cotton States and International Exposition | Atlanta, GA

September 18, 1895

BACKGROUND

Following the Civil War, African Americans—many of whom were former slaves—struggled to be fully accepted into American society due to white racial prejudice in the North and South alike, despite the presence of the Reconstruction Amendments to the Constitution. Thus, different schools of thought developed in the African American community as to how best address this issue given the present circumstances. Booker T. Washington, himself a former slave, gave his views on the subject and the problems facing a changing America in this speech at the Cotton States and International Exposition.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. By what means does Washington suggest blacks can improve their position in American society?
2. For what reason does Washington believe that blacks will find success even in the South?
3. What public activity does he say most African Americans would consider ill-advised?
4. What virtue does Washington say is crucial to making progress in racial relationships?

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Board of Directors and Citizens:

One-third of the population of the South is of the Negro race. No enterprise seeking the material, civil, or moral welfare of this section can disregard this element of our population and reach the highest success. I but convey to you, Mr. President and Directors, the sentiment of the masses of my race when I say that in no way have the value and manhood of the American Negro been more fittingly and generously recognized than by the managers of this magnificent exposition at every stage of its progress. It is a recognition that will do more to cement the friendship of the two races than any occurrence since the dawn of our freedom.

Not only this, but the opportunity here afforded will awaken among us a new era of industrial progress. Ignorant and inexperienced, it is not strange that in the first years of our new life we began at the top instead of at the bottom; that a seat in Congress or the state legislature was more sought than real estate or industrial skill; that the political convention or stump speaking had more attractions than starting a dairy farm or truck garden.

A ship lost at sea for many days suddenly sighted a friendly vessel. From the mast of the unfortunate vessel was seen a signal: “Water, water; we die of thirst.” The answer from the friendly vessel at once came back: “Cast down your bucket where you are.” A second time the signal, “Water, water, send us water!” ran up from the distressed vessel, and was answered: “Cast down your bucket where you are.” And a third and fourth signal for water was answered: “Cast down your bucket where you are.” The captain of the distressed vessel, at last heeding the injunction, cast down his bucket, and it came up full of fresh, sparkling water from the mouth of the Amazon River.

To those of my race who depend on bettering their condition in a foreign land or who underestimate the importance of cultivating friendly relations with the southern white man, who is their next-door neighbor, I would say: Cast down your bucket where you are; cast it down in making friends, in every manly way, of the people of all races by whom
we are surrounded. Cast it down in agriculture, mechanics, in commerce, in domestic service, and in the professions. And in this connection it is well to bear in mind that whatever other sins the South may be called to bear, when it comes to business, pure and simple, it is in the South that the Negro is given a man’s chance in the commercial world, and in nothing is this exposition more eloquent than in emphasizing this chance.

Our greatest danger is that, in the great leap from slavery to freedom, we may overlook the fact that the masses of us are to live by the productions of our hands and fail to keep in mind that we shall prosper in proportion as we learn to dignify and glorify common labor, and put brains and skill into the common occupations of life; shall prosper in proportion as we learn to draw the line between the superficial and the substantial, the ornamental gewgaws of life and the useful. No race can prosper till it learns that there is as much dignity in tilling a field as in writing a poem. It is at the bottom of life we must begin, and not at the top. Nor should we permit our grievances to overshadow our opportunities.

To those of the white race who look to the incoming of those of foreign birth and strange tongue and habits for the prosperity of the South, were I permitted I would repeat what I say to my own race, “Cast down your bucket where you are.” Cast it down among the 8 million Negroes whose habits you know, whose fidelity and love you have tested in days when to have proved treacherous meant the ruin of your firesides. Cast down your bucket among these people who have, without strikes and labor wars, tilled your fields, cleared your forests, built your railroads and cities, and brought forth treasures from the bowels of the earth and helped make possible this magnificent representation of the progress of the South. Casting down your bucket among my people, helping and encouraging them as you are doing on these grounds, and, with education of head, hand, and heart, you will find that they will buy your surplus land, make blossom the waste places in your fields, and run your factories.

While doing this, you can be sure in the future, as in the past, that you and your families will be surrounded by the most patient, faithful, law-abiding, and unresentful people that
the world has seen. As we have proved our loyalty to you in the past, in nursing your children, watching by the sickbed of your mothers and fathers, and often following them with tear-dimmed eyes to their graves, so in the future, in our humble way, we shall stand by you with a devotion that no foreigner can approach, ready to lay down our lives, if need be, in defense of yours; interlacing our industrial, commercial, civil, and religious life with yours in a way that shall make the interests of both races one. In all things that are purely social we can be as separate as the fingers, yet one as the hand in all things essential to mutual progress.

There is no defense or security for any of us except in the highest intelligence and development of all. If anywhere there are efforts tending to curtail the fullest growth of the Negro, let these efforts be turned into stimulating, encouraging, and making him the most useful and intelligent citizen. Effort or means so invested will pay a thousand percent interest. These efforts will be twice blessed—“blessing him that gives and him that takes.”

There is no escape, through law of man or God, from the inevitable:

The laws of changeless justice bind
Oppressor with oppressed;
And close as sin and suffering joined
We march to fate abreast.

Nearly 16 million hands will aid you in pulling the load upward, or they will pull against you the load downward. We shall constitute one-third and more of the ignorance and crime of the South, or one-third its intelligence and progress; we shall contribute one-third to the business and industrial prosperity of the South, or we shall prove a veritable body of death, stagnating, depressing, retarding every effort to advance the body politic. Gentlemen of the exposition, as we present to you our humble effort at an exhibition of our progress, you must not expect overmuch. Starting thirty years ago with ownership here and there in a few quilts and pumpkins and chickens (gathered from miscellaneous sources), remember: the path that has led from these to the invention and production of agricultural implements, buggies, steam engines, newspapers, books, statuary, carving, paintings, the management of drugstores and banks, has not been trodden without
contact with thorns and thistles. While we take pride in what we exhibit as a result of our independent efforts, we do not for a moment forget that our part in this exhibition would fall far short of your expectations but for the constant help that has come to our educational life, not only from the southern states but especially from northern philanthropists who have made their gifts a constant stream of blessing and encouragement.

The wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremest folly, and that progress in the enjoyment of all the privileges that will come to us must be the result of severe and constant struggle rather than of artificial forcing. No race that has anything to contribute to the markets of the world is long in any degree ostracized. It is important and right that all privileges of the law be ours, but it is vastly more important that we be prepared for the exercise of those privileges. The opportunity to earn a dollar in a factory just now is worth infinitely more than the opportunity to spend a dollar in an opera house.

In conclusion, may I repeat that nothing in thirty years has given us more hope and encouragement and drawn us so near to you of the white race as this opportunity offered by the exposition; and here bending, as it were, over the altar that represents the results of the struggles of your race and mine, both starting practically empty-handed three decades ago, I pledge that, in your effort to work out the great and intricate problem which God has laid at the doors of the South, you shall have at all times the patient, sympathetic help of my race; only let this be constantly in mind that, while from representations in these buildings of the product of field, of forest, of mine, of factory, letters, and art, much good will come—yet far above and beyond material benefits will be that higher good, that let us pray God will come, in a blotting out of sectional differences and racial animosities and suspicions, in a determination to administer absolute justice, in a willing obedience among all classes to the mandates of law. This, coupled with our material prosperity, will bring into our beloved South a new heaven and a new earth.
The open expanse of the American West provided substantial room for settlement, national growth, and exploration even before the Civil War. By the close of the 19th century, however, due to continued expansion and the relegation of the Indians to comparatively small reservations, the Western frontier could be said to have faded into irrelevancy—there was simply not as much (if anything) left to explore. In 1890, the U.S. Census Bureau itself officially declared that the frontier no longer existed. In response, American scholar Frederick Jackson Turner published this essay exploring the tangible, lasting effects of the Western frontier’s exploration on the United States.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. How does Turner describe the Western frontier?

2. What are the multiple “frontiers” that have existed throughout American history?

3. In what ways does Turner say the West shaped the rest of America both culturally and politically?
In a recent bulletin of the Superintendent of the Census for 1890 appear these significant words: “Up to and including 1880 the country had a frontier of settlement, but at present the unsettled area has been so broken into by isolated bodies of settlement that there can hardly be said to be a frontier line. In the discussion of its extent, its westward movement, etc., it can not, therefore, any longer have a place in the census reports.” This brief official statement marks the closing of a great historic movement. Up to our own day American history has been in a large degree the history of the colonization of the Great West. The existence of an area of free land, its continuous recession, and the advance of American settlement westward, explain American development.

Behind institutions, behind constitutional forms and modifications, lie the vital forces that call these organs into life and shape them to meet changing conditions. The peculiarity of American institutions is, the fact that they have been compelled to adapt themselves to the changes of an expanding people—to the changes involved in crossing a continent, in winning a wilderness, and in developing at each area of this progress out of the primitive economic and political conditions of the frontier into the complexity of city life. Said Calhoun in 1817, “We are great, and rapidly—I was about to say fearfully—growing!” [1] So saying, he touched the distinguishing feature of American life. All peoples show development; the germ theory of politics has been sufficiently emphasized. In the case of most nations, however, the development has occurred in a limited area; and if the nation has expanded, it has met other growing peoples whom it has conquered. But in the case of the United States we have a different phenomenon. Limiting our attention to the Atlantic coast, we have the familiar phenomenon of the evolution of institutions in a limited area, such as the rise of representative government; the differentiation of simple colonial governments into complex organs; the progress from primitive industrial society, without division of labor, up to manufacturing civilization. But we have in addition to this a recurrence of the process of evolution in each western area reached in the process of expansion. Thus American development has exhibited not merely advance along a single line, but a return to primitive conditions on a continually advancing frontier line, and a new development for that area. American social development has been continually beginning over again on the frontier. This perennial
rebirth, this fluidity of American life, this expansion westward with its new opportunities, its continuous touch with the simplicity of primitive society, furnish the forces dominating American character. The true point of view in the history of this nation is not the Atlantic coast, it is the great West. Even the slavery struggle, which is made so exclusive an object of attention by writers like Prof. von Holst, occupies its important place in American history because of its relation to westward expansion.

In this advance, the frontier is the outer edge of the wave—the meeting point between savagery and civilization. Much has been written about the frontier from the point of view of border warfare and the chase, but as a field for the serious study of the economist and the historian it has been neglected.

The American frontier is sharply distinguished from the European frontier—a fortified boundary line running through dense populations. The most significant thing about the American frontier is, that it lies at the hither edge of free land. In the census reports it is treated as the margin of that settlement which has a density of two or more to the square mile. The term is an elastic one, and for our purposes does not need sharp definition. We shall consider the whole frontier belt, including the Indian country and the outer margin of the “settled area” of the census reports. This paper will make no attempt to treat the subject exhaustively; its aim is simply to call attention to the frontier as a fertile field for investigation, and to suggest some of the problems which arise in connection with it.

In the settlement of America we have to observe how European life entered the continent, and how America modified and developed that life and reacted on Europe. Our early history is the study of European germs developing in an American environment. Too exclusive attention has been paid by institutional students to the Germanic origins, too little to the American factors. The frontier is the line of most rapid and effective Americanization. The wilderness masters the colonist. It finds him a European in dress, industries, tools, modes of travel, and thought. It takes him from the railroad car and puts him in the birch canoe. It strips off the garments of civilization and arrays him in the hunting shirt and the moccasin. It puts him in the log cabin of the Cherokee and
Iroquois and runs an Indian palisade around him. Before long he has gone to planting Indian corn and plowing with a sharp stick; he shouts the war cry and takes the scalp in orthodox Indian fashion. In short, at the frontier the environment is at first too strong for the man. He must accept the conditions which it furnishes, or perish, and so he fits himself into the Indian clearings and follows the Indian trails. Little by little he transforms the wilderness; but the outcome is not the old Europe, not simply the development of Germanic germs, any more than the first phenomenon was a case of reversion to the Germanic mark. The fact is, that here is a new product that is American. At first, the frontier was the Atlantic coast. It was the frontier of Europe in a very real sense. Moving westward, the frontier became more and more American. As successive terminal moraines result from successive glaciations, so each frontier leaves its traces behind it, and when it becomes a settled area the region still partakes of the frontier characteristics. Thus the advance of the frontier has meant a steady movement away from the influence of Europe, a steady growth of independence on American lines. And to study this advance, the men who grew up under these conditions, and the political, economic, and social results of it, is to study the really American part of our history.

**Stages of Frontier Advance**

In the course of the seventeenth century the frontier was advanced up the Atlantic river courses, just beyond the “fall line,” and the tidewater region became the settled area. In the first half of the eighteenth century another advance occurred. Traders followed the Delaware and Shawnee Indians to the Ohio as early as the end of the first quarter of the century. [2] Gov. Spotswood, of Virginia, made an expedition in 1714 across the Blue Ridge. The end of the first quarter of the century saw the advance of the Scotch-Irish and the Palatine Germans up the Shenandoah Valley into the western part of Virginia, and along the Piedmont region of the Carolinas. [3] The Germans in New York pushed the frontier of settlement up the Mohawk to German Flats. [4] In Pennsylvania the town of Bedford indicates the line of settlement. Settlements had begun on New River, a branch of the Kanawha, and on the sources of the Yadkin and French Broad. [5] The King attempted to arrest the advance by his proclamation of 1763, [6] forbidding settlements beyond the sources of the rivers flowing into the Atlantic; but in vain. In the period of
the Revolution the frontier crossed the Alleghanies into Kentucky and Tennessee, and the upper waters of the Ohio were settled. [7] When the first census was taken in 1790, the continuous settled area was bounded by a line which ran near the coast of Maine, and included New England except a portion of Vermont and New Hampshire, New York along the Hudson and up the Mohawk about Schenectady, eastern and southern Pennsylvania, Virginia well across the Shenandoah Valley, and the Carolinas and eastern Georgia. [8] Beyond this region of continuous settlement were the small settled areas of Kentucky and Tennessee, and the Ohio, with the mountains intervening between them and the Atlantic area, thus giving a new and important character to the frontier. The isolation of the region increased its peculiarly American tendencies, and the need of transportation facilities to connect it with the East called out important schemes of internal improvement, which will be noted farther on. The “West,” as a self-conscious section, began to evolve.

From decade to decade distinct advances of the frontier occurred. By the census of 1820, [9] the settled area included Ohio, southern Indiana and Illinois, southeastern Missouri, and about one-half of Louisiana. This settled area had surrounded Indian areas, and the management of these tribes became an object of political concern. The frontier region of the time lay along the Great Lakes, where Astor’s American Fur Company operated in the Indian trade, [10] and beyond the Mississippi, where Indian traders extended their activity even to the Rocky Mountains; Florida also furnished frontier conditions. The Mississippi River region was the scene of typical frontier settlements. [11]

The rising steam navigation [12] on western waters, the opening of the Erie Canal, and the westward extension of cotton [13] culture added five frontier states to the Union in this period. Grund, writing in 1836, declares: “It appears then that the universal disposition of Americans to emigrate to the western wilderness, in order to enlarge their dominion over inanimate nature, is the actual result of an expansive power which is inherent in them, and which by continually agitating all classes of society is constantly throwing a large portion of the whole population on the extreme confines of the State, in order to gain space for its development. Hardly is a new State or Territory formed before
the same principle manifests itself again and gives rise to a further emigration; and so is it destined to go on until a physical barrier must finally obstruct its progress.” [14]

In the middle of this century the line indicated by the present eastern boundary of Indian Territory, Nebraska, and Kansas marked the frontier of the Indian country. [15] Minnesota and Wisconsin still exhibited frontier conditions, [16] but the distinctive frontier of the period is found in California, where the gold discoveries had sent a sudden tide of adventurous miners, and in Oregon, and the settlements in Utah. [17] As the frontier has leaped over the Alleghanies, so now it skipped the Great Plains and the Rocky Mountains; and in the same way that the advance of the frontiersmen beyond the Alleghanies had caused the rise of important questions of transportation and internal improvement, so now the settlers beyond the Rocky Mountains needed means of communication with the East, and in the furnishing of these arose the settlement of the Great Plains and the development of still another kind of frontier life. Railroads, fostered by land grants, sent an increasing tide of immigrants into the far West. The United States Army fought a series of Indian wars in Minnesota, Dakota, and the Indian Territory. By 1880 the settled area had been pushed into northern Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, along Dakota rivers, and in the Black Hills region, and was ascending the rivers of Kansas and Nebraska. The development of mines in Colorado had drawn isolated frontier settlements into that region, and Montana and Idaho were receiving settlers. The frontier was found in these mining camps and the ranches of the Great Plains. The superintendent of the census for 1890 reports, as previously stated, that the settlements of the West lie so scattered over the region that there can no longer be said to be a frontier line.

In these successive frontiers we find natural boundary lines which have served to mark and to affect the characteristics of the frontiers, namely: The “fall line,” the Alleghany Mountains; the Mississippi; the Missouri, where its direction approximates north and south; the line of the arid lands, approximately the ninety-ninth meridian; and the Rocky Mountains. The fall line marked the frontier of the seventeenth century; the Alleghanies
that of the eighteenth; the Mississippi that of the first quarter of the nineteenth; the
Missouri that of the middle of this century (omitting the California movement); and the
belt of the Rocky Mountains and the arid tract, the present frontier. Each was won by a
series of Indian wars. […]
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Intellectual Traits
From the conditions of frontier life came intellectual traits of profound importance. The
works of travelers along each frontier from colonial days onward describe certain
common traits, and these traits have, while softening down, still persisted as survivals in
the place of their origin, even when a higher social organization succeeded. The result is
that to the frontier the American intellect owes its striking characteristics. That
coarseness and strength combined with acuteness and inquisitiveness; that practical,
inventive turn of mind, quick to find expedients; that masterful grasp of material things,
lacking in the artistic but powerful to effect great ends; that restless, nervous energy;
[53] that dominant individualism, working for good and for evil, and withal that
buoyancy and exuberance which comes with freedom—these are traits of the frontier, or
traits called out elsewhere because of the existence of the frontier. Since the days when
the fleet of Columbus sailed into the waters of the New World, America has been another
name for opportunity, and the people of the United States have taken their tone from the
incessant expansion which has not only been open but has even been forced upon them.

He would be a rash prophet who should assert that the expansive character of American
life has now entirely ceased. Movement has been its dominant fact, and, unless this
training has no effect upon a people, the American energy will continually demand a
wider field for its exercise. But never again will such gifts of free land offer themselves.

For a moment, at the frontier, the bonds of custom are broken and unrestraint is
triumphant. There is not tabula rasa. The stubborn American environment is there with
its imperious summons to accept its conditions; the inherited ways of doing things are
also there; and yet, in spite of environment, and in spite of custom, each frontier did
indeed furnish a new field of opportunity, a gate of escape from the bondage of the past;
and freshness, and confidence, and scorn of older society, impatience of its restraints and
its ideas, and indifference to its lessons, have accompanied the frontier. What the
Mediterranean Sea was to the Greeks, breaking the bond of custom, offering new experiences, calling out new institutions and activities, that, and more, the ever retreating frontier has been to the United States directly, and to the nations of Europe more remotely. And now, four centuries from the discovery of America, at the end of a hundred years of life under the Constitution, the frontier has gone, and with its going has closed the first period of American history.
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BACKGROUND

As noted in previous selections, the Gilded Age produced a variety of new problems and issues that Americans were initially unprepared to solve. However, the rise of the “new” political philosophy of Progressivism promised to provide a blueprint guaranteeing not only solutions to America’s current problems, but also the nation’s future development. Woodrow Wilson, the governor of New Jersey—as well as the former president of Princeton University and one of the earliest Progressives—ran his 1912 American presidential campaign on a promise to reform America’s ideals and structures to meet the challenges of the ever-changing political landscape. Such rhetoric is typified by this campaign speech of Wilson’s, published after he had won the presidency.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. With what parable does Wilson begin his speech?
2. What does it mean to be Progressive?
3. What is “progress,” according to Wilson?
4. What does Wilson say about the American Founding?

In that sage and veracious chronicle, Alice through the Looking-Glass, it is recounted how, on a noteworthy occasion, the little heroine is seized by the Red Chess Queen, who races her off at a terrific pace. They run until both of them are out of breath; then they stop, and Alice looks around her and says, “Why, we are just where we were when we started!” “Oh, yes,” says the Red Queen; “you have to run twice as fast as that to get anywhere else.”

That is a parable of progress. The laws of this country have not kept up with the change of economic circumstances in this country; they have not kept up with the change of political circumstances; and therefore we are not even where we were when we started. We shall have to run, not until we are out of breath, but until we have caught up with our own conditions, before we shall be where we were when we started; when we started this great experiment which has been the hope and the beacon of the world. And we should have to run twice as fast as any rational program I have seen in order to get anywhere else.

I am, therefore, forced to be a progressive, if for no other reason, because we have not kept up with our changes of conditions, either in the economic field or in the political field. We have not kept up as well as other nations have. We have not kept our practices adjusted to the facts of the case, and until we do, and unless we do, the facts of the case will always have the better of the argument; because if you do not adjust your laws to the facts, so much the worse for the laws, not for the facts, because law trails along after the facts. Only that law is unsafe which runs ahead of the facts and beckons to it and makes it follow the will-o’-the-wisps of imaginative projects. …

Politics in America is in a case which sadly requires attention. The system set up by our law and our usage doesn’t work—or at least it can’t be depended on; it is made to work only by a most unreasonable expenditure of labor and pains. The government, which was designed for the people, has got into the hands of bosses and their employers, the special interests. An invisible empire has been set up above the forms of democracy. …
Now, movement has no virtue in itself. Change is not worth while for its own sake. I am not one of those who love variety for its own sake. If a thing is good today, I should like to have it stay that way tomorrow. Most of our calculations in life are dependent upon things staying the way they are. For example, if, when you got up this morning, you had forgotten how to dress, if you had forgotten all about those ordinary things which you do almost automatically, which you can almost do half awake, you would have to find out what you did yesterday. I am told by the psychologists that if I did not remember who I was yesterday, I should not know who I am today, and that, therefore, my very identity depends upon my being able to tally today with yesterday. If they do not tally, then I am confused; I do not know who I am, and I have to go around and ask somebody to tell me my name and where I came from.

I am not one of those who wish to break connection with the past; I am not one of those who wish to change for the mere sake of variety. The only men who do that are the men who want to forget something, the men who filled yesterday with something they would rather not recollect today, and so go about seeking diversion, seeking abstraction in something that will blot out recollection, or seeking to put something into them which will blot out all recollection. Change is not worth while unless it is improvement. If I move out of my present house because I do not like it, then I have got to choose a better house, or build a better house, to justify the change. …

Progress! Did you ever reflect that that word is almost a new one? No word comes more often or more naturally to the lips of modern man, as if the thing it stands for were almost synonymous with life itself, and yet men through many thousand years never talked or thought of progress. They thought in the other direction. Their stories of heroisms and glory were tales of the past. The ancestor wore the heavier armor and carried the larger spear. “There were giants in those days.” Now all that has altered. We think of the future, not the past, as the more glorious time in comparison with which the present is nothing. Progress, development—those are modern words. The modern idea is to leave the past and press onward to something new.
But what is progress going to do with the past, and with the present? How is it going to treat them? With ignominy, or respect? Should it break with them altogether, or rise out of them, with its roots still deep in the older time? What attitude shall progressives take toward the existing order, toward those institutions of conservatism, the Constitution, the laws, and the courts?

Are those thoughtful men who fear that we are now about to disturb the ancient foundations of our institutions justified in their fear? If they are, we ought to go very slowly about the processes of change. If it is indeed true that we have grown tired of the institutions which we have so carefully and sedulously built up, then we ought to go very slowly and very carefully about the very dangerous task of altering them. We ought, therefore, to ask ourselves, first of all, whether thought in this country is tending to do anything by which we shall retrace our steps, or by which we shall change the whole direction of our development?

I believe, for one, that you cannot tear up ancient rootages and safely plant the tree of liberty in soil which is not native to it. I believe that the ancient traditions of a people are its ballast; you cannot make a tabula rasa upon which to write a political program. You cannot take a new sheet of paper and determine what your life shall be tomorrow. You must knit the new into the old. You cannot put a new patch on an old garment without ruining it; it must be not a patch, but something woven into the old fabric, of practically the same pattern, of the same texture and intention. If I did not believe that to be progressive was to preserve the essentials of our institutions, I for one could not be a progressive.

One of the chief benefits I used to derive from being president of a university was that I had the pleasure of entertaining thoughtful men from all over the world. I cannot tell you how much has dropped into my granary by their presence. I had been casting around in my mind for something by which to draw several parts of my political thought together when it was my good fortune to entertain a very interesting Scotsman who had been devoting himself to the philosophical thought of the seventeenth century. His talk was so
engaging that it was delightful to hear him speak of anything, and presently there came out of the unexpected region of his thought the thing I had been waiting for. He called my attention to the fact that in every generation all sorts of speculation and thinking tend to fall under the formula of the dominant thought of the age. For example, after the Newtonian theory of the universe had been developed, almost all thinking tended to express itself in the analogies of the Newtonian theory, and since the Darwinian theory has reigned amongst us, everybody is likely to express whatever he wishes to expound in terms of development and accommodation to environment.

Now, it came to me, as this interesting man talked, that the Constitution of the United States had been made under the dominion of the Newtonian theory. You have only to read the papers of *The Federalist* to see that fact written on every page. They speak of the “checks and balances” of the Constitution, and use to express their idea the simile of the organization of the universe, and particularly of the solar system—how by the attraction of gravitation the various parts are held in their orbits; and then they proceed to represent Congress, the judiciary, and the president as a sort of imitation of the solar system.

They were only following the English Whigs, who gave Great Britain its modern constitution. Not that those Englishmen analyzed the matter, or had any theory about it; Englishmen care little for theories. It was a Frenchman, Montesquieu, who pointed out to them how faithfully they had copied Newton’s description of the mechanism of the heavens.

The makers of our federal Constitution read Montesquieu with true scientific enthusiasm. They were scientists in their way—the best way of their age—those fathers of the nation. Jefferson wrote of “the laws of Nature”—and then by way of afterthought—“and of Nature’s God.” And they constructed a government as they would have constructed an orrery—to display the laws of nature. Politics in their thought was a variety of mechanics. The Constitution was founded on the law of gravitation. The government was to exist and move by virtue of the efficacy of “checks and balances.”
The trouble with the theory is that government is not a machine but a living thing. It falls not under the theory of the universe, but under the theory of organic life. It is accountable to Darwin, not to Newton. It is modified by its environment, necessitated by its tasks, shaped to its functions by the sheer pressure of life. No living thing can have its organs offset against each other, as checks, and live. On the contrary, its life is dependent upon their quick cooperation, their ready response to the commands of instinct or intelligence, their amicable community of purpose. Government is not a body of blind forces; it is a body of men, with highly differentiated functions, no doubt, in our modern day, of specialization, with a common task and purpose. Their cooperation is indispensable, their warfare fatal. There can be no successful government without the intimate, instinctive coordination of the organs of life and action. This is not theory, but fact, and displays its force as fact, whatever theories may be thrown across its track. Living political constitutions must be Darwinian in structure and in practice. Society is a living organism and must obey the laws of life, not of mechanics; it must develop.

All that progressives ask or desire is permission—in an era when “development,” “evolution,” is the scientific word—to interpret the Constitution according to the Darwinian principle; all they ask is recognition of the fact that a nation is a living thing and not a machine.

Some citizens of this country have never got beyond the Declaration of Independence, signed in Philadelphia, July 4th, 1776. Their bosoms swell against George III, but they have no consciousness of the war for freedom that is going on today.

The Declaration of Independence did not mention the questions of our day. It is of no consequence to us unless we can translate its general terms into examples of the present day and substitute them in some vital way for the examples it itself gives, so concrete, so intimately involved in the circumstances of the day in which it was conceived and written. It is an eminently practical document, meant for the use of practical men; not a thesis for philosophers, but a whip for tyrants; not a theory of government, but a program of action.
Unless we can translate it into the questions of our own day, we are not worthy of it, we are not the sons of the sires who acted in response to its challenge.

What form does the contest between tyranny and freedom take today? What is the special form of tyranny we now fight? How does it endanger the rights of the people, and what do we mean to do in order to make our contest against it effectual? What are to be the items of our new declaration of independence?

By tyranny, as we now fight it, we mean control of the law, of legislation and adjudication, by organizations which do not represent the people, by means which are private and selfish. We mean, specifically, the conduct of our affairs and the shaping of our legislation in the interest of special bodies of capital and those who organize their use. We mean the alliance, for this purpose, of political machines with selfish business. We mean the exploitation of the people by legal and political means. We have seen many of our governments under these influences cease to be representative governments, cease to be governments representative of the people, and become governments representative of special interests, controlled by machines, which in their turn are not controlled by the people. …

Well, we have started now at all events. The procession is under way. The stand-patter doesn’t know there is a procession. He is asleep in the back part of his house. He doesn’t know that the road is resounding with the tramp of men going to the front. And when he wakes up, the country will be empty. He will be deserted, and he will wonder what has happened. Nothing has happened. The world has been going on. The world has a habit of going on. The world has a habit of leaving those behind who won’t go with it. The world has always neglected stand-patters. And, therefore, the stand-patter does not excite my indignation; he excites my sympathy. He is going to be so lonely before it is all over. And we are good fellows, we are good company; why doesn’t he come along? We are not going to do him any harm. We are going to show him a good time. We are going to climb the slow road until it reaches some upland where the air is fresher, where the whole talk of mere politicians is stilled, where men can look in each other’s faces and see that there
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is nothing to conceal, that all they have to talk about they are willing to talk about in the open and talk about with each other; and whence, looking back over the road, we shall see at last that we have fulfilled our promise to mankind. We had said to all the world, “America was created to break every kind of monopoly, and to set men free, upon a footing of equality, upon a footing of opportunity, to match their brains and their energies.” And now we have proved that we meant it.
On September 6, 1901, President McKinley was shot by an Anarchist in the city of Buffalo…

On three previous occasions the Vice-President had succeeded to the Presidency on the death of the President. In each case there had been a reversal of party policy, and a nearly immediate and nearly complete change in the personnel of the higher offices, especially the Cabinet. I had never felt that this was wise from any standpoint. If a man is fit to be President, he will speedily so impress himself in the office that the policies pursued will be his anyhow, and he will not have to bother as to whether he is changing them or not; while as regards the offices under him, the important thing for him is that his subordinates shall make a success in handling their several departments. The subordinate is sure to desire to make a success of his department for his own sake, and if he is a fit man, whose views on public policy are sound, and whose abilities entitle him to his position, he will do excellently under almost any chief with the same purposes.

I at once announced that I would continue unchanged McKinley’s policies for the honor and prosperity of the country, and I asked all the members of the Cabinet to stay. There were no changes made among them save as changes were made among their successors whom I myself appointed. I continued Mr. McKinley’s policies, changing and developing them and adding new policies only as the questions before the public changed and as the needs of the public developed. Some of my friends shook their heads over this, telling me that the men I retained would not be “loyal to me,” and that I would seem as if I were “a pale copy of McKinley.” I told them that I was not nervous on this score, and that if the men I retained were loyal to their work they would be giving me the loyalty for which I most cared; and that if they were not, I would change them anyhow; and that as for being “a pale copy of McKinley,” I was not primarily concerned with either following or not following in his footsteps, but in facing the new problems that arose; and that if I were competent I would find ample opportunity to show my competence by my deeds without worrying myself as to how to convince people of the fact…

The most important factor in getting the right spirit in my Administration, next to the insistence upon courage, honesty, and a genuine democracy of desire to serve the plain people, was my insistence upon the theory that the executive power was limited only by
specific restrictions and prohibitions appearing in the Constitution or imposed by the Congress under its Constitutional powers. My view was that every executive officer, and above all every executive officer in high position, was a steward of the people bound actively and affirmatively to do all he could for the people, and not to content himself with the negative merit of keeping his talents undamaged in a napkin. I declined to adopt the view that what was imperatively necessary for the Nation could not be done by the President unless he could find some specific authorization to do it. My belief was that it was not only his right but his duty to do anything that the needs of the Nation demanded unless such action was forbidden by the Constitution or by the laws. Under this interpretation of executive power I did and caused to be done many things not previously done by the President and the heads of the departments. I did not usurp power, but I did greatly broaden the use of executive power. In other words, I acted for the public welfare, I acted for the common well-being of all our people, whenever and in whatever manner was necessary, unless prevented by direct constitutional or legislative prohibition. I did not care a rap for the mere form and show of power; I cared immensely for the use that could be made of the substance. The Senate at one time objected to my communicating with them in printing, preferring the expensive, foolish, and laborious practice of writing out the messages by hand. It was not possible to return to the outworn archaism of hand writing; but we endeavored to have the printing made as pretty as possible. Whether I communicated with the Congress in writing or by word of mouth, and whether the writing was by a machine, or a pen, were equally, and absolutely, unimportant matters. The importance lay in what I said and in the heed paid to what I said. So as to my meeting and consulting Senators, Congressmen, politicians, financiers, and labor men. I consulted all who wished to see me; and if I wished to see anyone, I sent for him; and where the consultation took place was a matter of supreme unimportance. I consulted every man with the sincere hope that I could profit by and follow his advice; I consulted every member of Congress who wished to be consulted, hoping to be able to come to an agreement of action with him; and I always finally acted as my conscience and common sense bade me act.

About appointments I was obliged by the Constitution to consult the Senate; and the long-established custom of the Senate meant that in practice this consultation was with
individual Senators and even with big politicians who stood behind the Senators. I was only one-half the appointing power; I nominated; but the Senate confirmed. In practice, by what was called “the courtesy of the Senate,” the Senate normally refused to confirm any appointment if the Senator from the State objected to it. In exceptional cases, where I could arouse public attention, I could force through the appointment in spite of the opposition of the Senators; in all ordinary cases this was impossible. On the other hand, the Senator could of course do nothing for any man unless I chose to nominate him. In consequence the Constitution itself forced the President and the Senators from each State to come to a working agreement on the appointments in and from that State.

My course was to insist on absolute fitness, including honesty, as a prerequisite to every appointment; and to remove only for good cause, and, where there was such cause, to refuse even to discuss with the Senator in interest the unfit servant’s retention. Subject to these considerations, I normally accepted each Senator’s recommendations for offices of a routine kind, such as most post-offices and the like, but insisted on myself choosing the men for the more important positions. I was willing to take any good man for postmaster; but in the case of a Judge or District Attorney or Canal Commissioner or Ambassador, I was apt to insist either on a given man or else on any man with a given class of qualifications. If the Senator deceived me, I took care that he had no opportunity to repeat the deception.

I can perhaps best illustrate my theory of action by two specific examples. In New York Governor Odell and Senator Platt sometimes worked in agreement and sometimes were at swords’ points, and both wished to be consulted. To a friendly Congressman, who was also their friend, I wrote as follows on July 22, 1903:

“I want to work with Platt. I want to work with Odell. I want to support both and take the advice of both. But of course ultimately I must be the judge as to acting on the advice given. When, as in the case of the judgeship, I am convinced that the advice of both is wrong, I shall act as I did when I appointed Holt. When I can find a friend of Odell’s like Cooley, who is thoroughly fit for the position I desire to fill, it gives me the greatest pleasure to appoint him. When Platt proposes to me a man like Hamilton Fish, it is equally a pleasure to appoint him.”
This was written in connection with events which led up to my refusing to accept Senator Platt’s or Governor Odell’s suggestions as to a Federal Judgeship and a Federal District Attorneyship, and insisting on the appointment, first of Judge Hough and later of District Attorney Stimson; because in each case I felt that the work to be done was of so high an order that I could not take an ordinary man.

The other case was that of Senator Fulton, of Oregon. Through Francis Heney I was prosecuting men who were implicated in a vast network of conspiracy against the law in connection with the theft of public land in Oregon. I had been acting on Senator Fulton’s recommendations for office, in the usual manner. Heney had been insisting that Fulton was in league with the men we were prosecuting, and that he had recommended unfit men. Fulton had been protesting against my following Heney’s advice, particularly as regards appointing Judge Wolverton as United States Judge. Finally Heney laid before me a report which convinced me of the truth of his statements. I then wrote to Fulton as follows, on November 20, 1905:

“My dear Senator Fulton: I inclose you herewith a copy of the report made to me by Mr. Heney. I have seen the originals of the letters from you and Senator Mitchell quoted therein. I do not at this time desire to discuss the report itself, which of course I must submit to the Attorney-General. But I have been obliged to reach the painful conclusion that your own letters as therein quoted tend to show that you recommended for the position of District Attorney B when you had good reason to believe that he had himself been guilty of fraudulent conduct; that you recommended C for the same position simply because it was for B’s interest that he should be so recommended, and, as there is reason to believe, because he had agreed to divide the fees with B if he were appointed; and that you finally recommended the reappointment of H with the knowledge that if H were appointed he would abstain from prosecuting B for criminal misconduct, this being why B advocated H’s claims for reappointment. If you care to make any statement in the matter, I shall of course be glad to hear it. As the District Judge of Oregon I shall appoint Judge Wolverton.”

In the letter I of course gave in full the names indicated above by initials. Senator Fulton gave no explanation. I therefore ceased to consult him about appointments under the Department of Justice and the Interior, the two departments in which the crookedness had occurred – there was no question of crookedness in the other offices in the State, and they could be handled in the ordinary manner. Legal proceedings were undertaken
against his colleague in the Senate, and one of his colleagues in the lower house, and the former was convicted and sentenced to the penitentiary.

In a number of instances the legality of executive acts of my Administration was brought before the courts. They were uniformly sustained. For example, prior to 1907 statutes relating to the disposition of coal lands had been construed as fixing the flat price at $10 to $20 per acre. The result was that valuable coal lands were sold for wholly inadequate prices, chiefly to big corporations. By executive order the coal lands were withdrawn and not opened for entry until proper classification was placed thereon by Government agents. There was a great clamor that I was usurping legislative power; but the acts were not assailed in court until we brought suits to set aside entries made by persons and associations to obtain larger areas than the statutes authorized. This position was opposed on the ground that the restrictions imposed were illegal; that the executive orders were illegal. The Supreme Court sustained the Government. In the same way our attitude in the water power question was sustained, the Supreme Court holding that the Federal Government had the rights we claimed over streams that are or may be declared navigable by Congress. Again, when Oklahoma became a State we were obliged to use the executive power to protect Indian rights and property, for there had been an enormous amount of fraud in the obtaining of Indian lands by white men. Here we were denounced as usurping power over a State as well as usurping power that did not belong to the executive. The Supreme Court sustained our action.

In connection with the Indians, by the way, it was again and again necessary to assert the position of the President as steward of the whole people. I had a capital Indian Commissioner, Francis E. Leupp. I found that I could rely on his judgment not to get me into fights that were unnecessary, and therefore I always backed him to the limit when he told me that a fight was necessary. On one occasion, for example, Congress passed a bill to sell to settlers about half a million acres of Indian land in Oklahoma at one and a half dollars an acre. I refused to sign it, and turned the matter over to Leupp. The bill was accordingly withdrawn, amended so as to safeguard the welfare of the Indians, and the minimum price raised to five dollars an acre. Then I signed the bill. We sold that land under sealed bids, and realized for the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians more than
four million dollars – three millions and a quarter more than they would have obtained if I had signed the bill in its original form. In another case, where there had been a division among the Sac and Fox Indians, part of the tribe removing to Iowa, the Iowa delegation in Congress, backed by two Iowans who were members of my Cabinet, passed a bill awarding a sum of nearly a half million dollars to the Iowa seceders. They had not consulted the Indian Bureau. Leupp protested against the bill, and I vetoed it. A subsequent bill was passed on the lines laid down by the Indian Bureau, referring the whole controversy to the courts, and the Supreme Court in the end justified our position by deciding against the Iowa seceders and awarding the money to the Oklahoma stay-at-homes.

As to all action of this kind there have long been two schools of political thought, upheld with equal sincerity. The division has not normally been along political, but temperamental, lines. The course I followed, of regarding the executive as subject only to the people, and, under the Constitution, bound to serve the people affirmatively in cases where the Constitution does not explicitly forbid him to render the service, was substantially the course followed by both Andrew Jackson and Abraham Lincoln. Other honorable and well-meaning Presidents, such as James Buchanan, took the opposite and, as it seems to me, narrowly legalistic view that the President is the servant of Congress rather than of the people, and can do nothing, no matter how necessary it be to act, unless the Constitution explicitly commands the action. Most able lawyers who are past middle age take this view, and so do large numbers of well-meaning, respectable citizens. My successor in office took this, the Buchanan, view of the President’s powers and duties.

For example, under my Administration we found that one of the favorite methods adopted by the men desirous of stealing the public domain was to carry the decision of the Secretary of the Interior into court. By vigorously opposing such action, and only by so doing, we were able to carry out the policy of properly protecting the public domain. My successor not only took the opposite view, but recommended to Congress the passage of a bill which would have given the courts direct appellate power over the Secretary of the Interior in these land matters. This bill was reported favorably by Mr. Mondell, Chairman of the House Committee on public lands, a Congressman who took the lead
in every measure to prevent the conservation of our natural resources and the preservation of the National domain for the use of home-seekers. Fortunately, Congress declined to pass the bill. Its passage would have been a veritable calamity.

I acted on the theory that the President could at any time in his discretion withdraw from entry any of the public lands of the United States and reserve the same for forestry, for water-power sites, for irrigation, and other public purposes. Without such action it would have been impossible to stop the activity of the land thieves. No one ventured to test its legality by lawsuit. My successor, however, himself questioned it, and referred the matter to Congress. Again Congress showed its wisdom by passing a law which gave the President the power which he had long exercised, and of which my successor had shorn himself.

Perhaps the sharp difference between what may be called the Lincoln-Jackson and the Buchanan-Taft schools, in their views of the power and duties of the President, may be best illustrated by comparing the attitude of my successor toward his Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ballinger, when the latter was accused of gross misconduct in office, with my attitude towards my chiefs of department and other subordinate officers. More than once while I was President my officials were attacked by Congress, generally because these officials did their duty well and fearlessly. In every such case I stood by the official and refused to recognize the right of Congress to interfere with me excepting by impeachment or in other Constitutional manner. On the other hand, wherever I found the officer unfit for his position I promptly removed him, even although the most influential men in Congress fought for his retention. The Jackson-Lincoln view is that a President who is fit to do good work should be able to form his own judgment as to his own subordinates, and, above all, of the subordinates standing highest and in closest and most intimate touch with him. My secretaries and their subordinates were responsible to me, and I accepted the responsibility for all their deeds. As long as they were satisfactory to me I stood by them against every critic or assailant, within or without Congress; and as for getting Congress to make up my mind for me about them, the thought would have been inconceivable to me. My successor took the opposite, or Buchanan, view when he permitted and requested Congress to pass judgment on the charges made against Mr.
Ballinger as an executive officer. These charges were made to the President; the President had the facts before him and could get at them at any time, and he alone had power to act if the charges were true. However, he permitted and requested Congress to investigate Mr. Ballinger. The party minority of the committee that investigated him, and one member of the majority, declared that the charges were well founded and that Mr. Ballinger should be removed. The other members of the majority declared the charges ill founded. The President abode by the view of the majority. Of course believers in the Jackson-Lincoln theory of the Presidency would not be content with this town meeting majority and minority method of determining by another branch of the Government what it seems the especial duty of the President himself to determine for himself in dealing with his own subordinate in his own department.

There are many worthy people who reprobate the Buchanan method as a matter of history, but who in actual life reprobate still more strongly the Jackson-Lincoln method when it is put into practice. These persons conscientiously believe that the President should solve every doubt in favor of inaction as against action, that he should construe strictly and narrowly the Constitutional grant of powers both to the National Government, and to the President within the National Government. In addition, however, to the men who conscientiously believe in this course from high, although as I hold misguided, motives, there are many men who affect to believe in it merely because it enables them to attack and to try to hamper, for partisan or personal reasons, an executive whom they dislike. There are other men in whom, especially when they are themselves in office, practical adherence to the Buchanan principle represents not well-thought-out devotion to an unwise course, but simple weakness of character and desire to avoid trouble and responsibility. Unfortunately, in practice it makes little difference which class of ideas actuates the President, who by his action sets a cramping precedent. Whether he is high minded and wrongheaded or merely infirm of purpose, whether he means well feebly or is bound by a mischievous misconception of the powers and duties of the National Government and of the President, the effect of his actions is the same. The President’s duty is to act so that he himself and his subordinates shall be able to do efficient work for the people, and this efficient work he and they cannot do if Congress
is permitted to undertake the task of making up his mind for him as to how he shall [perform] what is clearly his sole duty[.]
W. E. B. DuBois

The Talented Tenth

ESSAY EXCERPTS

BACKGROUND

William Edward Burghardt DuBois was an early civil rights activist and the first African American to earn a doctorate from Harvard University. He realized that, even decades after the Emancipation Proclamation and the end of the Civil War, the integration of black and white communities was still greatly lacking. This famous essay of DuBois' highlights his belief that African Americans' societal development lay not exclusively in work, but also in an education—a means both to better themselves as human beings and to prepare more readily for their future roles in American society. (Note the contrasts with Booker T. Washington's speech.)

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What history does DuBois tell?

2. What is "the Talented Tenth?"

3. What is the importance of education, according to DuBois?

4. How does DuBois understand the relationship between education and work?

The Negro race, like all races, is going to be saved by its exceptional men. The problem of education, then, among Negroes must first of all deal with the Talented Tenth; it is the problem of developing the Best of this race that they may guide the Mass away from the contamination and death of the Worst, in their own and other races. Now the training of men is a difficult and intricate task. Its technique is a matter for educational experts, but its object is for the vision of seers. If we make money the object of man-training, we shall develop money-makers but not necessarily men; if we make technical skill the object of education, we may possess artisans but not, in nature, men. Men we shall have only as we make manhood the object of the work of the schools—intelligence, broad sympathy, knowledge of the world that was and is, and of the relation of men to it—this is the curriculum of that Higher Education which must underlie true life. On this foundation we may build bread winning, skill of hand and quickness of brain, with never a fear lest the child and man mistake the means of living for the object of life.

 [...] It is the fashion of to-day to [...] say that with freedom Negro leadership should have begun at the plow and not in the Senate—a foolish and mischievous lie; two hundred and fifty years that black serf toiled at the plow and yet that toiling was in vain till the Senate passed the war amendments; and two hundred and fifty years more the half-free serf of to-day may toil at his plow, but unless he have political rights and righteously guarded civic status, he will still remain the poverty-stricken and ignorant plaything of rascals, that he now is. This all sane men know even if they dare not say it.

And so we come to the present—a day of cowardice and vacillation, of strident wide-voiced wrong and faint hearted compromise; of double-faced dallying with Truth and Right. Who are to-day guiding the work of the Negro people? The “exceptions” of course. And yet so sure as this Talented Tenth is pointed out, the blind worshippers of the Average cry out in alarm: “These are exceptions, look here at death, disease and crime—these are the happy rule.”

 [...] A saving remnant continually survives and persists, continually aspires, continually shows itself in thrift and ability and character. Exceptional it is to be sure, but this is its chiepest promise; it shows the capability of Negro blood, the promise
black men. Do Americans ever stop to reflect that there are in this land a million men of Negro blood, well-educated, owners of homes, against the honor of whose womanhood no breath was ever raised, whose men occupy positions of trust and usefulness, and who, judged by any standard, have reached the full measure of the best type of modern European culture? Is it fair, is it decent, is it Christian to ignore these facts of the Negro problem, to belittle such aspiration, to nullify such leadership and seek to crush these people back into the mass out of which by toil and travail, they and their fathers have raised themselves?

Can the masses of the Negro people be in any possible way more quickly raised than by the effort and example of this aristocracy of talent and character? Was there ever a nation on God’s fair earth civilized from the bottom upward? Never; it is, ever was and ever will be from the top downward that culture filters. The Talented Tenth rises and pulls all that are worth the saving up to their vantage ground. This is the history of human progress; and the two historic mistakes which have hindered that progress were the thinking first that no more could ever rise save the few already risen; or second, that it would better the uprisen to pull the risen down.

How then shall the leaders of a struggling people be trained and the hands of the risen few strengthened? There can be but one answer: The best and most capable of their youth must be schooled in the colleges and universities of the land. We will not quarrel as to just what the university of the Negro should teach or how it should teach it—I willingly admit that each soul and each race-soul needs its own peculiar curriculum. But this is true: A university is a human invention for the transmission of knowledge and culture from generation to generation, through the training of quick minds and pure hearts, and for this work no other human invention will suffice, not even trade and industrial schools.

All men cannot go to college but some men must; every isolated group or nation must have its yeast, must have for the talented few centers of training where men are not so mystified and befuddled by the hard and necessary toil of earning a living, as to have no aims higher than their bellies, and no God greater than Gold. This is true training,
and thus in the beginning were the favored sons of the freedmen trained. {...} Y et to-
day men {...} in fine superiority tell us that {...} a proper way to found a system of
education is first to gather the children and buy them spelling books and hoes;
afterward men may look about for teachers, if haply they may find them; or again they
would teach men Work, but as for Life—why, what has Work to do with Life, they ask
vacantly. {...}

... [The college-bred Negro] is, as he ought to be, the group leader, the man who sets
the ideals of the community where he lives, directs its thoughts and heads its social
movements. It need hardly be argued that the Negro people need social leadership more
than most groups; that they have no traditions to fall back upon, no long established
customs, no strong family ties, no well defined social classes. All these things must be
slowly and painfully evolved. The preacher was, even before the war, the group leader
of the Negroes, and the church their greatest social institution. Naturally this preacher
was ignorant and often immoral, and the problem of replacing the older type by better
educated men has been a difficult one. Both by direct work and by direct influence on
other preachers, and on congregations, the college-bred preacher has an opportunity
for reformatory work and moral inspiration, the value of which cannot be
overestimated.

It has, however, been in the furnishing of teachers that the Negro college has found its
peculiar function. Few persons realize how vast a work, how mighty a revolution has
been thus accomplished. To furnish five millions and more of ignorant people with
teachers of their own race and blood, in one generation, was not only a very difficult
undertaking, but very important one, in that, it placed before the eyes of almost every
Negro child an attainable ideal. It brought the masses of the blacks in contact with
modern civilization, made black men the leaders of their communities and trainers of
the new generation. In this work college-bred Negroes were first teachers, and then
teachers of teachers. And here it is that the broad culture of college work has been of
peculiar value. Knowledge of life and its wider meaning, has been the point of the
Negro’s deepest ignorance, and the sending out of teachers whose training has not been
simply for bread winning, but also for human culture, has been of inestimable value in the training of these men. […]

The problem of training the Negro is to-day immensely complicated by the fact that the whole question of the efficiency and appropriateness of our present systems of education, for any kind of child, is a matter of active debate, in which final settlement seems still afar off. […] It goes without saying that it is hard to do all these things simultaneously or suddenly and that at the same time it will not do to give all the attention to one and neglect the others; we could give black boys trades, but that alone will not civilize a race of ex-slaves; we might simply increase their knowledge of the world, but this would not necessarily make them wish to use this knowledge honestly; we might seek to strengthen character and purpose, but to what end if this people have nothing to eat or to wear? A system of education is not one thing, nor does it have a single definite object, nor is it a mere matter of schools. Education is that whole system of human training within and without the school house walls, which molds and develops men. […] There must be teachers, and teachers of teachers, and to attempt to establish any sort of a system of common and industrial school training, without first (and I say first advisedly) without first providing for the higher training of the very best teachers, is simply throwing your money to the winds. School houses do not teach themselves – piles of brick and mortar and machinery do not send out men. It is the trained, living human soul, cultivated and strengthened by long study and thought, that breathes the real breath of life into boys and girls and makes them human, whether they be black or white, Greek, Russian or American. […]

I would not deny, or for a moment seem to deny, the paramount necessity of teaching the Negro to work, and to work steadily and skillfully; or seem to depreciate in the slightest degree the important part industrial schools must play in the accomplishment of these ends, but I do say, and insist upon it, that it is industrialism drunk with its vision of success, to imagine that its own work can be accomplished without providing for the training of broadly cultured men and women to teach its own teachers, and to teach the teachers of the public schools.
But I have already said that human education is not simply a matter of schools; it is much more a matter of family and group life – the training of one’s home, of one’s daily companions, of one’s social class. Now the black boy of the South moves in a black world – a world with its own leaders, its own thoughts, its own ideals. In this world he gets by far the larger part of his life training, and through the eyes of this dark world he peers into the veiled world beyond. Who guides and determines the education which he receives in his world? His teachers here are the group-leaders of the Negro people—the physicians and clergymen, the trained fathers and mothers, the influential and forceful men about him of all kinds; here it is, if at all, that the culture of the surrounding world trickles through and is handed on by the graduates of the higher schools. Can such culture training of group leaders be neglected? Can we afford to ignore it? Do you think that if the leaders of thought among Negroes are not trained and educated thinkers, that they will have no leaders? On the contrary a hundred half-trained demagogues will still hold the places they so largely occupy now, and hundreds of vociferous busy-bodies will multiply. You have no choice; either you must help furnish this race from within its own ranks with thoughtful men of trained leadership, or you must suffer the evil consequences of a headless misguided rabble.

{…} I insist that the object of all true education is not to make men carpenters, it is to make carpenters men {…} {…}

{…} If carpenters are needed it is well and good to train men as carpenters. But to train men as carpenters, and then set them to teaching is wasteful and criminal; and to train men as teachers and then refuse them living wages, unless they become carpenters, is rank nonsense. {…}

Further than this, after being provided with group leaders of civilization, and a foundation of intelligence in the public schools, the carpenter, in order to be a man, needs technical skill. This calls for trade schools. {…} A really efficient workman must be to-day an intelligent man who has had good technical training in addition to thorough common school, and perhaps even higher training. {…} A prominent educator tells us that, in Sweden, “In the beginning the economic conception was
generally adopted, and everywhere manual training was looked upon as a means of preparing the children of the common people to earn their living. But gradually it came to be recognized that manual training has a more elevated purpose, and one, indeed, more useful in the deeper meaning of the term. It came to be considered as an educative process for the complete moral, physical and intellectual development of the child.”

[…] Indeed the demand for college-bred men by a school like Tuskegee, ought to make Mr. Booker T. Washington the firmest friend of higher training. Here he has as helpers the son of a Negro senator, trained in Greek and the humanities, and graduated at Harvard; the son of a Negro congressman and lawyer, trained in Latin and mathematics, and graduated at Oberlin; he has as his wife, a woman who read Virgil and Homer in the same class room with me; he has as college chaplain, a classical graduate of Atlanta University; as teacher of science, a graduate of Fisk; as teacher of history, a graduate of Smith,—indeed some thirty of his chief teachers are college graduates, and instead of studying French grammars in the midst of weeds, or buying pianos for dirty cabins, they are at Mr. Washington’s right hand helping him in a noble work. And yet one of the effects of Mr. Washington’s propaganda has been to throw doubt upon the expediency of such training for Negroes, as these persons have had.

Men of America, the problem is plain before you. Here is a race transplanted through the criminal foolishness of your fathers. Whether you like it or not the millions are here, and here they will remain. If you do not lift them up, they will pull you down. Education and work are the levers to uplift a people. Work alone will not do it unless inspired by the right ideals and guided by intelligence. Education must not simply teach work—it must teach Life. The Talented Tenth of the Negro race must be made leaders of thought and missionaries of culture among their people. No others can do this work and Negro colleges must train men for it. The Negro race, like all other races, is going to be saved by its exceptional men.
WOODROW WILSON

War Message to Congress

SPEECH

April 2, 1917
United States Congress | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

Although World War I began in mid-1914, the United States did not initially join the conflict, with President Woodrow Wilson opting instead to pursue neutrality. However, the 1915 sinking of the Lusitania and the 1917 resumption of unrestricted submarine warfare by Germany eventually drove the United States to side with the Allied Powers. Wilson gave this speech to a joint session of Congress in the latter year, advocating for a formal declaration of war against Germany and the Central Powers, but also explaining his radically different reasons for the United States’ fighting in the war.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What policy is not “constitutionally permissible” for Wilson to enact alone?
2. What is his primary grievance against Germany?
3. Why does Wilson advocate for joining World War I?
4. What does Wilson say are America’s objectives in fighting World War I?

Gentlemen of the Congress:

I have called the Congress into extraordinary session because there are serious, very serious, choices of policy to be made, and made immediately, which it was neither right nor constitutionally permissible that I should assume the responsibility of making.

On the third of February last I officially laid before you the extraordinary announcement of the Imperial German Government that on and after the first day of February it was its purpose to put aside all restraints of law or of humanity and use its submarines to sink every vessel that sought to approach either the ports of Great Britain and Ireland or the western coasts of Europe or any of the ports controlled by the enemies of Germany within the Mediterranean. That had seemed to be the object of the German submarine warfare earlier in the war, but since April of last year the Imperial Government had somewhat restrained the commanders of its undersea craft in conformity with its promise then given to us that passenger boats should not be sunk and that due warning would be given to all other vessels which its submarines might seek to destroy when no resistance was offered or escape attempted, and care taken that their crews were given at least a fair chance to save their lives in their open boats. The precautions taken were meager and haphazard enough, as was proved in distressing instance after instance in the progress of the cruel and unmanly business, but a certain degree of restraint was observed. The new policy has swept every restriction aside. Vessels of every kind, whatever their flag, their character, their cargo, their destination, their errand, have been ruthlessly sent to the bottom: without warning and without thought of help or mercy for those on board, the vessels of friendly neutrals along with those of belligerents. Even hospital ships and ships carrying relief to the sorely bereaved and stricken people of Belgium, though the latter were provided with safe conduct through the proscribed areas by the German Government itself and were distinguished by unmistakable marks of identity, have been sunk with the same reckless lack of compassion or of principle. I was for a little while unable to believe that such things would in fact be done by any government that had hitherto subscribed to the humane practices of civilized nations. International law had its origin in the attempt to set up some law which would be respected and observed upon the seas, where no nation had right of dominion and where lay the free highways of the
world…. This minimum of right the German Government has swept aside under the plea of retaliation and necessity and because it had no weapons which it could use at sea except these which it is impossible to employ as it is employing them without throwing to the winds all scruples of humanity or of respect for the understandings that were supposed to underlie the intercourse of the world. I am not now thinking of the loss of property involved, immense and serious as that is, but only of the wanton and wholesale destruction of the lives of noncombatants, men, women, and children, engaged in pursuits which have always, even in the darkest periods of modern history, been deemed innocent and legitimate. Property can be paid for; the lives of peaceful and innocent people cannot be. The present German submarine warfare against commerce is a warfare against mankind.

It is a war against all nations. American ships have been sunk, American lives taken, in ways which it has stirred us very deeply to learn of, but the ships and people of other neutral and friendly nations have been sunk and overwhelmed in the waters in the same way. There has been no discrimination. The challenge is to all mankind. Each nation must decide for itself how it will meet it. The choice we make for ourselves must be made with a moderation of counsel and a temperateness of judgment befitting our character and our motives as a nation. We must put excited feeling away. Our motive will not be revenge or the victorious assertion of the physical might of the nation, but only the vindication of right, of human right, of which we are only a single champion.

When I addressed the Congress on the twenty-sixth of February last I thought that it would suffice to assert our neutral rights with arms, our right to use the seas against unlawful interference, our right to keep our people safe against unlawful violence. But armed neutrality, it now appears, is impracticable. Because submarines are in effect outlaws when used as the German submarines have been used against merchant shipping, it is impossible to defend ships against their attacks as the law of nations has assumed that merchantmen would defend themselves against privateers or cruisers, visible craft giving chase upon the open sea. It is common prudence in such circumstances, grim necessity indeed, to endeavor to destroy them before they have shown their own intention. They must be dealt with upon sight, if dealt with at all. The German
Government denies the right of neutrals to use arms at all within the areas of the sea which it has proscribed, even in the defense of rights which no modern publicist has ever before questioned their right to defend. The intimation is conveyed that the armed guards which we have placed on our merchant ships will be treated as beyond the pale of law and subject to be dealt with as pirates would be. Armed neutrality is ineffectual enough at best; in such circumstances and in the face of such pretensions it is worse than ineffectual: it is likely only to produce what it was meant to prevent; it is practically certain to draw us into the war without either the rights or the effectiveness of belligerents. There is one choice we cannot make, we are incapable of making: we will not choose the path of submission and suffer the most sacred rights of our Nation and our people to be ignored or violated. The wrongs against which we now array ourselves are no common wrongs; they cut to the very roots of human life.

With a profound sense of the solemn and even tragical character of the step I am taking and of the grave responsibilities which it involves, but in unhesitating obedience to what I deem my constitutional duty, I advise that the Congress declare the recent course of the Imperial German Government to be in fact nothing less than war against the government and people of the United States; that it formally accept the status of belligerent which has thus been thrust upon it, and that it take immediate steps not only to put the country in a more thorough state of defense but also to exert all its power and employ all its resources to bring the Government of the German Empire to terms and end the war.

What this will involve is clear. It will involve the utmost practicable cooperation in counsel and action with the governments now at war with Germany, and, as incident to that, the extension to those governments of the most liberal financial credit, in order that our resources may so far as possible be added to theirs. It will involve the organization and mobilization of all the material resources of the country to supply the materials of war and serve the incidental needs of the Nation in the most abundant and yet the most economical and efficient way possible. It will involve the immediate full equipment of the navy in all respects but particularly in supplying it with the best means of dealing with the enemy's submarines. It will involve the immediate addition to the armed forces of the United States already provided for by law in case of war at least five hundred thousand
men, who should, in my opinion, be chosen upon the principle of universal liability to service, and also the authorization of subsequent additional increments of equal force so soon as they may be needed and can be handled in training. It will involve also, of course, the granting of adequate credits to the Government, sustained, I hope, so far as they can equitably be sustained by the present generation, by well conceived taxation. I say sustained so far as may be equitable by taxation because it seems to me that it would be most unwise to base the credits which will now be necessary entirely on money borrowed. It is our duty, I most respectfully urge, to protect our people so far as we may against the very serious hardships and evils which would be likely to arise out of the inflation which would be produced by vast loans.

In carrying out the measures by which these things are to be accomplished we should keep constantly in mind the wisdom of interfering as little as possible in our own preparation and in the equipment of our own military forces with the duty—for it will be a very practical duty—of supplying the nations already at war with Germany with the materials which they can obtain only from us or by our assistance. They are in the field and we should help them in every way to be effective there.

I shall take the liberty of suggesting, through the several executive departments of the Government, for the consideration of your committees, measures for the accomplishment of the several objects I have mentioned. I hope that it will be your pleasure to deal with them as having been framed after very careful thought by the branch of the Government upon which the responsibility of conducting the war and safeguarding the Nation will most directly fall.

While we do these things, these deeply momentous things, let us be very clear, and make very clear to all the world what our motives and our objects are. My own thought has not been driven from its habitual and normal course by the unhappy events of the last two months, and I do not believe that the thought of the Nation has been altered or clouded by them. I have exactly the same things in mind now that I had in mind when I addressed the Senate on the twenty—second of January last, the same that I had in mind when I addressed the Congress on the third of February and on the twenty-sixth of February. Our object now, as then, is to vindicate the principles of peace and justice in the life of
the world as against selfish and autocratic power and to set up amongst the really free and selfgoverned peoples of the world such a concert of purpose and of action as will henceforth insure the observance of those principles Neutrality is no longer feasible or desirable where the peace of the world is involved and the freedom of its peoples, and the menace to that peace and freedom lies in the existence of autocratic governments backed by organized force which is controlled wholly by their will, not by the will of their people. We have seen the last of neutrality in such circumstances. We are at the beginning of an age in which it will be insisted that the same standards of conduct and of responsibility for wrong done shall be observed among nations and their governments that are observed among the individual citizens of civilized states.

We have no quarrel with the German people. We have no feeling towards them but one of sympathy and friendship. It was not upon their impulse that their government acted in entering this war. It was not with their previous knowledge or approval. It was a war determined upon as wars used to be determined upon in the old, unhappy days when peoples were nowhere consulted by their rulers and wars were provoked and waged in the interest of dynasties or of little groups of ambitious men who were accustomed to use their fellow men as pawns and tools.

Selfgoverned nations do not fill their neighbor states with spies or set the course of intrigue to bring about some critical posture of affairs which will give them an opportunity to strike and make conquest. Such designs can be successfully worked out only under cover and where no one has the right to ask questions. Cunningly contrived plans of deception or aggression, carried, it may be, from generation to generation, can be worked out and kept from the light only within the privacy of courts or behind the carefully guarded confidences of a narrow and privileged class. They are happily impossible where public opinion commands and insists upon full information concerning all the nation’s affairs.

A steadfast concert for peace can never be maintained except by a partnership of democratic nations. No autocratic government could be trusted to keep faith within it or observe its covenants. It must be a league of honor, a partnership of opinion. Intrigue
would eat its vitals away; the plottings of inner circles who could plan what they would and render account to no one would be a corruption seated at its very heart. Only free peoples can hold their purpose and their honor steady to a common end and prefer the interests of mankind to any narrow interest of their own.

Does not every American feel that assurance has been added to our hope for the future peace of the world by the wonderful and heartening things that have been happening within the last few weeks in Russia? Russia was known by those who knew it best to have been always in fact democratic at heart, in all the vital habits of her thought, in all the intimate relationships of her people that spoke their natural instinct, their habitual attitude towards life. The autocracy that crowned the summit of her political structure, long as it had stood and terrible as was the reality of its power, was not in fact Russian in origin, character, or purpose; and now it has been shaken off and the great, generous Russian people have been added in all their naive majesty and might to the forces that are fighting for freedom in the world, for justice, and for peace. Here is a fit partner for a League of Honor.

One of the things that has served to convince us that the Prussian, autocracy was not and could never be our friend is that from the very outset of the present war it has filled our unsuspecting communities and even our offices of government with spies and set criminal intrigues everywhere afoot against our national unity of counsel, our peace Within and without, our industries and our commerce. Indeed it is now evident that its spies were here even before the war began; and it is unhappily not a matter of conjecture but a fact proved in our courts of justice that the intrigues which have more than once come perilously near to disturbing the peace and dislocating the industries of the country have been carried on at the instigation, with the support, and even under the personal direction of official agents of the Imperial Government accredited to the Government of the United States. Even in checking these things and trying to extirpate them we have sought to put the most generous interpretation possible upon them because we knew that their source lay, not in any hostile feeling or purpose of the German people towards us (who were, no doubt, as ignorant of them as we ourselves were), but only in the selfish designs of a Government that did what it pleased and told its people nothing. But they
have played their part in serving to convince us at last that that Government entertains no real friendship for us and means to act against our peace and security at its convenience. That it means to stir up enemies against us at our very doors the intercepted note to the German Minister at Mexico City is eloquent evidence.

5

We are accepting this challenge of hostile purpose because we know that in such a Government, following such methods, we can never have a friend; and that in the presence of its organized power, always lying in wait to accomplish we know not what purpose, there can be no assured security for the democratic Governments of the world.

10

We are now about to accept gauge of battle with this natural foe to liberty and shall, if necessary, spend the whole force of the nation to check and nullify its pretensions and its power. We are glad, now that we see the facts with no veil of false pretense about them to fight thus for the ultimate peace of the world and for the liberation of its peoples, the German peoples included: for the rights of nations great and small and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of life and of obedience. The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty. We have no selfish ends to serve.

15

We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make. We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind. We shall be satisfied when those rights have been made as secure as the faith and the freedom of nations can make them. Just because we fight without rancor and without selfish object, seeking nothing for ourselves but what we shall wish to share with all free peoples, we shall, I feel confident, conduct our operations as belligerents without passion and ourselves observe with proud punctilio the principles of right and of fair play we profess to be fighting for.

20

I have said nothing of the Governments allied with the Imperial Government of Germany because they have not made war upon us or challenged us to defend our right and our honor. The Austro-Hungarian Government has, indeed, avowed its unqualified endorsement and acceptance of the reckless and lawless submarine warfare adopted now without disguise by the Imperial German Government, and it has therefore not been
possible for this Government to receive Count Tarnowski, the Ambassador recently accredited to this Government by the Imperial and Royal Government of Austria-Hungary; but that Government has not actually engaged in warfare against citizens of the United States on the seas, and I take the liberty, for the present at least, of postponing a discussion of our relations with the authorities at Vienna. We enter this war only where we are clearly forced into it because there are no other means of defending our rights.

It will be all the easier for us to conduct ourselves as belligerents in a high spirit of right and fairness because we act without animus, not in enmity towards a people or with the desire to bring any injury or disadvantage upon them, but only in armed opposition to an irresponsible government which has thrown aside all considerations of humanity and of right and is running amuck. We are, let me say again, the sincere friends of the German people, and shall desire nothing so much as the early reestablishment of intimate relations of mutual advantage between us,— however hard it may be for them, for the time being, to believe that this is spoken from our hearts. We have borne with their present Government through all these bitter months because of that friendship,— exercising a patience and forbearance which would otherwise have been impossible. We shall, happily, still have an opportunity to prove that friendship in our daily attitude and actions towards the millions of men and women of German birth and native sympathy who live amongst us and share our life, and we shall be proud to prove it towards all who are in fact loyal to their neighbors and to the Government in the hour of test. They are, most of them, as true and loyal Americans as if they had never known any other fealty or allegiance. They will be prompt to stand with us in rebuking and restraining the few who may be of a different mind and purpose. If there should be disloyalty, it will be dealt with a firm hand of stern repression; but, if it lifts its head at all, it will lift it only here and there and without countenance except from a lawless and malignant few.

It is a distressing and oppressive duty, Gentlemen of the Congress, which I have performed in thus addressing you. There are, it may be many months of fiery trial and sacrifice ahead of us. It is a fearful thing to lead this great peaceful people into war, into the most terrible and disastrous of all wars, civilization itself seeming to be in the balance.
But the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts,—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own Governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free. To such a task we can dedicate our lives and our fortunes, every thing that we are and everything that we have, with the pride of those who know that the day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace which she has treasured. God helping her, she can do no other.
**WOODROW WILSON**  
Fourteen Points  
**SPEECH**  
January 8, 1918  
United States Congress | Washington, D.C.

**BACKGROUND**

With the United States’ entry into World War I in April 1917, the stalemate in Europe was finally broken, and the Allies at last defeated the Central Powers in November 1918. However, President Woodrow Wilson—motivated by his Progressive political philosophy—sought to make the subsequent peace lasting and beneficial for the world as a whole. This speech, delivered before a joint session of Congress prior to the war’s end, saw Wilson outline his vision of the terms of peace, and how the world would be better for accepting them.

**GUIDING QUESTIONS**

1. What event does Wilson cite as a key development in the war effort?
2. What was the purpose of the war, according to him?
3. Why does Wilson suggest his plan for peace should be followed by other nations above all others?
4. How does Wilson view the defeated Germany?

Gentlemen of the Congress, —

Once more, as repeatedly before, the spokesmen of the Central Empires have indicated their desire to discuss the objects of the war and the possible basis of a general peace. Parleys have been in progress at Brest-Litovsk between representatives of the Central Powers to which the attention of all the belligerents has been invited for the purpose of ascertaining whether it may be possible to extend these parleys into a general conference with regard to terms of peace and settlement.

The Russian representatives presented not only a perfectly definite statement of the principles upon which they would be willing to conclude peace, but also an equally definite program of the concrete application of those principles. The representatives of the Central Powers, on their part, presented an outline of settlement which, if much less definite, seemed susceptible of liberal interpretation until their specific program of practical terms was added. That program proposed no concessions at all either to the sovereignty of Russia or to the preferences of the populations with whose fortunes it dealt, but meant, in a word, that the Central Empires were to keep every foot of territory their armed forces had occupied, — every province, every city, every point of vantage, — as a permanent addition to their territories and their power. It is a reasonable conjecture that the general principles of settlement which they at first suggested originated with the more liberal statesmen of Germany and Austria, the men who have begun to feel the force of their own peoples’ thought and purpose, while the concrete terms of actual settlement came from the military leaders who have no thought but to keep what they have got. The negotiations have been broken off. The Russian representatives were sincere and in earnest. They cannot entertain such proposals of conquest and domination.

The whole incident is full of significance. It is also full of perplexity. With whom are the Russian representatives dealing? For whom are the representatives of the Central Empires speaking? Are they speaking for the majorities of their respective parliaments or for the minority parties, that military and imperialistic minority which has so far dominated their whole policy and controlled the affairs of Turkey and of the Balkan states which have felt obliged to become their associates in this war? The Russian
representatives have insisted, very justly, very wisely, and in the true spirit of modern democracy, that the conferences they have been holding with the Teutonic and Turkish statesmen should be held within open, not closed doors, and all the world has been audience, as was desired.

To whom have we been listening, then? To those who speak the spirit and intention of the Resolutions of the German Reichstag on the 9th of July last, the spirit and intention of the liberal leaders and parties of Germany, or to those who resist and defy that spirit and intention and insist upon conquest and subjugation? Or are we listening, in fact, to both, unreconciled and in open and hopeless contradiction? These are very serious and pregnant questions. Upon the answer to them depends the peace of the world. But, whatever the results of the parleys at Brest-Litovsk, whatever the confusions of counsel and of purpose in the utterances of the spokesmen of the Central Empires, they have again attempted to acquaint the world with their objects in the war and have again challenged their adversaries to say what their objects are and what sort of settlement they would deem just and satisfactory. There is no good reason why that challenge should not be responded to, and responded to with the utmost candor. We did not wait for it. Not once, but again and again, we have laid our whole thought and purpose before the world, not in general terms only, but each time with sufficient definition to make it clear what sort of definitive terms of settlement must necessarily spring out of them.

Within the last week Mr. Lloyd George has spoken with admirable candor and in admirable spirit for the people and Government of Great Britain. There is no confusion of counsel among the adversaries of the Central Powers, no uncertainty of principle, no vagueness of detail. The only secrecy of counsel, the only lack of fearless frankness, the only failure to make definite statement of the objects of the war, lies with Germany and her Allies. The issues of life and death hang upon these definitions. No statesman who has the least conception of his responsibility ought for a moment to permit himself to continue this tragical and appalling outpouring of blood and treasure unless he is sure beyond a peradventure that the objects of the vital sacrifice are part and parcel of the very life of Society and that the people for whom he speaks think them right and imperative as he does.
There is, moreover, a voice calling for these definitions of principle and of purpose which is, it seems to me, more thrilling and more compelling than any of the many moving voices with which the troubled air of the world is filled. It is the voice of the Russian people. They are prostrate and all but helpless, it would seem, before the grim power of Germany, which has hitherto known no relenting and no pity. Their power, apparently, is shattered. And yet their soul is not subservient. They will not yield either in principle or in action. Their conception of what is right, of what is humane and honorable for them to accept, has been stated with a frankness, a largeness of view, a generosity of spirit, and a universal human sympathy which must challenge the admiration of every friend of mankind; and they have refused to compound their ideals or desert others that they themselves may be safe.

They call to us to say what it is that we desire, — in what, if in anything, our purpose and our spirit differ from theirs; and I believe that the people of the United States would wish me to respond, with utter simplicity and frankness. Whether their present leaders believe it or not, it is our heartfelt desire and hope that some way may be opened whereby we may be privileged to assist the people of Russia to attain their utmost hope of liberty and ordered peace.

It will be our wish and purpose that the processes of peace, when they are begun, shall be absolutely open and that they shall involve and permit henceforth no secret understandings of any kind. The day of conquest and aggrandizement is gone by; so is also the day of secret covenants entered into in the interest of particular governments and likely at some unlooked-for moment to upset the peace of the world. It is this happy fact, now clear to the view of every public man whose thoughts do not still linger in an age that is dead and gone, which makes it possible for every nation whose purposes are consistent with justice and the peace of the world to avow now or at any other time the objects it has in view.

We entered this war because violations of right had occurred which touched us to the quick and made the life of our own people impossible unless they were corrected and the
world secured once for all against their recurrence. What we demand in this war, therefore, is nothing peculiar to ourselves. It is that the world be made fit and safe to live in; and particularly that it be made safe for every peace-loving nation which, like our own, wishes to live its own life, determine its own institutions, be assured of justice and fair dealing by the other peoples of the world as against force and selfish aggression. All the peoples of the world are in effect partners in this interest, and for our own part we see very clearly that unless justice be done to others it will not be done to us.

The program of the world’s peace, therefore, is our program; and that program, the only possible program, as we see it, is this:

1. Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.

2. Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas, outside territorial waters, alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants.

3. The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance.

4. Adequate guarantees given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety.

5. A free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims, based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty the interests of the populations concerned must have equal weight with the equitable claims of the government whose title is to be determined.

6. The evacuation of all Russian territory and such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia as will secure the best and freest cooperation of the other nations of the world.
in obtaining for her an unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development and national policy and assure her of a sincere welcome into the society of free nations under institutions of her own choosing; and, more than a welcome, assistance also of every kind that she may need and may herself desire. The treatment accorded Russia by her sister nations in the months to come will be the acid test of their good will, of their comprehension of her needs as distinguished from their own interests, and of their intelligent and unselfish sympathy.

7. Belgium, the whole world will agree, must be evacuated and restored, without any attempt to limit the sovereignty which she enjoys in common with all other free nations. No other single act will serve as this will serve to restore confidence among the nations in the laws which they have themselves set and determined for the government of their relations with one another. Without this healing act the whole structure and validity of international law is forever impaired.

8. All French territory should be freed and the invaded portions restored, and the wrong done to France by Prussia in 1871 in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine, which has unsettled the peace of the world for nearly fifty years, should be righted, in order that peace may once more be made secure in the interests of all.

9. A readjustment of the frontiers of Italy should be effected along clearly recognizable lines of nationality.

10. The peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development.

11. Rumania, Serbia, and Montenegro should be evacuated; occupied territories restored; Serbia accorded free and secure access to the sea; and the relations of the several Balkan states to one another determined by friendly counsel along historically established lines of allegiance and nationality; and international guarantees of the
political and economic independence and territorial integrity of the several Balkan states should be entered into.

12. The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development, and the Dardanelles should be permanently opened as a free passage to the ships and commerce of all nations under international guarantees.

13. An independent Polish state should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations, which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant.

14. A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike.

In regard to these essential rectifications of wrong and assertions of right we feel ourselves to be intimate partners of all the governments and peoples associated together against the Imperialists. We cannot be separated in interest or divided in purpose. We stand together until the end.

For such arrangements and covenants we are willing to fight and to continue to fight until they are achieved; but only because we wish the right to prevail and desire a just and stable peace such as can be secured only by removing the chief provocations to war, which this program does remove. We have no jealousy of German greatness, and there is nothing in this program that impairs it. We grudge her no achievement or distinction of learning or of pacific enterprise, such as have made her record very bright and very enviable. We do not wish to injure her or to block in any way her legitimate influence or power. We do not wish to fight her either with arms or with hostile arrangements of trade if she is willing to associate herself with us and the other peace-loving nations of the world in covenants of justice and law and fair dealing. We wish her only to accept a place of
equality among the peoples of the world, — the new world in which we now live, — instead of a place of mastery.

Neither do we presume to suggest to her any alteration or modification of her institutions. But it is necessary, we must frankly say, and necessary as a preliminary to any intelligent dealings with her on our part, that we should know whom her spokesmen speak for when they speak to us, whether for the Reichstag majority or for the military party and the men whose creed is imperial domination.

We have spoken now, surely, in terms too concrete to admit of any further doubt or question. An evident principle runs through the whole program I have outlined. It is the principle of justice to all peoples and nationalities, and their right to live on equal terms of liberty and safety with one another, whether they be strong or weak.

Unless this principle be made its foundation no part of the structure of international justice can stand. The people of the United States could act upon no other principle; and to the vindication of this principle they are ready to devote their lives, their honor, and everything they possess. The moral climax of this the culminating and final war for human liberty has come, and they are ready to put their own strength, their own highest purpose, their own integrity and devotion to the test.
HENRY CABOT LODGE

League of Nations Speech

SPEECH

August 12, 1919
Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

In President Woodrow Wilson’s “Fourteen Points” (see previous selection), his last was the creation of a “League of Nations” that he believed would prevent another conflict like World War I from occurring in the future. Following the conclusion of the war and the signing of the Treaty of Versailles (which helped to formalize the League), Wilson returned to the United States to attract support for America’s membership in the new organization. However, many members of Congress, including Senator Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts, strongly opposed the League because they feared increased American involvement in overseas affairs would ultimately be detrimental to the nation. This speech by Lodge echoes many sentiments of future Americans on foreign policy.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What does Lodge say is “more precious to ourselves, [and] to the world, than any single possession”?

2. What does Lodge compare “internationalism” to?

3. What does he say is the primary result of the United States joining the League of Nations?
Mr. President:

The independence of the United States is not only more precious to ourselves but to the world than any single possession. Look at the United States today. We have made mistakes in the past. We have had shortcomings. We shall make mistakes in the future and fall short of our own best hopes. But none the less is there any country today on the face of the earth which can compare with this in ordered liberty, in peace, and in the largest freedom?

I feel that I can say this without being accused of undue boastfulness, for it is the simple fact, and in making this treaty and taking on these obligations all that we do is in a spirit of unselfishness and in a desire for the good of mankind. But it is well to remember that we are dealing with nations, every one of which has a direct individual interest to serve, and there is grave danger in an unshared idealism.

Contrast the United States with any country on the face of the earth today and ask yourself whether the situation of the United States is not the best to be found. I will go as far as anyone in world service, but the first step to world service is the maintenance of the United States.

I have always loved one flag and I cannot share that devotion [with] a mongrel banner created for a League.

You may call me selfish if you will, conservative or reactionary, or use any other harsh adjective you see fit to apply, but an American I was born, an American I have remained all my life. I can never be anything else but an American, and I must think of the United States first, and when I think of the United States first in an arrangement like this I am thinking of what is best for the world, for if the United States fails, the best hopes of mankind fail with it.

I have never had but one allegiance - I cannot divide it now. I have loved but one flag and I cannot share that devotion and give affection to the mongrel banner invented for a
league. Internationalism, illustrated by the Bolshevik and by the men to whom all
countries are alike provided they can make money out of them, is to me repulsive.

National I must remain, and in that way I like all other Americans can render the ampest
service to the world. The United States is the world’s best hope, but if you fetter her in
the interests and quarrels of other nations, if you tangle her in the intrigues of Europe,
you will destroy her power for good and endanger her very existence. Leave her to march
freely through the centuries to come as in the years that have gone.

Strong, generous, and confident, she has nobly served mankind. Beware how you trifle
with your marvellous inheritance, this great land of ordered liberty, for if we stumble and
fall freedom and civilization everywhere will go down in ruin.

We are told that we shall ‘break the heart of the world’ if we do not take this league just
as it stands. I fear that the hearts of the vast majority of mankind would beat on strongly
and steadily and without any quickening if the league were to perish altogether. If it
should be effectively and beneficently changed the people who would lie awake in sorrow
for a single night could be easily gathered in one not very large room but those who
would draw a long breath of relief would reach to millions.

We hear much of visions and I trust we shall continue to have visions and dream dreams
of a fairer future for the race. But visions are one thing and visionaries are another, and
the mechanical appliances of the rhetorician designed to give a picture of a present which
does not exist and of a future which no man can predict are as unreal and short-lived as
the steam or canvas clouds, the angels suspended on wires and the artificial lights of the
stage.

They pass with the moment of effect and are shabby and tawdry in the daylight. Let us at
least be real. Washington’s entire honesty of mind and his fearless look into the face of
all facts are qualities which can never go out of fashion and which we should all do well
to imitate.
Ideals have been thrust upon us as an argument for the league until the healthy mind which rejects cant revolts from them. Are ideals confined to this deformed experiment upon a noble purpose, tainted, as it is, with bargains and tied to a peace treaty which might have been disposed of long ago to the great benefit of the world if it had not been compelled to carry this rider on its back? 'Post equitem sedet atra cura {Behind the rider sits a dark concern},’ Horace tells us, but no blacker care ever sat behind any rider than we shall find in this covenant of doubtful and disputed interpretation as it now perches upon the treaty of peace.

No doubt many excellent and patriotic people see a coming fulfillment of noble ideals in the words 'league for peace.' We all respect and share these aspirations and desires, but some of us see no hope, but rather defeat, for them in this murky covenant. For we, too, have our ideals, even if we differ from those who have tried to establish a monopoly of idealism.

Our first ideal is our country, and we see her in the future, as in the past, giving service to all her people and to the world. Our ideal of the future is that she should continue to render that service of her own free will. She has great problems of her own to solve, very grim and perilous problems, and a right solution, if we can attain to it, would largely benefit mankind.

We would have our country strong to resist a peril from the West, as she has flung back the German menace from the East. We would not have our politics distracted and embittered by the dissensions of other lands. We would not have our country’s vigour exhausted or her moral force abated, by everlasting meddling and muddling in every quarrel, great and small, which afflicts the world.

Our ideal is to make her ever stronger and better and finer, because in that way alone, as we believe, can she be of the greatest service to the world’s peace and to the welfare of mankind.
UNIT 6

The Interwar Years and World War II

1919–1945

40-50-minute classes | 27-31 classes

UNIT PREVIEW

Structure

LESSON 1  1919–1929  The Roaring Twenties  4-5 classes  p. 7

LESSON 2  1929–1939  The Great Depression  7-8 classes  p. 15

LESSON 3  1939–1945  World War II  12-13 classes  p. 24

APPENDIX A  Study Guides, Tests, and Writing Assignment  p. 39

APPENDIX B  Primary Sources  p. 57

Why Teach the Interwar Years and World War II

The “war to end all wars” did not live up to its name. Although during the 1920s the United States enjoyed a decade of economic prosperity, the rest of the world endured an uneasy peace marked by portents of future tumult and anxiety. Then Americans would suffer their own crash and a Great Depression that changed American government and economics in ways that broke sharply with the American founding. In retrospect, the Second World War seemed inevitable. The world was hurled into the greatest age of bloodshed known to man, a brutal rebuke to those who imagined that the world was reaching its zenith of enlightenment. But it is miraculous that America, despite the many great upheavals and pressures she faced, largely stood firm in the face of a totalitarian conquest of the world. Students need to grasp what was at
stake in this great conflict and why the key role played by the United States should be a point of enduring pride for all Americans. The totalitarian regimes sought to annihilate the very principles on which human freedom and dignity were founded. It was for these principles, and the way of life to which they gave rise, that Americans sacrificed, and died, and saved the world.

Enduring Ideas from This Unit

1. The 1920s were a decade not only of prosperity and of cultural change but also of a renewal of the principles and practice of limited government that had waned during the Progressive Era.
2. The stock market crash and the Great Depression were predictable economic consequences of normal economic forces exacerbated by government actions.
3. The Roosevelt administration and the New Deal brought much-needed encouragement to Americans living through hardship, while also transforming the size, scope, and power of government in unprecedented ways.
4. World War II was the bloodiest war in human history and demonstrated the potential of new philosophies and technologies to unleash untold horrors.
5. The United States took up the cause of the heroic British and saved civilization from a modern barbarism that trampled on the truth of each person’s inherent dignity.

What Teachers Should Consider

The Harding and Coolidge administrations preserved dialed back the expansion of government that had taken place under the Progressives and reasserted principles of limited self-government and the free market. The Roaring Twenties witnessed exceptional prosperity for many, and with this affluence came novel cultural norms, at least for America’s well-to-do. For most of the rest, the cultural changes were less dramatic, and the difficult conditions of farmers and others dependent upon the agricultural economy during the twenties should not be forgotten. Overall, however, life was comfortable, and the standard of living continued to rise.

The second quarter of the twentieth century, however, saw America torn between her founding principles and new ideas that argued those principles were largely outdated. With the Great Depression, a combination of economic forces and unfortunate government actions sank the American and world economies into a decade-long quagmire.

The response in the United States was the New Deal. American society was buoyed by Franklin D. Roosevelt’s personality and his unprecedented expansion of government, even though the actual economic effectiveness of these efforts would elicit questions over time. What is certain is this: expansion and its many programs would change American government and economics, marking a decisive contrast with America’s founding ideas.

Elsewhere in the world, ideologies arose that concentrated on dividing people into groups based on class or race. In trampling on the natural rights of millions of individuals, these totalitarian ideologues rejected
America’s founding principles, especially the view of the dignity of the human person and the dangers of concentrated power. This assault on principle had its counterpart in the horrendous machines of war that swept through Europe, North Africa, and the Pacific. The world found itself on the cusp of global tyranny, with evil powers aligned against all that the American experiment in self-government had stood for. Americans rose to meet the challenge and to distinguish their country yet again by their commitment to enduring and timeless truths.

How Teachers Can Learn More

**TEXTS**

- *New World Coming*, Nathan Miller
- *The Forgotten Man*, Amity Shlaes
- *Freedom from Fear*, David Kennedy
- *Three New Deals*, Wolfgang Schivelbusch
- *From Isolation to War: 1931–1941*, Justus Doenecke
- *The Second World War*, Martin Gilbert
- *The Second World Wars*, Victor Davis Hanson
- *To Hell and Back*, Ian Kershaw
- *American Heritage: A Reader*, ed. Hillsdale College History Faculty

**ONLINE COURSES** | Online.Hillsdale.edu

- *The Great American Story*
- *American Heritage*
- *Constitution 101*
- *Constitution 201*
- *The Second World Wars*

Lesson Planning Resources

**TEACHER RESOURCES**

- *Land of Hope*, Wilfred McClay
- *A Student Workbook for Land of Hope*, Wilfred McClay and John McBride
- *A Short History of World War II*, James Stokesbury

**STUDENT RESOURCES**

PRIMARY SOURCES

“The Inspiration of the Declaration of Independence,” Calvin Coolidge
Commonwealth Club address, Franklin Roosevelt
First inaugural address, Franklin Roosevelt
“The Conservative Manifesto,” Josiah Bailey
Annual Message to Congress, 1941, Franklin Roosevelt
Atlantic Charter, Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill
LESSON PLANS, ASSIGNMENTS, AND QUIZZES
Lesson 1 — The Roaring Twenties

1919–1929

Lesson Objective

Students learn about the prosperity that much of America produced and enjoyed during the 1920s, the presidency of Calvin Coolidge, and the cultural transformations that followed America’s victory in the Great War.

Teacher Preparation

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
- Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 2 Pages 74–89
- Primary Sources See below.

Teacher Texts
- Land of Hope Pages 276–294
- A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope Pages 265–273
- A Student Workbook for Land of Hope Pages 166–170

Online.Hillsdale.edu
- The Great American Story Lecture 17

Student Preparation

Assignment 1: Students read Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 2, pages 74–81, and prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).


Core Content in This Lesson

Geography and Places
- New York City Harlem
- Detroit Tulsa

Persons
- Woodrow Wilson Warren G. Harding
- Carrie Nation Calvin Coolidge
- Susan B. Anthony Henry Ford
- Joseph Stalin Walt Disney
Charles Lindbergh
Al Capone
William Jennings Bryan
Norman Rockwell
Robert Frost

Irving Berlin
Louis Armstrong
Langston Hughes
Zora Neale Hurston

Terms and Topics
- inflation
- Spanish Flu
- 18th Amendment
- Prohibition
- 19th Amendment
- Russian Civil War
- Red Scare
- free market
- laissez-faire
- Great Migration
- Tulsa Massacre
- Teapot Dome Scandal
- electricity
- automobile
- long-term mortgage
- radio
- advertising
- organized crime
- flappers
- fundamentalism
- Scopes Trial
- art deco
- Empire State Building
- jazz
- Harlem Renaissance

Primary Sources
“The Inspiration of the Declaration of Independence,” Calvin Coolidge

To Know by Heart
“Perhaps one of the most important characteristics of my administration has been minding my own business.” —Calvin Coolidge

Timeline
1923 Warren G. Harding dies; Calvin Coolidge becomes president
1928 Herbert Hoover elected

Images
- Historical figures and events
- Cities affected by the Spanish Flu
- Women’s suffrage movement
- Painting of Calvin Coolidge being sworn in by his father
- New inventions
- Automobiles
- Professional sporting events
- First motion pictures
- Bootleggers
- Flappers
- Upper class society
- Art deco architecture and art
- Cityscapes
Map of the Great Migration
Factories and workers
Jazz halls and musicians
Pictures from before and after the Tulsa Race Massacre

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Biographies and the roles of Susan B. Anthony and Calvin Coolidge
- The trial of Sacco and Vanzetti
- The death of Warren G. Harding in San Francisco
- Calvin Coolidge being sworn in by his father
- The New York Times’ 1927 account of a television broadcast
- Edwin James’s account of Charles Lindbergh’s arriving in Paris

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- How did the Great War change America?
- What challenges did America face domestically following the Great War? Why?
- What was the Russian Civil War about? Who won? Why?
- What did Warren G. Harding mean by a “return to normalcy”?
- How might Warren G. Harding’s presidency be characterized?
- Why did the Great Migration begin during the Great War and accelerate during the 1920s?
- How might Calvin Coolidge’s presidency be characterized?
- What technological innovations were most responsible for transforming the pace and busyness of life for Americans during the 1920s?
- How was the 18th Amendment ineffective, and how did it undermine the rule of law?
- To what extent and in what ways did American culture change during the 1920s? Why?
- How did art and architecture change in America following the Great War? What inspirations and principles shaped the artists who introduced these styles?
- How did jazz develop, and what were its main characteristics?
- What was the Harlem Renaissance? What were its origins and main ideas?
- Questions from the US Civics Test:
  - Question 5: How are changes made to the US Constitution?
  - Question 13: What is the rule of law?
  - Question 48: What are two Cabinet-level positions?
  - Question 63: There are four amendments to the US Constitution about who can vote. Describe one of them.
  - Question 99: Name one leader of the women’s rights movement in the 1800s.
  - Question 102: When did all women get the right to vote?
  - Question 118: Name one example of an American innovation.

KEYS TO THE LESSON

The 1920s were another period of great change in American life. First, the transition from wartime to peacetime involved many challenges, including an influenza pandemic, an economic downturn, and fears of anarchist and communist attacks on the American way of life. It was argued that the return to a policy of
limited government under the Harding and Coolidge administrations brought a renewed confidence in American entrepreneurship and innovation. The 1920s thus saw tremendous gains in the standard of living and prosperity. New technologies, especially the mass production of the automobile and new forms of mass communication, led to a life for the middle class that has much in common with life in America today. A different kind of culture and lifestyle began to emerge, however, in America’s large cities and among its upper income earners, who enjoyed exceptional wealth and opulence.

Teachers might best plan and teach The Roaring Twenties with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Discuss the two amendments to the Constitution that were ratified during and after the Great War. Teach about the work of Carrie Nation and Progressives to ratify the 18th Amendment (which prohibited the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages); the work of suffragists Susan B. Anthony, Alice Paul, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucy Stone, and Ida B. Wells; and the 19th Amendment (which secured women’s right to vote).
- Note the challenges that the end of the war brought to America: a recession coupled with inflation, housing and job shortages for returning soldiers, a summer of riots and violence against African Americans in dozens of cities, and the terrifying epidemic of Spanish Flu.
- Teach about the Russian Civil War, the involvement of Allied and American soldiers on the side of the Whites, and the Red Terror. Amid the chaos left in the wake of the Great War, communist groups attempted to seize power in European nations just as the Bolsheviks had done in Russia. With the upheavals that America was experiencing in the first year following the Armistice, communist and anarchist agitation was also present in the United States, a time that some have dubbed the “Red Scare.”
- Introduce Warren G. Harding as a president who generally moved against the Progressive rhetoric and views on government power, of which many Americans had grown weary under Woodrow Wilson. His promise of a “return to normalcy” in America represented a restoration of limited constitutional government after Progressivism. The cutting of taxes and streamlining of regulations in particular unleashed the productive capacity of the American economy. Harding’s administration was overshadowed, though, by a series of scandals among government officials, most notably the Teapot Dome scandal.
- Teach students about the condition of African Americans in various parts of the country, including the beginning of the Great Migration of African Americans from southern states to northern cities. Show the students why these cities became hotbeds of social tension. Highlight, for instance, the racial violence directed against African Americans in the city of Tulsa, Oklahoma.
- Teach about Warren G. Harding’s sudden death in 1923 and Calvin Coolidge’s assuming the presidency. Coolidge continued many of Harding’s limited government policies while openly defending the principles of the American founding against the Progressive view that they had been made obsolete by social changes. Read with students Coolidge’s “The Inspiration of the Declaration of Independence.”
- Present a canvas of America during the 1920s. Begin with the transforming effects of mass automobile ownership, thanks to Henry Ford’s assembly line system, and the proliferation of faster means of communication. The ability to watch motion pictures and to listen to recorded music and the radio complemented the changes to American life brought about by the car. Students should be asked to imagine life before these inventions and how these inventions changed the way Americans experienced life.
- Continue to teach about the efforts to circumvent Prohibition, the rise of organized crime, and the broader lifestyle of the well-to-do, particularly in America’s cities. The emergence of the flapper culture, opulence, and open flouting of Prohibition by America’s leading politicians and businessmen has come to characterize the America of the 1920s. But it is important for students to recognize that this view of America was based on a select elite on which the journalism of the day focused its writings. The vast majority of America underwent no such overwhelming cultural transformation, aside from what was wrought by the automobile, new forms of communication, larger markets, and mass advertisement. Moreover, most of America’s farmers saw little of the prosperity that industry brought and that those in cities were experiencing.

- Spend some time on the art, architecture, music, and literature of the interwar years. Include art deco; the development of jazz; and the literature of the Harlem Renaissance. Students should recognize and understand the ideas informing these changes and developments in art.

**Strengthening Understanding: Post-Lesson Assignments**

**Assignment:** Explain the main policies of the Harding and Coolidge administrations and the principles behind them (1–2 paragraphs).
Reading Quiz 6.1

The Interwar Years and World War II | Lesson 1
Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 2, Pages 74-81

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. Warren Harding campaigned in 1920 on the promise to “return to ________________.”

2. What killed millions of people worldwide immediately following the end of the Great War?

3. What was the target of the “Palmer raids”?

4. Did the Harding and Coolidge administrations raise or lower taxes in the 1920s?

5. What person was able to mass-produce the automobile in America by inventing the assembly line process?
Reading Quiz 6.2

The Interwar Years and World War II | Lesson 1
Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 2, Pages 81-89

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. Name one invention that was introduced or mass-produced in America in the 1920s?

2. What made Charles Lindbergh famous?

3. What was the Teapot Dome scandal about?

4. Who became president when Warren Harding died?

5. How does the book describe the personality or manners of the answer to #4?
DIRECTIONS: Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. What was the Russian Civil War about? Who won? Why?

2. Why did the Great Migration begin during the Great War and accelerate during the 1920s?

3. How was the 18th Amendment ineffective, and how did it undermine the rule of law?

4. To what extent and in what ways did American culture change during the 1920s? Why?

5. What was the Harlem Renaissance? What were its origins and main ideas?
Lesson 2 — The Great Depression

1929–1939

7–8 classes

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the stock market crash of 1929 and the subsequent Great Depression, including the actions of the federal government under President Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s New Deal.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 2
Pages 89–116
Primary Sources
See below.

Teacher Texts
Land of Hope
Pages 294–315
A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope
Pages 273–274, 286–293
A Student Workbook for Land of Hope
Pages 170–171, 182–186

Online.Hillsdale.edu
The Great American Story
Lecture 18
Constitution 101
Lecture 9
Constitution 201
Lecture 5

STUDENT PREPARATION


CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography and Places
Hoover Dam
Tennessee Valley Authority
Persons
Herbert Hoover
Franklin Delano Roosevelt
Jesse Owens

Terms and Topics
stock market
Federal Reserve rate
speculation
overvaluation
Black Tuesday
bank run
fractional reserve banking
recession
Smoot-Hawley Tariff
retaliatory tariffs
depression
Great Depression
Hoovervilles
Bonus Army
21st Amendment
New Deal
brain trust
fireside chats
regulation
bureaucracy
public works programs
Civilian Conservation Corps
Works Progress Administration
National Recovery Administration
Agricultural Adjustment Administration
Dust Bowl
Social Security Act
welfare
income tax
court packing
“Roosevelt recession”

Primary Sources
Commonwealth Club address, Franklin Roosevelt
First inaugural address, Franklin Roosevelt
“The Conservative Manifesto,” Josiah Bailey

To Know by Heart
“God Bless America” —Irving Berlin

Timeline
Oct. 29, 1929 Stock Market Crash (Black Tuesday)
1932 Franklin Roosevelt elected
1937 “Roosevelt recession”

Images
Historical figures and events
Wall Street on Black Tuesday
Hoovervilles
Poverty in cities
The Bonus Army and its dispersion
Fireside chat
Workers in public works programs
Hoover Dam
Tennessee Valley Authority projects
The Dust Bowl
Jesse Owens on the podium at the Berlin Olympics

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Biography and presidential actions of Franklin Delano Roosevelt
- Elliott Bell’s account of the stock market crash of 1929
- Jesse Owens’s gold medal at the 1936 Berlin Olympics in Nazi Germany

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What does the Federal Reserve rate do? How is it decided?
- What is the purpose of buying and selling stocks, both for corporations and investors?
- How does stock trading work? What ultimately determines a stock’s price?
- For what reasons were many stocks grossly overvalued by the late 1920s?
- How did the sell-off influence other investors?
- What is a bank run? What is its connection to fractional reserve banking?
- What actions by the Hoover administration and Congress may have caused a temporary recession to become the Great Depression? How so?
- What was life like for many Americans during the Great Depression?
- How might one describe Franklin Delano Roosevelt? Why did he appeal to so many Americans, and why did his foes dislike him?
- What were the main ideas behind Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal?
- What were the main types of government action taken as part of the New Deal?
- How did the New Deal transform the role and functioning of the federal government?
- How did the Dust Bowl come about?
- Why do some scholars claim that the New Deal may have unintentionally prolonged the Great Depression?
- What was Franklin Roosevelt’s court-packing plan, and why did that plan backfire in public opinion?
- Questions from the US Civics Test:
  - Question 53: How many seats are on the Supreme Court?
  - Question 103: What was the Great Depression?
  - Question 104: When did the Great Depression start?
  - Question 105: Who was president during the Great Depression and World War II?

KEYS TO THE LESSON

Rarely in American history can two adjoining time periods be juxtaposed so sharply as the 1920s and the 1930s, as the boom of the Roaring Twenties gave way abruptly to the bust of the Great Depression. Fluctuations in the economic decisions of millions of people are natural, relatively brief, and often clarifying for producers and consumers alike, but the economic abyss into which Americans descended was unlike anything else. Likewise, the response of the federal government was unmatched to any other time in its history. In the presidencies of Herbert Hoover and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a second run of Progressivism rose in response to the laissez-faire approach of the previous decade. Roosevelt’s policies often went far beyond the traditional constitutional limits on government authority in order to win (as he
framed it) the war against the Depression. Students should understand the debates over the causes, the deepening, and the perpetuation of the Great Depression, as well as the types and effectiveness of various government actions in response.

Teachers might best plan and teach The Great Depression with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Review with students the role and functioning of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Reserve rate.
- Spend some time at the outset of this lesson to help them understand how the stock market works. Of particular importance is that they understand the normal function of buying and selling stocks, both for corporations and for investors. Admittedly, many achievements in American life would have been nearly impossible without the raising of capital through the sale of stocks. But students should also learn how the price of a stock can become detached from the hard realities and purposes behind a corporation’s offering of stocks.
- With this backdrop, help students understand what makes a person less careful in the stock market. Students should be aware of the perception that the gains of the 1920s economy were unstoppable. By 1929, almost every bet in the stock market seemed sure to gain in value, and the money to borrow to place such bets seemed unending thanks to low interest rates. It was human nature to respond in this way—both for investors and government experts at the Federal Reserve.
- Clarify for students what this meant: In the broader economy, much of Americans’ savings had been loaned out, with complete confidence that they would be repaid with a sure profit. The capital raised from these savings was readily available and readily spent to expand the production of businesses. This production was responding more to the available capital rather than to the actual quantity of goods and services that Americans wanted. Almost everything was overvalued: the price a person saw a stock or company to be worth was far higher than its actual business success would yield. All it took was somebody to realize this, to attempt to sell their stocks at this higher price before they fell back to their real value, and then for others to notice what this person just did, recognize the underlying discrepancy, and do the same. Then the valuations would crash.
- While it is difficult to pinpoint what caused investors in late 1929 to look into the real value of the companies in which they had invested, a possible alarm might have been the sudden closing of a major investment firm in London that had been charged with fraud. While it did not have a direct impact on the American stock market, the sudden closure may have alerted enough American investors to take a closer look at the companies in which they had invested. What they found was that their stocks were indeed overvalued, and they began to sell.
- Be sure to note for students that a stock market crash and, in this case, the onset of a recession, is made up of the reactions of millions of individuals. In October 1929, that meant that a growing number of investors were frightened by the first sell-offs and began to presume that every stock—even those that were sound—were overvalued or would be affected by other overvalued stocks. It became a race to save something of their original investments.
- Next, begin to explain the various effects of this stock market crash in other areas of the economy, noting how the consequences were something like a trip wire that would then double back and trigger itself again. As a company’s stocks were deflated, the business model and outlook of a company dimmed, production and services halted, and employees were furloughed and then laid off. Now in need of money, the unemployed went to withdraw some of their personal savings from their banks. Here, introduce students to fractional reserve banking. With only a fraction of deposits on hand and the rest loaned out—in many cases, in overvalued stocks and companies—
the deposits for all who had savings at a bank were not readily available for everyone all at once, should a bank run occur. As events unfolded, these savings were dissipated with the collapse of each additional business, and news of a limited supply of savings led to further panicked bank runs. With their savings gone, the unemployed and employed alike further lost the means to spend money at businesses and repay loans when businesses and banks were already short on revenue. More businesses closed, more stocks lost value, more people were unemployed, and the pattern repeated, continuing its downward spiral.

- Consider with students how the initial stock market crash did not make the Great Depression inevitable. The crash was harder than most sell-offs and recessions owing to a combination of the Federal Reserve System’s monetary policy, overvaluation, and overproduction, but a relatively quick (albeit longer) correction was generally anticipated. Focus, then, on the important actions of the Hoover administration that arguably turned a bad recession into a depression. This series of events runs counter to the perception of Herbert Hoover as a dedicated champion of the free market and limited government. In contrast with Warren G. Harding and Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover believed the American government and large American businesses were capable of using their authority, often in concert, to solve economic problems. But the passage of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff and the consequent retaliatory tariffs by other nations raised prices for the unemployed and underemployed while stifling international trade when the economy was already faltering. The Federal Reserve’s belated raising of interest rates further restricted the flow of increasingly scarce dollars and dampened new investments and spending when that is just what businesses needed. Aid to key industries for mortgages and in the form of public works seemed to do little to help. Some argue that it was these events that actually caused the recession to turn into a historic depression.

- Take time to teach about the experiences of those who were suffering during the early days of the Great Depression, comparing it to the great prosperity they had experienced during the 1920s. Help students to see the desperation and disillusionment that so many families endured and the growing demand for some sort of radical solution. With the situation ripe for anarchist, socialist, and communist agitators to gain a sizeable following, things were volatile, to say the least.

- Explain the changes in party constituencies—particularly the Democratic alliance of southerners, western farmers, immigrants, workers in northern urban centers, and some African Americans—and the reasons for these shifts.

- Help students to understand the appeal of Franklin Delano Roosevelt in his ideas, his words, and his personality, particularly as they fit the situation America was in by 1932. The fact that he spoke well and affably—combined with his penchant to have the government take action as though it were fighting a war—made him highly successful in garnering support from a downtrodden populace. Consider reviewing Roosevelt’s Commonwealth Club address with students on this point.

- Explain the core features of Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal. The New Deal had many strands and, considered in its totality, can seem to be a collection of competing policies. But a common principle was that the federal government would not abide by the principles of limited government set forth in the American founding and reasserted during the 1920s but rather would adopt the Progressive belief in government action to solve problems, confident in the power of bureaucratic expertise. The chief difference between the original Progressives and the Progressives of the New Deal was the dramatic scope of and almost exclusive economic focus of the New Deal. Reading with students Roosevelt’s First Inaugural Address captures the Progressivism to which Roosevelt held.


- Lead students through a consideration of the New Deal’s various approaches and programs to address the economic struggles America faced. Key areas to focus on include efforts to make banking less volatile and restore investor confidence; the myriad of public works programs; the close cooperation of the federal government and large businesses to fix the prices, wages, and other standards within various industries; the creation of certain limited welfare programs such as Social Security; and the record increase in income tax rates. Be sure to consider with students whether these actions worked as intended, followed the Constitution, and helped or hurt the economy. Chapter 17 of *Land of Hope* may be of help in navigating these questions, as well as for tracking the ebb and flow of Franklin Roosevelt’s popularity. It may be helpful to read with students “The Conservative Manifesto” by Josiah Bailey, which challenged aspects of the New Deal at the time.

- Discuss Franklin Roosevelt’s reelection campaigns and the eventual decline in Democratic electoral victories as the Depression dragged on. Roosevelt’s plan to pack the Supreme Court hurt him at the polls while many argued that his New Deal policies led to a recession in 1937.

- Be sure students understand and reflect on the tremendous transformations that Franklin Roosevelt and the New Deal wrought in the size, purpose, and functioning of the federal government and the place of the presidency. Never had the federal government been so large. The bureaucratic ideals first envisioned by the Progressives expanded greatly. Roosevelt’s use of the presidency’s bully pulpit surpassed perhaps even that of his cousin Theodore Roosevelt. Students should explore what advantages and risks are inherent in such changes in government power, particularly in light of the principles of the American founding and traditional manner of governance that had formerly defined the United States. They should also consider the fact that Roosevelt and his New Deal provided a psychological boost to millions of suffering Americans.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Explain what life was like for millions of Americans during the Great Depression (1 paragraph).

**Assignment 2:** Explain the major policies and ideas of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and his New Deal (1–2 paragraphs).
Reading Quiz 6.3

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. Who was elected after Calvin Coolidge?

2. To what do “Black Thursday” and “Black Tuesday” refer?

3. To what does the term “Hooverville” refer?

4. What happened with the Bonus Army?

5. Which political party suddenly enjoyed renewed interest in the early years of the Great Depression?
Reading Quiz 6.4

The Interwar Years and World War II | Lesson 2

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. The author mentions that Franklin Delano Roosevelt had what kind of personality?

2. As evident from his 1932 campaign speeches and his first inaugural address, Franklin Roosevelt promised to do what?

3. What was Franklin Roosevelt’s “Brain Trust”?

4. Name one kind of job the New Deal hired unemployed Americans to do?

5. Name one problem with the efforts of the National Recovery Administration (NRA) mentioned by the author.
**Reading Quiz 6.5**

The Interwar Years and World War II | Lesson 2  

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question.

1. Which party won most of the elections in the 1930s?

2. In which party did Franklin Roosevelt unexpectedly find a challenge to his rule as the Depression drew on?

3. What did the Social Security Act do?

4. What did Franklin Roosevelt try to do to the Supreme Court?

5. What caused the “Roosevelt recession”?
Lesson 3 — World War II

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the rise of totalitarianism during the interwar years, the outbreak of war in Europe and Asia, and the role of the United States in moving from a position of neutrality to its own entrance into the war and ultimate victory.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 2 Pages 117–146
Primary Sources See below.

Teacher Texts
Land of Hope Pages 316–340
A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope Pages 305–317
A Student Workbook for Land of Hope Pages 198–205
A Short History of World War II

Online.Hillsdale.edu
The Great American Story Lecture 19
The Second World Wars Lectures 1–7
American Heritage Lecture 9

STUDENT PREPARATION


CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography and Places
Ukraine
Imperial Japan
China
Rhineland
Sudetenland  
Dunkirk  
Vichy France  
English Channel  
Caucuses  
Pacific Ocean  
Detroit  
Seattle  

Tunisia  
Sicily  
Normandy  
Bastogne  
Dresden  
Tokyo  
Hiroshima and Nagasaki  

Persons

Franklin D. Roosevelt  
Joseph Stalin  
Benito Mussolini  
Adolf Hitler  
Hirohito  
Hideki Tojo  
Francisco Franco  
Neville Chamberlain  
Winston Churchill  
Charles de Gaulle  
Heinrich Himmler  
Erwin Rommel  
Bernard Montgomery  
George Patton  
Dwight Eisenhower  
Douglas MacArthur  
Harry Truman  
Albert Einstein  

Terms and Topics

Treaty of Versailles  
League of Nations  
totalitarianism  
communism  
nationalism  
Cheka  
gulag archipelago  
Holodomor  
Meiji Restoration  
Weimar Republic  
fascism  
Nazi Party  
Brownshirts  
SS  
Reichstag fire  
Gestapo  
Nuremberg Laws  
Kristallnacht  
Neutrality Acts  
Spanish Civil War  
Japanese Invasion of China  
rearmament  
Luftwaffe  
Austrian Anschluss  
Munich Crisis  
appeasement  
Nazi-Soviet Nonaggression Pact  
Invasion of Poland  
Allied Powers  
Blitzkrieg  
Miracle of Dunkirk  
Axis Powers  
Royal Air Force (RAF)  
Battle of Britain  
The Blitz  
Ultra decrypting  
Cash and carry  
Destroyers for Bases  
Atlantic Charter  
Lend-Lease  
Hemispheric Defense Zone  
Operation Barbarossa  
Battle of Moscow  
Attack on Pearl Harbor  
Bataan Death March  
“Arsenal of Democracy”  
code talkers  
Japanese Internment  
Tuskegee Airmen  
Battle of the Coral Sea  
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Battle of Midway          Warsaw Uprising
Battle of the Atlantic    Battle of the Bulge
Battle of Stalingrad      Battle of Iwo Jima
Battle of Guadalcanal     concentration/death camps
Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam    Auschwitz
resistance/partisan groups The Holocaust
Operation Torch           genocide
Italian Campaign          VE Day
strategic bombing         Firebombing of Tokyo
US Marines                Manhattan Project
island hopping            atomic bomb
Atlantic Wall             Enola Gay
Operation Overlord        VJ Day
D-Day                     Battle of Normandy

Primary Sources
Annual Message to Congress, 1941, Franklin Roosevelt
Atlantic Charter, Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill

To Know by Heart
“December 7, 1941, a date which will live in infamy.” —Franklin Roosevelt, War Message to Congress

“I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears and sweat.” —Winston Churchill to Parliament, May 13, 1940

“Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few.”
—Winston Churchill on the Royal Air Force pilots who fought in the Battle of Britain, August 20, 1940

Timeline
1939–1945  World War II
  1939  Sept. 1  Germany and the Soviet Union invade Poland
  1940  Fall of France
        Battle of Britain and the Blitz
  1941  Germany invades the Soviet Union
        Dec. 7  Japanese attack Pearl Harbor
  1942  Battles of Midway & Stalingrad
  1943  Battle of Guadalcanal
        Invasions of North Africa and Italy
  1944  June 6  Normandy Invasion (D-Day)
        Battle of the Bulge
  1945  Aug. 15  VJ Day
Images

- Historical figures and events
- Photographs from the Soviet gulags
- Images and uniforms of Allied and Axis officers and soldiers
- Depictions and photographs of figures at various scenes and moments in battle
- Maps: alliances, overall strategies, specific battles
- Military equipment and weaponry
- War propaganda
- Reenactment photos
- Facsimiles of documents and letters
- Home front and factory production
- Japanese internment notices
- Prisoner-of-war and death camps
- Destruction from the war
- Postwar maps

Stories for the American Heart

- Life in a Soviet gulag
- Life during the Holodomor
- Life in Weimar, Germany
- Sefton Delmer’s account of the Reichstag fire
- Erwin Rommel’s account of blitzkrieg in France
- The evacuation of the British Army from Dunkirk, mainly using British civilian boats; John Austin’s account
- Winston Churchill and the Royal Air Force in the Battle of Britain; Richard Hillary’s account
- Frances Faviell’s account of the Blitz
- The Russian winter setting in as the Germans were on the outskirts of Moscow
- The mass murders committed by the Soviet Union, Imperial Japan, and Nazi Germany
- Resistance fighting
- John Garcia’s and Daniel Inouye’s accounts of the attack on Pearl Harbor
- Bataan Death March
- Doolittle Raid
- Mitsuo Fuchida’s account of the Battle of Midway
- Fighting in the various theaters of war, especially those involving American soldiers
- Stories of American soldiers in various major battles
- Robert Sherrod’s account of the Marines landing at Tarawa
- James Rudder and the Army Rangers attacking Pointe du Hoc
- Robert Edlin’s account of fighting at Omaha Beach on D-Day
- First reports to the Allies of the “Final Solution,” by Gerhart Riegner
- Life in Nazi concentration camps and stories of resistance and survival
- Warsaw uprising
- Jack Lucas fighting at Iwo Jima
- Deaths of Franklin Roosevelt, Benito Mussolini, and Adolf Hitler in April 1945
- The Enola Gay dropping the first atomic bomb
- Survivors of strategic bombing and atomic bombing campaigns
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What forms of political persecution and extermination did the communist Soviet Union inflict on its people?
- What groups of people in Europe especially feared communism during the 1920s and 1930s?
- What is economic fascism?
- What problems did Weimar, Germany, face? What caused these problems?
- Why were Germans attracted to the ideas of the Nazi Party in the 1930s?
- Why was Adolf Hitler obsessed with a person’s race?
- What was the Reichstag fire? How did it come about, and why was it important for Adolf Hitler’s dictatorship?
- What are the ways in which communism, socialism, and fascism are similar and different? What roles did nationalism and militarism play in each?
- What were Adolf Hitler’s foreign policy goals, and how did he try to justify them to the other countries of Europe?
- How did World War II begin in September 1939?
- How significant were the persona and the actions of Winston Churchill, especially during the early years of World War II?
- What were the ways the United States indirectly but intentionally helped the British in their war with Germany and in their deterrence of Japan in the Pacific?
- Why was Operation Barbarossa so significant?
- Why did Japan attack the United States? What was the strategic goal of the attack on Pearl Harbor? Why was the attack not completely successful?
- How did Nazi Germany, communist Soviet Union, and Imperial Japan treat their own people, the people they conquered, and soldiers they captured? Why?
- What was strategic bombing? What were the problems with it, both practical and moral?
- How were American industrial might and American generals important to the Allied cause?
- What was fighting like in the Pacific, in North Africa, and in Italy? How were the Allies eventually successful in each theater?
- How did Operation Overlord work?
- What did Nazi Germany do in the Holocaust?
- What happened to Poland and all of Eastern Europe in the final year of the war?
- How was the atomic bomb developed?
- What moral dilemmas did the Allies face at numerous points in the war?
- Question from the US Civics Test:
  - Question 105: Who was president during the Great Depression and World War II?
  - Question 106: Why did the United States enter World War II?
  - Question 107: Dwight Eisenhower is famous for many things. Name one.

KEYS TO THE LESSON

World War II was one of the monumental events in world history, an epic struggle between good and evil. This is not to say that the Allied war effort was morally perfect. But if there ever was a moment when we can say that an evil regime was set to conquer the world and heroes rose to meet it, World War II was such a moment. The efforts of Americans of the time—from business leaders and workers to generals and citizen soldiers—saved the world. In recognizing these facts, students should be able to acknowledge the gratitude
and honor they owe to this “greatest generation” and should rise to conserve what those soldiers sacrificed and died to defend.

Teachers might best plan and teach World War II with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Begin the lesson with a retracing of events in Europe and Asia during the 1920s and 1930s. In addition to the tumult of the global Depression, Europe was slow to recover from the Great War, particularly with respect to the shakiness of its political and traditional institutions and beliefs.
- Spend time with Soviet Russia as the experiment in communism played out. Under both Vladimir Lenin and Joseph Stalin, the Soviet Union was the world’s first totalitarian state, combining an atheistic philosophy with modern scientific technology and thus controlling its people and seeking to spread its revolutionary power worldwide.
- Pivot to discussing the other branch of totalitarianism: fascism. Imperial Japan, Benito Mussolini’s Italy, Nazi Germany, and Francisco Franco’s Spain were distinct from communism mainly in economic policy. Whereas communism in the Soviet Union owned all business and property, economic fascism sought more to direct or force private businesses and property toward certain state-sanctioned goals. Communism, socialism, and fascism thus are all distinct from the American economic principle of free markets that come with limited constitutional government and capitalism.
- Consider with students that, with the exception of economic policy, the communist and fascist regimes of the interwar years were similar to each other. Discuss with students how this was the case, for even though the specific goals were different, the means were the same. Students may consider, for example, how all three regimes:
  - opposed the free market
  - divided people into superior and inferior groups
  - sought conquest
  - involved enormous centralized government action without enforced constitutions
  - appealed to the common man even as their leaders sacrificed the common man to preserve themselves
  - harnessed both traditional culture and cultural change to mobilize and unite their people
  - held no objective moral principles besides the will to power
  - employed propaganda and restricted free speech
  - appealed to passion instead of reason
  - indoctrinated the youth by dividing them from their parents
  - used science and technology for mass control
  - worked in close concert with military leaders and industries
  - coalesced around a single individual leader
  - took advantage of economic and political crises to gain power
  - employed secret police
  - endorsed gang violence and thuggery
  - persecuted political opponents
- Students should understand the way of life in these regimes, contrasting it with such American principles as freedom of speech, freedom of religion, private property, protection against unreasonable search and seizure, limited government, representative democracy, and the dignity of the human person and natural rights.
Discuss how Adolf Hitler’s Nazi party gained power, at first legally, and the circumstances—for example, inflation from reparations, the humiliations from the Treaty of Versailles, the Great Depression, and fears of a communist revolution—that had made the Nazi platform initially appealing to Germans. Then walk through the various steps Hitler took to gain dictatorial power, including the Nazi-organized Reichstag fire that was used to justify this power grab, the suspension of the constitution, and the violation of rights. At this point in the lesson, students should learn about the Nazis’ treatment of Jews and others up through Kristallnacht, waiting to teach about the Holocaust itself until the final years of the war, when the ordinary people of the rest of the world first learned of it (see guidance below).

Begin the prelude to war with Italy’s invasion of Ethiopia, Italy and Germany’s involvement in the Spanish Civil War, and Japan’s complete invasion of China. Turn to Hitler’s violations of the Treaty of Versailles as he rearmed Germany and imposed territorial claims. Students should understand the sources of the European policy of appeasement, even while asking whether the policy was misguided, as Winston Churchill warned. Consider especially how each of Hitler’s moves was an admitted gamble in his eyes, as well as the clear actions European powers could have taken to rebut Germany successfully. Be sure to track Churchill’s warnings during these years, even as he was not yet prime minister. By the time Hitler invaded Poland, Germany had grown too powerful to be easily checked. Still, a French offensive in the west may have done some good instead of forces waiting behind the Maginot Line.

Amid the growing belligerence of these powers, note America’s general return to the foreign policy of George Washington and subsequent policies that had preceded its involvement in the Great War. A series of Neutrality Acts sought to keep America in this position, one of avoiding any war that was not in the national interest of America, here meaning the preservation of the constitutional government that preserved the natural rights of Americans.

Have students think through and compare the various advantages and disadvantages each side had at the outset of the war and how these shifted during the war. Have students take simple notes, as a “T-Chart” can be effective for this part of the lesson.

Build students’ familiarity with the style of warfare in 1939, and show them plenty of images to do so. Students need this foundation for their subsequent study of battles. This helps them to imagine and understand what happens in battle and to appreciate the bravery of soldiers fighting on both sides. Explain in particular the great changes in technology and tactics.

Present to students explanations of each side’s strategy at various stages of the war and the tactics and battle plans employed in specific battles. Have students track strategy changes on a map of Europe and the Pacific during World War II.

As with any conflict, dwell on the key contributions of both leaders and common soldiers in the war, especially Winston Churchill, Charles de Gaulle, Erwin Rommel, George Patton, Dwight Eisenhower, and Douglas MacArthur. The Second World War was an exceptionally well-documented conflict, and every battle has plenty of firsthand accounts and stories of individual soldiers that students deserve to learn.

Teach the war in some detail, especially the major battles and military campaigns. Students should understand how the battles came to be, the key stories, factors, and moments from the battle itself, and the significance of their various outcomes on subsequent events. Employ battle maps often and have students track battles and campaigns on maps of Europe, North Africa, and the Pacific. There are many well-documented and engaging battles to teach, so prudence and time will determine which to treat in depth and which to summarize in a lively and telling manner. A Short History of World War II is a great aid for teaching these battles.
Teach the beginning of the war through 1941 with all the speed and drama that defined the time. Matters reached a crisis point at Dunkirk, where the British army was facing almost certain annihilation but executed a miracle evacuation. But the British had appeared merely to forestall the inevitable, as the German army prepared for the invasion of the British Isles and the end to free government on the frontier of Western civilization. Here teachers must help students imagine what they and the world would have been facing. It is not an overstatement to say this: the fate of the world lay in the hands of the British, particularly in their leader, Winston Churchill, their ordinary citizens, and the young men of the Royal Air Force. Their sacrifice in the Battle of Britain and then the Blitz staved off a German victory. Likewise, students should be aware of the crucial folly of Hitler’s invasion of Russia.

Note for students how the rapid German conquest of Europe and the heroism of the British moved the American people, not to outright support for war, but to support material aid to the British. Discuss Roosevelt’s unprecedented third term and the various ways he and Congress aided the British and checked the Japanese in the Pacific. With this background and especially the American policy toward Japan, teach the attack on the US Pacific Fleet stationed at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. Reading Roosevelt’s 1941 Annual Message to Congress and the Atlantic Charter may be warranted.

Briefly walk through the main ways that America mobilized for war, which had the side effect of lifting America out of the Great Depression, with millions of soldiers leaving the workforce or unemployment rolls to fight, just as demand for workers for the war effort soared.

Teachers will need to decide whether to teach the war from Pearl Harbor onward in one of two ways. The first way is to teach the European theater and then the Pacific. The other way is to teach the war year-by-year, oscillating between theaters and touching on the other ongoing war efforts, both domestically and in combat, in the process. This latter effort can be more challenging but also presents a fuller and more realistic experience of the course of events.

Of special import, highlight for students the moments and factors that led to an Allied victory once America entered the war. These factors may include the sheer manpower and industrial might of America, the failure of the Japanese to destroy America’s aircraft carriers and oil reserves at Pearl Harbor, the ingenuity that closed the Atlantic Gap, the work of codebreakers, the enterprise and daring of American soldiers and generals in innumerable situations, the hubris of Axis leaders, and the key battles of Midway, Stalingrad, Guadalcanal, small islands in the vast Pacific, Leyte Gulf, D-Day, the Battle of the Bulge, and the resistance efforts of many brave people.

As the lesson proceeds toward the end of the war, discuss the various conferences and conversations among the “Big Three” concerning the postwar world. As their common enemy was nearing defeat, the awkward alliance was sure to pit a totalitarian regime against those of representative self-government. Students should understand the ideas and maneuverings (or lack thereof) by the Americans and the British, especially Winston Churchill’s salient predictions about Joseph Stalin and the Soviet Union.

Teach students about the Holocaust, beginning with the moment that the Allies began to enter Poland and Germany in 1944 and 1945 and discovered the concentration and death camps. Students should learn about the Nazis’ purposes for this genocide—the murder of Jews and others they considered inferior or who stood up to them. Students may be asked to make these reflections in consideration of the moral and political philosophy on which the American founders established the United States. The Holocaust entailed the total annihilation of natural rights, of freedom, of the dignity of the human person, and of human life itself.
- Outline the basic terms of the treaties ending the war and the state of affairs among the British and the Americans and the Soviets.
- Recap the war by considering major statistics, including the number of casualties and deaths on each side, and its effects on America and the world. Considering the civilian death toll and murder of so many noncombatant men, women, and children is also appropriate and sobering. In many ways, the jubilance that America experienced at the end of the war was a rarity in the world.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Explain the main characteristics of totalitarian regimes in the 1930s (1–2 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Explain how the Allied Powers won the Second World War (2–3 paragraphs).
DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. Name one conflict in the 1920s or 1930s that predated World War II.

2. What country did France and Britain promise to defend if Adolf Hitler invaded it?

3. What was America’s position at the beginning of the Second World War?

4. What happened in the Battle of Britain?

5. Name one way the United States was helping the British prior to the entrance of America into World War II.
Reading Quiz 6.7

The Interwar Years and World War II | Lesson 3
Land of Hope Young Reader’s Edition, Volume 2, Pages 125-135

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. How did the Roosevelt administration inhibit Japan’s plans for expansion in Asia and the Pacific prior to the attack at Pearl Harbor?

2. What did the Japanese fail to do to America’s Pacific naval fleet in their attack on Pearl Harbor?

3. Which country had Adolf Hitler invaded earlier in 1941?

4. What did the Roosevelt administration do with Americans of Japanese descent after Pearl Harbor?

5. In which country did American troops first fight in Europe?
DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. Where did the D-Day invasions take place?

2. What was the consequence of the American victories at Coral Sea and Midway?

3. Name one World War II general the author mentions.

4. What was the Holocaust?

5. How did the United States end the war with Japan?
Unit 6 | Formative Quiz 2

Covering Lesson 3, Part 1
10-15 minutes

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. What forms of political persecution and extermination did the communist Soviet Union inflict on its people?

2. Why were Germans attracted to the ideas of the Nazi Party in the 1930s?

3. What were Adolf Hitler’s foreign policy goals, and how did he try to justify them to the other countries of Europe?

4. What were the ways the United States indirectly but intentionally helped the British in their war with Germany and in their deterrence of Japan in the Pacific?

5. Why was Operation Barbarossa so significant?
APPENDIX A

Study Guides

Tests

Writing Assignment
Unit 6 | Test 1 — Study Guide

Lesson 1 | The Roaring Twenties
Lesson 2 | The Great Depression

Test on ____________

TIMELINE

When given chronological dates, match events from a list to the years or dates that they happened.

1923    Warren G. Harding dies; Calvin Coolidge becomes president
1928    Herbert Hoover elected
Oct. 29, 1929 Stock Market Crash (Black Tuesday)
1932    Franklin Roosevelt elected president

GEOGRAPHY AND PLACES

Identify each on a map and/or tell where it is and explain its significance.

New York City    Harlem
Detroit          Tennessee Valley Authority

PERSONS

Identify each, provide biographical details, and explain what he or she thought or did in specific periods or events.

Woodrow Wilson    Henry Ford    Herbert Hoover
Susan B. Anthony  Charles Lindbergh Franklin Delano Roosevelt
Joseph Stalin     Irving Berlin  Jesse Owens
Warren G. Harding Louis Armstrong
Calvin Coolidge   Langston Hughes

TERMS AND TOPICS

Identify each and explain its significance to the period of history studied.

Spanish Flu    automobile    stock market
Prohibition    radio        Federal Reserve rate
19th Amendment organized crime overvaluation
Russian Civil War flappers    Black Tuesday
free market    Scopes Trial bank run
laissez-faire  art deco    recession
Great Migration Empire State Building Smoot-Hawley Tariff
Tulsa Massacre jazz    retaliatory tariffs
Teapot Dome Scandal Harlem Renaissance depression
Great Depression  regulation  income tax
Hoovervilles  bureaucracy  court packing
Bonus Army  public works programs  “Roosevelt recession”
New Deal  Dust Bowl
fireside chats  Social Security Act

PRIMARY SOURCES

Based on annotations and notes from seminar conversations, be able to answer questions on each primary source. While you will not necessarily be asked why each primary source was created, what it did or argued, and what its effects were, being able to answer these kinds of questions will make you well prepared.

“The Inspiration of the Declaration of Independence,” Calvin Coolidge
Commonwealth Club address, Franklin Roosevelt

TO KNOW BY HEART

Fill in missing words and/or identify the speaker and context.

“Perhaps one of the most important characteristics of my administration has been minding my own business.” —Calvin Coolidge

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be 3rd grade students.

- Biographies and the roles of Susan B. Anthony and Franklin Delano Roosevelt
- Calvin Coolidge being sworn in by his father
- Edwin James’s account of Charles Lindbergh’s arriving in Paris
- Elliott Bell’s account of the stock market crash of 1929
- Jesse Owens’s gold medal at the 1936 Berlin Olympics in Nazi Germany

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.

Lesson 1 | The Roaring Twenties

☐ How did the Great War change America?
☐ What challenges did America face domestically following the Great War? Why?
☐ What was the Russian Civil War about? Who won? Why?
☐ What did Warren G. Harding mean by a “return to normalcy”?
☐ How might Calvin Coolidge’s presidency be characterized?
☐ What technological innovations were most responsible for transforming the pace and busyness of life for Americans during the 1920s?
☐ How was the 18th Amendment ineffective, and how did it undermine the rule of law?
How did art and architecture change in America following the Great War? What inspirations and principles shaped the artists who introduced these styles?

What was the Harlem Renaissance? What were its origins and main ideas?

Lesson 2 | The Great Depression

What does the Federal Reserve rate do? How is it decided?

How does stock trading work? What ultimately determines a stock’s price?

For what reasons were many stocks grossly overvalued by the late 1920s?

What is a bank run? What is its connection to fractional reserve banking?

What actions by the Hoover administration and Congress may have caused a temporary recession to become the Great Depression? How so?

What was life like for many Americans during the Great Depression?

How might one describe Franklin Delano Roosevelt? Why did he appeal to so many Americans, and why did his foes dislike him?

What were the main types of government action taken as part of the New Deal?

How did the New Deal transform the role and functioning of the federal government?

Why do some scholars claim that the New Deal may have unintentionally prolonged the Great Depression?

What was Franklin Roosevelt’s court-packing plan, and why did that plan backfire in public opinion?
Unit 6 | Test 1 — The Interwar Years

Lesson 1 | The Roaring Twenties
Lesson 2 | The Great Depression

TIMELINE

Write the letter of each event next to the date or years it took place.

- 1923
- 1928
- Oct. 29, 1929
- 1932

A. Franklin Roosevelt elected president
B. Herbert Hoover elected
C. Stock Market Crash (Black Tuesday)
D. Warren G. Harding dies; Calvin Coolidge becomes president

PERSONS, TERMS, AND TOPICS

Fill in the blank with the letter of the correct answer.

A. art deco  F. income tax  K. Smoot-Hawley Tariff
B. Dust Bowl  G. Joseph Stalin  L. Susan B. Anthony
C. Federal Reserve rate  H. Louis Armstrong  M. Warren G. Harding
D. Great Migration  I. New Deal
E. Herbert Hoover  J. organized crime

1. ___________________________ was a leading advocate for a constitutional amendment that guaranteed the right to vote to women.

2. Having defeated his rival Leon Trotsky for control of the Soviet Union, ___________________________ implemented communist ideology through the use of secret police, political purges, central state planning, and the Holodomor in the Ukraine.

3. After the Progressive Era and the Great War, ___________________________ promised a “return to normalcy” by limiting economic interference by the federal government, cutting taxes, and easing back from the goals and actions of progressivism. His scandal-plagued career, however, came to an end with his sudden death while in office.

4. Although the Eighteenth Amendment attempted to ban the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages, its enforcement proved impractical and the skirting of the law along with lax enforcement gave rise to ___________________________ during the 1920s.

5. Identified as rectilinear (or “boxy”), the 1920s and 1930s art style known as ___________________________ mimicked the industrial and modern spirit of the age.
6. Seeking new economic opportunities and an escape from lingering unequal treatment and outright discrimination in southern states, many African Americans migrated to northern cities burgeoning with new industrial jobs in what is known as the _____________________________.

7. The new genre of music known as jazz emerged from New Orleans, with ____________________________ being one of the most famous of its early musicians.

8. A hallmark of progressive legislation was the introduction of a ____________________________ rate, which allowed the government to encourage borrowing and spending by decreasing the rate or caution and responsibility by increasing it. Such a balancing act would prove difficult to manage by the late 1920s.

9. A “boy genius” who had a storied early career in government, ____________________________’s presidency was undermined by the stock market crash and a series of government policies that, though well-intended, may have made the economy worse.

10. In an effort to shield American manufacturers from overseas competition after the stock market crash, Congress passed the ____________________________, which had the unintentional consequences of forcing other countries to raise import taxes on goods from America and, some argue, turning a bad recession into the Great Depression.

11. Franklin Delano Roosevelt campaigned on the promise to wield the power of the federal government in economic matters in an effort to help end the Great Depression. His ____________________________ set of policies expanded the power and size of the federal government and provided a morale boost for Americans, even as its effectiveness became a matter of historical debate.

12. Due to poor farming techniques and drought, much of middle America experienced agricultural devastation in the midst of the Great Depression in a phenomenon known as the _____________________________.

13. Made constitutional through the Seventeenth Amendment, the ____________________________ on the highest earners was raised to extraordinary levels as part of Franklin Roosevelt’s government policies to address the Great Depression.

**Known By Heart**

*Fill in missing words and/or identify the speaker.*

14. “Perhaps one of the most important characteristics of my administration has been ____________________________ my own ____________________________.”

   Speaker: ____________________________
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be 3rd grade students.

15. Calvin Coolidge being sworn in as President.


QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and writing should be employed and responses must fully answer each question.

17. How did the Great War change America?

18. How might Calvin Coolidge’s presidency be characterized?
19. What technological innovations were most responsible for transforming the pace and busyness of life for Americans during the 1920s?

20. What was the Harlem Renaissance? What were its origins and main ideas?

21. For what reasons were many stocks grossly overvalued by the late 1920s?

22. What is a bank run? What is its connection to fractional reserve banking?

23. What was life like for many Americans during the Great Depression?

24. What was Franklin Roosevelt's court-packing plan, and why did that plan backfire in public opinion?
## Timeline

When given chronological dates, match events from a list to the years or dates that they happened.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Germany and the Soviet Union invade Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Germany invades the Soviet Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 7</td>
<td>Japanese attack Pearl Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Normandy Invasion (D-Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Battle of the Bulge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>VJ Day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Geography and Places

Identify each on a map and/or tell where it is and explain its significance.

- Ukraine
- Imperial Japan
- China
- Rhineland
- Dunkirk
- Caucuses
- Pacific Ocean
- Detroit
- Tunisia
- Sicily
- Normandy
- Bastogne
- Dresden
- Tokyo
- Hiroshima and Nagasaki

## Persons

Identify each, provide biographical details, and explain what he or she thought or did in specific periods or events.

- Franklin D. Roosevelt
- Joseph Stalin
- Benito Mussolini
- Adolf Hitler
- Hirohito
- Hideki Tojo
- Neville Chamberlain
- Winston Churchill
- Charles de Gaulle
- Heinrich Himmler
- Erwin Rommel
- Bernard Montgomery
- George Patton
- Dwight Eisenhower
- Douglas MacArthur
- Harry Truman
- Albert Einstein

## Terms and Topics

Identify each and explain its significance to the period of history studied.

- Treaty of Versailles
- League of Nations
- totalitarianism
- communism
- nationalism
- gulag archipelago
Holodomor
Meiji Restoration
Weimar Republic
fascism
Nazi Party
SS
Reichstag fire
Gestapo
Nuremberg Laws
Kristallnacht
Neutrality Acts
rearmament
Luftwaffe
Munich Crisis
 appeasement

Nazi-Soviet Nonaggression Pact
Allied Powers Blitzkrieg Miracle of Dunkirk
Axis Powers Royal Air Force (RAF)
Cash and carry Destroyers for Bases
Destroyers for Bases Lend-Lease
Bataan Death March code talkers
Japanese Internment
Tuskegee Airmen
Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam

US Marines
island hopping
Atlantic Wall
concentration/death camps
Auschwitz
The Holocaust genocide
VE Day
Firebombing of Tokyo
Manhattan Project
atomic bomb
Enola Gay
VJ Day

MAJOR CONFLICTS

Explain how each battle began, narrate what happened in it and how, and explain the significance of the battle’s outcome.

Battle of Britain Battle of Stalingrad Battle of Normandy
The Blitz Battle of Guadalcanal Battle of the Bulge
Operation Barbarossa Operation Torch Battle of Iwo Jima
Attack on Pearl Harbor Italian Campaign
Battle of Midway D-Day

PRIMARY SOURCE

Based on annotations and notes from seminar conversations, be able to answer questions on each primary source. While you will not necessarily be asked why each primary source was created, what it did or argued, and what its effects were, being able to answer these kinds of questions will make you well prepared.

Atlantic Charter, Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill

TO KNOW BY HEART

Be prepared to fill in missing words and/or identify the speaker and context.

“December 7, 1941, a date which will live in infamy.” —Franklin Roosevelt, War Message to Congress

“I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears and sweat.” —Winston Churchill to Parliament, May 13, 1940
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be your classmates.

- Life in a Soviet gulag
- Life during the Holodomor
- The Reichstag fire
- Winston Churchill and the Royal Air Force in the Battle of Britain
- The Russian winter setting in as the Germans were on the outskirts of Moscow
- The mass murders committed by the Soviet Union, Imperial Japan, and Nazi Germany
- Resistance fighting
- The attack on Pearl Harbor
- Doolittle Raid
- Fighting in the various theaters of war, especially those involving American soldiers
- Stories of American soldiers in various major battles
- Fighting at Omaha Beach on D-Day
- Life in Nazi concentration camps and stories of resistance and survival
- Fighting at Iwo Jima
- The Enola Gay dropping the first atomic bomb
- Survivors of strategic bombing and atomic bombing campaigns

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.

Lesson 3 | World War II

☐ What forms of political persecution and extermination did the communist Soviet Union inflict on its people?
☐ What is economic fascism?
☐ What problems did Weimar, Germany, face? What caused these problems?
☐ Why was Adolf Hitler obsessed with a person’s race?
☐ What was the Reichstag fire? How did it come about, and why was it important for Adolf Hitler’s dictatorship?
☐ What are the ways in which communism, socialism, and fascism are similar and different? What roles did nationalism and militarism play in each?
☐ What were Adolf Hitler’s foreign policy goals, and how did he try to justify them to the other countries of Europe?
☐ How did World War II begin in September 1939?
☐ How significant were the persona and the actions of Winston Churchill, especially during the early years of World War II?
☐ What were the ways the United States indirectly but intentionally helped the British in their war with Germany and in their deterrence of Japan in the Pacific?
☐ Why was Operation Barbarossa so significant?
☐ Why did Japan attack the United States? What was the strategic goal of the attack on Pearl Harbor? Why was the attack not completely successful?
□ How did Nazi Germany, communist Soviet Union, and Imperial Japan treat their own people, the people they conquered, and soldiers they captured? Why?
□ How were American industrial might and American generals important to the Allied cause?
□ What was fighting like in the Pacific, in North Africa, and in Italy? How were the Allies eventually successful in each theater?
□ How did Operation Overlord work?
□ What did Nazi Germany do in the Holocaust?
□ What happened to Poland and all of Eastern Europe in the final year of the war?
Unit 6 | Test 2 — World War II

Lesson 3 | World War II

TIMELINE

Write the letter of each event next to the date or years it took place.

1939–1945 ______
1939 Sept. 1 ______
1941 ______
   Dec. 7 ______
1944 June 6 ______
1945 Aug. 15 ______

A. World War II
B. VJ Day
C. Normandy Invasion (D-Day)
D. Japanese attack Pearl Harbor
E. Germany invades the Soviet Union
F. Germany and the Soviet Union invade Poland
G. Battle of the Bulge

GEOGRAPHY AND PLACES

1. Mark the approximate location and label the following on the maps using the corresponding letters:

A. Ukraine
B. Imperial Japan
C. China
D. Rhineland
E. Caucuses
F. Tunisia
G. Sicily
H. Normandy
I. Bastogne
J. Hiroshima and Nagasaki

Maps courtesy of A Student Workbook for Land of Hope.
PERSONS, TERMS, AND TOPICS

Fill in the blank with the letter of the correct answer.

A. Adolf Hitler D. Lend-Lease G. totalitarianism
B. code talkers E. Manhattan Project H. US Marines
C. Dwight Eisenhower F. Reichstag fire

2. Exploiting the national humiliation from the Treaty of Versailles and the Great Depression under which Germans suffered in the Weimar Republic, ____________ brought the Nazi Party to power in Germany through democratic elections and was appointed chancellor in 1933.

3. In the name of an emergency, the Nazi Party assumed a dictatorship in response to the ________________, which they themselves had started in order to frame their political opponents and justify their power grab.

4. Native Americans from the Navajo and Lakota nations worked as ________________ in World War II, as they transmitted military messages in their native tongues, which the Axis Powers could not translate.

5. America’s preeminent general during World War II, ________________ oversaw Operation Overlord and the Allies’ push to Germany from France.

6. The only way for the Americans to advance against the Japanese in the Pacific involved the ________________ “island hopping,” that is, conducting amphibious landings on small islands with airfields and fighting to secure the island.

7. The United States worked on the atomic bomb in secret as part of the ________________, with the goal of developing a weapon that would end the war.

8. The Roosevelt administration, though technically neutral prior to Pearl Harbor, took many actions to aid the British against the Germans and Japanese, including securing the passage of the ________________ Act which allowed the British to rent military equipment from the United States.

9. Soviet Russia, Fascist Italy, and Nazi Germany were all first examples of ________________, or the political ideology that requires all power be concentrated in a centralized state, that does not permit democratic representation, respect for the dignity of individuals, or freedom of speech, and that uses technology and force to maintain power.
MAJOR CONFLICTS

Explain how each battle began, narrate what happened in it and how, and explain the significance of the battle’s outcome.

10. Pearl Harbor

11. Battle of Stalingrad

12. Battle of Iwo Jima

KNOWN BY HEART

Fill in missing words and/or identify the speaker.

13. “I have nothing to offer but ____________, toil, ____________ and ____________.”

   Speaker: ______________________________

14. “December ______, 1941, a date which will live in ____________.”

   Speaker: ______________________________
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

*In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be your classmates.*

15. Life during the Holodomor

16. Winston Churchill and the Royal Air Force in the Battle of Britain

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

*Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and writing should be employed and responses must fully answer each question.*

1. What forms of political persecution and extermination did the communist Soviet Union inflict on its people?

2. What were Adolf Hitler’s foreign policy goals, and how did he try to justify them to the other countries of Europe?
3. How did World War II begin in September 1939?

4. Why was Operation Barbarossa so significant?

5. Why did Japan attack the United States? What was the strategic goal of the attack on Pearl Harbor? Why was the attack not completely successful?

6. How were American industrial might and American generals important to the Allied cause?

7. What did Nazi Germany do in the Holocaust?
Unit 6 | Writing Assignment — The Interwar Years and World War II

Due on ____________

**DIRECTIONS:** Citing events and primary sources in your argument, write a 4–5 paragraph essay answering the question:

How did the totalitarian regimes of the 1920s and 1930s differ from the ideas of the Declaration of Independence?
APPENDIX B

Primary Sources

Calvin Coolidge

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

Josiah Bailey

Winston Churchill
The Hillsdale 1776 Curriculum
American History
Middle School

PRESIDENT CALVIN COOLIDGE (R)
The Inspiration of the
Declaration of Independence
SPEECH EXCERPTS

July 5, 1926
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

BACKGROUND

President Calvin Coolidge delivered this speech at Philadelphia to celebrate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence and the founding of the United States.

ANNOTATIONS

We meet to celebrate the birthday of America. The coming of a new life always excites our interest. Although we know in the case of the individual that it has been an infinite repetition reaching back beyond our vision, that only makes it the more wonderful. But how our interest and wonder increase when we behold the miracle of the birth of a new nation. It is to pay our tribute of reverence and respect to those who participated in such a mighty event that we annually observe the fourth day of July. Whatever may have been the impression created by the news which went out from this city on that summer day in 1776, there can be no doubt as to the estimate which is now placed upon it. At the end of 150 years the four corners of the earth unite in coming to Philadelphia as to a holy shrine in grateful acknowledgment of a service so great, which a few inspired men here rendered to humanity, that it is still the preeminent support of free government throughout the world.

Although a century and a half measured in comparison with the length of human experience is but a short time, yet measured in the life of governments and nations it ranks as a very respectable period. Certainly enough time has elapsed to demonstrate with a great deal

---

of thoroughness the value of our institutions and their dependability as rules for the regu-
lation of human conduct and the advancement of civilization. They have been in existence
long enough to become very well seasoned. They have met, and met successfully, the test
of experience.

5 It is not so much then for the purpose of undertaking to proclaim new theories and prin-
ciples that this annual celebration is maintained, but rather to reaffirm and reestablish
those old theories and principles which time and the unerring logic of events have demon-
strated to be sound. Amid all the clash of conflicting interests, amid all the welter of partisan
politics, every American can turn for solace and consolation to the Declaration of Inde-
pendence and the Constitution of the United States with the assurance and confidence that
those two great charters of freedom and justice remain firm and unshaken. Whatever perils
appear, whatever dangers threaten, the Nation remains secure in the knowledge that the
ultimate application of the law of the land will provide an adequate defense and protection.

It is little wonder that people at home and abroad consider Independence Hall as hallowed
ground and revere the Liberty Bell as a sacred relic. That pile of bricks and mortar, that
mass of metal, might appear to the uninstructed as only the outgrown meeting place and
the shattered bell of a former time, useless now because of more modern conveniences, but
to those who know they have become consecrated by the use which men have made of
them. They have long been identified with a great cause. They are the framework of a spir-
itual event. The world looks upon them, because of their associations of one hundred and
fifty years ago, as it looks upon the Holy Land because of what took place there nineteen
hundred years ago. Through use for a righteous purpose they have become sanctified…. 

When we come to examine the action of the Continental Congress in adopting the Decla-
ration of Independence in the light of what was set out in that great document and in the
light of succeeding events, we can not escape the conclusion that it had a much broader
and deeper significance than a mere secession of territory and the establishment of a new
nation. Events of that nature have been taking place since the dawn of history. One empire
after another has arisen, only to crumble away as its constituent parts separated from each
other and set up independent governments of their own. Such actions long ago became commonplace. They have occurred too often to hold the attention of the world and command the admiration and reverence of humanity. There is something beyond the establishment of a new nation, great as that event would be, in the Declaration of Independence which has ever since caused it to be regarded as one of the great charters that not only was to liberate America but was everywhere to ennoble humanity.

It was not because it was proposed to establish a new nation, but because it was proposed to establish a nation on new principles, that July 4, 1776, has come to be regarded as one of the greatest days in history. Great ideas do not burst upon the world unannounced. They are reached by a gradual development over a length of time usually proportionate to their importance. This is especially true of the principles laid down in the Declaration of Independence. Three very definite propositions were set out in its preamble regarding the nature of mankind and therefore of government. These were the doctrine that all men are created equal, that they are endowed with certain inalienable rights, and that therefore the source of the just powers of government must be derived from the consent of the governed.

If no one is to be accounted as born into a superior station, if there is to be no ruling class, and if all possess rights which can neither be bartered away nor taken from them by any earthly power, it follows as a matter of course that the practical authority of the Government has to rest on the consent of the governed. While these principles were not altogether new in political action, and were very far from new in political speculation, they had never been assembled before and declared in such a combination. But remarkable as this may be, it is not the chief distinction of the Declaration of Independence. The importance of political speculation is not to be underestimated, as I shall presently disclose. Until the idea is developed and the plan made there can be no action.

It was the fact that our Declaration of Independence containing these immortal truths was the political action of a duly authorized and constituted representative public body in its sovereign capacity, supported by the force of general opinion and by the armies of Washington already in the field, which makes it the most important civil document in the world.
It was not only the principles declared, but the fact that therewith a new nation was born which was to be founded upon those principles and which from that time forth in its development has actually maintained those principles, that makes this pronouncement an incomparable event in the history of government. It was an assertion that a people had arisen determined to make every necessary sacrifice for the support of these truths and by their practical application bring the War of Independence to a successful conclusion and adopt the Constitution of the United States with all that it has meant to civilization....

About the Declaration there is a finality that is exceedingly restful. It is often asserted that the world has made a great deal of progress since 1776, that we have had new thoughts and new experiences which have given us a great advance over the people of that day, and that we may therefore very well discard their conclusions for something more modern. But that reasoning can not be applied to this great charter. If all men are created equal, that is final. If they are endowed with inalienable rights, that is final. If governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, that is final. No advance, no progress can be made beyond these propositions. If anyone wishes to deny their truth or their soundness, the only direction in which he can proceed historically is not forward, but backward toward the time when there was no equality, no rights of the individual, no rule of the people. Those who wish to proceed in that direction can not lay claim to progress. They are reactionary. Their ideas are not more modern, but more ancient, than those of the Revolutionary fathers.

In the development of its institutions America can fairly claim that it has remained true to the principles which were declared 150 years ago. In all the essentials we have achieved an equality which was never possessed by any other people. Even in the less important matter of material possessions we have secured a wider and wider distribution of wealth. The rights of the individual are held sacred and protected by constitutional guarantees, which even the Government itself is bound not to violate. If there is any one thing among us that is established beyond question, it is self-government—the right of the people to rule. If there is any failure in respect to any of these principles, it is because there is a failure on the part of individuals to observe them. We hold that the duly authorized expression of the will
of the people has a divine sanction. But even in that we come back to the theory of John Wise that “Democracy is Christ’s government....” The ultimate sanction of law rests on the righteous authority of the Almighty....

Under a system of popular government there will always be those who will seek for political preferment by clamoring for reform. While there is very little of this which is not sincere, there is a large portion that is not well informed. In my opinion very little of just criticism can attach to the theories and principles of our institutions. There is far more danger of harm than there is hope of good in any radical changes. We do need a better understanding and comprehension of them and a better knowledge of the foundations of government in general. Our forefathers came to certain conclusions and decided upon certain courses of action which have been a great blessing to the world. Before we can understand their conclusions we must go back and review the course which they followed. We must think the thoughts which they thought. Their intellectual life centered around the meeting-house. They were intent upon religious worship. While there were always among them men of deep learning, and later those who had comparatively large possessions, the mind of the people was not so much engaged in how much they knew, or how much they had, as in how they were going to live. While scantily provided with other literature, there was a wide acquaintance with the Scriptures. Over a period as great as that which measures the existence of our independence they were subject to this discipline not only in their religious life and educational training, but also in their political thought. They were a people who came under the influence of a great spiritual development and acquired a great moral power.

No other theory is adequate to explain or comprehend the Declaration of Independence. It is the product of the spiritual insight of the people. We live in an age of science and of abounding accumulation of material things. These did not create our Declaration. Our Declaration created them. The things of the spirit come first. Unless we cling to that, all our material prosperity, overwhelming though it may appear, will turn to a barren scepter in our grasp. If we are to maintain the great heritage which has been bequeathed to us, we must be like-minded as the fathers who created it. We must not sink into a pagan materialism. We must cultivate the reverence which they had for the things that are holy. We
must follow the spiritual and moral leadership which they showed. We must keep replenished, that they may glow with a more compelling flame, the altar fires before which they worshipped.
GOVERNOR FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT (D)
Commonwealth Club Address

SPEECH EXCERPTS

September 23, 1932
Commonwealth Club of California | San Francisco, California

BACKGROUND

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, then Governor of New York, won the Democratic nomination for President in 1932 and delivered this campaign speech a month and a half before the election.

ANNOTATIONS

. . . A glance at the situation today only too clearly indicates that equality of opportunity as we have known it no longer exists. Our industrial plant is built; the problem just now is whether under existing conditions it is not overbuilt. Our last frontier has long since been reached, and there is practically no more free land. More than half of our people do not live on the farms or on lands and cannot derive a living by cultivating their own property. There is no safety valve in the form of a Western prairie to which those thrown out of work by the Eastern economic machines can go for a new start. We are not able to invite the immigration from Europe to share our endless plenty. We are now providing a drab living for our own people.

Our system of constantly rising tariffs has at last reacted against us to the point of closing our Canadian frontier on the north, our European markets on the east, many of our Latin-American markets to the south, and a goodly proportion of our Pacific markets on the west, through the retaliatory tariffs of those countries. It has forced many of our great industrial institutions which exported their surplus production to such countries, to establish plants in such countries, within the tariff walls. This has

resulted in the reduction of the operation of their American plants, and opportunity for employment.

Just as freedom to farm has ceased, so also the opportunity in business has narrowed. It still is true that men can start small enterprises, trusting to native shrewdness and ability to keep abreast of competitors; but area after area has been pre-empted altogether by the great corporations, and even in the fields which still have no great concerns, the small man starts under a handicap. The unfeeling statistics of the past three decades show that the independent business man is running a losing race.

Clearly, all this calls for a re-appraisal of values. A mere builder of more industrial plants, a creator of more railroad systems, an organizer of more corporations, is as likely to be a danger as a help. The day of the great promoter or the financial Titan, to whom we granted anything if only he would build, or develop, is over. Our task now is not discovery or exploitation of natural resources, or necessarily producing more goods. It is the soberer, less dramatic business of administering resources and plants already in hand, of seeking to reestablish foreign markets for our surplus production, of meeting the problem of underconsumption, of adjusting production to consumption, of distributing wealth and products more equitably, of adapting existing economic organizations to the service of the people. The day of enlightened administration has come.

As I see it, the task of Government in its relation to business is to assist the development of an economic declaration of rights, an economic constitutional order. This is the common task of statesman and business man. It is the minimum requirement of a more permanently safe order of things.

The Declaration of Independence discusses the problem of Government in terms of a contract. Government is a relation of give and take, a contract, perforce, if we would follow the thinking out of which it grew. Under such a contract, rulers were accorded
power, and the people consented to that power on consideration that they be accorded certain rights. The task of statesmanship has always been the re-definition of these rights in terms of a changing and growing social order. New conditions impose new requirements upon Government and those who conduct Government. . . .

The terms of that contract are as old as the Republic, and as new as the new economic order.

Every man has a right to life; and this means that he has also a right to make a comfortable living. He may by sloth or crime decline to exercise that right; but it may not be denied him. We have no actual famine or dearth; our industrial and agricultural mechanism can produce enough and to spare. Our Government formal and informal, political and economic, owes to everyone an avenue to possess himself of a portion of that plenty sufficient for his needs, through his own work.

Every man has a right to his own property; which means a right to be assured, to the fullest extent attainable, in the safety of his savings. By no other means can men carry the burdens of those parts of life which, in the nature of things, afford no chance of labor: childhood, sickness, old age. In all thought of property, this right is paramount; all other property rights must yield to it. If, in accord with this principle, we must restrict the operations of the speculator, the manipulator, even the financier, I believe we must accept the restriction as needful, not to hamper individualism but to protect it.

. . . The Government should assume the function of economic regulation only as a last resort, to be tried only when private initiative, inspired by high responsibility, with such assistance and balance as Government can give, has finally failed. As yet there has been no final failure, because there has been no attempt; and I decline to assume that this Nation is unable to meet the situation. . . .
Faith in America, faith in our tradition of personal responsibility, faith in our institutions, faith in ourselves demand that we recognize the new terms of the old social contract. We shall fulfill them, as we fulfilled the obligation of the apparent Utopia which Jefferson imagined for us in 1776, and which Jefferson, Roosevelt and Wilson sought to bring to realization. We must do so, lest a rising tide of misery, engendered by our common failure, engulf us all. But failure is not an American habit; and in the strength of great hope we must all shoulder our common load.
**President Franklin D. Roosevelt (D)**

First Inaugural Address

**Speech Excerpts**

March 4, 1933

U.S. Capitol | Washington, D.C.

**Background**

Franklin Delano Roosevelt delivered this address upon his inauguration in 1933.

**Annotations**

I am certain that my fellow Americans expect that on my induction into the Presidency I will address them with a candor and a decision which the present situation of our Nation impels. This is preeminently the time to speak the truth, the whole truth, frankly and boldly. Nor need we shrink from honestly facing conditions in our country today. This great Nation will endure as it has endured, will revive and will prosper. So, first of all, let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself – nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance. In every dark hour of our national life a leadership of frankness and vigor has met with that understanding and support of the people themselves which is essential to victory. I am convinced that you will again give that support to leadership in these critical days.

In such a spirit on my part and on yours we face our common difficulties. They concern, thank God, only material things. Values have shrunken to fantastic levels; taxes have risen; our ability to pay has fallen; government of all kinds is faced by serious curtailment of income; the means of exchange are frozen in the currents of trade; the

---

withered leaves of industrial enterprise lie on every side; farmers find no markets for their produce; the savings of many years in thousands of families are gone.

More important, a host of unemployed citizens face the grim problem of existence, and an equally great number toil with little return. Only a foolish optimist can deny the dark realities of the moment….

This Nation asks for action, and action now.

Our greatest primary task is to put people to work. This is no unsolvable problem if we face it wisely and courageously. It can be accomplished in part by direct recruiting by the Government itself, treating the task as we would treat the emergency of a war, but at the same time, through this employment, accomplishing greatly needed projects to stimulate and reorganize the use of our natural resources.

Hand in hand with this we must frankly recognize the overbalance of population in our industrial centers and, by engaging on a national scale in a redistribution, endeavor to provide a better use of the land for those best fitted for the land. The task can be helped by definite efforts to raise the values of agricultural products and with this the power to purchase the output of our cities. It can be helped by preventing realistically the tragedy of the growing loss through foreclosure of our small homes and our farms. It can be helped by insistence that the Federal, State, and local governments act forthwith on the demand that their cost be drastically reduced. It can be helped by the unifying of relief activities which today are often scattered, uneconomical, and unequal. It can be helped by national planning for and supervision of all forms of transportation and of communications and other utilities which have a definitely public character. There are many ways in which it can be helped, but it can never be helped merely by talking about it. We must act and act quickly.
Finally, in our progress toward a resumption of work we require two safeguards against a return of the evils of the old order; there must be a strict supervision of all banking and credits and investments; there must be an end to speculation with other people’s money, and there must be provision for an adequate but sound currency.

There are the lines of attack. I shall presently urge upon a new Congress in special session detailed measures for their fulfillment, and I shall seek the immediate assistance of the several States.

If I read the temper of our people correctly, we now realize as we have never realized before our interdependence on each other; that we can not merely take but we must give as well; that if we are to go forward, we must move as a trained and loyal army willing to sacrifice for the good of a common discipline, because without such discipline no progress is made, no leadership becomes effective. We are, I know, ready and willing to submit our lives and property to such discipline, because it makes possible a leadership which aims at a larger good. This I propose to offer, pledging that the larger purposes will bind upon us all as a sacred obligation with a unity of duty hitherto evoked only in time of armed strife.

With this pledge taken, I assume unhesitatingly the leadership of this great army of our people dedicated to a disciplined attack upon our common problems.

Action in this image and to this end is feasible under the form of government which we have inherited from our ancestors. Our Constitution is so simple and practical that it is possible always to meet extraordinary needs by changes in emphasis and arrangement without loss of essential form. That is why our constitutional system has proved itself the most superbly enduring political mechanism the modern world has produced. It has met every stress of vast expansion of territory, of foreign wars, of bitter internal strife, of world relations.
It is to be hoped that the normal balance of executive and legislative authority may be wholly adequate to meet the unprecedented task before us. But it may be that an unprecedented demand and need for undelayed action may call for temporary departure from that normal balance of public procedure.

I am prepared under my constitutional duty to recommend the measures that a stricken nation in the midst of a stricken world may require. These measures, or such other measures as the Congress may build out of its experience and wisdom, I shall seek, within my constitutional authority, to bring to speedy adoption.

But in the event that the Congress shall fail to take one of these two courses, and in the event that the national emergency is still critical, I shall not evade the clear course of duty that will then confront me. I shall ask the Congress for the one remaining instrument to meet the crisis – broad Executive power to wage a war against the emergency, as great as the power that would be given to me if we were in fact invaded by a foreign foe.

For the trust reposed in me I will return the courage and the devotion that befit the time. I can do no less.

We face the arduous days that lie before us in the warm courage of the national unity; with the clear consciousness of seeking old and precious moral values; with the clean satisfaction that comes from the stern performance of duty by old and young alike. We aim at the assurance of a rounded and permanent national life.

We do not distrust the future of essential democracy. The people of the United States have not failed. In their need they have registered a mandate that they want direct, vigorous action. They have asked for discipline and direction under leadership. They have made me the present instrument of their wishes. In the spirit of the gift I take it.
In this dedication of a Nation we humbly ask the blessing of God. May He protect each and every one of us. May He guide me in the days to come.
REP. JOSIAH BAILEY (R-NC)

An Address to the People of the United States

NEWSPAPER TRANSCRIPT EXCERPTS FROM AN UNDELIVERED SPEECH

December 16, 1937

The New York Times

BACKGROUND

More conservative members of both the Republican and Democratic parties, including former allies of Franklin Roosevelt, were represented by Representative Josiah Bailey in this undelivered speech drafted by Bailey and leaked to The New York Times before it was delivered.

ANNOTATIONS

A sudden and extensive recession in business, industry, employment, prices and values demands instant attention of all in positions of responsibility. To arrest it, to reverse it and to avert its consequences is the common task. In this as Senators we have a duty, and in partial discharge of it we have determined upon this statement.

We have now not only the problem of caring for the unemployed pending opportunity for their employment, but also the task of preventing many now employed from losing their jobs.

We believe that a policy of cooperation by all concerned upon sound lines will suffice to set the country as a whole on its accustomed way toward higher ground. This cooperation is the objective of this address to the American people. This is no time for alarm or pessimism. We have come to the inevitable period of transition, and fortunately the underlying conditions are favorable.

We are concerned now only with our duty in view of the conditions that confront us, in order that full activity of employment and commerce may be had. To avoid controversy...

and make for unity, we may dispense with appraisals of policies or arguments. The past is experience, and is of value only for its lessons. We propose no criticism, no politics.

**Private Investment the Key**

We consider that the time has come when liberal investment of private savings in enterprise as a means of employment must be depended upon and, without delay, heartily encouraged by the public policy and all Americans.

Public spending, invoked in the recent emergency, was recognized as a cushion rather than as a substitute for the investment of savings by the people. To this latter all have looked at length. We believe that an encouraging public policy will ensue quickly in expanding enterprise, in active business, in widespread employment and in abundant demand for farm products.

Without criticism of the public spending policy attendant upon the former emergency, we recognize that a repetition of that policy would not serve again and moreover is out of the question. It ought to be borne in mind that private enterprise, properly fostered, carries the indispensable element of vigor.

The present unemployed and employed, and the young men and women about to enter upon careers, rightly desire and must have the opportunity which is afforded only by private enterprise. The President recently informed the Congress of the instant and obvious task of inducing the investment of private funds. We perceive, as does he, the necessity for the transition, gradual, to be sure, but distinct. And we propose to do our part to accomplish this objective in full cooperation.

**Reasonable Profit Essential**

1. We recognize that the value of investment, and the circulation of money, depends upon reasonable profit, not only to protect the investment and assure confidence, but also to provide increasing employment, and consumption of goods from farm to factory. We favor the competitive system as against either private or government
The Conservative Manifesto
Josiah Bailey

monopoly, as preventing unreasonable profit and demanding vigor of enterprise. Our American competitive system is superior to any form of the collectivist program. We intend to preserve and foster it as the means of employment, of livelihood, and of maintaining our standard of living.

2. The sources of credit are abundant, but credit depends upon security—the soundness and stability of values; and these are governed by the profitable operation of the concerns in which stocks are certificates of interest or in which bonds are evidences of debt. If, therefore, the reservoirs of credit are to be tapped, we must assure a policy making for the sense of the safety of the collateral which is the basis of credit....

Rely on the American System

3. We propose to preserve and rely upon the American system of private enterprise and initiative, and our American form of government. It is not necessary to claim perfection for them. On the record they are far superior to and infinitely to be preferred to any other so far devised. They carry the priceless content of liberty and the dignity of man. They carry spiritual values of infinite import, and which constitute the source of the American spirit. We call upon all Americans to renew their faith in them and press an invincible demand in their behalf.

We can and will erect appropriate safeguards under the common law principles of free men without surrendering in any degree the vital principles and self-reliant spirit on which we must depend.

Our economic system must be such as to stimulate ambition, afford opportunity, and excite in each boy and girl a sense of responsibility to produce to his capacity.

Through individual self-reliance and service only can abundance, security, and happiness be attained.

Pledging ourselves to uphold these principles, we summon our fellow citizens, without regard to party, to join with us in advancing them as the only hope of
permanent recovery and further progress. They will serve to take us safely through
the period of transition now suddenly thrust upon us as they have taken us through
every emergency. They will not fail us, if we adhere to them. But if we shall abandon
them, the consequences will be outweigh in penalty the sacrifices we may make to
our faith in them.

The heart of the American people is sound. They have met every emergency and
demand. We will meet those of today and so hand down to our children our most
precious heritage enhanced by a new and major trophy of free institutions. Let us
not be dismayed but press on in the great liberal tradition and in its spirit of
courageous self-reliance which has won through all the vicissitudes of a great
period, and has made our country the strongest, the most progressive and the best
of nations.
PRESIDENT FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT (D)

Annual Message to Congress

ADDRESS EXCERPTS

January 6, 1941
U.S. Congress | Washington, D.C.

Four Freedoms Speech

BACKGROUND

As Great Britain’s Royal Air Force fended off the German Luftwaffe during the Battle of Britain, President Franklin D. Roosevelt delivered this message to Congress, as required annually by the Constitution.

ANNOTATIONS

…Just as our national policy in internal affairs has been based upon a decent respect for the rights and the dignity of all our fellow men within our gates, so our national policy in foreign affairs has been based on a decent respect for the rights and dignity of all nations, large and small. And the justice of morality must and will win in the end.

Our national policy is this:

First, by an impressive expression of the public will and without regard to partisanship, we are committed to all-inclusive national defense.

Second, by an impressive expression of the public will and without regard to partisanship, we are committed to full support of all those resolute peoples, everywhere, who are resisting aggression and are thereby keeping war away from our Hemisphere. By this support, we express our determination that the democratic cause shall prevail; and we strengthen the defense and the security of our own nation.

Third, by an impressive expression of the public will and without regard to partisanship, we are committed to the proposition that principles of morality and
considerations for our own security will never permit us to acquiesce in a peace dictated by aggressors and sponsored by appeasers. We know that enduring peace cannot be bought at the cost of other people’s freedom.

In the recent national election there was no substantial difference between the two great parties in respect to that national policy. No issue was fought out on this line before the American electorate. Today it is abundantly evident that American citizens everywhere are demanding and supporting speedy and complete action in recognition of obvious danger.

Therefore, the immediate need is a swift and driving increase in our armament production….

As men do not live by bread alone, they do not fight by armaments alone. Those who man our defenses, and those behind them who build our defenses, must have the stamina and the courage which come from unshakable belief in the manner of life which they are defending. The mighty action that we are calling for cannot be based on a disregard of all things worth fighting for.

The Nation takes great satisfaction and much strength from the things which have been done to make its people conscious of their individual stake in the preservation of democratic life in America. Those things have toughened the fibre of our people, have renewed their faith and strengthened their devotion to the institutions we make ready to protect.

Certainly this is no time for any of us to stop thinking about the social and economic problems which are the root cause of the social revolution which is today a supreme factor in the world.
For there is nothing mysterious about the foundations of a healthy and strong democracy. The basic things expected by our people of their political and economic systems are simple. They are:

Equality of opportunity for youth and for others.

Jobs for those who can work.

Security for those who need it.

The ending of special privilege for the few.

The preservation of civil liberties for all.

The enjoyment of the fruits of scientific progress in a wider and constantly rising standard of living.

These are the simple, basic things that must never be lost sight of in the turmoil and unbelievable complexity of our modern world. The inner and abiding strength of our economic and political systems is dependent upon the degree to which they fulfill these expectations….

I have called for personal sacrifice. I am assured of the willingness of almost all Americans to respond to that call.

A part of the sacrifice means the payment of more money in taxes. In my Budget Message I shall recommend that a greater portion of this great defense program be paid for from taxation than we are paying today. No person should try, or be allowed, to get rich out of this program; and the principle of tax payments in accordance with ability to pay should be constantly before our eyes to guide our legislation.
If the Congress maintains these principles, the voters, putting patriotism ahead of pocketbooks, will give you their applause.

In the future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms.

The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world.

The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world.

The third is freedom from want—which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants—everywhere in the world.

The fourth is freedom from fear—which, translated into world terms, means a world-wide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor—anywhere in the world.

That is no vision of a distant millennium. It is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our own time and generation. That kind of world is the very antithesis of the so-called new order of tyranny which the dictators seek to create with the crash of a bomb.

To that new order we oppose the greater conception—the moral order. A good society is able to face schemes of world domination and foreign revolutions alike without fear.

Since the beginning of our American history, we have been engaged in change—in a perpetual peaceful revolution—a revolution which goes on steadily, quietly adjusting itself to changing conditions—without the concentration camp or the quick-lime in the
ditch. The world order which we seek is the cooperation of free countries, working together in a friendly, civilized society.

This nation has placed its destiny in the hands and heads and hearts of its millions of free men and women; and its faith in freedom under the guidance of God. Freedom means the supremacy of human rights everywhere. Our support goes to those who struggle to gain those rights or keep them. Our strength is our unity of purpose. To that high concept there can be no end save victory.
**PRESIDENT FRANKLIN ROOSEVELT & PRIME MINISTER WINSTON CHURCHILL**

**Joint Declaration by the President and the Prime Minister**

**INTERNATIONAL JOINT STATEMENT**

**August 14, 1941**

Atlantic Conference

Naval Station Argentia | Dominion of Newfoundland, British Empire

**Atlantic Charter**

**BACKGROUND**

While the United States remained officially out of World War II, American President Franklin D. Roosevelt and British Prime Minister Winston Churchill articulated a joint policy plan for the post-war world.

**ANNOTATIONS**

The President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty’s Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

1. First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

2. Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

3. Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;

---

Fourth, they will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity;

Fifth, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement and social security;

Sixth, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want;

Seventh, such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance;

Eighth, they believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

Franklin D. Roosevelt

Winston S. Churchill
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Why Teach the Declaration of Independence

The Declaration of Independence was not merely a renunciation of dependence on Great Britain. It was, in fact, generative. It created an entity—a nation—that stood on its own, had its own existence, and was independent of other nations. Even today, it offers guiding principles that continue to shape our arguments about the nature and limits of political authority. In brief, the Declaration of Independence created and still defines the United States of America. Like an organizational mission statement, the Declaration is an indication of the Founders’ intention, a guiding star for our political life, and a benchmark for measuring our public institutions. Americans should consider all questions concerning the public sphere in light of the truths asserted in the Declaration. The Declaration of Independence should be both the beginning and end for students’ understanding of their country, their citizenship, and the benefits and responsibilities of being an American. In order to judge prudently in matters of public interest in the present day, students must learn about the philosophical principles upon which the American Founders created the United States of America. These include the assertion of self-evident, objective truths about natural rights, morality, and self-government, which find their best expression in the document that founded America.
What Teachers Should Consider

Americans in general—but especially American students—take a lot for granted about their way of life in this country. This is not surprising, given human nature and the wide achievements of American society. But it does indicate one of the primary roles of the teacher of American civics and history: to help students to understand the arguments and the actions, the sacrifices and accomplishments, that led to the way of life they enjoy today.

To that end, teachers themselves must not take life in America for granted and teach history backwards. That means recognizing what America shares with other countries, especially today, but then also looking back at history and comparing the development of United States to life and government in contemporary civilizations. This is a great feat of the imagination that takes great effort on the part of the teacher.

The key starting point for putting America in perspective is its very unique founding. As reflected in its government and institutions, the country was founded as a republic. The people themselves determine what their government will do by choosing from among their fellow citizens those who will represent their interest in government decisions. Compared to monarchies and tyrannies, aristocracies and oligarchies, establishing a republic was an extraordinary exception in the 1700s, especially given its poor historical record of success dating back to the ancient world.

But what was truly unprecedented about America is that it was founded based not merely on borders and not on ethnicity, but on an idea, namely that “all men are created equal,” a truth for all peoples at all times. To found a political community and government on an explicit idea about human beings was truly unheard of in history.

The sources of this truth were as old as the ancients, but their particular articulation in the Declaration of Independence and their assertion as the foundation of just government were altogether novel attempts in political history. “[T]he Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God” served as the foundation for America, where nature indicated the truth of reality and of human nature. These truths stood outside of the will of any human being.

And so within the specific circumstances of the colonists’ struggle with the British government in the 18th century the founders posited in the Declaration of Independence the “abstract truth, applicable to all men and all times,” as Abraham Lincoln put it, that “all men are created equal” and that the purpose of government is to “secure these rights.”

These principles are what made the founding of America truly exceptional, and an exception in human history.
How Teachers Can Learn More

**TEXTS**

- *The U.S. Constitution: A Reader*, ed. Hillsdale College Politics Faculty  
  Chapters 1–3
- *We Still Hold These Truths*, Matthew Spalding  
  Chapters 1–4
- *The Constitutional Convention*, James Madison
- *American Government and Politics*, Joseph Bessette and John Pitney  
  Chapters 1 and 4

**ONLINE COURSES** | Online.Hillsdale.edu

- *Introduction to the Constitution*
- *Constitution 101*

**Primary Sources Studied in This Unit**

- The Declaration of Independence
- The Mayflower Compact
- Thanksgiving Proclamation, George Washington
- Letter to the Massachusetts Militia, John Adams
- Farewell Address, George Washington
- Report of the Commissioners for the University of Virginia, Thomas Jefferson & James Madison
- First Annual Address to Congress, George Washington
- The Northwest Ordinance, Article III
- “Property,” James Madison
- The Examination Number No. 7, Alexander Hamilton
LESSON PLANS, ASSIGNMENTS, AND FORMATIVE QUIZ
Lesson 1 — The Human Person

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn the Founders’ understanding and assertions about the human person and human nature, understandings that are the starting point for all considerations of political order and on which the United States is established.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

*Introduction to the Constitution*  
Lectures 1, 2, 3, and 4

*Constitution 101*  
Lectures 1 and 2

PRIMARY SOURCES

Students may read and annotate the following primary source(s), either at home or together in class. Using their annotations and the below questions, lead students through a seminar conversation on each text.

The Declaration of Independence

TERMS AND TOPICS

| history | principles |
| polis | morality |
| politics | equality |
| power | natural rights |
| Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God | unalienable |
| nature | life |
| natural law | liberty |
| objective truth | pursuit of happiness |
| self-evident |

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What is the “Course of human events”?
- What is politics?
- According to the text itself, why are the colonists issuing a Declaration of Independence?
- What are “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God”?
- What is a “self–evident” truth?
- What does human equality mean in the statement, “all men are created equal”?
- What are natural rights and why do human beings have them?
- According to the Declaration of Independence, from where do natural rights come?
- What does it mean to say that men are “endowed by their Creator” with the rights?
What does “unalienable” mean?

Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
- Question 8: Why is the Declaration of Independence important?
- Question 9: What founding document said the American colonies were free from Britain?
- Question 10: Name two important ideas from the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution.
- Question 11: The words “Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness” are in what founding document?
- Question 78: Who wrote the Declaration of Independence?
- Question 79: When was the Declaration of Independence adopted?
- Question 81: There were 13 original states. Name five.
- Question 85: Benjamin Franklin is famous for many things. Name one.
- Question 87: Thomas Jefferson is famous for many things. Name one.
- Question 125: What is Independence Day?
- Question 126: Name three national U.S. holidays.

KEYS TO THE LESSON

America is like other nations in that it has a people, a geographic location, and laws that govern it. But America is also very different. It was founded at a particular time on the basis of particular ideas. In the end, America is not bound by an ethnic character, a common religion, or even a shared history as much as by a set of principles held to be true and universal and established as the basis for this particular nation. These principles bind America’s extraordinarily diverse people into one nation through a shared belief and commitment to these principles. Students must understand this unique quality about their country and know what these principles are, beginning with the Founders’ assertions about the human person: that there are self-evident truths, that all are equal and equally possess rights by nature, and that chief among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Human Person with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Teachers would benefit from familiarizing themselves with non-American thinkers who, while disagreeing in many ways, were at least united in conversation around what human nature is and what it means for the civic body. These would include those who contributed to the western philosophical tradition and experience in government up to and during the American founding, such as Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Niccolò Machiavelli, Thomas Hobbes, and Adam Smith; those who more directly informed the Founders, such as John Locke, Algernon Sidney, William Blackstone, and Montesquieu; and the relevant political histories of ancient civilizations (e.g., Babylonians, Hebrews, Greeks, Romans), medieval society, the Enlightenment, England, and the British North American colonies. Being able to summarize and point students to these figures, ideas, and histories where appropriate may be helpful in teaching the first two units of this course.
- Outline with students (or if they have already studied early American history, review) the key historical circumstances in which the Founding occurred, especially the following:
  - The colonists who settled in British North America came from many nations (chiefly but not exclusively those of Europe) for many different reasons, but one thing they did not
bring with them were the class distinctions that defined the aristocratic and monarchical nations they left behind. These individuals (except for their British governors) were common people who immigrated to America seeking their freedom and to better their station in life.

- Religious faith strongly defined colonial culture, largely because so many came to America to escape the religious persecutions of the old world. From the pilgrims and the Puritans to Roman Catholics and Jews, a wide variety of denominations (mostly Christian) are found throughout colonial settlements. This diversity fostered religious liberty and toleration at the same time that it strengthened a common morality rooted in religious faith and practice, which was widespread and imbued colonial society.

- Colonial America was highly literate and the leading members of colonial society and government were educated in classical thought, ancient and contemporary history, and philosophy and politics (including thinkers of the moderate Enlightenment).

- Have students read and annotate the introduction and first part of the preamble to the Declaration of Independence.

- Begin by considering history (as in the “Course of human events”) and politics. Briefly sketch its origins in the ancient world and what virtues it demands of those who would practice it well, particularly that cardinal virtue of prudence.

- Help students to consider that the Founders were making assertions about the existence of objective truth by referencing “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God” and by describing the truths as self-evident. This line of thinking adheres to the first law of logic, that of contradiction, which is the basis of all reasoning and of our capacity to make sense of reality: i.e., that something cannot both be and not be at the same time in the same way. The use of the words “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God” ties truth to an external reality (nature) with fixed and reliable features (laws). “Self-evident” ties truth to fixed definitions—a “self-evident” claim is one that is true by definition of the idea in question, like the claim that a triangle has three sides. A “self-evident” truth is not merely a matter of perspective; it can be known and understood by anyone at any time.

- Note that for the Founders, the “Laws…of Nature’s God” implied that this understanding of nature was consistent with the Christian tradition within which the American founding occurred. Other references to divine sources of truth in the Declaration include that men are “endowed by their Creator” and its appeals to “the Supreme Judge of the world” and to “the protection of divine Providence.”

- Emphasize with students the importance of an understanding of “nature,” particularly human nature. “Nature” here means not the physical world but the purpose of things, that toward which a thing’s very existence aims: why something exists. The feature of human nature that distinguishes people from animals is man’s ability to think, communicate, and live together. This means that humans can speak, debate, and agree on certain things. Since man has the ability to deliberate and choose, he is responsible morally for his actions and is also capable of liberty. When we consider human beings living with other human beings, the ends of politics are determined by human nature. That is, the justness of one’s actions or the actions of a people depend on what it means to be human, and should comport with truth.

- Ask students what the Declaration means by “all men are created equal.” The meaning of equality in the Declaration refers to universal human dignity and to the equal possession by each person of
natural rights, freedoms that are simply part of being human. Individuals are obviously different by almost any measure. Yet, by nature, human beings are all the same in that they are human, have a human nature, and therefore have the same natural rights.

- Have students consider whether women and slaves were included in this understanding of equality. For one thing, in traditional usage, man, or in this case men, used without an article itself refers to the species or to humanity (mankind) as a whole, not male as opposed to female. Based on the totality of their writings available, the Founders meant that men and women share equally in human dignity and in possession of natural rights or freedoms that are simply part of being human. A consistent application of equality would make slavery, for instance, impossible.

- Consider with students how many have understood the principle of equality as the enduring object or goal of American political life, with each generation seeking further to expand the conditions of political equality. This was the view of many Founders, as well as of Abraham Lincoln, abolitionists like Frederick Douglass, and civil rights leaders like Martin Luther King Jr., who called the Declaration a “promissory note to which every American was to fall heir” in his 1963 “I Have a Dream” speech. The Declaration’s principle of equality—and the persistence and bravery of Americans of all origins to sacrifice and even die insisting that the nation should live up to the principle—has led to unprecedented achievements of human equality and the protection of equal rights.

- Spend time with the rights to life, to liberty, and to the pursuit of happiness. While not exhaustive, these natural rights are the most important and comprehensive freedoms that each human person possesses by nature. All are necessary for each person to fulfill his or her purpose as a human being.

**Strengthening Understanding: Post-Lesson Assignment**

**Assignment:** Based on the Declaration of Independence, what was the Founders’ understanding of the human person? Why is this view, and founding a country based on this belief, so extraordinary? (1–2 paragraphs)
Lesson 2 — Government

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn what the Founders understood to be the purpose and composition of government based on the nature of the human person asserted in the Declaration of Independence.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

- *Introduction to the Constitution* Lectures 1, 2, 3, and 4
- *Constitution 101* Lectures 1 and 2

PRIMARY SOURCES

Students may read and annotate the following primary source(s), either at home or together in class. Using their annotations and the below questions, lead students through a seminar conversation on each text.

- The Declaration of Independence
- The Mayflower Compact

TERMS AND TOPICS

- natural rights
- power
- consent of the governed
- sovereignty
- self-government
- equality
- justice
- rule of law
- limited government
- state of nature
- social contract
- liberalism
- tyranny
- revolution

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What is the purpose of government and it powers?
- How do natural rights limit the government?
- What is meant by “limited government”? 
- From where does government derive its just powers?
- Who are the governed?
- What does consent mean?
- What is self-government?
- What is the connection between consent, equality, and justice?
- What is the relationship between the state of nature, the social contract, and consent of the governed?
- What are the people free—and even obligated—to do if the government fails or violates its purpose?
- Ought it to be easy or frequent for a people to overthrow and replace its government? If not, under which circumstances may they do so?
- What is tyranny?
- How does the fact that America was founded with the words of the Declaration of Independence make America the exception in the history of nations, even exceptional?
- America is a country whose existence and purpose for existing rests on belief in and commitment to certain ideas its Founders asserted to be objectively true. What are these truths?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 8: Why is the Declaration of Independence important?
  - Question 9: What founding document said the American colonies were free from Britain?
  - Question 10: Name two important ideas from the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution.
  - Question 13: What is the rule of law?
  - Question 77: Name one reason why the Americans declared independence from Britain.
  - Question 78: Who wrote the Declaration of Independence?
  - Question 79: When was the Declaration of Independence adopted?
  - Question 85: Benjamin Franklin is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 87: Thomas Jefferson is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 125: What is Independence Day?
  - Question 126: Name three national U.S. holidays.

Keys to the Lesson

Having established the understanding of the human person that the Founders’ held, the unit may progress through the Declaration of Independence to consider the nature of government power based on this understanding of human beings. The reason people join together to form a government is to secure their rights and preserve their safety and happiness. Students should know this purpose to their government and consider the ways in which we determine whether the government is just, through both consent and the extent to which it fulfills its purpose. Students should also learn about what ought to be done when a government becomes an unjust tyranny and under what circumstances the people should take such actions. The list of grievances in the remainder of the Declaration of Independence offers a case study in such tyrannical circumstances.

Teachers might best plan and teach Government with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Ask students what the Declaration states to be the purpose of government. Students should be able to see in the Declaration that the purpose of government is to secure the natural rights of each person.
- Ask students about the source of a government’s legitimate power. The basis of rule in the American regime is the sovereignty of the people: since all are equal by nature, no one is born to rule or to be ruled. Legitimate government can only arise out of the consent of those governed. The powers of government are defined when they are delegated by agreement of those who possess rights. Thus, the principle of natural rights both empowers government at the same time that it limits it to these specific purposes.
Consider with students that, according to the Declaration, rights do not come from government. Rights are inherent in nature, that is, they come with being a human person. Likewise, individuals do not give up their rights by forming government. People may give to government their individual power to secure those rights in certain circumstances in order that the government might use that power to protect the rights of all. But the natural rights possessed by each individual cannot be given up, or taken away unless one has violated the rights of another. This is what is meant by “unalienable.”

Ask students how the establishment and recognition of equal natural rights guards against discrimination based on class, religion, or race, and against the factions and civil divisions that often result from such unjust distinctions. Upholding equal natural rights preserves the humanity of each person, encourages all to recognize that humanity in others despite differences, and reminds all to be mindful that one’s own dignity is protected insofar as others also hold to the belief in natural rights.

Help students to understand what is meant by self-government in the political body, i.e., that government derives its “just powers from the consent of the governed,” that is, from the people themselves. Consent requires the people, directly or indirectly, to be involved in making the laws. It also implies participation in the activities of governing (office holding, voting, serving as jurors, etc.). As a result, and by design, the people have the liberty to govern themselves in most aspects of their daily lives.

Connect these parts of the Declaration of Independence to the Mayflower Compact. Read the list of grievances and ask students to connect each grievance to the historical events they studied in the previous lesson. Then ask students to explain how those events violate the statements made in the first two paragraphs of the Declaration.

Consider with students the colonists’ “appeal to heaven.” King George III was neither securing the rights of the colonists nor providing for the protection. In fact, he and the British Parliament were doing many things that denied the colonists’ rights. When a government fails to protect fundamental rights, the people may alter or abolish the current government and form a new one at assure their safety and happiness. This is called the right of revolution.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

**Assignment:** According to the Declaration of Independence, how and why do a people form a government? What are the people to do should that government become ineffective or hostile to the purpose for which the people created it? Using the list of grievances, what are some examples of government abandoning or violating its purpose? (2–3 paragraphs).
Unit 1 — Formative Quiz

Covering Lessons 1-2
10-15 minutes

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. According to the text itself, why are the colonists issuing a Declaration of Independence?

2. What does human equality mean in the statement, “all men are created equal”?

3. What are natural rights and why do human beings have them?

4. What is the purpose of government and its powers?

5. What are the people free—and even obligated—to do if the government fails or violates its purpose?
Lesson 3 — The Citizen and Self-Government

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the conditions necessary, both in society and in the characters of most citizens, for the flourishing and perpetuation of freedom and self-government.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

- Introduction to the Constitution Lectures 7 and 9
- Constitution 101 Lectures 3 and 5

PRIMARY SOURCES

The following primary sources are potential readings for students. Teachers should use their discretion based on grade level ability in deciding which texts to share with students. The texts may be assigned for homework, read together in class, or simply read aloud by the teacher. Some texts include guiding reading questions to assist students in the event that the text is assigned for homework. Students should annotate the texts either in preparation for or during a seminar conversation. Teachers should not feel it necessary to assign all of the texts, especially in light of grade level considerations.

- Thanksgiving Proclamation, George Washington
- Letter to the Massachusetts Militia, John Adams
- Farewell Address, George Washington
- Report of the Commissioners for the University of Virginia, Thomas Jefferson & James Madison
- First Annual Address to Congress, George Washington
- The Northwest Ordinance, Article III
- “Property,” James Madison
- The Examination Number No. 7, Alexander Hamilton

TERMS AND TOPICS

- self-government
- morality
- virtue
- liberal education
- property
- commercial republic
- religion
- free exercise of religion
- freedom of speech
- public policy
- economics
- taxation
- property rights
- immigration
- marriage and family law
**QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND**

- What are the virtues and character necessary for freedom and self-government?
- How did the Founders promote morality?
- Why is self-reliance important for a free people?
- How is liberal education necessary for freedom and self-government?
- How does religion help promote morality and freedom?
- What is the free exercise of religion and why is it important?
- What is freedom of speech and why is it so crucial to freedom and self-government?
- What is the significance of property rights and work?
- What is the commercial republic and how does it shape character?
- How did the Founders think about the following:
  - economics
  - taxation
  - the protection of property
  - war and diplomacy
  - taxation
  - the protection of property
  - marriage and family
- Why were the Founders worried about partisanship? How did they attempt to overcome it?
- How did partisanship nonetheless arise?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 6: What does the Bill of Rights protect?
  - Question 12: What is the economic system of the United States?
  - Question 13: What is the rule of law?
  - Question 65: What are three rights of everyone living in the United States?
  - Question 67: Name two promises that new citizens make in the Oath of Allegiance.
  - Question 69: What are two examples of civic participation in the United States?
  - Question 70: What is one way Americans can serve their country?

**KEYS TO THE LESSON**

Benjamin Franklin, on departing the Constitutional Convention, was asked what the convention’s delegates had proposed. Franklin responded, “A republic, if you can keep it.” The American system of self-government rests ultimately on the capacity of Americans to govern themselves in political terms and to exercise personal self-government (good character) in their own lives. American students ought to understand thoroughly this necessity to life in the American republic. The key facets to preserving free government involve citizens being knowledgeable, morally upright, spirited, and free to use their minds, voices, and possessions to maintain liberty and the rule of law. Schools, religion, civic organizations, and the family are the key institutions by which citizens are formed to be able to govern themselves. The public and private contributions of the vast majority of citizens who govern their own lives as such is the determining factor in the health of the American republic and in the experiment in free self-government. Should these falter or fail in the individual lives of citizens, the preservation of liberty and equal human dignity will not long last.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Citizen and Self-Government with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Read with students George Washington’s Thanksgiving Proclamation, his Farewell Address, and John Adams’ letter to the Massachusetts militia. Have students consider the Founders’ arguments
for the necessity of religion in fostering morality, virtue, and character. While opinions varied on religious belief and the extent to which government should endorse a single church, specifically at the state-level, there was general consensus that the instruction in moral conduct, duty, and charity in religion warranted at least the encouragement of religious practice by governments. They should see that the free exercise of religion was simultaneously of utmost importance.

- Read the University of Virginia’s Board of Commissioners report and George Washington’s First Annual Address and highlight the important and broad role education would play in the formation of a free citizenry.
- Teach students about the two major achievements of Congress under the Articles of Confederation: the Land Ordinance of 1785 and the Northwest Ordinance of 1787. Students should understand the historic emphasis the Founders placed on public education and private land ownership as evident in these laws. The Northwest Ordinance in particular articulates principles that would later be reflected in the Constitution, namely, consent of the governed, private property, and the liberty of individuals. Each of these, the Founders argued, would be indispensable if freedom and self-government were to succeed in the United States.
- Consider with students George Washington’s observation in his First Inaugural that “the foundations of our national policy will be laid in the pure and immutable principles of private morality” and in his Farewell Address that “Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports” and that “let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion.”
- Emphasize with students the most famous line from Article III of the Northwest Ordinance: “Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.” Make clear for students the significance of knowledge and character as fostered by education. Public (meaning taxpayer-funded) support for education, both secular and religious, was present in colonial Massachusetts for decades prior to the founding and would continue through the Land Ordinance of 1785 and the Northwest Ordinance. The township system portioned out land reserved for education explicitly. America was a trailblazer in allocating so many resources exclusively for education. In addition to instruction in knowledge, character-building and the development of patriotic and dutiful citizens were chief purposes of these public schools.
- Read with students James Madison’s “Property.” Rights to hold and preserve property are intimately tied to one’s right to defend oneself and to better one’s condition. The “pursuit of happiness” aims at and recognizes goods higher than mere material prosperity. The right to property, if not sufficient to human happiness, is most certainly necessary to the individual liberty to pursue such happiness. Moreover, the free allocation of scarce resources through commerce ensures that all can have what they most need at the times in which they most need it while contributing to ideas and positive activity conducive to the general improvement of human life.
- Talk with students about how the Founders saw the economic role of government as being to uphold the rule of law, enforce contracts, protect property, and permit economic activity that did not violate natural rights. This ensured broad latitude to the liberty of private individuals to trade with one another freely with only minimal regulation. Taxation at the federal level was limited largely to matters of national defense.
- Read aloud with students in class Alexander Hamilton’s Examination No. 7 on the need for a citizenry that holds certain principles and habits of conduct conducive to respecting the rights of fellow citizens. In a nation as diverse as the United States and that is not bound by blood, understanding of, adherence to, and practice in these principles of self-government become all the
more important. Immigration policy for Hamilton, therefore, sought to encourage as much immigration as was possible while still achieving these prerequisites to maintaining free government. In brief, an immigrant had to understand and be willing and able to practice the responsibilities of self-government.

- Consider with students the Founders’ positions on the preservation of morality and the role of the family. While freedom of speech was given broad interpretation, the public utterance and promotion of obscenity was understood to undermine the moral habits of the citizenry, especially the young, and government thus had an interest in restricting such speech to private quarters. The primacy of the family was also significant, as the security, material support, education, sense of duty, and work ethic cultivated first in the family were all equally important to a self-governing citizenry.

- Explain to students how strongly the Founders sought to resist the rise of factions and partisanship. It should be made clear, however, that the Founders’ resistance to partisanship was not in some general idea of bipartisanship for bipartisanship’s sake. Instead, the Founders believed that if all Americans held to the ideas of the American founding, then there were few disagreements so fundamental as to justify separate and permanent parties. The Founders had no qualms, however, with resisting movements and ideas that rejected the principles of the founding, mainly because such a rejection was, in their view, a rejection of objective truth and justice themselves. Such a rejection of these founding principles was thought irrational and almost certainly to lead to tyranny.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

**Assignment:** Why did the American Founders argue that education, religion, and private property were necessary in a citizenry in order for freedom and self-government to exist? (1–2 paragraphs)
APPENDIX A

Study Guide

Test

Writing Assignment
Study Guide — The Declaration of Independence Test

TERMS AND TOPICS

Explain each of the following and the context in which it was discussed during this unit’s lessons.

- politics
- power
- Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God
- nature
- self-evident
- principles
- morality
- equality
- natural rights
- unalienable
- life
- liberty
- pursuit of happiness
- consent of the governed
- self-government
- justice
- rule of law
- limited government
- state of nature
- social contract
- liberalism
- tyranny
- revolution
- virtue
- liberal education
- property
- property rights
- commercial republic
- free exercise of religion
- freedom of speech
- economics
- taxation
- immigration
- family

PRIMARY SOURCES

Explain the main arguments in each of the following sources and their significance to our understanding of the Declaration of Independence and the necessities for self-government.

- The Declaration of Independence
- The Mayflower Compact
- Farewell Address, George Washington
- The Northwest Ordinance, Article III
- “Property,” James Madison

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.

Lesson 1 | The Human Person

☐ What is the “Course of human events”?
☐ What is politics?
☐ According to the text itself, why are the colonists issuing a Declaration of Independence?
☐ What are “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God”?
☐ What is a “self-evident” truth?
☐ What does human equality mean in the statement, “all men are created equal”?
☐ What are natural rights and why do human beings have them?
According to the Declaration of Independence, from where do natural rights come?

What does it mean to say that men are "endowed by their Creator" with the rights?

What does “unalienable” mean?

Lesson 2 | The Government

What is the purpose of government and it powers?

How do natural rights limit the government?

What is meant by “limited government”?

From where does government derive its just powers?

Who are the governed?

What does consent mean?

What is self-government?

What is the connection between consent, equality, and justice?

What is the relationship between the state of nature, the social contract, and consent of the governed?

What are the people free—and even obligated—to do if the government fails or violates its purpose?

Ought it to be easy or frequent for a people to overthrow and replace its government? If not, under which circumstances may they do so?

What is tyranny?

How does the fact that America was founded with the words of the Declaration of Independence make America the exception in the history of nations, even exceptional?

America is a country whose existence and purpose for existing rests on belief in and commitment to certain ideas its Founders asserted to be objectively true. What are these truths?

Lesson 3 | The Citizen and Self-Government

What are the virtues and character necessary for freedom and self-government?

How did the Founders promote morality?

Why is self-reliance important for a free people?

How is liberal education necessary for freedom and self-government?

How does religion help promote morality and freedom?

What is the free exercise of religion and why is it important?

What is freedom of speech and why is it so crucial to freedom and self-government?

What is the significance of property rights and work?

What is the commercial republic and how does it shape character?

How did the Founders think about the following:

- economics
- taxation
- the protection of property
- war and diplomacy
- immigration
- marriage and family

Why were the Founders worried about partisanship? How did they attempt to overcome it?

How did partisanship nonetheless arise?
Test — The Declaration of Independence

**TERMS AND TOPICS**

*Explain each of the following and the context in which it was discussed during this unit's lessons.*

1. Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God

2. self-evident

3. morality

4. unalienable

5. self-government

6. rule of law

7. tyranny

8. freedom of speech
**PRIMARY SOURCES**

*Explain the main arguments in each of the following sources and their significance to our understanding of the Declaration of Independence and the necessities for self-government.*

9. Farewell Address, George Washington

10. The Northwest Ordinance

**QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND**

*Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and writing should be employed, and responses must fully answer each question.*

11. What does human equality mean in the statement, “all men are created equal”?

12. What are natural rights and why do human beings have them?
13. According to the Declaration of Independence, from where do natural rights come?

14. What does it mean to say that men are “endowed by their Creator” with the rights?

15. What is the purpose of government and its powers?

16. From where does government derive its just powers?

17. What are the people free—and even obligated—to do if the government fails or violates its purpose?

18. How does the fact that America was founded with the words of the Declaration of Independence make America the exception in the history of nations, even exceptional?

19. What is the free exercise of religion and why is it important?

20. What is the significance of property rights and work?
Writing Assignment — The Declaration of Independence

Due on

DIRECTIONS

Citing primary sources and conversations from class in your argument, write a 4–5 paragraph essay answering the question:

According to the Founders, what do people need to understand about themselves, about government, and about the kind of people they need to be in order to freely govern themselves?
APPENDIX B

Primary Sources

The Second Continental Congress

The Pilgrims

George Washington

John Adams

Thomas Jefferson

James Madison

The United States Congress

Alexander Hamilton
THE THIRTEEN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Unanimous Declaration

A DECLARATION

July 4, 1776

Pennsylvania State House | Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Declaration of Independence

BACKGROUND

The delegates from each colony at the Second Continental Congress announced their votes to form a new country separate from Great Britain in this statement to mankind that expounds both the principles on which this new country would be founded and the reasons they judged themselves justified to separate.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Why do the United States believe they need to release a statement about their decision to form a country separate from Great Britain?

2. What do they consider about the truths they posit?

3. How are all men equal?

4. From where comes their rights?

5. What is the reason why people create governments?

6. From where comes a government’s powers?

7. What may a people do if a government does not fulfill its ends?

8. Although governments should not be changed for small reasons, when should the people change them?

9. Against which person does the Declaration of Independence level its charges?

10. What actions involving the military has this person carried out against the colonists?

11. What legal practices has this person violated?

12. What efforts have the colonists made to seek redress and reconciliation with Great Britain?

13. To whom do the representatives appeal for the justness of their intentions?

14. By whose authority do the representatives declare independence?

15. What do each of the representatives pledge to one another?
When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.—That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,—That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security.—Such has been the patient sufferance of these Colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former Systems of Government. The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. To prove this, let Facts be submitted to a candid world.

He has refused his Assent to Laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

He has forbidden his Governors to pass Laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his Assent should be obtained; and when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.
He has refused to pass other Laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of Representation in the Legislature, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only.

He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their public Records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures.

He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly, for opposing with manly firmness his invasions on the rights of the people.

He has refused for a long time, after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected; whereby the Legislative powers, incapable of Annihilation, have returned to the People at large for their exercise; the State remaining in the mean time exposed to all the dangers of invasion from without, and convulsions within.

He has endeavored to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the Laws for Naturalization of Foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migrations hither, and raising the conditions of new Appropriations of Lands.

He has obstructed the Administration of Justice, by refusing his Assent to Laws for establishing Judiciary powers.

He has made Judges dependent on his Will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.

He has erected a multitude of New Offices, and sent hither swarms of Officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance.

He has kept among us, in times of peace, Standing Armies without the Consent of our legislatures.
He has affected to render the Military independent of and superior to the Civil power.

He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his Assent to their Acts of pretended Legislation:

For Quartering large bodies of armed troops among us:

For protecting them, by a mock Trial, from punishment for any Murders which they should commit on the Inhabitants of these States:

For cutting off our Trade with all parts of the world:

For imposing Taxes on us without our Consent:

For depriving us in many cases, of the benefits of Trial by Jury:

For transporting us beyond Seas to be tried for pretended offenses:

For abolishing the free System of English Laws in a neighboring Province, establishing therein an Arbitrary government, and enlarging its Boundaries so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these Colonies:

For taking away our Charters, abolishing our most valuable Laws, and altering fundamentally the Forms of our Governments:

For suspending our own Legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

He has abdicated Government here, by declaring us out of his Protection and waging War against us.
He has plundered our seas, ravaged our Coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people.

He is at this time transporting large Armies of foreign Mercenaries to complete the works of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of Cruelty and perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the Head of a civilized nation.

He has constrained our fellow Citizens taken Captive on the high Seas to bear Arms against their Country, to become the executioners of their friends and Brethren, or to fall themselves by their Hands.

He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavored to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian Savages, whose known rule of warfare, is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes and conditions.

In every stage of these Oppressions We have Petitioned for Redress in the most humble terms: Our repeated Petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A Prince whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a Tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.

Nor have We been wanting in attentions to our British brethren. We have warned them from time to time of attempts by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement here. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured them by the ties of our common kindred to disavow these usurpations, which, would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence. They too have been deaf to the voice of justice and of consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity, which denounces our Separation, and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind, Enemies in War, in Peace Friends.
The Declaration of Independence

We, therefore, the Representatives of the united States of America, in General Congress, Assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the Name, and by Authority of the good People of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, That these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be Free and Independent States; that they are Absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as Free and Independent States, they have full Power to levy War, conclude Peace, contract Alliances, establish Commerce, and to do all other Acts and Things which Independent States may of right do. And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor.

Georgia
Button Gwinnett, Lyman Hall, George Walton

North Carolina
William Hooper, Joseph Hewes, John Penn

South Carolina
Edward Rutledge, Thomas Heyward, Jr., Thomas Lynch, Jr., Arthur Middleton

Maryland
Samuel Chase, William Paca, Thomas Stone, Charles Carroll of Carrollton

Virginia
George Wythe, Richard Henry Lee, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Harrison, Thomas Nelson, Jr., Francis Lightfoot Lee, Carter Braxton

Pennsylvania
Robert Morris, Benjamin Rush, Benjamin Franklin, John Morton, George Clymer, James Smith, George Taylor, James Wilson, George Ross
The Declaration of Independence

Delaware
Caesar Rodney, George Read, Thomas McKean

New York
William Floyd, Philip Livingston, Francis Lewis, Lewis Morris

New Jersey
Richard Stockton, John Witherspoon, Francis Hopkinson, John Hart, Abraham Clark

New Hampshire
Josiah Bartlett, William Whipple, Matthew Thornton

Massachusetts
John Hancock, Samuel Adams, John Adams, Robert Treat Paine, Elbridge Gerry

Rhode Island
Stephen Hopkins, William Ellery

Connecticut
Roger Sherman, Samuel Huntington, William Williams, Oliver Wolcot
**The Undersigned Subjects of King James**

Agreement Between
the Settlers of New Plymouth

**Law**

November 11, 1620

_Off the Coast of Cape Cod_

The Mayflower Compact

**BACKGROUND**

The settlers who traveled to the British possession of Virginia on the *Mayflower* drafted and signed this agreement pertaining to their governance before disembarking in the New World.

**ANNOTATIONS**

IN THE NAME OF GOD, AMEN. We, whose names are underwritten, the Loyal Subjects of our dread Sovereign Lord King James, by the Grace of God, of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, King, Defender of the Faith, &c. Having undertaken for the Glory of God, and Advancement of the Christian Faith, and the Honour of our King and Country, a Voyage to plant the first Colony in the northern Parts of Virginia; Do by these Presents, solemnly and mutually, in the Presence of God and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil Body Politick, for our better Ordering and Preservation, and Furtherance of the Ends aforesaid: And by Virtue hereof do enact, constitute, and frame, such just and equal Laws, Ordinances, Acts, Constitutions, and Officers, from time to time, as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the general Good of the Colony; unto which we promise all due Submission and Obedience.

IN WITNESS whereof we have hereunto subscribed our names at Cape-Cod the eleventh of November, in the Reign of our Sovereign Lord King James, of England, France, and Ireland, the eighteenth, and of Scotland the fifty-fourth, Anno Domini; 1620.

**President George Washington**

Thanksgiving Proclamation

**Proclamation**

October 3, 1789

Federal Hall | New York City, New York

**Background**

President George Washington established a day of thanksgiving to God for peaceably establishing a new form of government, to be observed around the one-year anniversary of the new Constitution.

**Annotations**

By the President of the United States of America, a Proclamation.

Whereas it is the duty of all Nations to acknowledge the providence of Almighty God, to obey his will, to be grateful for his benefits, and humbly to implore his protection and favor—and whereas both Houses of Congress have by their joint Committee requested me “to recommend to the People of the United States a day of public thanksgiving and prayer to be observed by acknowledging with grateful hearts the many signal favors of Almighty God especially by affording them an opportunity peaceably to establish a form of government for their safety and happiness.”

Now therefore I do recommend and assign Thursday the 26th day of November next to be devoted by the People of these States to the service of that great and glorious Being, who is the beneficent Author of all the good that was, that is, or that will be—That we may then all unite in rendering unto him our sincere and humble thanks—for his kind care and protection of the People of this Country previous to their becoming a Nation—for the signal and manifold mercies, and the favorable interpositions of his Providence which we experienced in the course and conclusion of the late war—for the great degree of tranquillity,

---

union, and plenty, which we have since enjoyed—for the peaceable and rational manner, in which we have been enabled to establish constitutions of government for our safety and happiness, and particularly the national One now lately instituted—for the civil and religious liberty with which we are blessed; and the means we have of acquiring and diffusing useful knowledge; and in general for all the great and various favors which he hath been pleased to confer upon us.

And also that we may then unite in most humbly offering our prayers and supplications to the great Lord and Ruler of Nations and beseech him to pardon our national and other transgressions—to enable us all, whether in public or private stations, to perform our several and relative duties properly and punctually—to render our national government a blessing to all the people, by constantly being a Government of wise, just, and constitutional laws, discreetly and faithfully executed and obeyed—to protect and guide all Sovereigns and Nations (especially such as have shewn kindness unto us) and to bless them with good government, peace, and concord—To promote the knowledge and practice of true religion and virtue, and the encrease of science among them and us—and generally to grant unto all Mankind such a degree of temporal prosperity as he alone knows to be best.

Given under my hand at the City of New-York the third day of October in the year of our Lord 1789.

George Washington
President John Adams (Federalist)

To the Officers of the Militia of Massachusetts

LETTER

October 11, 1798

Quincy, Massachusetts

BACKGROUND

President John Adams responds to a message sent to him from the militia of his home state of Massachusetts.

ANNOTATIONS

To the Officers of the first Brigade of the third Division of the Militia of Massachusetts

Quincy October 11, 1798

Gentlemen

I have received from Major General Hull and Brigadier General Walker your unanimous Address from Lexington, animated with a martial Spirit and expressed with a military Dignity, becoming your Characters and the memorable Plains, in which it was adopted.

While our Country remains untainted with the Principles and manners, which are now producing desolation in so many Parts of the World: while she continues Sincere and incapable of insidious and impious Policy: We shall have the Strongest Reason to rejoice in the local destination assigned Us by Providence. But should the People of America, once become capable of that deep simulation towards one another and towards foreign nations, which assumes the Language of Justice and moderation while it is practicing Iniquity and Extravagance; and displays in the most captivating manner the charming Pictures of Candour frankness & sincerity while it is rioting in rapine and Insolence: this Country will be

To the Officers of the Militia of Massachusetts
John Adams

the most miserable Habitation in the World. Because We have no Government armed with
Power capable of contending with human Passions unbridled by morality and Religion.
Avarice, Ambition Revenge or Galantry, would break the strongest Cords of our Constitu-
tion as a Whale goes through a Net. Our Constitution was made only for a moral and reli-
gious People. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other

An Address so unanimous and firm from the officers commanding two thousand Eight
hundred Men, consisting of such substantial Citizens as are able and willing at their own
Expence, compleatly to arm, And cloath themselves in handsome Uniforms does honor to
that Division of the Militia which has done so much honor to their Country. Oaths, in this
Country, are as yet universally considered as Sacred Obligations. That which you have
taken and so solemnly repeated on that venerable Spot is an ample Pledge of your sincerity,
and devotion to your Country and its Government.

John Adams
**PRESIDENT GEORGE WASHINGTON**

To the People of America

**LETTER EXCERPTS**

September 19, 1796

*American Daily Advertiser | Philadelphia, Pennsylvania*

**Farewell Address**

**BACKGROUND**

George Washington wrote this letter to the American people announcing his retirement from the Presidency after his second term. At the time, there were no term limits on the presidency.

**ANNOTATIONS**

…For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to You, in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of Patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same Religion, Manners, Habits and political Principles. You have in a common cause fought and triumphed together. The independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint councils, and joint efforts; of common dangers, sufferings and successes….

…[Y]ou have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a Constitution of Government, better calculated than your former for an intimate Union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its Laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true Liberty. The

---

basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their Constitutions of Government. But the Constitution which at any time exists, ’til changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole People, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the People to establish Government presupposes the duty of every Individual to obey the established Government.…

I have already intimated to you the danger of Parties in the State, with particular reference to the founding of them on Geographical discriminations. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the Spirit of Party, generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human Mind. It exists under different shapes in all Governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but, in those of the popular form, it is seen in its greatest rankness and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissention, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries, which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an Individual; and sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation, on the ruins of Public Liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of Party are sufficient to make it the interest and the duty of a wise People to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the Public Councils and enfeeble the Public administration. It agitates the Community with ill-founded jealousies and false alarms, kindles the animosity of one part against another, foments occasionally riot and insurrection. It opens the door
to foreign influence and corruption, which find a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country, are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the Administration of the government and serve to keep alive the spirit of Liberty. This within certain limits is probably true, and in Governments of a Monarchical cast Patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in Governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched; it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent its bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free Country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective Constitutional spheres; avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power, and proneness to abuse it, which predominates in the human heart is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power; by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the Guardian of the Public Weal against invasions by the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern, some of them in our country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If in the opinion of the People, the distribution or modification of the Constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.
Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, Religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of Patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great Pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of Men and citizens. The mere Politician, equally with the pious man ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in Courts of Justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that National morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

"Tis substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free Government. Who that is a sincere friend to it, can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric.

Promote then as an object of primary importance, Institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened....
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

Report of the Board of Commissioners

REPORT EXCERPTS

August 4, 1818
Rockfish Gap, Virginia

BACKGROUND

Thomas Jefferson and James Madison had a role in forming these ideas on education and the public support thereof as members of the Board of Commissioners for the University of Virginia.

ANNOTATIONS

...The objects of this primary education determine its character and limits. These objects would be,

To give to every citizen the information he needs for the transaction of his own business;

To enable him to calculate for himself, and to express and preserve his ideas, his contracts and accounts, in writing;

To improve, by reading, his morals and faculties;

To understand his duties to his neighbors and country, and to discharge with competence the functions confided to him by either;

To know his rights; to exercise with order and justice those he retains; to choose with discretion the fiduciary of those he delegates; and to notice their conduct with diligence, with candor, and judgment;

NOTES & QUESTIONS

And, in general, to observe with intelligence and faithfulness all the social relations under which he shall be placed.

To instruct the mass of our citizens in these, their rights, interests and duties, as men and citizens, being then the objects of education in the primary schools, whether private or public, in them should be taught reading, writing and numerical arithmetic, the elements of mensuration, (useful in so many callings,) and the outlines of geography and history.

And this brings us to the point at which are to commence the higher branches of education, of which the Legislature require the development; those, for example, which are,

To form the statesmen, legislators and judges, on whom public prosperity and individual happiness are so much to depend;

To expound the principles and structure of government, the laws which regulate the intercourse of nations, those formed municipally for our own government, and a sound spirit of legislation, which, banishing all arbitrary and unnecessary restraint on individual action, shall leave us free to do whatever does not violate the equal rights of another;

To harmonize and promote the interests of agriculture, manufactures and commerce, and by well informed views of political economy to give a free scope to the public industry;

To develop the reasoning faculties of our youth, enlarge their minds, cultivate their morals, and instill into them the precepts of virtue and order;

To enlighten them with mathematical and physical sciences, which advance the arts, and administer to the health, the subsistence, and comforts of human life;

And, generally, to form them to habits of reflection and correct action, rendering them examples of virtue to others, and of happiness within themselves.
These are the objects of that higher grade of education, the benefits and blessings of which the Legislature now propose to provide for the good and ornament of their country, the gratification and happiness of their fellow-citizens, of the parent especially, and his progeny, on which all his affections are concentrated.
PRESIDENT GEORGE WASHINGTON

Annual Message to Congress

SPEECH EXCERPTS

January 8, 1790

Senate Chamber, Federal Hall | New York City, New York

BACKGROUND

President George Washington gave this address as the first annual message to Congress on the state of the Union, as required per the Constitution.

ANNOTATIONS

Fellow Citizens of the Senate, and House of Representatives…

Among the many interesting objects which will engage your attention, that of providing for the common defence will merit particular regard. To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace….

Nor am I less persuaded, that you will agree with me in opinion, that there is nothing which can better deserve your patronage, than the promotion of Science and Literature. Knowledge is in every country the surest basis of publick happiness. In one, in which the measures of government receive their impression so immediately from the sense of the community, as in our’s, it is proportionately essential. To the security of a free Constitution it contributes in various ways: By convincing those who are entrusted with the publick administration, that every valuable end of government is best answered by the enlightened confidence of the people: And by teaching the people themselves to know, and to value their own rights; to discern and provide against invasions of them; to distinguish between oppression and the necessary exercise of lawful authority; between burthens proceeding

---
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from a disregard to their convenience, and those resulting from the inevitable exigencies of society; to discriminate the spirit of liberty from that of licentiousness, cherishing the first, avoiding the last, and uniting a speedy, but temperate vigilance against encroachments, with an inviolable respect to the laws.

5 Whether this desirable object will be best promoted by affording aids to seminaries of learning already established, by the institution of a national university, or by any other expedients, will be well worthy of a place in the deliberations of the Legislature....
**THE U.S. CONGRESS OF THE CONFEDERATION**

*An Ordinance for the Government of the Territory of the United States Northwest of the River Ohio*

**LAW EXCERPT**

**BACKGROUND**

Congress passed the Northwest Ordinance to provide the governing structure for all of the territories of the young United States, lands that would later become the states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin.

**ANNOTATIONS**

Article III

Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged. The utmost good faith shall always be observed towards the Indians; their lands and property shall never be taken from them without their consent; and in their property, rights, and liberty they never shall be invaded or disturbed unless in just and lawful wars authorized by Congress; but laws founded in justice and humanity shall, from time to time, be made, for preventing wrongs being done to them, and for preserving peace and friendship with them....


“Property”

**Essay**

March 27, 1792

*The National Gazette* | Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

**Background**

James Madison included this essay as part of a series of articles he wrote for *The National Gazette* in the early years of American government under the Constitution.

**Guiding Questions**

1. What are the two senses of the word "property" according to Madison?

2. In what way can man’s rights, opinions, and the use of his faculties be his property?

3. According to Madison, what must a government do to secure the various senses of property?

---

This term in its particular application means “that dominion which one man claims and exercises over the external things of the world, in exclusion of every other individual.”

In its larger and juster meaning, it embraces every thing to which a man may attach a value and have a right; and which leaves to every one else the like advantage.

In the former sense, a man’s land, or merchandise, or money is called his property.

In the latter sense, a man has a property in his opinions and the free communication of them.

He has a property of peculiar value in his religious opinions, and in the profession and practice dictated by them.

He has a property very dear to him in the safety and liberty of his person.

He has an equal property in the free use of his faculties and free choice of the objects on which to employ them.

In a word, as a man is said to have a right to his property, he may be equally said to have a property in his rights.

Where an excess of power prevails, property of no sort is duly respected. No man is safe in his opinions, his person, his faculties, or his possessions.

Where there is an excess of liberty, the effect is the same, though from an opposite cause.

Government is instituted to protect property of every sort; as well that which lies in the various rights of individuals, as that which the term particularly expresses. This being the end of government, that alone is a just government, which impartially secures to every man, whatever is his own.

According to this standard of merit, the praise of affording a just securing to property, should be sparingly bestowed on a government which, however scrupulously guarding the possessions of individuals, does not protect them in the enjoyment and communication of
their opinions, in which they have an equal, and in the estimation of some, a more valuable property.

More sparingly should this praise be allowed to a government, where a man’s religious rights are violated by penalties, or fettered by tests, or taxed by a hierarchy. Conscience is the most sacred of all property; other property depending in part on positive law, the exercise of that, being a natural and unalienable right. To guard a man’s house as his castle, to pay public and enforce private debts with the most exact faith, can give no title to invade a man’s conscience which is more sacred than his castle, or to withhold from it that debt of protection, for which the public faith is pledged, by the very nature and original conditions of the social pact.

That is not a just government, nor is property secure under it, where the property which a man has in his personal safety and personal liberty, is violated by arbitrary seizures of one class of citizens for the service of the rest. A magistrate issuing his warrants to a press gang, would be in his proper functions in Turkey or Indostan, under appellations proverbial of the most complete despotism.

That is not a just government, nor is property secure under it, where arbitrary restrictions, exemptions, and monopolies deny to part of its citizens that free use of their faculties, and free choice of their occupations, which not only constitute their property in the general sense of the word; but are the means of acquiring property strictly so called. What must be the spirit of legislation where a manufacturer of linen cloth is forbidden to bury his own child in a linen shroud, in order to favor his neighbour who manufactures woolen cloth; where the manufacturer and wearer of woolen cloth are again forbidden the economical use of buttons of that material, in favor of the manufacturer of buttons of other materials!

A just security to property is not afforded by that government, under which unequal taxes oppress one species of property and reward another species: where arbitrary taxes invade the domestic sanctuaries of the rich, and excessive taxes grind the faces of the poor; where the keenness and competitions of want are deemed an insufficient spur to labor, and taxes
are again applied, by an unfeeling policy, as another spur; in violation of that sacred property, which Heaven, in decreeing man to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow, kindly reserved to him, in the small repose that could be spared from the supply of his necessities.

If there be a government then which prides itself in maintaining the inviolability of property; which provides that none shall be taken directly even for public use without indemnification to the owner, and yet directly violates the property which individuals have in their opinions, their religion, their persons, and their faculties; nay more, which indirectly violates their property, in their actual possessions, in the labor that acquires their daily subsistence, and in the hallowed remnant of time which ought to relieve their fatigues and soothe their cares, the influence will have been anticipated, that such a government is not a pattern for the United States.

If the United States mean to obtain or deserve the full praise due to wise and just governments, they will equally respect the rights of property, and the property in rights: they will rival the government that most sacredly guards the former; and by repelling its example in violating the latter, will make themselves a pattern to that and all other governments.
Alexander Hamilton wrote this article examining President Thomas Jefferson's message to Congress at the beginning of his presidency.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. According to Hamilton, what are the several principles that ought to govern immigration?

---

The next exceptionable feature in the Message, is the proposal to abolish all restriction on naturalization, arising from a previous residence. In this the President is not more at variance with the concurrent maxims of all commentators on popular governments, than he is with himself. The Notes on Virginia are in direct contradiction to the Message, and furnish us with strong reasons against the policy now recommended. The passage alluded to is here presented: Speaking of the population of America, Mr. Jefferson there says, “Here I will beg leave to propose a doubt. The present desire of America, is to produce rapid population, by as great importations of foreigners as possible. But is this founded in good policy?” “Are there no inconveniences to be thrown into the scale, against the advantage expected from a multiplication of numbers, by the importation of foreigners? It is for the happiness of those united in society, to harmonize as much as possible, in matters which they must of necessity transact together. Civil government being the sole object of forming societies, its administration must be conducted by common consent. Every species of government has its specific principles: Ours, perhaps, are more peculiar than those of any other in the universe. It is a composition of the freest principles of the English Constitution, with others, derived from natural right and reason. To these, nothing can be more opposed than the maxims of absolute monarchies. Yet from such, we are to expect the greatest number of emigrants. They will bring with them the principles of the governments they leave, imbibed in their early youth; or if able to throw them off, it will be in exchange for an unbounded licentiousness, passing as is usual, from one extreme to another. It would be a miracle were they to stop precisely at the point of temperate liberty. Their principles with their language, they will transmit to their children. In proportion to their numbers, they will share with us in the legislation. They will infuse into it their spirit, warp and bias its direction, and render it a heterogeneous, incoherent, distracted mass. I may appeal to experience, during the present contest, for a verification of these conjectures: but if they be not certain in event, are they not possible, are they not probable? Is it not safer to wait with patience for the attainment of any degree of population desired or expected? May not our government be more homogeneous, more peaceable, more durable? Suppose 20 millions of republican Americans, thrown all of a sudden into France, what would be the condition of that kingdom? If it would be more turbulent, less happy, less strong, we may believe that the addition of half a
million of foreigners, to our present numbers, would produce a similar effect here.” Thus wrote Mr. Jefferson in 1781….

…The impolicy of admitting foreigners to an immediate and unreserved participation in the right of suffrage, or in the sovereignty of a Republic, is as much a received axiom as any thing in the science of politics, and is verified by the experience of all ages. Among other instances, it is known, that hardly any thing contributed more to the downfall of Rome, than her precipitate communication of the privileges of citizenship to the inhabitants of Italy at large. And how terribly was Syracuse scourged by perpetual seditions, when, after the overthrow of the tyrants, a great number of foreigners were suddenly admitted to the rights of citizenship? Not only does ancient but modern, and even domestic history furnish evidence of what may be expected from the dispositions of foreigners, when they get too early footing in a country. Who wields the sceptre of France, and has erected a Despotism on the ruins of a Republic? A foreigner. Who rules the councils of our own ill-fated, unhappy country? And who stimulates persecution on the heads of its citizens, for daring to maintain an opinion, and for exercising the rights of suffrage? A foreigner! Where is the virtuous pride that once distinguished Americans? Where the indignant spirit which in defence of principle, hazarded a revolution to attain that independence now insidiously attacked?
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Why Teach the United States Constitution

“[I]t seems to have been reserved to the people of this country, by their conduct and example, to decide the important question, whether societies of men are really capable or not of establishing good government from reflection and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend for their political constitutions on accident and force.” Thus wrote Alexander Hamilton in the opening paragraph of Federalist 1 in support of the newly proposed United States Constitution. Indeed, it is the Constitution that gives institutional form to the principles of the Declaration of Independence. The Constitution is the vehicle for the American experiment in self-government. Study of the Constitution therefore shows students how and that human beings are able to govern themselves in freedom, securing the equal protection of rights and the dignity of
each person through reflection, deliberation, and choice. This is a significant thing for students to grasp, for if the Constitution cannot achieve these ends, then force and violence are the only alternatives left to humankind. It is important for students to understand how and why the Framers formed the three branches and how they were intended to operate. This unit also covers the added safeguards to freedom in the first ten amendments to the Constitution: The Bill of Rights.

What Teachers Should Consider

The idea and presence of a constitution is so ubiquitous to Americans that we forget how it was really the U.S. Constitution that made constitutions so common and expected. With this familiarity comes a lack of consideration of the uniqueness of the U.S. Constitution not only for being the first and oldest written constitution, but especially of the carefully discerned principles on which it rests.

The first of these is the rule of law, a principle that was not new but that was restored from antiquity through the Magna Carta and the English law tradition. The American colonists inherited this legal tradition and practiced it in the colonies for a century and a half in the colonies. Violations of the rule of law were at the heart of the colonists’ complaints against the British.

After the Revolution, it was of great significance to construct a government that would preserve the rule of law and create structures and processes that would ward against its violations.…

After treating of the main principles that the framers brought to bear on the Constitution, it passes next to examine the actual text of the Constitution. The different articles lay out the structure, selection, and powers of each branch of the federal government. It is here that students come to see how the principles of the Constitution informed the way that the federal government is structured and how it functions.

The chief goal behind every clause to the Constitution is to allow the people to govern but to do so justly, that is, without violating the rights of the minority. The importance of representation, therefore, underlies every consideration. Students should be asked to identify this principle as it functions within each branch of the government and how certain requirements of the Constitution seek to foster good representation.

At the same time, the Constitution limits the power of each branch and official. In the event that good representatives gain power—but given the nature of human beings with respect to power—the Constitution sets guardrails for how much power a branch can accumulate and how that power is wielded. Ultimately, every government decision comes back to the will of the people through elections.

In addition to making these connections between principles and practice, students must learn the simple facts of how the federal government is composed and how it functions. This information is necessary to being a well-informed citizen. Fortunately, students’ background knowledge in the principles of the Constitution lend such straightforward study an additional degree of understanding and appreciation. The facts of governing through the Constitution are significant because they were carefully determined, the product of reflective thought and experience. Their historical success, moreover, is a testimony to how well conceived they turned out to be.
Finally, the addition of the Bill of Rights is worthy of careful study on the part of students. Contentious at the time of the ratification debates, the Bill of Rights has proven to be a bulwark against government violations of rights. Students should examine them closely and tie their inclusion both to historical situations which the framers had recently experienced and to the principles of the Declaration of Independence.

How Teachers Can Learn More

**TEXTS**

*The U.S. Constitution: A Reader*, ed. Hillsdale College Politics Faculty  
*We Still Hold These Truths*, Matthew Spalding  
*The Federalist*, Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay  
*American Government and Politics*, Joseph Bessette and John Pitney

**ONLINE COURSES** | Online.Hillsdale.edu

*Introduction to the Constitution*  
*Constitution 101*  
*The Federalist Papers*

**Primary Sources Studied in This Unit**

The U.S. Constitution  
*Federalist* 10  
*Federalist* 51  
The Bill of Rights
Lesson 1 — The Principles of the Constitution

Lesson Objective

Students learn about the main ideas and principles that the Founders had in mind when they organized the government through the Constitution.

Online Courses for Teachers | Online.Hillsdale.edu

- Introduction to the Constitution
  - Lectures 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
- Constitution 101
  - Lectures 1, 3, 4
- The Federalist Papers
  - Lecture 1, 2, 3, 4, 5

Primary Sources

The following primary sources are potential readings for students. Teachers should use their discretion based on grade level ability in deciding which texts to share with students. The texts may be assigned for homework, read together in class, or simply read aloud by the teacher. Some texts include guiding reading questions to assist students in the event that the text is assigned for homework. Students should annotate the texts either in preparation for or during a seminar conversation. Teachers should not feel it necessary to assign all of the texts, especially in light of grade level considerations.

- The U.S. Constitution
- The Federalist, Nos. 10 and 51

Terms and Topics

- Articles of Confederation
- Constitution
- power
- union
- republic
- representation
- representative democracy
- direct democracy
- extended sphere
- human nature
- interest
- faction
- parties
- majority tyranny
- federalism
- local government
- state government
- federal government
- township
- republic
- enumerated powers
- separation of powers
- branch
- checks and balances
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- In light of the weaknesses and failures of the Articles of Confederation, why did the Federalists believe a Constitution was necessary?
- What is the relationship between the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution?
- What was *The Federalist* and what was its purpose?
- How is representative democracy distinct from direct democracy?
- How is representation supposed to lead to the creation of better laws?
- According to *The Federalist*, what are the virtues and limitations of human nature?
- What did the Framers think about the tendencies of power?
- What is the danger with factions and parties?
- Why did *The Federalist* believe a larger country would help prevent the danger of majority tyranny from factions?
- What is federalism? What are its advantages?
- What are the distinctions among the local, state, and federal governments?
- What are your state and local governments?
- What is separation of powers? Why does the Constitution separate the powers of government?
- What are checks and balances? What is their purpose?
- How did the Constitution balance freedom (majority rule) and justice (preserving minority rights)?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 1: What is the form of government of the United States?
  - Question 2: What is the supreme law of the land?
  - Question 3: Name one thing the U.S. Constitution does.
  - Question 4: The U.S. Constitution starts with the words "We the People." What does “We the People” mean?
  - Question 10: Name two important ideas from the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution.
  - Question 13: What is the rule of law?
  - Question 14: Many documents influenced the U.S. Constitution. Name one.
  - Question 15: There are three branches of government. Why?
  - Question 16: Name the three branches of government.
  - Question 58: Name one power that is only for the federal government.
  - Question 59: Name one power that is only for the states.
  - Question 82: What founding document was written in 1787?
  - Question 83: The Federalist Papers supported the passage of the U.S. Constitution. Name one of the writers.
  - Question 84: Why were the Federalist Papers important?
  - Question 86: George Washington is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 88: James Madison is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 89: Alexander Hamilton is famous for many things. Name one.
KEYS TO THE LESSON

The Constitution should be studied in two steps. The first explores the principles the framers had in mind when they were crafting the form of government. This is essential for understanding the Constitution, for without the underlying principles the form seems conventional and just one of many constitutions in history. The second part to instruction involves learning about the actual structure and function of the government under the Constitution. This lesson is concerned first with the principles and how exceptional and carefully the framers considered them.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Principles of the Constitution with emphasis on the following approaches.

- Survey with students the various main forms of government from which America is distinct, including pure democracy, monarchy, aristocracy, oligarchy, theocracy, autocracy, socialist, communist, fascist, etc.
- Review with students the structure of the Articles of Confederation and the issues that emerged under such a structure. The Articles were drafted by Americans wary of a strong central government in light of their experience with the British. They wanted to keep the states as independent as possible. To prevent the national government from becoming too powerful, the second Article asserted the sovereignty of each state except in case when a power is explicitly delegated to the United States Congress. While united on some matters of foreign policy, the Articles would prove to be ineffective as a federal government charter, because they did not provide a strong and unified executive, and they had no power to enforce laws or levy taxes to pay for the expenses of government.
- Proceed to considering the issues that dominated the 1780s, especially the debt cancellation laws by states (a clear example of majority tyranny) and the event that impressed upon George Washington and James Madison the importance of reforming the Articles: Shays' Rebellion.
- Review with students their history knowledge concerning past experiments with democratic government. Democracies and republics had historically been short-lived because of two primary faults. The first was the tyranny of the majority, when the rights of the minority are trampled by the majority. Second was the ineptitude of democratic governments. Such a government was usually inefficient, weak, divided, and susceptible to the passions of the mob. Factions divided the institutions of such a regime. The result was civil war or conquest by an outside nation. The Constitution intended to form a government that would preserve the benefits of republicanism while guarding against its defects.
- Note for students the senses in which the Framers believed they were in the best position to achieve a free, self-governing republic in 1787, as opposed to previous times. The Framers argued that certain experiences and intelligent thinkers had helped mankind learn from past failures and improve the science of politics. This improved science of politics included the principles of the separation of powers, the office of an independent judiciary serving lifetime appointments, representatives selected by the people, and the extended sphere of a nation’s geographic size. This did not mean that they believed human nature changed or improved or that people and governments naturally evolve to become better over time. Human nature, as with all natures, was and is unchanging and therefore would always be prone to certain faults in character and intellect. So, too, would governments, as people are those who govern.
Help students to appreciate the difficulty of what the delegates to the Constitutional Convention were attempting to do. They had to account, above all, for human nature, mitigating its negative tendencies while channeling its neutral and good tendencies toward constructive governance. Simultaneously, the delegates had to account for the myriad interests and situations of the various states. The issue of how the people and the states would be represented was a chief contention, one that resulted in a bicameral legislature with different means of representation. Other results were strong debates and compromises over the question of slavery.

- Introduce students briefly to the origins and purpose of The Federalist, including the backgrounds and roles of their principal authors, James Madison and Alexander Hamilton. It is worth noting that each would disagree strongly with one another on future issues, but on the Constitution, they found common ground, a good model for civil dialogue today.

- Consider with students the main arguments in Federalist 10 and 51. These key documents should afford a review of the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the problems of the Articles of Confederation while also illustrating the purposes of the Constitution. The form of the Constitution follows its function with respect to human nature and the purposes for which governments are established, per the Declaration of Independence. The Federalist explains both of these functions and the nature of men.

- Make sure students are mindful of the overall goals toward which the Founders directed every decision: freedom and self-government. In other words, they needed to arrange the government and distribute powers so as to enable representatives chosen by the people to protect the rights of the people while avoiding tyranny, either by the one, the few, or the many.

- Spend some time considering the Preamble to the Constitution. It is remarkable in stating two things: first, what the purposes of the government established by the Constitution are to be, and second, that it is the people who are establishing it for these purposes. Students should be able to relate everything mentioned in the Constitution to both of these elements of the Preamble: how does each arrangement achieve these stated purposes of government; and how does it reflect the consent of the governed?

- Ask about the source and purpose of a government’s power. Review how the Declaration of Independence claims that government power comes from the free consent of the people, and ask students to identify whether and how the Constitution accomplishes that goal.

- Clarify that the Constitution establishes a republic, not a democracy. In a pure democracy the people make all legislative decisions by direct majority vote; in a republic, the people elect certain individuals to represent their interests in deliberating and voting. The deliberations and voting record of representatives should usually reflect but should also be more refined than that of the entire people voting directly. Sometimes this distinction is described in terms of direct democracy vs. representative democracy.

- Describe the American Founders’ understanding of human nature. They understood human nature to be fixed and unchanging, good but also flawed and tending toward corrupting power. In response to human nature, government must guard against the opposite dangers of lawlessness and tyranny, accounting for the realities of human nature and rejecting the possibility of utopia.

- Show how the Constitution does not deny, demonize, or elevate human nature, but rather seeks to channel the powers of human beings into constructive institutions while mitigating man’s baser tendencies. In brief, the Constitution is constructed on a deep and accurate understanding of fixed human nature born of the Founders’ knowledge of history, their own experience, and their prudence.
- Emphasize for students the reality of majority tyranny. There is a straightforward though mistaken belief nowadays that justice is the rule of the majority and that 51 percent of the people have a moral right to impose whatever they wish on the 49 percent. The Founders rejected this idea of democracy and morality as “might makes right.” They asserted objective standards of right and wrong by which government must abide in protecting rights if it is to be a just government. The Framers of the Constitution were chiefly concerned with allowing the will of the majority to rule—thereby guaranteeing the consent of the governed—while still preserving the rights of the minority and thereby securing justice.

- Note with students how powers are enumerated, thus limiting the scope of government activity afforded by the Constitution, a key feature of limited government.

- Consider how the Constitution repeatedly structures federal institutions to refine and enlarge the will of the people.

- Explain to students how the extended territory under American rule was thought to prevent majority tyranny by taking in a wider array of opinions and interests, many of which depended on geography, with the ties of occupation, culture, and religious beliefs that are connected to a certain location. To achieve a majority in government the representatives would have to achieve a broad consensus on the issues, meaning that only the most universally held positions would be possible to enact.

- Explain the importance of the principles of federalism and the separation of powers, and why these ideas are central to the Constitution’s safeguards against the corrupting tendency of power.

- Distinguish the focus of the federal government compared to the state governments.

- Highlight how the separation of powers (along with checks and balances between the branches) is the key “mechanism” of the Constitution. Remind students that the separation of powers is not an arbitrary design, but serves two purposes: 1) it upholds the rule of law (and good government) by focusing government on its core functions of making law, enforcing law, and adjudicating law; and 2) it preserves liberty (and limited government) by preventing the accumulation of power in the hands of any one branch, which Madison defines as the very definition of tyranny. The system of checks and balances encourages each branch to protect its own powers and to do its assigned duty. The separation of powers coupled with checks and balances was intended to prevent the defects of republican government (namely, the tyrannical rule of a majority faction) while retaining what was good: the consent of the governed under the constitutional rule of law.

- Have students converse about the importance of the rule of law. With deep historical roots (especially British constitutional history and particular events such as the Magna Carta), the rule of law is a general concept of government that is straightforward but extremely important and historically rare. First, it states that all of the governed abide by the law and are equally protected by the law; and second, that even those who govern must abide by the same law. It means that everyone—citizens and government officials alike—should be governed by agreed-upon rules that apply equally to everyone, rather than by the arbitrary judgment of government officials applying one set of rules to the governed and a separate set to themselves. The law is above any one person or group of people and their interests, and everyone is equally accountable to the law. John Adams put it simply when he described the purpose of a constitution government as “a government of laws, not of men.”
**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

**Assignment:** What are the main ideas the Framers kept in mind as they designed the government through the Constitution? (1–2 paragraphs).
Lesson 2 — The Congress

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn how the Constitution structures the federal legislature to ensure that the will of the people is both expressed as well as refined and enlarged by the people’s representatives to effect good government.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

The Federalist Papers Lecture 6
Congress Lectures 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12

PRIMARY SOURCES

Students may read and annotate the following primary source(s), either at home or together in class. Using their annotations and the below questions, lead students through a seminar conversation on each text.

The U.S. Constitution, Articles I and IV

TERMS AND TOPICS

- legislature
- legislative power
- Virginia Plan
- New Jersey Plan
- Great Compromise
- bill
- Congress
- bicameralism
- House of Representatives
- Senate
- term
- refine and enlarge
- majority/minority leader
- lame duck
- filibuster
- Speaker of the House
- 17th Amendment

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- Which purposes and powers does Congress have?
- How does the Constitution place and structure the legislative power in the Congress?
- What is bicameralism, and what are its advantages?
- What are the similarities and differences between the structure of the House of Representatives and the Senate?
- What are the requirements for becoming a Representative or Senator? Why are they different?
- How does one become Representative or Senator?
- What are the chief characteristics of the House of Representatives, and why?
- What are the chief characteristics of the Senate, and why?
- How does representation itself and the differences between the House of Representatives and the Senate combine to refine and enlarge the will of the people?
- How does a bill become a law?
- How can Congress check and balance the power of the president?
- How can Congress check and balance the power of the judiciary?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 18: What part of the federal government writes laws?
  - Question 19: What are the two parts of the U.S. Congress?
  - Question 20: Name one power of the U.S. Congress.
  - Question 21: How many U.S. senators are there?
  - Question 22: How long is a term for a U.S. senator?
  - Question 24: How many voting members are in the House of Representatives?
  - Question 25: How long is a term for a member of the House of Representatives?
  - Question 26: Why do U.S. representatives serve shorter terms than U.S. senators?
  - Question 27: How many senators does each state have?
  - Question 28: Why does each state have two senators?
  - Question 31: Who does a U.S. senator represent?
  - Question 32: Who elects U.S. senators?
  - Question 33: Who does a member of the House of Representatives represent?
  - Question 34: Who elects members of the House of Representatives?
  - Question 35: Some states have more representatives than other states. Why?

**Keys to the Lesson**

The legislative power and the Congress that holds it are the most quintessentially American facets to government in the United States. Composed of the elected representatives of the American people, Congress embodies self-government in America. Hence it is listed first among the three equal branches of government. Its bicameral structure satisfied both large and small states and has proven to be a bulwark against the accumulation of power and against momentary passions that sweep through the country while carrying out government’s core function of making law. While representation in and of itself seeks to elevate the will of the majority through relatively talented and mindful Representatives, the further refinement and broadening of legislation through the Senate brings an additional safeguard. Prudent and effective legislation supported by a broad legislative consensus was the goal the Framers had in mind when forming the Congress. For all of these reasons, over much of American history, the Congress has operated as the core representative branch—and thus the heart—of American constitutional government. Historically, its power had been great and intentionally so. The two houses had brought and, to lesser extent, continue to bring their unique characters together to form laws most representative of the American citizenry. The structure and functions of Congress are manifold but also inspiring, for it is the clearest expression of the people governing themselves. Students should come away from this unit knowing both the mechanics and functions of Congress today and how they have changed from the original intentions of the Founders.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Congress with emphasis on the following approaches:
Throughout this lesson, have students consider how the Constitution repeatedly structures the
government to refine and enlarge public opinion so as to reflect their consent through the rule of
law.

Help students to understand the very meaningful words *legislative*, *executive*, *judicial*, and *power*. 
All four words are not merely conventions but are full of significance. In fact, they are true to the
very nature of the rule of law. They connote the act of lawmaking, the act of enforcing the law made, and the act of determining whether the law has been violated, either by an individual
against a specific law, or by a law itself against the Supreme Law of the Land, the Constitution.

Clarify for students that under the Constitution the United States is not a democracy but rather a
republic. The main distinction is that in a pure democracy, everyone votes on actually making
every law, and the only factor to consider in enacting a law is 51 percent of the people. In a
republic, the people elect certain of the fellow citizens to represent their views and interests in
deliberating and making decisions. The deliberations and voting record of representatives should
not only reflect the opinions of the people they represent but also their settled concerns and
common good as understood by the representative. How well they have represented the opinions
and good of their constituents is determined by election of those being represented. Other terms
relevant to these distinctions are *direct democracy* versus *representative democracy*.

Ask students why the Constitution begins by describing the legislative power and legislative
branch. The reason is Congress is most connected with the people at large. Lawmaking is the chief
governing act, and in a democratic republic, it is the representatives of the people who do the
lawmaking. Students should understand how very different the locus of lawmaking and power is
today when one considers the present executive, judiciary, and bureaucracy.

Have students discuss and understand the purpose of the main legislative powers granted to
Congress. Students should be able to connect each of these powers with the purposes of the
Constitution as outlined in the Preamble. The structure, character, and operation of Congress are
designed in the way most fitting to the function of lawmaking, that is, to exercise the power of
making law on behalf of (or as representatives of) the people. Make clear that the legislative power
is vested uniquely in the legislative branch, not in the federal government as a whole or in another
branch.

Have students understand clearly the requirements for holding office in the House of
Representatives and the Senate and the terms of office. Students should be able to account for the
differences and what it means for the purposes and manner of legislating in each body: namely,
that the House is more reflective and responsive to the people, while the Senate is more
deliberative and refining of the majority will.

Teach about the House of Representatives in light the appropriateness of the quantity of
representatives that the Constitution had originally set and the quality required of such
representatives, including the ways in which the Constitution seeks to ensure such individuals are
more likely to be elected. The teacher may review *Federalist* Nos. 55 and 57 in preparation.

Teach about the Senate, paying special attention to how the Senate is structured and chosen, and
how these features provide stability and wisdom to the legislature while strengthening federalism
and the role of states in the federal government structure. The teacher may review *Federalist* Nos.
62 and 63 in preparation. It is worth noting how the 17th Amendment in 1913 altered this
arrangement and changed the role played by the Senate.

Outline in general some of the more prominent offices and committees within Congress and the
process of how laws are made.
- Explain how Congressmen and Congresswomen address constituent relations.
- Spend time on the unique powers each house has, why they have those powers, and how the powers are carried out, for example, the confirmation of appointees, ratification of treaties, introducing appropriations bills, and impeaching and conducting impeachment trials.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

**Assignment:** Explain the overall powers of Congress and why Congress, as opposed to other branches, has these powers (1–2 paragraphs).
Lesson 3 — The Presidency

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn how the Constitution arranges the executive power in the presidency and the purposes and powers of the office.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

- The Federalist Papers
- The Presidency and the Constitution

PRIMARY SOURCES

Students may read and annotate the following primary source(s), either at home or together in class. Using their annotations and the below questions, lead students through a seminar conversation on each text.

The U.S. Constitution, Article II

TERMS AND TOPICS

- executive power
- presidency
- Electoral College
- term
- veto power
- impeachment
- cabinet
- Commander-in-Chief
- presidential oath
- bully pulpit
- State of the Union address
- foreign policy
- vice president
- War Powers Resolution
- pardoning power
- impeachment
- 12th, 20th, 22nd, and 25th Amendments

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What were the debates about the presidency at the Constitutional Convention?
- What is the executive power? Why do we need a president?
- What purposes and powers does the presidency have?
- What are the requirements for becoming president?
- How does one become president?
- What are the chief characteristics of the presidency, and why?
- What is the Electoral College, how did it originally work, and what is its purpose?
- What was the purpose of the State of the Union address?
- How has the role of the president changed as political parties have changed?
- Explain the role of the president in relation to foreign policy. What powers does he have and not have?
- How can the president check and balance the power of the Congress?
- How can the president check and balance the power of the judiciary?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 17: The President of the United States is in charge of which branch of government?
  - Question 36: The President of the United States is elected for how many years?
  - Question 37: The President of the United States can serve only two terms. Why?
  - Question 38: What is the name of the President of the United States now?
  - Question 39: What is the name of the Vice President of the United States now?
  - Question 40: If the president can no longer serve, who becomes president?
  - Question 41: Name one power of the president.
  - Question 42: Who is Command in Chief of the U.S. military?
  - Question 43: Who signs bills to become laws?
  - Question 44: Who vetoes bills?
  - Question 45: Who appoints federal judges?
  - Question 46: The executive branch has many parts. Name one.
  - Question 47: What does the President’s cabinet do?
  - Question 48: What are two Cabinet-level positions?
  - Question 49: Why is the Electoral College important?

**Keys to the Lesson**

The office of president demonstrated some of the most significant changes the Framers put into the Constitution, compared to the Articles of Confederation. The Framers saw the need of a stronger executive, especially in the area of representing the United States on the world stage and in providing for the nation’s security and carrying out its foreign policy. The president’s first responsibility, however, was simply to enforce the laws passed by Congress. The Constitution states the bounds of this authority with respect to Congress in the Constitution’s charge that the president “take care that the laws be faithfully executed.” In this sense, the president is beholden to the legislature and to the law. It is his job to carry out the law as it is created by the legislature. This means he is neither to create laws nor fail to enforce them. His main check on the legislative power is his veto, and even that may be overridden by Congress. Once a law is passed, and only once it has been passed, does the president simply make sure people follow the law. In American history, the presidency has acquired an outsized regard for its importance and prestige. This is owing partly to the talents of exceptional presidents, partly to later reinventions of the office, and partly to America’s growth into a superpower in which foreign policy and the head of state have played a more prominent role in the world. Still, students should understand that the original intention for the office was to execute laws passed by Congress, uphold the rule of law, and defend the Constitution. The executive office has a character of its own: law enforcement, which ultimately means that the president exists to provide the necessary force behind law, which does not come about naturally. Students should understand these features of executive power as well as how the presidency functions.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Presidency with emphasis on the following approaches:
Consider with students the nature of executive power and its ultimate reliance on a fear of losing liberty, property, or even life, should appeals to virtue and right conduct fail to elicit an adherence to the law by citizens.

Examine with students Publius’s arguments for the presidency and the necessity of an energetic executive, especially the unity (one person) that is necessary for “decision, activity, secrecy, and dispatch” in executive actions. The teacher may review Federalist 70 in preparation.

Share with students that the office of the president was crafted by the Framers with both hindsight and foresight. On one hand, they had learned that the legitimate concern of the Articles of Confederation to prevent executive tyranny resulted in a weak if non-existent executive with no independent power to enforce the laws or conduct foreign policy. The Constitution defined the proper ground by creating the president vested with the executive power to enforce the law and administer the affairs of government at home and abroad while also preventing and checking executive tyranny. On the other hand, the Founders created the office with the knowledge that George Washington—who had already relinquished his military authority as general—would assuredly be the first president to exercise these powers and in doing so set precedents for the future. They were confident he would do so with vigor but also with prudence and justice for the sake of establishing the Constitution.

Note for students that the president’s executive power in Article II is a general grant of power, not “herein granted” or enumerated as in Article I. While Congress has great powers to control and influence the means of the president, especially through its control of the budget, the presidency is designed to embody the executive power of government, primarily enforcing all the laws enacted by Congress but also maintaining the rule of law, seeing to the nation’s security, and conducting the nation’s foreign policy.

Make sure students know the requirements for being president and the kind of individual the Framers believed would be best for the office.

Explain the circumstances under which the president can exercise the powers of Commander-in-Chief. Students should be aware that, as the most popular branch, only Congress has the power to declare war, while the president has the power to carry out that declaration and otherwise direct the armed forces in circumstances of military necessity. Emphasize for students how a unique trait of the American armed forces is that they are under civilian control, in particular a civilian, elected president, checked by Congress (and a Supreme Court), subservient to the Constitution and the rule of law.

Read aloud and discussion with students the president’s unique oath of office, found in Article II, Section 1, Clause 8: “I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.”

Clarify with students how the Electoral College works and why the Founders decided on this process for choosing the president. The first original reason was to provide a way for the people’s representatives in the states to check against a tyrannical or fraudulent choice of the president, a purpose which most states abandoned when they enacted laws tying a state’s choice of electors to the state’s popular vote and then usually requiring those electors to be faithful to the state’s popular vote. The second reason was to ensure that presidential candidates would have to pay attention to the interests and opinions of all the states and their populations. This prevented regional and encourage national candidates, and forced presidential candidates to address the concerns not merely of large population centers like cities but also of rural and more remote populations. Together with the equal representation among states in the Senate, the Electoral
College has discouraged majority tyranny in favor of a broader and more settled national consensus. Explain the Electoral College system as intended by the Founders and as it functions today.

- Make sure students understand how the presidency operates in the twenty-first century, with its various personnel and the responsibilities and roles the White House has acquired over the years. Spend time discussing the cabinet, the armed forces, and the bureaucratic agencies. Consider the president’s role in foreign policy and in appointing members of the judiciary.
- Survey and discuss with students the various amendments to the Constitution that have changed the role and functioning of the president and the executive branch, namely the 12th, 20th, 22nd, and 25th Amendments. Students should consider the merits and consequences of each change to the presidency.

STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT

Assignment: Explain the overall powers of the presidency and why the presidency, as opposed to other branches, has these powers (1–2 paragraphs).
Unit 3 — Formative Quiz

Covering Lessons 1-3
10-15 minutes

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. How is representative democracy distinct from direct democracy?

2. What did the Framers think about the tendencies of power?

3. What is federalism? What are its advantages?

4. What is separation of powers? Why does the Constitution separate the powers of government?

5. What are the chief characteristics of the House of Representatives, and why?

6. What are the chief characteristics of the Senate, and why?

7. What are the chief characteristics of the presidency, and why?
Lesson 4 — The Judiciary

**LESSON OBJECTIVE**

Students learn about the judicial power in the Constitution and about the Supreme Court’s power of judicial review.

**ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS** | Online.Hillsdale.edu

- The Federalist Papers | Lecture 8
- The U.S. Supreme Court | Lecture 1

**PRIMARY SOURCES**

Students may read and annotate the following primary source(s), either at home or together in class. Using their annotations and the below questions, lead students through a seminar conversation on each text.

The U.S. Constitution, Article III

**TERMS AND TOPICS**

- judicial power
- original jurisdiction
- Supreme Court
- appellate jurisdiction
- coequality of branches
- Marbury v. Madison
- Judiciary Act of 1789
- jurisdiction
- appellate courts

**QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND**

- Which purposes and powers does the Supreme Court have?
- How does the Constitution place and structure the judicial power in the Supreme Court?
- What are the requirements for becoming a justice?
- How does one become a justice?
- What are the chief characteristics of the Supreme Court, and why?
- What is judicial review? How was the power first claimed and asserted?
- Who has the power to establish “lesser courts”?
- How can the judiciary check and balance the power of the president?
- How can the judiciary check and balance the power of Congress?
- To whom are elected officials and the Constitution itself ultimately subject?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 2: What is the supreme law of the land?
  - Question 13: What is the rule of law?
Question 50: What is one part of the judicial branch?
Question 51: What does the judicial branch do?
Question 52: What is the highest court in the United States?
Question 53: How many seats are on the Supreme Court?
Question 54: How many Supreme Court justices are usually needed to decide a case?
Question 55: How long do Supreme Court justices serve?
Question 56: Supreme Court justices serve for life. Why?

KEYS TO THE LESSON

In many respects, the Supreme Court was not given much consideration by the founding generation. The relatively minimal amount of detail and deliberation concerning the judiciary may have been the result of the rather straightforward nature of the judicial power: to use reason to judge whether or not a law has been violated in particular cases. The keys to exercising such a power, which has historic origins, depended on the wisdom of the judge as well as their understanding of the law. The requirement that the more deliberative Senate would have to consent to an elected president’s appointment of federal judges acted as a check against judicial tyranny. A key innovation the Framers brought to the judiciary was making it separate from the lawmaking and law-enforcing parts of the government and independent by lifetime appointment. The coequality of the judiciary was also an important element in enacting the separation of powers to ensure that justice would be effectively served. Most important was that the judiciary would be the constant guard of the Constitution and the rule of law.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Judiciary with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Explain that the judicial power is vested by Article III in the Supreme Court and in such inferior Courts as Congress creates by law. The judicial power (and the judiciary’s function) is to decide (or adjudicate) the “cases and controversies” that come before the courts according to the jurisdiction assigned by the Constitution or by Congress.
- Point out that the key to understanding the role of the judiciary in upholding the rule of law is that the “Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof” is “the supreme Law of the Land” (Article VI). This means not only that all laws consistent with the Constitution must be followed but also that the Constitution is above ordinary laws.
- Explain that while lower court decision may be appealed, the decisions of the Supreme Court in particular cases before it are final. While the precedents of the Supreme Court (the doctrine of stare decisis) are important for instructing lower courts and predicting how the Supreme Court might decide similar cases in the future, the precedent of a particular case is neither final nor absolute. Significant cases (such as Dred Scott v. Sandford in 1857 and Plessy v. Ferguson in 1896) have been overturned years later despite the Court’s earlier decisions.
- Teach how Publius explains and defends the judicial power and the principle of judicial review—the authority of the courts to declare a law unconstitutional. It is important to note what Publius considered the role of the judge to be: not a legislator who makes laws but rather an impartial judge in a particular case who will uphold and apply the law fairly. In carrying out the judicial power, the judge must also support and defend the Constitution, which means that in making their decisions they are obligated to side with the Constitution if a law is inconsistent with the
“supreme Law of the Land.” The judge must therefore interpret the laws and the Constitution. In doing so they should look at the intentions of Congress in making the laws, and to the courts’ own precedents, but most important they should abide by the original meaning of the Constitution as the intent expressed by the American people. The teacher may review Federalist 78 in preparation.

- Explain that while judicial review is rightly understood as a crucial element implied in the Constitution’s grant of judicial power, this does not mean that the Supreme Court has either the only or the final say over the Constitution and its meaning. Each branch of government is responsible to the Constitution as the source and extent of their authority, and are obligated to uphold it in carrying out their constitutional duties. This means Congress should consider the constitutionality of the laws it passes (and repeal those it considers unconstitutional), presidents should veto bills that they believe are unconstitutional and execute laws only in a constitutional manner, and that courts should strike down laws that are inconsistent with the Constitution. Nevertheless, when the three branches are at odds about the Constitution, the sovereign people have the final say as to the meaning of the Constitution by electing legislators who will make different laws, presidents who will appoint different judges, or by amending the Constitution itself. No singular branch has a monopoly on what the Constitution means.

- Teach students about how the Supreme Court decisions Marbury v. Madison debated and asserted the idea of judicial review that had been previewed in The Federalist. As explained above, note how the argument for judicial review asserted by the Supreme Court in Marbury v. Madison is distinct from judicial absolutism or judicial finality.

- Note for students how Congress began to establish lesser courts, per the Constitution, with the Judiciary Act of 1789. Students should be generally familiar with lower courts established throughout American history, their jurisdictions, and the general workings of lawsuits, trials, etc.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

**Assignment:** Explain the overall structure and powers of the Supreme Court and lesser courts, and why the judiciary, as opposed to other branches, has these powers (1-2 paragraphs).
Lesson 5 — The Bill of Rights

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the arguments for and against a Bill of Rights, what each of the first ten amendments to the Constitution protects, and why each was included and written the way it was.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

- The Federalist Papers Lecture 9
- Civil Rights in American History Lecture 2

PRIMARY SOURCES

Students may read and annotate the following primary source(s), either at home or together in class. Using their annotations and the below questions, lead students through a seminar conversation on each text.

- The U.S. Constitution, Articles V-VII
- The Bill of Rights

TERMS AND TOPICS

- Bill of Rights
- freedom of religion
- free exercise
- establishment clause
- freedom of speech
- freedom of the press
- right to assembly
- right to bear arms
- due process

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What is the process for amending the Constitution?
- Why does the Constitution make it so hard for it to be amended?
- What were the arguments for and against a Bill of Rights?
- What do each of the following amendments in the Bill of Rights guarantee and why: 1st, 2nd, 4th, 5th, 9th, and 10th?
- What is the origin of the rights protected in the Bill of Rights?
- How does religion help promote morality and freedom?
- What is the free exercise of religion and why is it important?
- What is freedom of speech and why is it so crucial to freedom and self-government?
- Why does the 2nd Amendment make it evident that the Founders found it necessary to guarantee to private citizens the right to possess tools used for their self-defense?
- What is due process? Why is it such an important legal guarantor of freedom?
Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
- Question 5: How are changes made to the U.S. Constitution?
- Question 7: How many amendments does the U.S. Constitution have?
- Question 60: What is the purpose of the 10th Amendment?
- Question 65: What are three rights of everyone living in the United States?

KEYS TO THE LESSON

The genius of the Bill of Rights was in the recognition that while future changes would produce new debates on government power, there nevertheless were fundamental rights not subject to change. Some sort of absolute prohibition that makes clear what is nonnegotiable seemed prudent. It is important to note that the list of rights guaranteed by the Constitution did not indicate a view by the framers that rights came from the government. Rather, these rights were recognized as fundamentals which no government created or may violate. What is somewhat remarkable about this list of rights is how universal they are now considered. That is in many respects owing to their articulation and inclusion by the framers in America.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Bill of Rights with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Before looking at the Bill of Rights itself, read with students Articles V-VII of the Constitution. Students should be familiar with what these Articles, particularly concerning the amendment process and the status of the Constitution in the American constitutional system of law. Remind them that the Bill of Rights are ten amendments to the Constitution but do not replace or redefine the main Constitution as the main bulwark of liberty.
- Teach students about the Anti-Federalists’ concerns with the Constitution, the arguments for and against a Bill of Rights, and how the Federalists ultimately convinced key states to support the Constitution by guaranteeing to add a Bill of Rights if it was ratified.
- Lead students through a complete reading of the Bill of Rights. Pause frequently to ask students questions on the various parts of the text. Sometimes the Bill of Rights comes across as special rights that the government has given to the people (and, therefore, may conceivably take away). This is not the case. These are fundamental rights recognized and protected by the Constitution. The people may point to and claim these rights when government threatens them.
- Help students understand how the rights found in the Bill of Rights are related to the preservation of life, liberty, property, or the pursuit of happiness, or how they answer some of the grievances in the Declaration of Independence or problems discovered under the Articles of Confederation. Spend time especially considering the 1st, 2nd, 4th, 5th, 9th, and 10th Amendments and the following guarantees:
  - Religious Liberty: When the Founders wrote that “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion,” they were not at all against religion playing a significant public role in society. But they did not want to establish an official church and creed, because they feared this would become a threat to “the free exercise of religion,” which was also protected in the First Amendment. They wanted to encourage and protect religious belief and exercise from a government that was either hostile to religion in general or to a specific religion, as was the case in other countries where church and state were not officially separated. The Founders emphatically believed that religion was necessary to promote morality, to shape civil society, and to form virtuous, responsible,
wise, and caring citizens. They believed that government should encourage and support religion in general. But they did not think the government should endorse or fund one single, official church or do anything to obstruct the people from exercising their religious faith.

- Freedom of Speech: It is essential for any free society to have freedom of speech for citizens to hold government accountable and to discuss and debate ideas. Freedom of speech helps society to flourish by promoting the sharing of ideas, innovations, scientific thought, and virtue. The Founders also wanted to keep politicians and the government accountable to the people by allowing for the free expression of ideas in support of or critical of elected officials’ choices and character. Freedom of the Press applies freedom of speech to printed speech as well.

- Freedom of Assembly and to Petition. Any group of citizens can gather without the government’s permission as long as their activities are peaceful. Similarly, citizens have the right to make their interests known to the government, including to specific branches of the government and specific elected members of the government.

- The Right of Self-Defense: The right to bear arms reflects two essential principles: 1) individuals have a natural right to protect and defend their own lives, families, and property against the tyrannical actions of another person; and 2) citizens may protect their own lives, families, and properties against the tyrannical actions of the government itself. The right to bear arms protects citizens’ ability and right to counter any attempt at oppression by the government.

- Due Process: Due process is the legal process that every person under the rule of law is due as a matter of equal justice. It establishes that any deprivations of a person’s natural rights to life, liberty, and property must be accompanied by a legal process in which the law was already a law at the time of being violated and in which the opportunity to defend one’s innocence is afforded. Innocence is presumed until evidence is judged in a fair trial to prove guilt. All are equal before the law and are guaranteed the same fair and impartial justice and the equal protection of the law. The right of the criminally accused to a jury of their peers (meaning fellow citizens) is also an important and long established element of due process. This ensures that the government’s executives and judges are held accountable to public opinion and that those judging whether a law was broken are those who could one day have that same judgment applied to them, thus ensuring a fair trial and verdict.

- Explain that the Founders did not believe the Bill of Rights encompassed all the rights of men in society. While some of the rights in the Bill of Rights are natural rights, others are generally civil rights (rights existing in law) intended to preserve certain natural rights, particularly from the misapplication of government power. Many of these rights, moreover, require prudential judgment to determine if they have been violated in a particular instance. There are certainly other natural and civil rights retained by the people that might not be listed in the Constitution. Note that the 9th Amendment suggests and guarantees just that.

- Discuss how the 10th Amendment was written to affirm that any other powers that are not delegated to the government by the Constitution are reserved to the States or to the people. By this amendment, the Constitution recognizes that key powers remain with the States, which have the general authority over the safety and well-being of their state citizens. It also means (especially when read in conjunction with the 9th Amendment) that the ultimate sovereign are the people,
who are endowed with all rights and (as a result) are the only ones who can delegate any power to
government.

STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT

Assignment: Explain the meaning and importance of the freedom of religion, the freedom of
speech, the right to bear arms, and the 10th Amendment (2–3 paragraphs).
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Writing Assignment
Study Guide — The United States Constitution Test

 TERMS AND TOPICS

Explain each of the following and the context in which it was discussed during this unit’s lessons.

Articles of Confederation
Constitution
union
republic
representative democracy
direct democracy
extended sphere
human nature
faction
majority tyranny
federalism
local government
state government
federal government
township
republic
enumerated powers

separation of powers
branch
checks and balances
legislative power
bill
Congress
bicameralism
House of Representatives
Senate
term
Speaker of the House
executive power
presidency
veto power
impeachment
interim
Commander-in-Chief

vice president
judicial power
Supreme Court
coequality of branches
jurisdiction
Marbury v. Madison
judicial review
Bill of Rights
freedom of religion
free exercise
establishment clause
freedom of speech
freedom of the press
right to assembly
right to bear arms
due process

PRIMARY SOURCES

Explain the main arguments in each of the following sources and their significance to understanding the United States Constitution.

The U.S. Constitution
Federalist 10
Federalist 51
The Bill of Rights

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.

Lesson 1 | The Principles of the Constitution

☐ What is the relationship between the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution?
☐ How is representative democracy distinct from direct democracy?
☐ How is representation supposed to lead to the creation of better laws?
□ According to *The Federalist*, what are the virtues and limitations of human nature?
□ What is the danger with factions and parties?
□ Why did *The Federalist* believe a larger country would help prevent the danger of majority tyranny from factions?
□ What is federalism? What are its advantages?
□ What are the distinctions among the local, state, and federal governments?
□ What is separation of powers? Why does the Constitution separate the powers of government?
□ What are checks and balances? What is their purpose?

Lesson 2 | The Congress

□ Which purposes and powers does Congress have?
□ What is bicameralism, and what are its advantages?
□ What are the requirements for becoming a Representative or Senator? Why are they different?
□ How does one become Representative or Senator?
□ What are the chief characteristics of the House of Representatives, and why?
□ What are the chief characteristics of the Senate, and why?
□ How does representation itself and the differences between the House of Representatives and the Senate combine to refine and enlarge the will of the people?
□ How does a bill become a law?
□ How can Congress check and balance the power of the president?
□ How can Congress check and balance the power of the judiciary?

Lesson 3 | The Presidency

□ What is the executive power? Why do we need a president?
□ What purposes and powers does the presidency have?
□ What are the requirements for becoming president?
□ How does one become president?
□ What are the chief characteristics of the presidency, and why?
□ What is the Electoral College, how did it originally work, and what is its purpose?
□ What was the purpose of the State of the Union address?
□ Explain the role of the president in relation to foreign policy. What powers does he have and not have?
□ How can the president check and balance the power of the Congress?
□ How can the president check and balance the power of the judiciary?

Lesson 4 | The Judiciary

□ Which purposes and powers does the Supreme Court have?
□ What are the requirements for becoming a justice?
□ How does one become a justice?
□ What are the chief characteristics of the Supreme Court, and why?
□ What is judicial review? How was the power first claimed and asserted?
□ Who has the power to establish “lesser courts”?
□ How can the judiciary check and balance the power of the president?
How can the judiciary check and balance the power of Congress?
To whom are elected officials and the Constitution itself ultimately subject?

Lesson 5 | The Bill of Rights

Why does the Constitution make it so hard for it to be amended?
What do each of the following amendments in the Bill of Rights guarantee and why: 1st, 2nd, 4th, 5th, 9th, and 10th?
How does religion help promote morality and freedom?
What is the free exercise of religion and why is it important?
What is freedom of speech and why is it so crucial to freedom and self-government?
Why does the 2nd Amendment make it evident that the Founders found it necessary to guarantee to private citizens the right to possess tools used for their self-defense?
What is due process? Why is it such an important legal guarantor of freedom?
Test — The United States Constitution

**TERMS AND TOPICS**

*Explain each of the following and the context in which it was discussed during this unit’s lessons.*

1. representative democracy

2. majority tyranny

3. federalism

4. enumerated powers

5. legislative power

6. executive power

7. judicial power

8. judicial review
**PRIMARY SOURCES**

*Explain the main arguments in each of the following sources and their significance to our understanding of the United States Constitution.*

9. *Federalist* 10

10. *Federalist* 51

**QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND**

*Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and writing should be employed, and responses must fully answer each question.*

11. How is representation supposed to lead to the creation of better laws?

12. What is separation of powers? Why does the Constitution separate the powers of government?
13. Which purposes and powers does Congress have?

14. How can Congress check and balance the power of the president?

15. What purposes and powers does the presidency have?

16. Explain the role of the president in relation to foreign policy. What powers does he have and not have?

17. What is judicial review? How was the power first claimed and asserted?

18. To whom are elected officials and the Constitution itself ultimately subject?

19. Why does the 2nd Amendment make it evident that the Founders found it necessary to guarantee to private citizens the right to possess tools used for their self-defense?

20. What is due process? Why is it such an important legal guarantor of freedom?
Writing Assignment — The United States Constitution

DIRECTIONS

Citing primary sources and conversations from class in your argument, write a 4–5 paragraph essay answering the question:

How does the Constitution attempt to make sure the best people (wisest, honest, most talented, dutiful to the people they represent, etc.) are making, enforcing, and judging laws so that the laws that result are the most just?
APPENDIX B

Primary Sources

The American People

James Madison
BACKGROUND

Delegates to the Constitutional Convention drafted and the states ratified this Constitution, forming the second national government for the United States of America.

ANNOTATIONS

Preamble

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

Article I

Section 1. All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Section 2. The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States, and the Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature.

No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the Age of twenty five Years, and been seven Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected,

---

be an Inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons, including those bound to Service for a Term of Years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three fifths of all other Persons. The actual Enumeration shall be made within three Years after the first Meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent Term of ten Years, in such Manner as they shall by Law direct. The Number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every thirty Thousand, but each State shall have at Least one Representative; and until such enumeration shall be made, the State of New Hampshire shall be entitled to choose three, Massachusetts eight, Rhode-Island and Providence Plantations one, Connecticut five, New-York six, New Jersey four, Pennsylvania eight, Delaware one, Maryland six, Virginia ten, North Carolina five, South Carolina five, and Georgia three.

When vacancies happen in the Representation from any State, the Executive Authority thereof shall issue Writs of Election to fill such Vacancies.

The House of Representatives shall choose their Speaker and other Officers; and shall have the sole Power of Impeachment.

Section 3. The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the Legislature thereof, for six Years; and each Senator shall have one Vote.

Immediately after they shall be assembled in Consequence of the first Election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three Classes. The Seats of the Senators of the first Class shall be vacated at the Expiration of the second Year, of the second Class at the Expiration of the fourth Year, and of the third Class at the Expiration of the sixth Year, so that one third may be chosen every second Year; and if Vacancies happen by Resignation, or otherwise, during the Recess of the Legislature of any State, the Executive thereof may make temporary Appointments until the next Meeting of the Legislature, which shall then fill such Vacancies.
No Person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty Years, and been nine Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen.

The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no Vote, unless they be equally divided.

The Senate shall choose their other Officers, and also a President pro tempore, in the Absence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the Office of President of the United States.

The Senate shall have the sole Power to try all Impeachments. When sitting for that Purpose, they shall be on Oath or Affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside: And no Person shall be convicted without the Concurrence of two thirds of the Members present.

Judgment in Cases of Impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from Office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any Office of honor, Trust or Profit under the United States: but the Party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to Indictment, Trial, Judgment and Punishment, according to Law.

Section 4. The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of choosing Senators.

The Congress shall assemble at least once in every Year, and such Meeting shall be on the first Monday in December, unless they shall by Law appoint a different Day.

Section 5. Each House shall be the Judge of the Elections, Returns and Qualifications of its own Members, and a Majority of each shall constitute a Quorum to do Business; but a smaller Number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the Attendance of absent Members, in such Manner, and under such Penalties as each House may provide.
Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behavior, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.

Each House shall keep a Journal of its Proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such Parts as may in their Judgment require Secrecy; and the Yeas and Nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the Desire of one fifth of those Present, be entered on the Journal.

Neither House, during the Session of Congress, shall, without the Consent of the other, adjourn for more than three days, nor to any other Place than that in which the two Houses shall be sitting.

Section 6. The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States. They shall in all Cases, except Treason, Felony and Breach of the Peace, be privileged from Arrest during their Attendance at the Session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any Speech or Debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other Place.

No Senator or Representative shall, during the Time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil Office under the Authority of the United States, which shall have been created, or the Emoluments whereof shall have been encreased during such time; and no Person holding any Office under the United States, shall be a Member of either House during his Continuance in Office.

Section 7. All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills.

Every Bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a Law, be presented to the President of the United States; If he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his Objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the Objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If after such Reconsideration two thirds of that House shall agree to pass the Bill, it shall be sent, together with the Objections, to the other House, by which it shall
likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two thirds of that House, it shall become a
Law. But in all such Cases the Votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and Nays,
and the Names of the Persons voting for and against the Bill shall be entered on the Journal
of each House respectively. If any Bill shall not be returned by the President within ten days
(Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the Same shall be a Law, in
like Manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress by their Adjournment prevent its
Return in which Case it shall not be a Law.

Every Order, Resolution, or Vote to which the Concurrence of the Senate and House of
Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of Adjournment) shall be pre-
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sented to the President of the United States; and before the Same shall take Effect, shall be
approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two thirds of the Senate
and House of Representatives, according to the Rules and Limitations prescribed in the
Case of a Bill.

Section 8. The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and
Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the
United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United
States;

To borrow Money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the
20
Indian Tribes;

To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bank-
ruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of
Weights and Measures;

25 To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the
United States;

To establish Post Offices and post Roads;
To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;—And

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.
Section 9. The Migration or Importation of such Persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the Year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a Tax or duty may be imposed on such Importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each Person.

The Privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it.

No Bill of Attainder or ex post facto Law shall be passed.

No Capitation, or other direct, Tax shall be laid, unless in Proportion to the Census or Enumeration herein before directed to be taken.

No Tax or Duty shall be laid on Articles exported from any State.

No Preference shall be given by any Regulation of Commerce or Revenue to the Ports of one State over those of another: nor shall Vessels bound to, or from, one State, be obliged to enter, clear, or pay Duties in another.

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.

Section 10. No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts; pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, or Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts, or grant any Title of Nobility.

No State shall, without the Consent of the Congress, lay any Imposts or Duties on Imports or Exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection Laws: and
the net Produce of all Duties and Imposts, laid by any State on Imports or Exports, shall be for the Use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such Laws shall be subject to the Revision and Control of the Congress.

No State shall, without the Consent of Congress, lay any duty of Tonnage, keep Troops, or Ships of War in time of Peace, enter into any Agreement or Compact with another State, or with a foreign Power, or engage in War, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent Danger as will not admit of delay.

Article II

Section 1. The executive Power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his Office during the Term of four Years, and, together with the Vice-President chosen for the same Term, be elected as follows:

Each State shall appoint, in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors, equal to the whole Number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress: but no Senator or Representative, or Person holding an Office of Trust or Profit under the United States, shall be appointed an Elector.

The Electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by Ballot for two Persons, of whom one at least shall not be an Inhabitant of the same State with themselves. And they shall make a List of all the Persons voted for, and of the Number of Votes for each; which List they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the Seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall, in the Presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the Certificates, and the Votes shall then be counted. The Person having the greatest Number of Votes shall be the President, if such Number be a Majority of the whole Number of Electors appointed; and if there be more than one who have such Majority, and have an equal Number of Votes, then the House of Representatives shall immediately choose by Ballot one of them for President; and if no Person have a Majority, then from the five highest on the List the said House shall in like Manner choose the President. But in choosing the President, the Votes shall be taken by States, the Representation from each State having one Vote; a quorum for
this Purpose shall consist of a Member or Members from two thirds of the States, and a
Majority of all the States shall be necessary to a Choice. In every Case, after the Choice of
the President, the Person having the greatest Number of Votes of the Electors shall be the
Vice President. But if there should remain two or more who have equal Votes, the Senate
shall choose from them by Ballot the Vice President.

The Congress may determine the Time of choosing the Electors, and the Day on which
they shall give their Votes; which Day shall be the same throughout the United States.

No Person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of
the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President; neither shall
any Person be eligible to that Office who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty-five
Years, and been fourteen Years a Resident within the United States.

In Case of the Removal of the President from Office, or of his Death, Resignation, or Ina-
Bility to discharge the Powers and Duties of the said Office, the Same shall devolve on the
Vice President, and the Congress may by Law provide for the Case of Removal, Death,
Resignation or Inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what Officer
shall then act as President, and such Officer shall act accordingly, until the Disability be
removed, or a President shall be elected.

The President shall, at stated Times, receive for his Services, a Compensation, which shall
neither be increased nor diminished during the Period for which he shall have been elected,
and he shall not receive within that Period any other Emolument from the United States,
or any of them.

Before he enter on the Execution of his Office, he shall take the following Oath or Affirma-
tion:—"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President
of the United States, and will to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and defend the
Constitution of the United States."

Section 2. The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United
States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the
United States; he may require the Opinion, in writing, of the principal Officer in each of
the executive Departments, upon any subject relating to the Duties of their respective Of-
fices, and he shall have Power to grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offenses against the
United States, except in Cases of Impeachment.

He shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties,
provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with
the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers
and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States,
whose Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established
by Law: but the Congress may by Law vest the Appointment of such inferior Officers, as
they think proper, in the President alone, in the Courts of Law, or in the Heads of Depart-
ments.

The President shall have Power to fill up all Vacancies that may happen during the Recess
of the Senate, by granting Commissions which shall expire at the End of their next Session.

Section 3. He shall from time to time give to the Congress Information of the State of the
Union, and recommend to their Consideration such Measures as he shall judge necessary
and expedient; he may, on extraordinary Occasions, convene both Houses, or either of
them, and in Case of Disagreement between them, with Respect to the Time of Adjourn-
ment, he may adjourn them to such Time as he shall think proper; he shall receive Ambas-
sadors and other public Ministers; he shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed,
and shall Commission all the Officers of the United States.

Section 4. The President, Vice President and all civil Officers of the United States, shall be
removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other
high Crimes and Misdemeanors.

**Article III**

Section 1. The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court,
and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish.
The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good
Section 2. The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority;—to all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls;—to all Cases of admiralty and maritime Jurisdiction; —to Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party; —to Controversies between two or more States;—between a State and Citizens of another State;—between Citizens of different States;—between Citizens of the same State claiming Lands under Grants of different States, and between a State, or the Citizens thereof, and foreign States, Citizens or Subjects.

In all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, and those in which a State shall be Party, the supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction. In all the other Cases before mentioned, the supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make.

The Trial of all Crimes, except in Cases of Impeachment, shall be by Jury; and such Trial shall be held in the State where the said Crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State, the Trial shall be at such Place or Places as the Congress may by Law have directed.

Section 3. Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying War against them, or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort. No Person shall be convicted of Treason unless on the Testimony of two Witnesses to the same overt Act, or on Confession in open Court.

The Congress shall have Power to declare the Punishment of Treason, but no Attainder of Treason shall work Corruption of Blood, or Forfeiture except during the Life of the Person attained.
Article IV

Section 1. Full Faith and Credit shall be given in each State to the public Acts, Records, and judicial Proceedings of every other State. And the Congress may by general Laws prescribe the Manner in which such Acts, Records and Proceedings shall be proved, and the Effect thereof.

Section 2. The Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of Citizens in the several States.

A Person charged in any State with Treason, Felony, or other Crime, who shall flee from Justice, and be found in another State, shall on Demand of the executive Authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having Jurisdiction of the Crime.

No Person held to Service or Labor in one State, under the Laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in Consequence of any Law or Regulation therein, be discharged from such Service or Labor, but shall be delivered up on Claim of the Party to whom such Service or Labor may be due.

Section 3. New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the Junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the Consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

Section 4. The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic Violence.
Article V

The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

Article VI

All Debts contracted and Engagements entered into, before the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation.

This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States.
Article VII

The Ratification of the Conventions of nine States, shall be sufficient for the Establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the Same.

Done in Convention by the Unanimous Consent of the States present the Seventeenth Day of September in the Year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and Eighty seven and of the Independence of the United States of America the Twelfth In witness whereof We have hereunto subscribed our Names.

George Washington—
President and deputy from Virginia
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George Read, Gunning Bedford, Jr., John Dickinson, Richard Bassett, Jacob Broom
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James McHenry, Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer, Daniel Carroll
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John Blair, James Madison, Jr.
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William Blount, Richard Dobbs Spaight, Hugh Williamson
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John Rutledge, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, Charles Pinckney, Pierce Butler
Georgia

William Few, Abraham Baldwin

New Hampshire

John Langdon, Nicholas Gilman

Massachusetts

Nathaniel Gorham, Rufus King

Connecticut

William Samuel Johnson, Roger Sherman

New York

Alexander Hamilton
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William Livingston, David Brearley, William Paterson, Jonathan Dayton

Pennsylvania

Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Mifflin, Robert Morris, George Clymer, Thomas FitzSimmons, Jared Ingersoll, James Wilson, Gouverneur Morris

Attest William Jackson Secretary
Amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America

Amendment I

Ratified December 15, 1791

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Amendment II

Ratified December 15, 1791

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

Amendment III

Ratified December 15, 1791

No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

Amendment IV

Ratified December 15, 1791

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.
Amendment V

Ratified December 15, 1791

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Amendment VI

Ratified December 15, 1791

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defense.

Amendment VII

Ratified December 15, 1791

In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.
Amendment VIII

Ratified December 15, 1791

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

Amendment IX

Ratified December 15, 1791

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Amendment X

Ratified December 15, 1791

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Amendment XI

Ratified February 7, 1795

The Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State.

Amendment XII

Ratified June 15, 1804

The Electors shall meet in their respective states and vote by ballot for President and Vice-President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same state with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice-President, and they shall make distinct lists of all per-
sons voted for as President, and of all persons voted for as Vice-President, and of the number of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of the government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate;—the President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted;—The person having the greatest number of votes for President, shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of Electors appointed; and if no person have such majority, then from the persons having the highest numbers not exceeding three on the list of those voted for as President, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. But in choosing the President, the votes shall be taken by states, the representation from each state having one vote; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or members from two-thirds of the states, and a majority of all the states shall be necessary to a choice. And if the House of Representatives shall not choose a President whenever the right of choice shall devolve upon them, before the fourth day of March next following, then the Vice-President shall act as President, as in the case of the death or other constitutional disability of the President.—The person having the greatest number of votes as Vice-President, shall be the Vice-President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of Electors appointed, and if no person have a majority, then from the two highest numbers on the list, the Senate shall choose the Vice-President; a quorum for the purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice. But no person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice-President of the United States.

Amendment XIII

Ratified December 6, 1865

Section 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

Section 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.
Amendment XIV

Ratified July 9, 1868

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

Section 3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice-President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.
Section 4. The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.

Section 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

**Amendment XV**

Ratified February 3, 1870

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

**Amendment XVI**

Ratified February 3, 1913

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

**Amendment XVII**

Ratified April 8, 1913

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.
When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive au-
therity of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: Provided, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appoint-
ments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.

This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.

Amendment XVIII

Ratified January 16, 1919

Section 1. After one year from the ratification of this article the manufacture, sale, or trans-
portation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof for bev-
erage purposes is hereby prohibited.

Section 2. The Congress and the several States shall have concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Section 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amend-
ment to the Constitution by the legislatures of the several States, as provided in the Constitu-
tion, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Con-
gress.

Amendment XIX

Ratified August 18, 1920

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.
Amendment XX

Ratified January 23, 1933

Section 1. The terms of the President and the Vice President shall end at noon on the 20th day of January, and the terms of Senators and Representatives at noon on the 3rd day of January, of the years in which such terms would have ended if this article had not been ratified; and the terms of their successors shall then begin.

Section 2. The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall begin at noon on the 3rd day of January, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.

Section 3. If, at the time fixed for the beginning of the term of the President, the President elect shall have died, the Vice President elect shall become President. If a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or if the President elect shall have failed to qualify, then the Vice President elect shall act as President until a President shall have qualified; and the Congress may by law provide for the case wherein neither a President elect nor a Vice President shall have qualified, declaring who shall then act as President, or the manner in which one who is to act shall be selected, and such person shall act accordingly until a President or Vice President shall have qualified.

Section 4. The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.

Section 5. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect on the 15th day of October following the ratification of this article.

Section 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission.
Amendment XXI

Ratified December 5, 1933

Section 1. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

Section 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited.

Section 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress.

Amendment XXII

Ratified February 27, 1951

Section 1. No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than two years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of President more than once. But this Article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President when this Article was proposed by the Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this Article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term.

Section 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.
Amendment XXIII

Ratified March 29, 1961

Section 1. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct:

A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the twelfth article of amendment.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment XXIV

Ratified January 23, 1964

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment XXV

Ratified February 10, 1967

Section 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

Section 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.
Section 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

Section 4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office.
Amendment XXVI

Ratified July 1, 1971

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States, who are eighteen years of age or older, to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment XXVII

Ratified May 7, 1992

No law varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives shall take effect, until an election of Representatives shall have intervened.


**Publius (James Madison)**

**Federalist No. 10**

**Essay Excerpts**

November 22, 1787

*Daily Advertiser* | New York City, New York

**BACKGROUND**

Publius (James Madison) argues for the proposed Constitution by explaining the risks of factions and majority tyranny and how the Constitution addresses them.

**GUIDING QUESTIONS**

1. How does Madison define faction?
2. How is faction part of human nature?
3. How is minority faction solved?
4. What is the solution for majority faction?
5. What is the role of elected representatives in solving the problem of faction?
6. How does a large republic address the problem of majority faction?
7. What are the concerns of a republic being too large or too small?

The Union as a Safeguard Against Domestic Faction and Insurrection

Among the numerous advantages promised by a well-constructed Union, none deserves to be more accurately developed than its tendency to break and control the violence of faction.

By a faction I understand a number of citizens, whether amounting to a majority or minority of the whole, who are united and actuated by some common impulse of passion, or of interest, adverse to the rights of other citizens, or to the permanent and aggregate interests of the community.

The latent causes of faction are thus sown in the nature of man; and we see them everywhere brought into different degrees of activity, according to the different circumstances of civil society. A zeal for different opinions concerning religion, concerning government, and many other points, as well as speculation as of practice; an attachment to different leaders ambitiously contending for preeminence and power; or to persons of other descriptions whose fortunes have been interesting to the human passions, have, in turn, divided mankind into parties, inflamed them with mutual animosity, and rendered them much more disposed to vex and oppress each other than to cooperate for their common good. So strong is this propensity of mankind to fall into mutual animosities that where no substantial occasion presents itself the most frivolous and fanciful distinctions have been sufficient to kindle their unfriendly passions and excite their most violent conflicts. But the most common and durable source of factions has been the various and unequal distribution of property. Those who hold and those who are without property have ever formed distinct interests in society. Those who are creditors, and those who are debtors, fall under a like discrimination. A landed interest, a manufacturing interest, a mercantile interest, a moneyed interest, with many lesser interests, grow up of necessity in civilized nations, and divide them into different classes, actuated by different sentiments and views. The regulation of these various and interfering interests forms the principal task of modern legislation and involves the spirit of party and faction in the necessary and ordinary operations of government.
The inference to which we are brought is that the causes of faction cannot be removed and that relief is only to be sought in the means of controlling its effects.

If a faction consists of less than a majority, relief is supplied by the republican principle, which enables the majority to defeat its sinister views by regular vote. It may clog the administration, it may convulse the society; but it will be unable to execute and mask its violence under the forms of the Constitution. When a majority is included in a faction, the form of popular government, on the other hand, enables it to sacrifice to its ruling passion or interest both the public good and the rights of other citizens. To secure the public good and private rights against the danger of such a faction, and at the same time to preserve the spirit and the form of popular government, is then the great object to which our inquiries are directed. Let me add that it is the great desideratum by which alone this form of government can be rescued from the opprobrium under which it has so long labored and be recommended to the esteem and adoption of mankind.

By what means is this object attainable? Evidently by one of two only. Either the existence of the same passion or interest in a majority at the same time must be prevented, or the majority, having such coexistent passion or interest, must be rendered, by their number and local situation, unable to concert and carry into effect schemes of oppression. If the impulse and the opportunity be suffered to coincide, we well know that neither moral nor religious motives can be relied on as an adequate control. They are not found to be such on the injustice and violence of individuals, and lose their efficacy in proportion to the number combined together, that is, in proportion as their efficacy becomes needful.

From this view of the subject it may be concluded that a pure democracy, by which I mean a society consisting of a small number of citizens, who assemble and administer the government in person, can admit of no cure for the mischiefs of faction. A common passion or interest will, in almost every case, be felt by a majority of the whole; a communication and concert result from the form of government itself; and there is nothing to check the inducements to sacrifice the weaker party or an obnoxious individual. Hence it is that such democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention; have ever been found
incompatible with personal security or the rights of property; and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths. Theoretic politicians, who have patronized this species of government, have erroneously supposed that by reducing mankind to a perfect equality in their political rights, they would at the same time be perfectly equalized and assimilated in their possessions, their opinions, and their passions.

A republic, by which I mean a government in which the scheme of representation takes place, opens a different prospect and promises the cure for which we are seeking. Let us examine the points in which it varies from pure democracy, and we shall comprehend both the nature of the cure and the efficacy which it must derive from the Union.

The two great points of difference between a democracy and a republic are: first, the delegation of the government, in the latter, to a small number of citizens elected by the rest; secondly, the greater number of citizens and greater sphere of country over which the latter may be extended.

The effect of the first difference is, on the one hand, to refine and enlarge the public views by passing them through the medium of a chosen body of citizens, whose wisdom may best discern the true interest of their country and whose patriotism and love of justice will be least likely to sacrifice it to temporary or partial considerations. Under such a regulation it may well happen that the public voice, pronounced by the representatives of the people, will be more consonant to the public good than if pronounced by the people themselves, convened for the purpose. On the other hand, the effect may be inverted. Men of factious tempers, of local prejudices, or of sinister designs, may, by intrigue, by corruption, or by other means, first obtain the suffrages, and then betray the interests of the people. The question resulting is, whether small or extensive republics are most favorable to the election of proper guardians of the public weal; and it is clearly decided in favor of the latter by two obvious considerations.

In the first place it is to be remarked that however small the republic may be the representatives must be raised to a certain number in order to guard against the cabals of a few; and that however large it may be they must be limited to a certain number in order to guard
against the confusion of a multitude. Hence, the number of representatives in the two cases
not being in proportion to that of the two constituents, and being proportionally greatest
in the small republic, it follows that if the proportion of fit characters be not less in the large
than in the small republic, the former will present a greater option, and consequently a
greater probability of a fit choice.

In the next place, as each representative will be chosen by a greater number of citizens in
the large than in the small republic, it will be more difficult for unworthy candidates to
practise with success the vicious arts by which elections are too often carried; and the suf-
frages of the people being more free, will be more likely to center on men who possess the
most attractive merit and the most diffusive and established characters.

It must be confessed that in this, as in most other cases, there is a mean, on both sides of
which inconveniences will be found to lie. By enlarging too much the number of electors,
you render the representative too little acquainted with all their local circumstances and
lesser interests; as by reducing it too much, you render him unduly attached to these, and
too little fit to comprehend and pursue great and national objects. The federal Constitution
forms a happy combination in this respect; the great and aggregate interests being referred
to the national, the local and particular to the State legislatures.

The other point of difference is the greater number of citizens and extent of territory which
may be brought within the compass of republican than of democratic government; and it
is this circumstance principally which renders factious combinations less to be dreaded in
the former than in the latter. The smaller the society, the fewer probably will be the distinct
parties and interests composing it; the fewer the distinct parties and interests, the more
frequently will a majority be found of the same party; and the smaller the number of indi-
viduals composing a majority, and the smaller the compass within which they are placed,
the more easily will they concert and execute their plans of oppression. Extend the sphere
and you take in a greater variety of parties and interests; you make it less probable that a
majority of the whole will have a common motive to invade the rights of other citizens; or
if such a common motive exists, it will be more difficult for all who feel it to discover their
own strength and to act in unison with each other. Besides other impediments, it may be remarked that, where there is a consciousness of unjust or dishonorable purposes, communication is always checked by distrust in proportion to the number whose concurrence is necessary.

Hence, it clearly appears that the same advantage which a republic has over a democracy in controlling the effects of faction is enjoyed by a large over a small republic—is enjoyed by the Union over the States composing it. Does this advantage consist in the substitution of representatives whose enlightened views and virtuous sentiments render them superior to local prejudices and to schemes of injustice? It will not be denied that the representation of the Union will be most likely to possess these requisite endowments. Does it consist in the greater security afforded by a greater variety of parties, against the event of any one party being able to outnumber and oppress the rest? In an equal degree, does the increased variety of parties comprised within the Union increase this security? Does it, in fine, consist in the greater obstacles opposed to the concert and accomplishment of the secret wishes of an unjust and interested majority? Here again the extent of the Union gives it the most palpable advantage.

The influence of factious leaders may kindle a flame within their particular States but will be unable to spread a general conflagration through the other States. A religious sect may degenerate into a political faction in a part of the Confederacy; but the variety of sects dispersed over the entire face of it must secure the national councils against any danger from that source. A rage for paper money, for an abolition of debts, for an equal division of property, or for any other improper or wicked project, will be less apt to pervade the whole body of the Union than a particular member of it, in the same proportion as such a malady is more likely to taint a particular county or district than an entire State.

In the extent and proper structure of the Union, therefore, we behold a republican remedy for the diseases most incident to republican government. And according to the degree of pleasure and pride we feel in being republicans ought to be our zeal in cherishing the spirit and supporting the character of federalists.
**PUBLIUS (JAMES MADISON)**

**Federalist No. 51**

**ESSAY**

February 8, 1788

*The New-York Packet* | New York City, New York

---

**BACKGROUND**

Publius (James Madison) argues for the proposed Constitution by explaining the risks of a concentration of power and how the Constitution addresses them.

**GUIDING QUESTIONS**

1. What does it mean for each branch of government to have a will of its own?
2. Is the separation of powers absolute, or should the powers overlap?
3. What additional methods help the government to control itself?
4. How is the power surrendered by the people divided to protect from government encroachment?
5. What is the end of government and civil society according to Publius in Federalist 51?

---

The Structure of the Government Must Furnish the Proper Checks and Balances Between the Different Departments

To what expedient, then, shall we finally resort, for maintaining in practice the necessary partition of power among the several departments, as laid down in the Constitution? The only answer that can be given is, that as all these exterior provisions are found to be inadequate, the defect must be supplied, by so contriving the interior structure of the government as that its several constituent parts may, by their mutual relations, be the means of keeping each other in their proper places. Without presuming to undertake a full development of this important idea, I will hazard a few general observations, which may perhaps place it in a clearer light, and enable us to form a more correct judgment of the principles and structure of the government planned by the convention.

In order to lay a due foundation for that separate and distinct exercise of the different powers of government, which to a certain extent is admitted on all hands to be essential to the preservation of liberty, it is evident that each department should have a will of its own; and consequently should be so constituted that the members of each should have as little agency as possible in the appointment of the members of the others. Were this principle rigorously adhered to, it would require that all the appointments for the supreme executive, legislative, and judiciary magistracies should be drawn from the same fountain of authority, the people, through channels having no communication whatever with one another. Perhaps such a plan of constructing the several departments would be less difficult in practice than it may in contemplation appear. Some difficulties, however, and some additional expense would attend the execution of it. Some deviations, therefore, from the principle must be admitted. In the constitution of the judiciary department in particular, it might be inexpedient to insist rigorously on the principle: first, because peculiar qualifications being essential in the members, the primary consideration ought to be to select that mode of choice which best secures these qualifications; secondly, because the permanent tenure by which the appointments are held in that department, must soon destroy all sense of dependence on the authority conferring them.
It is equally evident, that the members of each department should be as little dependent as possible on those of the others, for the emoluments annexed to their offices. Were the executive magistrate, or the judges, not independent of the legislature in this particular, their independence in every other would be merely nominal.

But the great security against a gradual concentration of the several powers in the same department, consists in giving to those who administer each department the necessary constitutional means and personal motives to resist encroachments of the others. The provision for defense must in this, as in all other cases, be made commensurate to the danger of attack. Ambition must be made to counteract ambition. The interest of the man must be connected with the constitutional rights of the place. It may be a reflection on human nature, that such devices should be necessary to control the abuses of government. But what is government itself, but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary. In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself. A dependence on the people is, no doubt, the primary control on the government; but experience has taught mankind the necessity of auxiliary precautions.

This policy of supplying, by opposite and rival interests, the defect of better motives, might be traced through the whole system of human affairs, private as well as public. We see it particularly displayed in all the subordinate distributions of power, where the constant aim is to divide and arrange the several offices in such a manner as that each may be a check on the other that the private interest of every individual may be a sentinel over the public rights. These inventions of prudence cannot be less requisite in the distribution of the supreme powers of the State.

But it is not possible to give to each department an equal power of self-defense. In republican government, the legislative authority necessarily predominates. The remedy for this inconveniency is to divide the legislature into different branches; and to render them, by
different modes of election and different principles of action, as little connected with each other as the nature of their common functions and their common dependence on the society will admit.…

There are, moreover, two considerations particularly applicable to the federal system of America, which place that system in a very interesting point of view.

First. In a single republic, all the power surrendered by the people is submitted to the administration of a single government; and the usurpations are guarded against by a division of the government into distinct and separate departments. In the compound republic of America, the power surrendered by the people is first divided between two distinct governments, and then the portion allotted to each subdivided among distinct and separate departments. Hence a double security arises to the rights of the people. The different governments will control each other, at the same time that each will be controlled by itself.

Second. It is of great importance in a republic not only to guard the society against the oppression of its rulers, but to guard one part of the society against the injustice of the other part. Different interests necessarily exist in different classes of citizens. If a majority be united by a common interest, the rights of the minority will be insecure. There are but two methods of providing against this evil: the one by creating a will in the community independent of the majority that is, of the society itself; the other, by comprehending in the society so many separate descriptions of citizens as will render an unjust combination of a majority of the whole very improbable, if not impracticable. The first method prevails in all governments possessing an hereditary or self-appointed authority. This, at best, is but a precarious security; because a power independent of the society may as well espouse the unjust views of the major, as the rightful interests of the minor party, and may possibly be turned against both parties. The second method will be exemplified in the federal republic of the United States. Whilst all authority in it will be derived from and dependent on the society, the society itself will be broken into so many parts, interests, and classes of citizens, that the rights of individuals, or of the minority, will be in little danger from interested combinations of the majority.…
Justice is the end of government. It is the end of civil society. It ever has been and ever will be pursued until it be obtained, or until liberty be lost in the pursuit. In a society under the forms of which the stronger faction can readily unite and oppress the weaker, anarchy may as truly be said to reign as in a state of nature, where the weaker individual is not secured against the violence of the stronger; and as, in the latter state, even the stronger individuals are prompted, by the uncertainty of their condition, to submit to a government which may protect the weak as well as themselves; so, in the former state, will the more powerful factions or parties be gradually induced, by a like motive, to wish for a government which will protect all parties, the weaker as well as the more powerful.… In the extended republic of the United States, and among the great variety of interests, parties, and sects which it embraces, a coalition of a majority of the whole society could seldom take place on any other principles than those of justice and the general good; whilst there being thus less danger to a minor from the will of a major party, there must be less pretext, also, to provide for the security of the former, by introducing into the government a will not dependent on the latter, or, in other words, a will independent of the society itself. It is no less certain than it is important, notwithstanding the contrary opinions which have been entertained, that the larger the society, provided it lie within a practical sphere, the more duly capable it will be of self-government. And happily for the republican cause, the practicable sphere may be carried to a very great extent, by a judicious modification and mixture of the federal principle.
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BACKGROUND

As part of a compromise to secure the ratification of the Constitution, Federalists introduced in the first Congress a Bill of Rights as twelve amendments to the new Constitution. Below are the ten amendments that were ultimately ratified.

ANNOTATIONS

Amendment I

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Amendment II

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms shall not be infringed.

Amendment III

No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

NOTES & QUESTIONS

Amendment IV

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Amendment V

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Amendment VI

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.

Amendment VII

In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.
Amendment VIII

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

Amendment IX

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Amendment X

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.
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Why Teach Politics and Policy

It is important for students to recognize that the political thought and governance they studied about the founding is not merely an abstraction. Instead, representative self-government plays out in real life with many individuals and private associations together influencing and reflecting the views of citizens and lawmakers. The political process and arena in the United States are the unofficial parts to American representative democracy. Students should understand American politics and how it operates to know the ways in which their civic participation may be effective and effected. Moreover, students should be aware of the various public policy areas that officeholders seek to address and around which much of politics revolves.
What Teachers Should Consider

The Founders’ principal fears in practical politics—faction and demagogues—were well founded, and their attempts to mitigate these threats were some of the most innovative parts to the constitutional order they arranged. Nevertheless, partisanship arose even with the ratification of the Constitution. The growth of political parties, the dominance of the election cycle, and the plethora of interest groups and civic associations have become hallmarks of American self-government. While the Founders may have sought to avoid this arrangement more than was possible, party politics are cemented in place in the United States. Moreover, general civic participation, as Alexis de Tocqueville noted, has provided for a degree of stability and practice in self-government that has been salutary. Students should appreciate the roles of these various forms of civic participation and how they function. Students should come to understand their own role in the political process, the important privilege that Americans have to participate in the political process, and the various associations, groups, parties, and media with which they may engage. And they should understand broadly the main arenas of domestic and foreign policy, including what each is concerned with, who makes such policy, and how it is made. The goal of this unit is to help students make sense of how representatives are chosen, how policy decisions are shaped, how public opinion is formed, and the civic responsibilities and opportunities afforded to students when they become adult citizens.

How Teachers Can Learn More

**TEXTS**

*American Government and Politics*, Joseph Bessette and John Pitney

Chapters 4, 7–11, 16–18

**ONLINE COURSES** | [Online.Hillsdale.edu](http://Online.Hillsdale.edu)

*Introduction to the Constitution*

*Constitution 101*

*Constitution 201*

*The U.S. Supreme Court*
LESSON PLANS, ASSIGNMENTS, AND FORMATIVE QUIZ
Lesson 1 — Parties, Elections, and Campaigns

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn how American citizens govern themselves through the constitutional framework for elections, the Electoral College, the election process, political parties, and campaigns.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

Introduction to the Constitution  Lecture 10

TEXTS FOR TEACHERS

Teachers may craft their lessons to include some of the material in chapters 9–10 of American Government and Politics. Certain narrow selections from these chapters may be read aloud together in class based on grade level ability.

TERMS AND TOPICS

- political party
- Electoral College
- popular vote
- winner-take-all
- ballot
- split ticket
- divided government
- platform
- referendum

- recall
- initiative
- general election
- primary/primary election
- incumbent
- PAC
- campaign advertisements

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- Why was the election of 1800 so important?
- What are the roles of parties?
- How has party power moved from local parties to national parties? Is this good or bad?
- What happens during an election cycle?
- How do candidates campaign?
- How do candidates finance their campaigns?
- Where do citizens vote? What do they have to do before and during voting?
- What was the purpose of the Electoral College? How does it work?
- Why do incumbents usually win elections even when people are unsatisfied with the institution?
Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
- Question 1: What is the form of government of the United States?
- Question 4: The U.S. Constitution starts with the words “We the People.” What does “We the People” mean?
- Question 22: How long is a term for a U.S. Senator?
- Question 25: How long is a term for a member of the House of Representatives?
- Question 32: Who elects U.S. senators?
- Question 34: Who elects members of the House of Representatives?
- Question 36: The President of the United States is elected for how many years?
- Question 64: Who can vote in federal elections, run for federal office, and serve on a jury in the United States?
- Question 69: What are two examples of civic participation in the United States?
- Question 70: What is one way Americans can serve their country?
- Question 119: What is the capital of the United States?

**Keys to the Lesson**

If there is one practice that is the most famous gesture of American life, it is the holding of elections. Indeed, the foundational governing principle of America—that of representative self-government—is expressed and achieved through elections. Freely voting for our neighbors to represent our views in making and enforcing laws—and to have confidence that the process for doing so is fair and just—is the bedrock of American representative democracy, the great achievement of the founding and the envy of oppressed peoples throughout the world and down through the ages. Students should appreciate these facts and also understand how this process of choosing representatives works: both how it was originally intended to work and how it has changed over the centuries to the political process of today.

Teachers might best plan and teach Parties, Elections, and Campaigns with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Explain to students how the American Founders structured the election process. Note the great deference in matters of elections that the Founders gave to state legislatures in particular. The reason they lodged this power for establishing election procedures in state legislatures is so that a separate elected body responsive to the people of a certain area would be accountable to the people for how the elections are conducted in that area. The key was, as much as possible, to make sure that those who establish election procedure were accountable to the people of a whole state, thus dispersing the potential for election fraud and corruption. This is the same reason why redrawing congressional districts is also left up to the state legislatures.
- Explain the one major nationally directed election, that of the president. Explain what the Electoral College is, how it works, and why. Chief goals for the Founders in establishing the Electoral College for choosing the president were twofold. First, by dividing the electorate into geographic groups by state, the Electoral College forces presidential candidates to recognize and incorporate the interests of more rural and remote citizens instead of only the interests of citizens who live in high-density areas, where it is easiest and most efficient to campaign. This arrangement has arguably prevented the division of American citizens into a ruling class of cities and a colony class of rural dwellers, whose interests and needs are ignored. Second, the Electoral College was meant to allow its electors to deny someone the presidency should the electors...
determine that the candidate was a demagogue or might act tyrannically. Students should
understand that many state legislatures have both allotted the state’s electoral vote to the winner
of the state's popular vote and have required that electors be faithful to that outcome, thus
undermining the second purpose of the Electoral College. The first goal, however, remains in
place, except in those states that have required their state electors to follow the national popular
vote.

- Walk students through the election cycle, including the various stages of elections, where
candidates come from, how candidates campaign, and the roles that various groups and media
play in influencing elections.
- Emphasize how it is the parties that determine the vast majority of what happens in the election
process and who ends up on a ballot. Students should recognize that one of the most influential
roles ordinary citizens can have in the official election process is being involved in the leadership
of political parties, beginning at the local level. In fact, it was the focus on the local party that was
the traditional place to practice self-government in the United States. Politicians first gained
power in their local communities, where they had to develop a good reputation before becoming
part of the national system. This meant they were personally tied to their local communities and
the issues therein. This enabled local issues to be considered by national politicians as well.
Students should understand that while this tradition may still be the most congruent with the
intentions of the Founders and with much of American history, in recent decades national parties
often dictate the direction of a party based on national priorities, rather than local parties and the
issues they seek to address.

- Consider the relationship between elected officials and their constituents. Not only do relatively
few Americans know who their representatives are or who governs them, the representative
himself or herself has increasingly been separated from his or her constituency in terms of
geography—and especially by lifestyle and economic status. Have students consider what effect
this has on self-government.

- Have students consider why so many people do not know who governs them. Help them to
understand that politicians used to be part of the community and not separate from it. Ask them
what this separation does to politicians, to politics, and to the people governed by such
representatives.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

**Assignment:** Considering the election cycle and what is involved in campaigning, what does an
American citizen need to do in order to be elected to public office? (1 paragraph)
Lesson 2 — Civic Participation

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about American citizenship and the roles that public opinion, civic associations, interest groups, First Amendment rights, and the media play in Americans exercising their civic responsibilities.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

The U.S. Supreme Court Lecture 5

TEXTS FOR TEACHERS

Teachers may craft their lessons to include some of the material in chapters 4, 7, 8, and 11 of *American Government and Politics*. Certain narrow selections from these chapters may be read aloud together in class based on grade level ability.

TERMS AND TOPICS

citizen  
citizenship  
birthright citizenship  
naturalization  
assimilation  
melting pot  
public opinion  
suffrage  
literal  
conservative  
independent  
libertarian  
populist  
voter registration  
social media  
interest group  
civic association  
families  
philanthropy  
churches  
unions  
think tank  
grassroots  
lobbyist  
First Amendment  
news  
media  
radio  
spin  
narrative

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What is citizenship? How does one become a citizen?
- What are the rights, privileges, and responsibilities of citizenship?
- Why is it important that only citizens vote and run for office?
- What is the political spectrum? How is it a helpful tool but sometimes unhelpful?
- How do citizens learn about or become influenced by public opinion?
- How has new technology (social media) impacted how public opinion is spread and understood?
- What are direct and indirect means of political participation?
- Should everyone choose to exercise their right to vote? Why or why not?
- How do interest groups ensure that individuals' voices are heard?
- How do interest groups act against the wills of individuals?
- Why are most interest groups and think tanks headquartered in Washington, DC? What does this say about power in America? What does this mean about local associations?
- What are the benefits and drawbacks to allowing professional lobbying?
- What forms of civic associations have been more traditional in American history? On what levels of government did they tend to focus?
- Why is freedom of speech for individuals necessary for freedom and justice?
- What is the purpose of freedom of the press? Does media accomplish this?
- What is the relationship between reporting and creating news?
- Why does local journalism matter?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 1: What is the form of government of the United States?
  - Question 4: The U.S. Constitution starts with the words “We the People.” What does “We the People” mean?
  - Question 63: There are four amendments to the U.S. Constitution about who can vote. Describe one of them.
  - Question 64: Who can vote in federal elections, run for federal office, and serve on a jury in the United States?
  - Question 65: What are three rights of everyone living in the United States?
  - Question 68: How can people become United States citizens?
  - Question 69: What are two examples of civic participation in the United States?
  - Question 70: What is one way Americans can serve their country?
  - Question 97: What amendment gives citizenship to all persons born in the United States?
  - Question 98: When did all men get the right to vote?
  - Question 102: When did all women get the right to vote?

**Keys to the Lesson**

In human history, citizenship and right to vote is extraordinarily, almost miraculously, rare. It is yet another of the many privileges and benefits that Americans have and that are so easily taken for granted. This right to vote and the holding of elections lies at the heart of representative self-government, as it is this action and this process through which the people give consent to the laws under which they conduct all their other actions. Students should understand what citizenship is and what their rights and responsibilities as citizens are. Students should also recognize, however, how their views when they someday go to vote are often influenced by the prevailing opinion shared in the community. This public opinion is, in turn, influenced by political party leadership, corporations, marketing, interest groups, the media, and social media. Students should be aware of the various entities that are involved in the political process and how they attempt to influence citizens. Beyond voting and running for office, students should recognize the other ways in which citizens may and should seek to fulfill their responsibilities as free citizens, including being well-informed, making their views heard at government meetings, abiding by the law, and respecting and assisting others.
Teachers might best plan and teach Civic Participation with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Discuss with students what a citizen is and the meaning, rights, and responsibilities of citizenship. Include conversations on birthright citizenship and the naturalization process, the various responsibilities held by citizens such as respecting the rule of law, voting, volunteering, staying well-informed, and exhibited personal virtue and a responsible use of time, talents, and resources.

- Students should gain a clear perspective on voting in human history. In brief, this privilege has been exceptionally rare and, therefore, the American citizen’s right to vote is a remarkable achievement. And nearly all of the groundbreaking moments in this achievement occurred in American history.

- Consider with students the power of public opinion and its foundations in a moral outlook and education. Students should understand how public opinion is formed and influenced and how, in turn, it influences the opinions of individual citizens. Public opinion is something that dominates in a democratic society because everyone is equally powerful in a democratic republic through their votes. People tend, therefore, to consider the majority opinion to be correct, meaning that many political fights occur in the court of public opinion more than in the legislative process. The side that can command public opinion can shape the nation politically.

- Make special note of how generations of educational practices, particularly at the collegiate level, as well as the emergence of powerful new forces such as activist interest groups, corporate marketing, and social media have greatly influenced public opinion over the past several decades.

- Share with students the variety of ways in which citizens can and in many cases should participate in the civic life of the country and their local community. At the very least, citizens have a responsibility to respect the rights of others, conduct their own personal lives with virtue, and take minimal steps to be informed on issues and on their representatives by seeking out the truth and thinking for themselves.

- Help students see the robust tradition of local civic participation America used to have and the great decline in civic participation in the United States, partly owing to the centralization of politics and lawmaking at the national level, the power of interest groups, activist groups, and bureaucracy in lawmaking, and the various new kinds of entertainment and technology that occupy citizens’ time and attention.

- Note for students how private associations have always existed in America and that America was known for the vibrancy of such associations, a phenomenon recognized by Alexis de Tocqueville. Associations are innately factious, because they define beliefs and prescribe limits to participation. In early America, associations allowed individuals to come together to make their voices heard against the majority. In this way, they protected individual rights.

- Consider the role that philanthropic individuals, organizations, and religious institutions have played in American representative democracy. These associations have shaped not only the moral character and conduct of their members but also major reform movements in America, such as abolition, anti-poverty, temperance, and civil rights.

- Clarify for students that the modern interest groups that lobby in Washington, DC, are significantly different from the private and local associations that existed in early America. Many interest groups generally do not represent private individuals but reflect the interests of the comparably wealthy and powerful—and even those who have become wealthy and powerful in the name of representing the weak and the downtrodden.
Help students understand the central role journalism and writing played in the American Revolution and founding. Consider all the documents that students have read that were published and promoted through newspapers or print.

Have students consider also the reason behind the First Amendment. Freedom of speech and of the press are a vital check against the government. They provide a means for criticizing the government and for informing the public about government actions. Furthermore, freedom of speech is connected to freedom of conscience. The destruction of speech will inevitably lead to the destruction of ideas, which is possible only by destroying the creators and possessors of those ideas: people themselves.

Consider how the media is also able to abuse the respect traditionally afforded to them by the people to engage in biased reporting under the cover of objectivity, oftentimes to the benefit of those who are most powerful in society.

Emphasize that intentional efforts by individuals to research, critique, and discern true reporting when making informed political decisions is essential to a free people and to being a responsible citizen.

Consider also with students the rise of social media and its influence on public opinion. Important questions have been raised in recent years over the power that social media has held in shaping public opinion by channeling or restricting access to the sharing of certain ideas.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

**Assignment:** How can American citizens participate in politics and government and what groups or factors should they keep in mind while fulfilling their responsibilities as citizens? (1-2 paragraphs)
Unit 3 — Formative Quiz

Covering Lessons 1-2
10-15 minutes

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. Why was the election of 1800 so important?

2. Where do citizens vote? What do they have to do before and during voting?

3. What is the political spectrum?

4. How do citizens learn about or become influenced by public opinion?

5. What is the relationship between reporting and creating news?
Lesson 3 — Placeholder: State and Local Government

Note: This lesson affords a school the space to teach about the specific details of their own state and local governments. Teachers may pull in content related to their state and community while still addressing the broad points outlined below.

Lesson Objective

Students learn about the state and local governments in which they are represented, as well as some of the principles and history undergirding these governing institutions in the United States.

Online Courses for Teachers | Online.Hillsdale.edu

- Constitution 101 | Lecture 4
- The Federalist Papers | Lecture 4

Terms and Topics

- federalism
- local government
- state government
- county
- township
- city
- school board
- domestic policy

Questions for the American Mind

- What value did the Founders place on state and local governments?
- How did the Framers of the Constitution seek to empower state and local governments?
- What benefits has federalism afforded the American experiment in self-government?
- What are the structure and primary roles of offices in the state government?
- What are the structure and primary roles of offices in the local government?
- What is the relationship among federal, state, and local governments?
- Which domestic policy areas are most commonly addressed by state governments?
- Which domestic policy areas are most commonly addressed by local governments?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 61: Who is the governor of your state now?
  - Question 62: What is the capital of your state?
**KEYS TO THE LESSON**

Students should understand how their state and local governments are structured, along with the roles that each has. Students should also consider these governments in light of the Founders’ views.

Beyond teaching about their specific state and local governments, teachers might best plan and teach with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Emphasize with students how, historically, states and local governments had far more power than they do today. The Founders placed great importance on the roles and powers of state and local governments as being one of the fundamental checks on the authority of the federal government.
- Note how the policies enacted in state and local governments often directly affect and shape the daily lives of citizens more than the policies of the federal government.
- Explain to students some of the benefits of federalism and of state and local governments. Besides forming another kind of separation of powers, state and local governments allow for experimentation with certain policies on small scales prior to adopting a policy for the entire country. Federal lawmakers can then learn from these experiments. They can avoid those that were poor or adapt or improve those that worked without inflicting experimental damage on the entire country. These state governments can also sue the federal government in court and, perhaps most importantly, state and local governments allow citizens to “vote with their feet” by moving from one place with policies they dislike to another place with policies they believe are good. This requires another level of responsiveness to the people and affords sanctuaries for freedom when one state becomes more tyrannical for a time.
- Point out to students that it is the state and especially the local governments where citizens have the greatest opportunity to be involved officially in government and where they are most likely to bring about policy changes. The local level in particular becomes both an outlet for civic participation as well as an arena for future state and federal statesmen to gain experience and practice in the art of statesmanship. These levels of government, due to the smaller and more personal constituency, are also the most likely to be the most representative of a citizenry’s interests and opinions.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

**Assignment:** Outline the kinds of government under which you live and how these kinds of government affect the daily lives of you and your neighbors (1–2 paragraphs)
Lesson 4 — Domestic Policy

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about social and economic policy within the United States—including the various fields of social and economic policy, the branches of government, bureaucratic agencies, and interests involved in such policy decisions—and a broad overview of the types of contested issues in these fields that have emerged in the country’s history to the present day.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

Constitution 201 Lecture 8
The U.S. Supreme Court Lecture 4

TEXTS FOR TEACHERS

Teachers may craft their lessons to include some of the material in chapters 16-17 of American Government and Politics. Certain narrow selections from these chapters may be read aloud together in class based on grade level ability.

TERMS AND TOPICS

- free market capitalism
- socialism
- communism
- welfare
- Social Security
- Medicare/Medicaid
- charter school
- redistribution
- Gross Domestic Product (GDP)
- unemployment
- inflation
- progressive taxation
- income tax
- Internal Revenue Service
- tariff
- protectionism
- Justice Department
- Federal Bureau of Investigation

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What are the various kinds of social and economic policies?
- What were the views of the Founders in these areas?
- How had the federal government become more involved in domestic policy?
- As the federal government has become more involved in domestic policy, what has happened to the roles and importance of religious institutions, charities, and the family in addressing domestic issues and caring for their neighbors?
- How have welfare programs changed the way people view the government?
- What accounts for the complexity of the United States tax system?
- How are government programs funded?
Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
- Question 20: Name one power of the U.S. Congress.
- Question 41: Name one power of the president.
- Question 48: What are two Cabinet-level positions?
- Question 58: Name one power that is only for the federal government.
- Question 59: Name one power that is only for the states.
- Question 71: Why is it important to pay federal taxes?

KEYS TO THE LESSON

Students should receive a survey of the kinds of domestic policy areas in which government is involved. This would include especially economic and welfare policy, but also cultural matters and various kinds of legal, election, immigration, education, and family policy. American Government and Politics can provide a good guide to these fields for teachers. Students should understand of what each consists, how policy is determined, and some of the government officials and interest groups involved in such decisions.

Teachers might best plan and teach Domestic Policy with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Outline for students the various domestic policy areas. Students should be able to identify each and the kinds of actions that fall within each field, gaining a "lay of the land." Middle school is not, however, the place to delve into current policy debates or to ask students to form judgments on contemporary issues.
- Proceed to trace in history the growth in kinds of policy fields and the basic arguments that emerged within those areas. Students should appreciate that the Founders recognized and had carefully informed views on many of the same policy areas that are dealt with today. Their thoughts regarding policy for the poor, immigration, and trade are worth careful consideration.
- While there are certain functions of the federal government that deal with domestic policy (most notably maintaining the rule of law, regulating interstate commerce, coining money and setting weights and measures), note for students the great expansion in the size of the federal government, and in particular, its role in domestic policy. The Founders had structured the federal government to be principally concerned with national security and foreign policy, those fields which only an energetic and united federal government could address.
- The vast majority of policies that most directly affect the daily lives of citizens were to be made by state and local governments. This was purposeful, as such lower governments could be more knowledgeable and responsive to their constituents and the needs and interests associated with life in a certain geographic area, much more so than a centralized and distant central government could be. The locus of power in domestic policy has since shifted away from states and localities and toward Washington, DC, and its bureaucracies.

STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT

Assignment: Choose one area of domestic policy and outline what it addresses and how decisions are made within that field (1 paragraph).
Lesson 5 — National Security and Foreign Policy

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the foreign policy of the United States, including the branches of the armed forces, bureaucratic agencies, and interests involved in such policy decisions, and gain a broad overview of the types of contested issues related to national security that have emerged in the country’s history to the present day.
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The Presidency and the Constitution Lecture 6

TEXTS FOR TEACHERS

Teachers may craft their lessons to include some of the material in chapter 18 of American Government and Politics. Certain narrow selections from this chapter may be read aloud together in class based on grade level ability.

TERMS AND TOPICS

national security U.S. Border Patrol
foreign policy State Department
border Central Intelligence Agency
citizen-controlled military preemption
U.S. Army isolationism
U.S. Navy unilateralism
U.S. Marine Corps multilateralism
U.S. Air Force intelligence
U.S. Coast Guard sanctions
U.S. Space Force nongovernmental organizations

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What is the primary purpose of the federal government? Why is this the case?
- What is foreign policy? How is it related to national security?
- How is foreign policy determined in the United States?
- How is foreign policy carried out in the United States?
- Who makes treaties? Who declares war? Who conducts war? Why are these powers separated in this manner?
- What is the difference between unilateralism and multilateralism? When did the shift to multilateralism occur, and what domestic policies accompanied it?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 20: Name one power of the U.S. Congress.
  - Question 41: Name one power of the president.
Question 48: What are two Cabinet-level positions?

Question 58: Name one power that is only for the federal government.

Question 67: Name two promises that new citizens make in the Oath of Allegiance.

Question 70: What is one way Americans can serve their country?

Question 72: It is important for all men ages 18 through 25 to register for the Selective Service. Name one reason why.

**Keys to the Lesson**

Students should understand the importance of the country’s foreign policy and its fundamental connection to America’s national security. The core purpose of the federal government (as with any national government) as laid out in the United States Constitution is to provide for the common defense. All other functions—lawmaking itself, and the establishment of justice—will fall if the nation is not defended. As such, the federal government has been historically and is still primarily oriented toward national security and national self-defense. Students should be made familiar with what government actions are involved in foreign policy and national security, how the executive branch and the military are arranged toward this end, and what other entities and groups are involved in determining foreign policy.

Teachers might best plan and teach National Security and Foreign Policy with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Outline with students which areas of government action fall under the titles of national security, which fall under foreign policy, and how the two categories are related.
- Review with students how the Constitution designed the federal government and the executive in particular to address issues of national security above all its other roles.
- Emphasize with students how the American armed forces are citizen-controlled, which means military authority is responsible to political authority under the constitutional rule of law. Spend some time outlining the roles of each branch of the armed forces.
- Consider this statement from George Washington’s Farewell Address: “The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign Nations[,] is in extending our commercial relations to have with them as little political connection as possible.” Political alliances or conflicts with other nations were only to be out of necessity. As in the Declaration of Independence, other nations assume their own “separate and equal station” as well, and their independence should be respected. In general, the United States should not interfere in the internal governance of other nations unless necessary for self-defense regarding the nation’s security.
- Discuss with students how George Washington’s overall objective in foreign policy was to defend the institutions of American constitutional government at home and develop the United States to “that degree of strength and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.” That is, the purpose of American foreign policy is to protect and defend American constitutional self-government. America’s principles are universal (“all men are created equal”) but America is a particular nation, which means that while the United States models and advocates for American principles its first obligation is to the defense and perpetuation of this country.
- Consider with students how foreign policy is informed by principle but is largely an exercise in prudential decision-making in particular circumstances.
STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT

Assignment: Outline what national security and foreign policy address and how decisions are made within these fields (1 paragraph).
APPENDIX

Study Guide

Test

Writing Assignment
Study Guide — Politics and Policy Test

UNIT 3

TERMS AND TOPICS

Explain each of the following and the context in which it was discussed during this unit’s lessons.

- political party
- Electoral College
- popular vote
- winner-take-all
- ballot
- split ticket
- divided government
- primary/primary election
- incumbent
- PAC
- citizenship
- naturalization
- assimilation
- public opinion
- suffrage
- liberal
- conservative

- independent
- social media
- interest group
- civic association
- philanthropy
- churches
- unions
- think tank
- grassroots
- lobbyist
- First Amendment
- media
- narrative
- county
- township
- city
- domestic policy

- free market capitalism
- welfare
- Gross Domestic Product (GDP)
- unemployment
- inflation
- progressive taxation
- income tax
- tariff
- protectionism
- national security
- foreign policy
- border
- citizen-controlled military
- sanctions

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.

Lesson 1 | Parties, Elections, and Campaigns

☐ What are the roles of parties?
☐ How has party power moved from local parties to national parties? Is this good or bad?
☐ What happens during an election cycle?
☐ How do candidates campaign?
☐ How do candidates finance their campaigns?
☐ Where do citizens vote? What do they have to do before and during voting?
☐ What was the purpose of the Electoral College? How does it work?

Lesson 2 | Civic Participation

☐ What is citizenship? How does one become a citizen?
☐ What are the rights, privileges, and responsibilities of citizenship?
☐ How do citizens learn about or become influenced by public opinion?
□ How has new technology (social media) impacted how public opinion is spread and understood?
□ How do interest groups ensure that individuals' voices are heard?
□ How do interest groups act against the wills of individuals?
□ Why are most interest groups and think tanks headquartered in Washington, DC? What does this say about power in America? What does this mean about local associations?
□ What are the benefits and drawbacks to allowing professional lobbying?
□ What forms of civic associations have been more traditional in American history? On what levels of government did they tend to focus?
□ Why is freedom of speech for individuals necessary for freedom and justice?
□ What is the purpose of freedom of the press? Does media accomplish this?

Lesson 3 | State and Local Government

□ How did the Framers of the Constitution seek to empower state and local governments?
□ What benefits has federalism afforded the American experiment in self-government?
□ What are the structure and primary roles of offices in the state government?
□ What are the structure and primary roles of offices in the local government?
□ What is the relationship among federal, state, and local governments?
□ Which domestic policy areas are most commonly addressed by state governments?
□ Which domestic policy areas are most commonly addressed by local governments?

Lesson 4 | Domestic Policy

□ What are the various kinds of social and economic policies?
□ What were the views of the Founders in these areas?
□ As the federal government has become more involved in domestic policy, what has happened to the roles and importance of religious institutions, charities, and the family in addressing domestic issues and caring for their neighbors?
□ How have welfare programs changed the way people view the government?
□ How are government programs funded?

Lesson 5 | National Security and Foreign Policy

□ What is the primary purpose of the federal government? Why is this the case?
□ What is foreign policy? How is it related to national security?
□ How is foreign policy determined in the United States?
□ How is foreign policy carried out in the United States?
□ Who makes treaties? Who declares war? Who conducts war? Why are these powers separated in this manner?
Test — Politics and Policy

**TERMS AND TOPICS**

Explain each of the following and the context in which it was discussed during this unit’s lessons.

1. political party

2. divided government

3. PAC

4. assimilation

5. interest group

6. lobbyist

7. free market capitalism

8. citizen-controlled military
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and writing should be employed, and responses must fully answer each question.

9. What happens during an election cycle?

10. How do candidates campaign?

11. What was the purpose of the Electoral College? How does it work?

12. What are the rights, privileges, and responsibilities of citizenship?

13. How do citizens learn about or become influenced by public opinion?

14. What forms of civic associations have been more traditional in American history? On what levels of government did they tend to focus?
15. Why is freedom of speech for individuals necessary for freedom and justice?

16. What benefits has federalism afforded the American experiment in self-government?

17. As the federal government has become more involved in domestic policy, what has happened to the roles and importance of religious institutions, charities, and the family in addressing domestic issues and caring for their neighbors?

18. How have welfare programs changed the way people view the government?

19. What is foreign policy? How is it related to national security?

20. Who makes treaties? Who declares war? Who conducts war? Why are these powers separated in this manner?
Writing Assignment — Politics and Policy

DIRECTIONS

Citing primary sources and conversations from class in your argument, write a 4–5 paragraph essay answering the question:

How can citizens exercise their civic responsibilities and participate in the political process? What should they keep in mind in doing so?
UNIT 4

Challenging and Defending America’s Principles

UNIT PREVIEW

Structure

LESSON 1  The Exception to the Rule  4-5 classes  p. 7
LESSON 2  Abolitionism vs. Slavery  5-6 classes  p. 14
LESSON 3  Progressive Government  3-4 classes  p. 20
LESSON 4  Civil Rights vs. Discriminatory Laws  5-6 classes  p. 26
APPENDIX A  Study Guide, Test, Writing Assignment  p. 31
APPENDIX B  Primary Sources  p. 43

Why Teach Challenging and Defending America’s Principles

The United States was the first country in history founded on a commitment to equality: that “all men are created equal.” Since 1776, Americans’ efforts to live and govern by this principle have resulted in the greatest degrees of freedom, prosperity, and security for the most people in human history, both for American citizens and for the peoples of the world. It is unprecedented. It is what makes America exceptional, as in, the exception. But it is also true that America has not always lived up to the great truth on which she was founded. Student should understand the various domestic challenges to America’s
principles that have arisen through its history, beginning with slavery. This unit explores those challenges and also highlights the individuals and movements that came to the defense of America’s principles, pushing the country to live up to its high ideals as expressed at its founding. This is one of the dramas of American civics, and one worth considering carefully with students.

What Teachers Should Consider

The political norms and way of life which Americans today enjoy are no accident. In many respects, they may trace their origins to Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the ideas and actions of the American founding. What is today commonplace and taken for granted were, in 1776 and 1787, by far the exceptions—and sometimes unprecedented exception—to the normal course of politics and human life. Teacher and students alike must first acknowledge these facts and attempt to understand just how rare the American founding was.

But then teachers should appreciate the various challenges to the exceptional institutions and principles that bequeathed the kind of life Americans enjoy today. Challenges during the Revolution itself and through the fraught history of slavery in America were the main ways in which American ideals were first undermined, sometimes by the very people who had asserted them. Thus while the American founding was at the vanguard of asserting and securing the equal natural rights of all people—setting the nation on the path to establishing such equality in law—the institution of slavery became the foremost stumbling block toward achieving the fundamental human equality the Declaration of Independence had proclaimed. Indeed, the stumbling block was only overcome through a bloody civil war fought in large part over the argument of whether “all men are created equal.”

Additional challenges to the principle of equality and limited self-government would manifest themselves after the Civil War and in the century that followed. Reconstruction was only partially and temporarily successful while ongoing discrimination lasted into the latter half of the 20th century. After World War II, the Civil Rights Movement answered the challenges of segregation and intimidation and helped fulfill America’s founding principle of equality before the law.

All throughout their history, Americans have repeatedly arisen to meet challenges in many ways, and especially by appealing to the principles of the American founding. Students should be aware of these, think about them, and consider their implications for their own lives as they approach the full responsibilities of an American citizen.

How Teachers Can Learn More

TEXTS

*The U.S. Constitution: A Reader*, ed. Hillsdale College Politics Faculty  Chapters 7, 9, 10, 11
*African Founders*, David Hackett Fischer
*No Property in Man*, Sean Wilentz
*The State*, Woodrow Wilson
Primary Sources Studied in This Unit

This unit has a larger number of primary sources than previous units. The texts, however, are each rather brief and are targeted to be illustrative of the main ideas at hand. As with other units, assigning them to students is at the discretion of the teacher, being mindful of grade level ability and pacing.

Letter to the Hebrew Congregation, George Washington
The Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom
Letter to the Danbury Baptist Association, Thomas Jefferson
“Property,” James Madison
The Examination Number No. 7, Alexander Hamilton
Statements on slavery, George Washington, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, James Madison
Notes on the State of Virginia, Query XVIII, “Manners,” Thomas Jefferson
The Declaration of Independence, Draft
The U.S. Constitution
The Northwest Ordinance, Article III
“The Constitution of the United States: Is It Pro-Slavery or Anti-Slavery?,” Frederick Douglass
Speech on the reception of abolition petitions, John C. Calhoun
Speech on the Oregon Bill, John C. Calhoun
Speech at Peoria, Abraham Lincoln
Lincoln’s Response in the Seventh Lincoln-Douglas Debate, Abraham Lincoln
First inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln
The Emancipation Proclamation, Abraham Lincoln
Gettysburg Address, Abraham Lincoln
Second inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln
13th Amendment to the Constitution
“What Is Progress?” Woodrow Wilson
War Message to Congress, Woodrow Wilson
“The Study of Administration,” Woodrow Wilson
Annual Message to Congress, 1944, Franklin Delano Roosevelt
“The Inspiration of the Declaration,” Calvin Coolidge
Seneca Falls “Declaration of Sentiments and Resolutions,” Elizabeth Cady Stanton
14th Amendment to the Constitution
15th Amendment to the Constitution
“I Have a Dream,” Martin Luther King Jr.
LESSON PLANS, ASSIGNMENTS, AND FORMATIVE QUIZ
Lesson 1 — The Exception to the Rule

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the ways in which the American founding was a momentous change in favor of equality and freedom in the history of the world and set the status of slavery on the path to extinction.
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Introduction to the Constitution Lecture 3
Constitution 101 Lecture 6
Civil Rights in American History Lectures 1 and 2

PRIMARY SOURCES

The following primary sources are potential readings for students. Teachers should use their discretion based on grade level ability in deciding which texts to share with students. The texts may be assigned for homework, read together in class, or simply read aloud by the teacher. Some texts include guiding reading questions to assist students in the event that the text is assigned for homework. Students should annotate the texts either in preparation for or during a seminar conversation. Teachers should not feel it necessary to assign all of the texts, especially in light of grade level considerations.

Letter to the Hebrew Congregation, George Washington
The Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom
Letter to the Danbury Baptist Association, Thomas Jefferson
“Property,” James Madison
The Examination Number No. 7, Alexander Hamilton
Statements on slavery, George Washington, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, James Madison
Notes on the State of Virginia, Query XVIII, “Manners,” Thomas Jefferson
The Declaration of Independence, Draft
The U.S. Constitution
The Northwest Ordinance, Article III
“The Constitution of the United States: Is It Pro-Slavery or Anti-Slavery?,” Frederick Douglass

TERMS AND TOPICS

religious tolerance equality
property rights slavery
rule of law abolition
consent of the governed morality
voting majority tyranny
suffrage objective truth
immigration Northwest Ordinance
Questions for the American Mind

- What was unique about America regarding religion?
- What was unique about America regarding private property?
- What was unique about America regarding immigration?
- What was unique about America regarding who makes law and who is subject to law?
- What was unique about America regarding voting?
- Which two practices began at Jamestown in 1619?
- Why did Thomas Jefferson’s first draft of the Declaration of Independence include condemnations of King George for perpetuating the Atlantic slave trade? Why was this section removed?
- What was the nature of the Founders’ compromise with slavery at the time of the founding for the sake of the union? Would it have been possible to abolish slavery in the southern colonies without union?
- What efforts did some founders make to abolish slavery?
- What are the three clauses related to slavery in the Constitution? Explain each.
- How was the Three-Fifth Compromise a partial victory for slaveholders and a partial victory for abolitionists?
- How did Frederick Douglass’s views on the founding with respect to slavery change during his work for abolition?
- Why did the Founders expect that slavery would eventually die out?
- What were the unforeseen consequences of the cotton gin, invented in 1793, four years after the adoption of the Constitution?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 63: There are four amendments to the U.S. Constitution about who can vote. Describe one of them.
  - Question 65: What are three rights of everyone living in the United States?
  - Question 68: How can people become United States citizens?
  - Question 75: What group of people was taken and sold as slaves?
  - Question 78: Who wrote the Declaration of Independence?
  - Question 92: Name the U.S. war between the North and the South.
  - Question 94: Abraham Lincoln is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 95: What did the Emancipation Proclamation do?
  - Question 96: What U.S. war ended slavery?
Consider the many ways that the American colonists were in fact the "exception to the rule" in the world, both at the time and in history, particularly in the areas of self-government, religious tolerance, private property rights among commoners, immigration, and suffrage.

Begin this unit by reviewing the principles advanced in the first two paragraphs of the Declaration of Independence. Review also how the Constitution seeks to achieve freedom, equality, and justice by establishing a system of limited self-government. Most of this unit should involve references back to these founding principles throughout American history, beginning with their efficacy during the founding generation itself. Students should understand the principles of the Declaration of Independence and self-government as the ways in which America was and remains most unique in human history. They form the bedrock on which rest all of America’s exceptions compared to the normal affairs of mankind.

Note the degree of religious toleration present in the colonies and at the founding. Religious faith strongly defined colonial culture, largely because so many came to America to escape the religious persecutions of the old world. From the pilgrims and the Puritans to Roman Catholics and Jews, a wide variety of denominations are found throughout colonial settlements. This diversity fostered religious liberty and toleration at the same time that it strengthened a common morality rooted in religious faith and practice, which was widespread and imbued colonial society. Read with students George Washington’s letter to the Hebrew congregation at Newport, the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, and Thomas Jefferson’s letter to the Danbury Baptists for insights into the unprecedented religious toleration present at the founding.

Remind students that the United States was founded as a country of commoners, which was by far the exception in human history. The colonists who settled in British North America came from many nations (chiefly but not exclusively those of Europe) for many different reasons, but one thing they did not bring with them were the legal class distinctions that defined the aristocratic and monarchical nations they left behind. These individuals (except for their British governors) were largely common people who immigrated to America seeking their freedom and betterment. Prohibiting titles of nobility and class distinctions in the Constitution itself worked in tandem with the recognized importance and protection of the ability of all Americans to acquire and hold private property to better their stations in life. The rule of law, moreover, ensured that all were subject to the same law and that the law was the product of the consent of the governed. James Madison’s “Property” essay outlines the kinds of property human beings have and how its protection relates to the dignity and freedom of human beings.

Read aloud with students in class Alexander Hamilton’s Examination No. 7 on the need for a citizenry that holds certain principles and habits of conduct conducive to respecting the rights of fellow citizens. In a nation as diverse as the United States and that is not bound by blood, understanding of, adherence to, and practice in these principles of self-government become all the more important. Immigration policy for Hamilton, therefore, sought to encourage as much immigration as was justly possible and good for Americans while still achieving these prerequisites to maintaining free government. In brief, an immigrant had to understand and be willing and able to practice the responsibilities of self-government, especially respect for the rule of law.

Make sure students have a clear perspective on voting in human history. In brief, this privilege has been exceptionally rare and, therefore, the American citizen’s right to vote is a remarkable achievement. The American colonies, for instance, were one of the few places in history up to that time where most ordinary male citizens of European descent were permitted to
vote. The rule in history has been that one person made the law (monarchy) or a few did so (oligarchy). That most male citizens, even though still restricted to those of European descent, were allowed to vote in the American colonies is therefore a consequential development in world history, a significant step toward universal suffrage.

- Explain to students how women, African Americans, and men who did not own property were generally, though not always, prohibited from voting. Yet even at the founding, every state north of Pennsylvania allowed free African Americans to vote. Students should appreciate the historic gains the American people made securing the right to vote for the abovementioned peoples while also recognizing that their original curtailment was more the rule than the exception in human history, not a phenomenon unique to America. What was unique to America was the right to vote at all and then the relatively rapid rate at which the right to vote was expanded.

- Explain that originally, voting was a privilege of citizenship and not a natural right. It was also a serious duty. It was meant to be carried out by people who had significant interest in protecting America, who actively informed themselves on the issues independent of what they were simply told, and who would be called to give their lives up for their country if it were threatened. Put another way, they had a high personal stake in what the country did regarding various policies, including going to war.

- Consider the year 1619 at Jamestown as an insight into colonial America:
  - On one hand, it was in 1619 that the first Africans, having been taken from a Portuguese slave ship en route to Mexico by an English privateer, landed at Jamestown.
  - On the other hand, it was also in 1619 at Jamestown that the Virginia House of Burgesses first convened, marking the beginning of representative self-government in the colonies. This self-government would flourish for over a hundred and fifty years as the British colonists of North America largely governed themselves and developed the thought, practice, and habits of a self-governing people (a phenomenon that Edmund Burke described as “salutary neglect”).

- Familiarize students with the views of the leading Founders on slavery, including by reading their own words and Thomas Jefferson’s Query XVIII in his Notes on the State of Virginia. Northern Founders—most of whom were strongly opposed to slavery—and even some southern Founders who believed slavery immoral were politically unable to end slavery. For instance, Gouverneur Morris repeatedly railed against slaveholders in the Constitutional Convention and Thomas Jefferson, who owned slaves himself, included a condemnation of the slave trade and referred to slaves as “men” in the draft of the Declaration of Independence, a section the slaveholding interest demanded be removed. Most anti-slavery Founders continued nevertheless in the belief that the only way that they could have any influence in order to end slavery in the southern states was through union. Without unity, the Americans would very likely have lost the Revolutionary War (giving up their independence and freedom to continued British rule that would perpetuate slavery anyways) or the southern colonies would have formed their own country, in which case those who opposed slavery would have no power to abolish slavery where it existed in the South. During the Civil War, Frederick Douglass made similar arguments for preserving the Union against fellow abolitionists who wanted to let the South secede with slavery intact.

- Consider with students the sectional nature of views on slavery during the founding. The majority of northerners and northern Founders (e.g., John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Benjamin Rush, Gouverneur Morris, and John Jay) spoke and wrote extensively on the immorality of slavery and its need to be abolished. Some northern Founders, such as John Jay, Alexander Hamilton, and Benjamin Franklin, founded or served in abolitionist societies.
Consider also that even among the southern Founders who supported slavery or held slaves, several leading Founders expressed regret and fear of divine retribution for slavery in America, such as Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and George Washington. Some freed their slaves as well, such as George Washington, who by the end of his life freed the slaves in his family estate. And many, like Thomas Jefferson, nevertheless maintained that slaves were men in full possession of the natural rights of all men. Making these observations does not diminish the inhumaneness of slavery or dismiss the wrong of racism by certain colonists or other individual Americans living in other generations.

Ask students how to judge the Founders who owned slaves and yet supported the Declaration of Independence and Constitution. Students should consider their public and private lives as well as their words and deeds. Taken altogether, students should recognize the difficulty in assigning an absolute moral judgment that a person is entirely bad or entirely good.

Have students also consider the distinction between judging character absolutely versus judging individual actions. When they do, students will encounter figures who did both much that was good and also some that was bad, and that this contradiction runs through the heart of every person.

Be careful with the phrase “consider the times,” as this phrase can easily give the impression that truth and morality (good and evil) are merely relative to one’s viewpoint or historical time period. Instead, help students understand that “to consider the times” in which the American colonists and Founders lived is not to excuse moral injustices or to justify relativism. We should consider the circumstances at the time and weigh them against principles that transcend time. It’s not whitewashing or rewriting history. It is recognizing the reality of history and honestly assessing how figures at the time acted within their circumstances in light of the truth.

Provide students with a copy of the first draft of the Declaration of Independence that tracks the edits made by the Second Continental Congress. Ask students why specific changes were made. Spend time especially with the sections that addressed slavery and were removed. While these changes were insisted upon by the slaveholding interest, have students consider what it meant that Jefferson, Adams, and Franklin attempted to include such a condemnation in the first place.

When discussing compromises between the principled claims of the Declaration and the brutal matter of slavery, be mindful of the following:

- Slavery was one of the few matters of disagreement among the colonial revolutionaries in their otherwise generally united challenge to England. Those who opposed slavery as well as those who favored it agreed about the growing threat of British tyranny.
- Many northern Founders and even some slaveholding Founders recognized the hypocrisy of claiming the principle of equality in spite of the continuing institution of slavery. Nevertheless, some southern Founders did not believe this phrase to be true for slaves and therefore did not believe it was hypocritical.
- Slavery and the subsequent inequality and violations of the rights of the descendants of slaves, as well as of women and certain immigrants, are glaring ways in which the country has fallen short of its founding idea.

Take the time to consider, read, and discuss the ways in which slavery was addressed in the Constitution. Helpful in this endeavor is reading Frederick Douglass’ “The Constitution of the United States. Is It Pro-Slavery or Anti-Slavery?” as a guide. While the Constitution did not abolish slavery, it did place new significant, national limits on it. Indeed, at the time it was adopted, the Constitution marked one of the most significant moves to restrict slavery in the world. As Frederick Douglass and Abraham Lincoln would later acknowledge, the Declaration’s
principle of equality and the Constitution’s arrangements gave the Founders the belief that they had placed slavery on the path to eventual extinction.

- Clarify for students the arguments of northerners and southerners concerning the Three-Fifths Clause. The clause was not about the humanity of slaves; it was strictly about how much representation slave-owning states would receive in Congress and the Electoral College. The great hypocrisy of the slaveholders was that while they refused to call a slave a human being, they insisted that each slave be counted as a whole person for purposes of representation. In fact, it was the anti-slavery Founders who did not want slaves counted at all in the Constitution for the purposes of representation. The fact that slaves were only counted as three-fifths for the purposes of representation was a disappointment for southern states, as they had demanded they be counted as a whole person. It was a partial victory for northern opponents to slavery, as it would give the slaveholding states less influence in lawmaking than they wished. Additionally, students should understand that in the mind of those opposed to slavery, this compromise was the only politically viable route if they were to secure southern support for the Constitution, without which the country would become disunited, with the South able to perpetuate slavery indefinitely as their own country without northern abolitionists. Students need not agree with the tenets of the compromise, but they must understand it as the founders themselves understood it.

- Remind students that the slave trade was not formally limited in the states (the Continental Congress had temporarily banned the practice in 1774) until the passage of the Constitution, which allowed for it to be outlawed nationwide in 1808 (which it was) and for Congress to discourage it by imposing tariffs on the slave trade in the meantime. Students should understand that without the compromise that allowed this twenty-year delay, the power to abolish the slave trade would not have been granted by the slaveholding interest in the first place.

- Consider with students the significance of the Constitution not using the word “slave” and instead using “person.” Refusing to use the word “slave” avoided giving legal legitimacy to slavery. Even Article IV, Section 2, Clause 3 emphasizes that slavery was legal based on certain state, not federal, laws. The use of the word “person” forced even slaveholders to recognize the humanity of the slave: that he or she was in fact a human person, not property. There would be no federally-recognized “property in man.”

- Point out for students that clauses that were not about slavery but which slaveholding interests could use to their benefit were not therefore deliberately pro-slavery clauses. Such a logical fallacy would implicate as morally evil anything hijacked for use in committing a wrong act, for example, a road used by bank robbers in their getaway would be “pro-robbery.”

- Have students consider the status of slavery over the initial decades of the country’s history. At the founding, slavery was either openly condemned by northerners or defended (but seldom celebrated) by southerners. Its toleration at the time of the founding was for the sake of a unity that even many abolitionists believed was the only eventual path toward abolition. Based on the evidence at the time, many leading Founders believed slavery was naturally destined for extinction, that public opinion had steadily grown toward seeing slavery for the moral evil that it was, and that the principles of the Declaration of Independence and Revolution helped shape this public opinion and would also be the vehicle for eventual equality. The Founders also believed the Constitution restricted slavery, created a path to restricting it further (by holding the union together), and kept slavery on the path it was already travelling: to extinction. The Declaration of Independence founded the country on principles of equality that could and would be used to demand the end of slavery. The Northwest Ordinance had prohibited the expansion of slavery. The Constitution refused to give legal standing to the institution, and many states had abolished
slavery outright. Even Founders who held slaves believed the profitability of slavery was gradually but decisively waning and that slavery would die out on its own in a short period of time.

- Note for students the history-changing invention of Eli Whitney’s cotton gin in 1793, four years after the adoption of the Constitution. The cotton gin would greatly increase the profitability of slavery in the cotton-growing states of the South and thereby create a significant (and regional) interest in perpetuating the institution of slavery. The new economics of slavery that would grow out of the cotton gin and the vast cotton industry questioned the assumption and changed the projection of the founding generation concerning the viability and eventual demise of slavery.

- Consider with students how America is unprecedented in the history of the world because it was founded on the principle that “all men are created equal and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights.” Consider the view of many Founders—as well as abolitionists Abraham Lincoln and Frederick Douglass, and the meaning of the “promissory note” of Martin Luther King Jr.—that America is founded on this principle of the inherent equality of every human being based on humanity and natural rights; and that consequently, the role of the American nation and her citizens, as well as her history, has been one of trying to establish this principle in practice through a self-governing people. Almost all of the Founders recognized at the very least that the statement of the principle of equality, despite a compromise that allowed for the pre-existing institution’s continuing existence, undermined the legitimacy of slavery.

- To recap what the Founders did for the cause of freedom and equality, complete the lesson by considering the Land Ordinance of 1785 and the Northwest Ordinance of 1787. These two exceptional documents capture much of what the founding accomplished to advance the principles of America, doing so in concrete and effective law, namely, promoting private land ownership, the free exercise of religion, and public education while prohibiting the expansion of slavery.

**Strengthening Understanding: Post-Lesson Assignment**

**Assignment:** In which ways was the American founding an exception to the rule, meaning, how were its achievements regarding self-government, religious tolerance, property ownership, voting, and restricting slavery uncommon compared to the rest of the world at the time? (1-2 paragraphs)
Lesson 2 — Abolitionism vs. Slavery

**LESSON OBJECTIVE**

Students learn about the ways in which the status of slavery changed in the decades following the Founding and the efforts of abolitionists, Abraham Lincoln, and the Civil War to end slavery by appealing to America’s founding principles.

**ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS** | Online.Hillsdale.edu

*Introduction to the Constitution*  
Lecture 3  
*Constitution 101*  
Lectures 6 and 7  
*Civil Rights in American History*  
Lectures 2 and 3

**PRIMARY SOURCES**

The following primary sources are potential readings for students. Teachers should use their discretion based on grade level ability in deciding which texts to share with students. The texts may be assigned for homework, read together in class, or simply read aloud by the teacher. Some texts include guiding reading questions to assist students in the event that the text is assigned for homework. Students should annotate the texts either in preparation for or during a seminar conversation. Teachers should not feel it necessary to assign all of the texts, especially in light of grade level considerations.

- Speech on the reception of abolition petitions, John C. Calhoun
- Speech on the Oregon Bill, John C. Calhoun
- Speech at Peoria, Abraham Lincoln
- Lincoln’s Response in the Seventh Lincoln-Douglas Debate, Abraham Lincoln
- First inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln
- The Emancipation Proclamation, Abraham Lincoln
- Gettysburg Address, Abraham Lincoln
- Second inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln
- 13th Amendment to the Constitution

**TERMS AND TOPICS**

- equality  
- slavery  
- abolition  
- cotton gin  
- Missouri Compromise  
- positive good  
- sectionalism  
- Compromise of 1850  
- statesmanship  
- morality  
- Kansas-Nebraska Act  
- *Dred Scott v. Sandford*  
- “a house divided”  
- popular sovereignty  
- majority tyranny  
- objective truth  
- moral relativism  
- “don’t care”
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What were the unforeseen consequences of the cotton gin, invented in 1793, four years after the adoption of the Constitution?
- What was the argument in the defense of slavery as a “positive good” that emerged among slavery apologists in the decades after the founding?
- How did the idea of slavery as a “positive good” challenge the Constitution’s stance on slavery and the path on which the founding generation had set slavery?
- How did John C. Calhoun reject the Founders on equality, natural rights, and the social contract?
- What did the Kansas-Nebraska Act and Dred Scott v. Sandford do, both in law and as a threat to public opinion on slavery at the time?
- How did Abraham Lincoln try to halt the expansion of slavery and win the moral battle against it?
- How did Abraham Lincoln and Stephen Douglas disagree on the limits of democracy and the danger of majority tyranny?
- What were Abraham Lincoln’s arguments against moral neutrality or relativism (“don’t care”) on the question of slavery?
- How was slavery the true cause of the Civil War?
- What were the arguments for and against Southern secession?
- What were the arguments for and against the Union fighting to keep the South from seceding?
- In what ways did Abraham Lincoln manifest the ideal qualities of a statesman and the virtue of prudence?
- How did Abraham Lincoln manage to accomplish his competing goals to maintain the union, preserve the Constitution and the rule of law, and end slavery?
- What did the Emancipation Proclamation do? How was Abraham Lincoln able to justify, issue, and enforce it successfully?
- How does Abraham Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address assert that freedom and self-government require devotion—and even a willingness to sacrifice for—the country and its principles of justice?
- As presented in his second inaugural address, how did Abraham Lincoln view the Civil War as a tragedy?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 94: Abraham Lincoln is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 95: What did the Emancipation Proclamation do?

KEYS TO THE LESSON

Slavery was one of the most significant institutions and practices that ran contrary to the principles of the Declaration of Independence. Understanding the events that followed the founding generation is a key part to understanding American civics. On one hand, there were those who further entrenched slavery and on the other those who gave rise to a movement and series of events that would eventually abolish slavery.
Teachers might best plan and teach Abolitionism vs. Slavery with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Review from the previous lesson the status of slavery over the initial decades of the country’s history, including the extent that advances were made towards equality during the founding and the history-changing invention of Eli Whitney’s cotton gin in 1793, four years after the adoption of the Constitution.

- Explain to students how during the early 1800s the growth in population in the North would eventually allow northern states to restrict slavery further and perhaps even abolish it via a constitutional amendment. Southern slaveholders recognized that they had to expand the number of slave states if they were to prohibit such actions by northerners. The challenge, however, was that they needed northern states to acquiesce to such expansion. To do so, they appealed first to the argument that slavery was a positive good, as captured in the writings of John C. Calhoun. Students should read Calhoun’s two speeches in order to examine his arguments and to understand how Calhoun explicitly rejected the American founding as captured in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. Students should work through and identify the serious faults in Calhoun’s arguments, particularly in light of the previous lesson.

- Read with students parts of Lincoln’s speech in Peoria in response to the Kansas-Nebraska Act. Students should understand that Lincoln saw slavery to be, above all, a moral question, and one that every American ought to take seriously as such. Lincoln also believed that moral relativism over the question of slavery, as conveyed in the idea of popular sovereignty, was antithetical to the ideas of the Declaration of Independence, and that slavery was simply a form of majority tyranny, the very danger latent in democracy that the Founders had warned against. Finally, Lincoln condemned the Kansas-Nebraska Act as achieving a complete reversal of the stance the Constitution, the Northwest Ordinance, and the founding generation had toward slavery: that it should be contained until it was abolished and by no means allowed to spread.

- Have students consider Abraham Lincoln’s arguments on how Roger Taney’s majority opinion in Dred Scott v. Sandford effectively ruled that slaves are not humans but property, and that the Constitution protects their enslavement just as it does any other property. Lincoln points out that Taney’s ruling rejected the Founders’ view on slavery and would lead, in tandem with Stephen Douglas’s popular sovereignty, to the spread of slavery throughout the country. By extension, this reasoning would also allow for any form of majority tyranny. Put another way, Taney’s argument in Dred Scott, the idea of “might makes right,” is the same argument that animated despotic regimes like Communist Russia, Fascist Italy, or Nazi Germany.

- Help students think through Lincoln’s understanding of the morality of slavery and its relationship to the founding ideas of America: that all men are created equal, have unalienable rights, and that legitimate government is based on the consent of the governed. Students should see that, although central to the Civil War, the practical question regarding the expansion of slavery ultimately turned on the moral status of slavery.

- Consider the apparently benign stance that Stephen Douglas takes in his position of popular sovereignty—that he does not care about what a group of people does regarding slavery so long as the majority opinion decides it. Students should be asked why this is problematic. Then read with students Abraham Lincoln’s response to Douglas in their seventh debate in which Lincoln shows the moral hollowness of Douglas’ argument.
• Have students consider the arguments by the South and by Abraham Lincoln regarding the idea of “states’ rights” and the constitutionality of secession, particularly by reading and discussing Abraham Lincoln’s first inaugural address. Students should understand that there is no such thing as a “state right,” since rights belong only to persons. States (as governments) possess powers (not rights), as outlined in their state and in the federal Constitution, which the states are to use to protect the rights and the common good of their citizens (including from encroachment by the federal government). Lincoln’s first inaugural address presents the case for how secession is unconstitutional and how he, having taken an oath in his office as president, can and must preserve the Constitution and Union.

• Explain that Abraham Lincoln’s first goal in fighting the Civil War was to preserve the Union. It is important that students understand Lincoln’s reasoning. He was against slavery and wanted it abolished, but his constitutional obligation was to preserve the Union. If he acted otherwise, he would violate the Constitution and the rule of law, becoming no better than the seceding states and forfeiting his moral authority as the defender of the rule of law. Students should also know that while Lincoln did not believe he could abolish slavery alone or that abolishing slavery was the purpose for fighting the war, he nonetheless believed, like many of the Founders, that the only way to abolish slavery would be if the Union were preserved.

• Read aloud in class the Emancipation Proclamation and teach students the technicalities Abraham Lincoln navigated in thinking of it, drawing it up, and the timing of its promulgation. He had to retain the border states, abide by the Constitution, achieve victory, and earn the support of public opinion in order for slaves to be effectively freed—and he did it all. Students should understand that Lincoln’s justification for freeing the slaves involved exercising his executive powers as commander-in-chief of the armed forces during an armed rebellion. This is why Lincoln only had the authority to apply the Emancipation Proclamation to those states in actual rebellion, why it could not be applied to slave-holding border states not in rebellion, and why he knew that after the war, an amendment to the Constitution would be necessary to bring emancipation to all the states and make it permanent.

• Have students read and hold a seminar conversation on the Gettysburg Address. It is a magnificent work of oratory, but it also gets at the heart of the American founding and the ideas that maintain the United States. It also shows the importance of defending and advancing those ideas, both in the Civil War and in our own day, as is incumbent on every American citizen.

• Read and have a seminar conversation about Abraham Lincoln’s second inaugural address. Lincoln addresses many topics within the speech, both reflecting on the war and outlining a plan for after the war. In some respects, this speech is “part two” of what Lincoln began to assert in the Gettysburg Address. One of the main ideas Lincoln suggests, however, is that the Civil War was a punishment for the whole nation. This punishment was not necessarily for the mere existence of slavery but because, unlike the founding generation, the nation had in the time since the founding not continued to work for the abolition of the evil of slavery. While no country will ever be perfect, a people should work to make sure its laws do not promote the perpetuation of a practice that violates the equal natural rights of its fellow citizens.

• While a further study of Reconstruction and civil rights will occur in Lesson 4, be sure to teach about the 13th Amendment outlawing slavery that Republicans introduced during the Civil War and the states ratified in 1865.
STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT

Assignment: Why did Abraham Lincoln and other abolitionists like Frederick Douglass believe the American founding condemned slavery? How did Lincoln and abolitionists overcome new challenges in support of slavery and against the founding in order eventually to abolish slavery? (1–2 paragraphs)
Unit 4 — Formative Quiz

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. What was unique about America regarding private property?

2. What was unique about America regarding who makes law and who is subject to law?

3. How did Frederick Douglass’s views on the founding with respect to slavery change during his work for abolition?

4. How did John C. Calhoun reject the Founders on equality, natural rights, and the social contract?

5. What did the Emancipation Proclamation do? How was Abraham Lincoln able to justify, issue, and enforce it successfully?
Lesson 3 — Progressive Government

Lesson Objective

Students learn how the Progressive movement sought to bring about progress and improvement and in the process offered a critique of some founding principles and America’s constitutional order.

Online Courses for Teachers | Online.Hillsdale.edu

Introduction to the Constitution
Constitution 101
Constitution 201

Lecture 12
Lectures 8 and 9
Lectures 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 10

Primary Sources

The following primary sources are potential readings for students. Teachers should use their discretion based on grade level ability in deciding which texts to share with students. The texts may be assigned for homework, read together in class, or simply read aloud by the teacher. Some texts include guiding reading questions to assist students in the event that the text is assigned for homework. Students should annotate the texts either in preparation for or during a seminar conversation. Teachers should not feel it necessary to assign all of the texts, especially in light of grade level considerations.

“What Is Progress?” Woodrow Wilson
War Message to Congress, Woodrow Wilson
“The Study of Administration,” Woodrow Wilson
Annual Message to Congress, 1944, Franklin Delano Roosevelt
“The Inspiration of the Declaration,” Calvin Coolidge

Terms and Topics

Progressivism
relativism
special interests
monopolies
direct democracy
living Constitution
politics
administration
expertise
bureaucracy
delegation
16th Amendment
17th Amendment
18th Amendment
The New Deal
Second Bill of Rights
Great Society
welfare
libertarianism
neoconservatism
Reaganism
populism
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- How did Progressives explain their argument that human nature, truth, and politics were inevitably evolving and improving over the course of history?
- How and why did the Progressives critique the Declaration of Independence, natural rights, and social contract theory?
- What were the Progressives’ conceptions of freedom, equality, and the role of government?
- Why did Progressives think about the power of special interests, monopolies, and the wealthy in politics?
- What social reforms did Progressives pursue to deal with problems of urbanization and industrialization?
- What were Progressives’ goals in foreign policy? Why did they hold these views?
- In what ways did Progressives critique the Constitution as being too slow, mechanical, and at odds with itself?
- What were Progressives’ early arguments for a “living Constitution”?
- Why did the Progressives critique the separation of powers and checks and balances?
- Why did Progressives believe that many of the Founders’ worries over the dangers of tyranny, and majority tyranny, were outdated, and thus that limits and checks on the government’s power were outdated?
- In what ways did Progressives promote direct democracy?
- What was government by expertise, and why did the Progressives think it was a good idea?
- How does the administrative bureaucracy often claim the formerly separated legislative, executive, and judicial branches all for itself?
- How has Congress delegated its legislative power to the administrative state?
- How did Progressives reimagine the presidency?
- Why did Franklin Roosevelt argue that rights are to be granted by the government according to the social conditions of the historical moment?
- How does this view of rights and their origin conform with or differ from the Founders’ understanding of rights?
- What was Franklin Roosevelt’s Second Bill of Rights? How did these rights differ from the Founders’ original Bill of Rights?
- What were the main ideas of Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society?
- What is welfare?
- For all of the following: what were their origins, how did they attempt to answer Progressivism, how are they distinct from one another, and how might the Founders respond to them?
  - libertarianism
  - neoconservatism
  - Reaganism
  - populism
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 5: How are changes made to the U.S. Constitution?
  - Question 32: Who elects U.S. senators?
  - Question 63: There are four amendments to the U.S. Constitution about who can vote. Describe one of them.
Question 71: Why is it important to pay federal taxes?

**Keys to the Lesson**

The industrialization and urbanization that followed the Civil War in America brought a dramatic transformation to American life, business, and politics. New ideas about the role of government in light of many of these changes were imported from German philosophers and models of government. This movement known as Progressivism asserted that the economic changes since the American founding necessitated new functions by government. Moreover, the Progressive belief that human knowledge and morality had progressed since the founding generation meant that government could take on new purposes and powers as well.

Teachers might best plan and teach Progressive Government with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Lead students through considerations of how the Progressives judged the Founders to have been too focused on the individual and the value of private property ownership. As a nation without titles of nobility and class distinctions, the founders understood the great importance of the ability of all Americans to acquire and hold private property. But that was by no means the sole or primary objective of the American founding. The Progressives, however, argued that the founding (and the Constitution in particular) was designed solely to protect private property. The great changes in industry and the accumulation of capital had since then made the founding problematic by allowing too much power to become concentrated in the hands of wealthy industrialists and large businesses. Read with students Woodrow Wilson’s “What is Progress?” with these points in mind and make reference to this work throughout the lesson.

- Help students understand that the presence of large corporations may not have been an issue in and of itself so long as individuals were still free to seek their own material prosperity. The reason it was an issue for the Progressives was due to their second critique of the Founders, one that was more theoretical concerning the idea of rights. The Progressives rejected the Founders’ insistence that rights were natural, that they were part of what made one human, and that they existed only at the individual level. Instead, they maintained that rights were conditioned on social circumstances and belong to groups of people, usually organized by class. The problem with the Founders’ system of equal natural rights was that the equal protection of those rights now favored the wealthy and powerful. Progressives believed government should redefine rights according to class and group, and that government should not protect rights equally when it came to the wealthy and other “special interests.” Indeed, since rights were not based on natural personhood, they were derived instead from some other source as determined by government. This means that the possession of rights is controlled by government: they can be given but also taken away by government. Rejecting the Founders’ understanding of equal and unalienable rights grounded in human nature, the Progressive’s argued for changing rights that were controlled by government.

- Review with students the American Founders’ understanding of human nature. They understood human nature to be fixed and unchanging, good but also flawed and tending toward corrupting power. In response to human nature, government must guard against the opposite dangers of lawlessness and tyranny, accounting for the realities of human nature and rejecting the possibility of utopia. The Constitution, therefore, did not deny, demonize, or elevate human
nature, but rather tried to channel the powers of human beings into constructive institutions while mitigating man’s baser tendencies. In brief, the Constitution was constructed on an understanding of fixed human nature born of the Founders’ knowledge of history, their own experience, and their prudence.

- Share with students that while both the Founders and Progressives believed in a moral foundation to politics, Progressives critiqued the above-mentioned view of human nature and government as too pessimistic and too simplistic. Progressives instead generally believed history to be evolving and automatically moving forward. That is, when looking on the technological gains, improvements in the standard of living, and the general pace of scientific discovery, Progressives believed that human beings, even human nature itself, would also improve and would be more likely to do what is right and good automatically. At the societal level, therefore, government ought to bring about that improvement and even aim to perfect human nature. Progressives disagreed with the Founders’ argument that government’s primary purpose was to secure unchanging rights and maintain a framework for self-government. Instead, they held that the purpose of government was to keep up with evolving rights and constant social change, what they called “progress.”

- Clarify with students that studying the philosophical, institutional, and political break that the Progressives made with the Founders does not mean that Progressives were wrong to highlight issues such as child labor, workplace and consumer safety, conservation, and monopolies, as the Founders also did. These are serious problems that ought to have been and should continue to be addressed. But students should consider the arguments surrounding the appropriate response, namely, whether it is the role of government to address these issues, or if private individuals, charities, businesses, consumers, churches, civic associations, and state and local governments are the proper entities to answer these problems, especially in light of students’ understanding of both the American founding and Progressivism.

- Make sure students appreciate the shift in the purpose and operation of government under such a view: government is no longer the defender of certain fundamental rights but otherwise limited to the basic functions (lawmaking, executing law, and adjudicating law) and core responsibilities (such as maintaining courts of law and the nation’s security) of government. Rather, government is to be the active force for change in America, bringing about personal fulfillment of individuals and progress for society. Moreover, these ends were not limited to merely domestic policies but were attainable also on the world stage in foreign affairs. Woodrow Wilson’s “War Message to Congress” articulates the spirit of Progressivism in foreign policy.

- The Progressives argued that the technical and time-consuming work of actually carrying out the broad, general ideas of the law—detailing how it is to be done, implementing the laws, and making sure they are enforced to achieve their objectives—is not the work of Congress or even the President but requires a new body of experts and bureaucrats to do the real work of governing (administration) outside of and not subject to politics. Congress would delegate some of its lawmaking power to these bureaucrats, most of whom would exist under the executive branch and so could also execute the “laws” or regulations they make (in this example, the clean air and water experts would make the specific details of the law). The president can delegate his power to enforce it. They often also are given judicial powers, and have their own courts to adjudicate claims against their own laws and regulations. This shift of legislative, executive, and judicial powers away from the branches in which these powers had been separately vested by the people through the Constitution, and its accumulation under various departments and agencies, amounts to the second great shift in the Progressive worldview: government needed to be
rearranged through the creation of the administrative state to circumvent the processes of the Constitution and bring about "progress."

- Ask students about the importance of this shift away from government by representatives of the people to government by bureaucratic expertise, including whether or not it stands against the principle of representative self-government on which the Founders established the United States. Other words to characterize this view is “government by bureaucracy” or “the administrative state.”

- Emphasize how the advent of the administrative state changed the Founders’ careful insistence that powers be separated and dispersed through the separation of powers, checks and balances, and federalism, not to mention government by elected representatives. All three types of government power (legislative, executive, and judicial) are instead consolidated into bureaucratic agencies that are, moreover, highly autonomous from the people. And all of this is in the name of efficiency: trusting in improved human nature and scientific expertise to achieve higher aims via government than the founding generation ever thought possible.

- Help students to understand the various changes the Progressives made to the functioning of the government. Include in this treatment the 16th, 17th, and 18th amendments, the initiative, the referendum, the recall, etc.

- Clarify for students that the chief long-term consequence of the New Deal was the expansion and formalization of the administrative state, its bureaucratic agencies and employees, and its extensive role in American life. Students should understand that Roosevelt justified such an aggressive political shift as a response to the Great Depression. By greatly expanding and centrally organizing many new aspects of government, the New Deal cemented the idea of government as expert administration. As Roosevelt said in his “Commonwealth Club Address,” the day of “enlightened administration” had arrived.

- Emphasize that Roosevelt saw the power of government not merely as a guarantor of the freedom to exercise natural rights but as actually guaranteeing economic conditions and assuring new economic rights. New entitlement programs guaranteed certain benefits to groups or segments of the population, and implied that individuals have a right to such government entitlements just as or even more important than their natural rights. Roosevelt argued (in his “Second Bill of Rights” speech) that the old rights guaranteed in the Constitution were inadequate and that America required a new economic bill of rights to guarantee employment, housing, medical care, social security, education, and even recreation. These ideas would inform future political debates over several decades.

- Note for students the effect that the New Deal had on federalism and the separation of powers. While the courts at first attempted to uphold limits on the powers of the federal government (by rejecting, for instance, attempts to delegate power to the bureaucracy), by the end of the New Deal the Supreme Court had abandoned attempts to restrict such limits, granting Congress vast authority to legislate about anything that pertained to economic activity. And in expanding its delegations of power to the bureaucracy, Congress in turn expanded the federal government’s power to regulate those activities.

- Present Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society as the third phase of Progressivism. The Great Society argued that government was not merely meant to preserve rights (as the Founders asserted), or even to achieve economic equality and fulfillment (as in early Progressivism and the New Deal). Taking Progressivism a step further, the Great Society sought to use government to achieve a kind of human fulfillment for groups of people. It sought to bring government action to areas previously not the realm of the federal government, such as public education.
• Conclude the lesson by surveying with students general constitutionalist interests, in the wake of the several progressive movements, to return the country to what they considered a proper respect and appreciation for the accomplishments of the American founding, its grounding in the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and its establishment of the rule of law and the forms of constitutional government. For these groups which may loosely be called the “conservative movement,” in particular was an emphasis on abiding by the Constitution as a ruling expression of the consent of the governed. This brought prominence to the appointment of judges and how they should be guided by the original meaning of the Constitution rather than reading the Constitution as a “living” document that evolves with time.

• Read with students Calvin Coolidge’s “The Inspiration of the Declaration” speech on the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, and consider his description of the moral and intellectual grounding of the Declaration, in particular his statement that “If all men are created equal, that is final. If they are endowed with inalienable rights, that is final. If governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, that is final. No advance, no progress can be made beyond these propositions.”

• Explain to students that the general tension within conservatism tend to concern the degree to which government is used to secure, encourage, or achieve constitutional principles, economic liberty, and the common good.

• Help students understand the following general constitutionalist approaches over the last several decades. Consider with students the extent to which each constitutionalist movement claimed to adhere to all or specific parts of the American founding, particularly through appeals to the Declaration of Independence and an originalist reading of the Constitution.
  - Libertarianism views government in the most limited sense: to securing the rule of law and economic contracts while permitting most other activities, regardless of their morality, so long as they do not immediately harm another.
  - William F. Buckley was critical of the New Deal and especially its socialist tendencies, and was also an advocate of churches, private associations, and the family.
  - Neoconservatism emerged as critics of the welfare state and the liberalization of social policy and advocates of a strong American foreign policy.
  - The New Right were especially concerned about social issues arising out of government policies (particularly as driven by the Supreme Court).
  - Ronald Reagan attempted to combine free-market economic concerns, the new concerns about matters of moral conduct, and concerns about America’s national security (especially in the midst of the Cold War). This new consensus sought to decrease the size of government (especially the federal government and its role in America’s economy) and reestablish Constitutional limits (especially to revive federalism) while asserting American principles and national strength on the world stage.
  - In recent years, some constitutionalist views have begun to emphasize what they consider to be more secure borders, economic nationalism, a moral outlook reflective of the founding generation, and an American-centric foreign policy.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

**Assignment:** What are the ways in which Progressives disagreed with the Founders? How might the Founders have replied? (1–2 paragraphs)
Lesson 4 — Civil Rights vs. Discriminatory Laws

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the various ways in which discriminatory laws were an affront to the principles of the Declaration of Independence and about the many successful efforts to change such laws.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

Civil Rights in American History Lectures 4, 5, 7, 8, 9
The U.S. Supreme Court Lecture 8

PRIMARY SOURCES

The following primary sources are potential readings for students. Teachers should use their discretion based on grade level ability in deciding which texts to share with students. The texts may be assigned for homework, read together in class, or simply read aloud by the teacher. Some texts include guiding reading questions to assist students in the event that the text is assigned for homework. Students should annotate the texts either in preparation for or during a seminar conversation. Teachers should not feel it necessary to assign all of the texts, especially in light of grade level considerations.

Seneca Falls “Declaration of Sentiments and Resolutions,” Elizabeth Cady Stanton
13th Amendment to the Constitution
14th Amendment to the Constitution
15th Amendment to the Constitution
“I Have a Dream,” Martin Luther King Jr.

TERMS AND TOPICS

19th Amendment
Worcester v. Georgia
Dawes Act
Indian Citizenship Act
nativism
Chinese Exclusion Act
melting pot
Civil Rights Act of 1866
13th Amendment
14th Amendment

15th Amendment
black codes
Jim Crow
segregation
“separate but equal”
discrimination
civil rights
civil rights movement
“promissory note”
color-blind
Civil Rights Act of 1964
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- How has suffrage been expanded since the founding?
- To what did Elizabeth Cady Stanton appeal in the Seneca Falls Declaration?
- Compare Andrew Johnson’s Reconstruction actions and those of the Radical Republicans.
- Regarding the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments, what did each do?
- In which ways did former confederate states attempt to curtail the rights of freedmen during Reconstruction? How did they respond to the actions of Republicans in the north?
- What kinds of gains did African Americans attain during Reconstruction after slavery was explicitly abolished via the 13th Amendment?
- What were the immediate consequences, especially for African Americans living in the South, of the end to Reconstruction in 1877?
- What forms of discrimination were present during much of the twentieth century?
- What did Plessy v. Ferguson rule? To what did Justice Harlan appeal in his dissent?
- What did Brown v. Board of Education rule?
- How did Martin Luther King Jr. justify the civil rights movement with the Declaration of Independence and the principles of the American founding?
- What did King mean by the “promissory note”?
- In what ways and by what means did the civil rights movement seek to change laws?
- In what ways and by what means did the civil rights movement seek to change the private consciences of individuals?
- In considering the Founding and the two centuries that have passed since, how have the successes of the United States in equality, security, freedom, and prosperity compared to the successes or failures of other nations in these areas? To what extent do those countries’ founding principles and governing institutions resemble or differ from America’s?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 63: There are four amendments to the U.S. Constitution about who can vote. Describe one of them.
  - Question 65: What are three rights of everyone living in the United States?
  - Question 97: What amendment gives citizenship to all persons born in the United States?
  - Question 98: When did all men get the right to vote?
  - Question 99: Name one leader of the women’s rights movement in the 1800s.
  - Question 102: When did all women get the right to vote?
  - Question 112: What did the civil rights movement do?
  - Question 113: Martin Luther King Jr. Is famous for many things. Name one.

KEYS TO THE LESSON

The story of Native American and African American civil rights has been one of failure, sacrifice, and eventual triumph in American history. Reconstruction was a period in which Congress attempted to secure civil rights for African Americans in accordance with the principles on which America was founded. The fact that the division over civil rights was largely though not exclusively along geographic lines and that it came in the wake of a bitter war meant for less than ideal circumstances for achieving long-term successes. Nonetheless, slavery was explicitly abolished by the Constitution and civil rights were enacted and guaranteed, albeit only by military force. The gains witnessed for African Americans were impressive in
many respects, but racial ideologies and resentments left over from the Civil War made for a fraught effort to achieve civil rights and heal the country. It would take almost a century for the modern civil rights movement to achieve in law what the Declaration of Independence and Abraham Lincoln outlined for America, a movement led especially by Martin Luther King, Jr.

Teachers might best plan and teach Civil Rights vs. Discriminatory Laws with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Consider with students distinctions between discrimination on the part of an individual person and laws which are discriminatory. While this unit makes the personal moral appeal to each person to respect the inherent, equal human dignity of each person, its focus is on laws that were explicitly discriminatory. That is, the letter of the law favored one individual over another simply based on the shade of their skin or biological sex.

- Read with students Elizabeth Cady Stanton’s 1848 Seneca Falls “Declaration of Sentiments and Resolutions.” Note Stanton’s appeal to the principles of the Declaration to argue for women’s suffrage. The 19th Amendment secured the right to vote for women in 1920, though many states had secured women’s voting rights decades earlier.

- Trace with students the history of Native Americans and U.S. citizenship. Consider the numerous instances in which Native Americans were denied their rights and the great gains they have witnessed in having those rights secured through American history, including the various laws to make Native Americans citizens and the ways in which Native Americans retain their own status as nations. Pages 106-108 of *American Government and Politics* offers a strong overview of this history.

- Have students consider the effect of Abraham Lincoln’s assassination on Reconstruction and the future of America, especially as regards civil rights for African Americans. Lincoln’s focus was healing the nation while simultaneously providing for the effective and long-term establishment of equal rights for African Americans.

- The transformation of a society away from decades of slavery was no small task. Reconstruction was tragically undermined and strained by the conflicts between congressional Republicans (who strongly opposed slavery), President Andrew Johnson (a pro-Union Democrat with little sympathy for former slaves), and lawmakers in the Southern states (who mostly wished to restrict the rights of the new freedmen), all of whom operated out of distrust following a painful and bloody Civil War.

- Have students read the three amendments to the Constitution related to the abolition of slavery and citizenship of freedmen. It is important to note the major and meaningful efforts northern Republicans made to guarantee the rights of African Americans.

- Teach students about both the important gains and protections Republicans won for African Americans during Reconstruction as well as the ways in which these were undermined by actions in the former Confederate states and Andrew Johnson himself. Students should gain an appreciation for the remarkable speed and degrees to which former slaves were incorporated into the civil body early in Reconstruction, including the thousands of African Americans who would hold office at the local, state, and even federal level. But they should also understand the ways that Johnson resisted equal treatment of African Americans and in doing so encouraged and allowed certain policies, like “black codes” passed by state legislatures, and movements, such as what would become the Ku Klux Klan, in the former Confederacy. In fact, many of the reversals of reconstruction began during the presidential reconstruction of Johnson, who was decidedly
against secession but by no means opposed to slavery. Congress repeatedly had to override his vetoes and enact Constitutional amendments to prevent his defense of inequalities.

- Have students learn about the ways in which many civil rights achievements were thwarted or undone both during and after Reconstruction. For instance, spend time discussing how as Southerners of European descent were reenfranchised, African American officials were voted out of office and how “black codes” would eventually become Jim Crow laws. Discuss how “black codes” limited freedmen’s civil rights and imposed economic restrictions, including making being unemployed illegal, prohibiting landownership, requiring long-term labor contracts, prohibiting assemblies of freedmen only, prohibiting teaching freedmen to read or write, segregating public facilities, prohibiting freedmen from serving on juries, and carrying out corporal punishments for violators, among other restrictions and injustices. Note also the use of poll taxes and literacy tests to prohibit African Americans from voting.

- Cover how northern Republicans passed and President Ulysses S. Grant signed into law the Ku Klux Klan Acts to prohibit intimidation of freedmen exercising their civil rights. Grant also empowered the president to use the armed forces against those who tried to deny freedmen equal protection under the laws. Nonetheless, such measures were usually sloppily or half-heartedly enforced.

- At the same time, note the improvements during Reconstruction in building hospitals, creating a public school system, securing civil rights in principle, and fostering community within the freedmen community, especially in marital and family stability and through vibrant churches.

- Explain that Reconstruction effectively ended with the Compromise of 1877 that settled the disputed election of 1876. With southern Democrats back in Congress, they would allow Republican Rutherford B. Hayes to be declared president in exchange for withdrawing federal troops in former confederate states. Point out that in the backdrop was both continuing Southern resistance to civil rights and a gradual waning of Northern zeal for (and political interest in) reform within the South after twelve years.

- Ask students to consider the tragic nature of Reconstruction: a time of so much hoped for and achieved in applying the principle of equal natural rights was repeatedly undermined and mismanaged, then suddenly ended for political expediency, enabling new forms of injustice in certain areas of the country, after a war to end injustice had consumed the lives of hundreds of thousands of Americans.

- Nevertheless, make sure students do not lose sight of the momentous achievements in liberty, equality, and self-government fulfilled because of the Civil War. Students should appreciate the very significant achievements of Lincoln and the Civil War while looking forward to future generations of Americans who would seek to live up to the fundamental principles of America in their own times.

- In general, canvass with students various government actions related to voter participation, such as the 15th, 19th, and 26th Amendments, Jim Crow, and poll taxes. Students should consider how each of these changes affects voting and the practice of representative self-government.

- Explain to students how the Supreme Court argued in *Plessy v. Ferguson* that segregation based on race, so long as circumstances were the same, would be considered “equal.” Students should think about Justice Harlan’s dissent, however, which appealed to the understanding of equality as found in the Declaration in order to condemn the ruling.
Help students to understand the significance of *Brown v. Board of Education*, especially once it was gradually enforced in the years following the decision. The court arrived at a judgment that aligned with the founding understanding of equality, even though it did not cite the founding principles but instead social science. Consider whether or not basing the decision on social science instead of the founding principles left open the possibility for government discrimination in different forms going forward.

Consider with students the goals and means of the civil rights movement in the terms in which Martin Luther King Jr. set them. He argued that the civil rights movement was meant to redeem the “promissory note” of the Declaration of Independence and Reconstruction Amendments that founded America on an idea: that since all men are created equal, justice demands that the rule of law be applied equally to all citizens. The civil rights movement, in King’s view, thus carried on the legacy of the founders, Frederick Douglass, and Abraham Lincoln. The two primary sources from King outline this view, its ties to the natural law, and its appeals to the Christian roots of such a political philosophy.

Spend time outlining what was meant by equality during the civil rights movement, both politically and philosophically. On the civil or political side, the civil rights movement’s appeal to equality in the Declaration of Independence demanded the equal application of the rule of law and the end to laws that established and enforced segregation and discrimination. The rights of all citizens were to be protected equally instead of protecting the rights of only some and not others based on the color of their skin. This was the great achievement of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. On the philosophical or moral side, Martin Luther King, Jr. also as a pastor called for a transformation in the heart of each American. For in addition to reforms in law, a color-blind society requires that each person would decide to view all people as equals in their humanity and rights.

Clarify with students how the civil rights movement largely focused on the government’s resolve and ability, based on the principle of equality, to enforce equal treatment as opposed to the creation of equity, that is, to enforcing an equality of results and outcomes.

Have students discuss and compare all of these achievements in light of America’s founding principles and history. Students should be asked to compare what America has achieved, ever since her founding, to the record of mankind up to and since the Declaration of Independence and Constitution. They should see clearly the many flaws in American history, but they should also see how it has been America’s principles and Americans sacrificing for them that have carried the day. Compared to the history of the world and to other nations, these achievements should strike students as exceptional. They should be asked to ponder what has made them possible and what might be risked if we forget, or worse yet, disavow the principles and people responsible for such degrees of equality, freedom, security, and prosperity. Students need not arrive at any one view, but they should at least entertain these kinds of questions.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

**Assignment:** Choose one of the main challenges to America’s founding principles studied in this lesson. Explain how it related to the principles of America (2-3 paragraphs).
APPENDIX A

Study Guide

Test

Writing Assignment
### TERMS AND TOPICS

Explain each of the following and the context in which it was discussed during this unit’s lessons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>religious tolerance</td>
<td>“don’t care”</td>
<td>libertarianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>property rights</td>
<td>secession</td>
<td>Reaganism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rule of law</td>
<td>states’ rights</td>
<td>19th Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consent of the governed</td>
<td>Emancipation Proclamation</td>
<td>Dawes Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suffrage</td>
<td>Progressivism</td>
<td>Indian Citizenship Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immigration</td>
<td>special interests</td>
<td>13th Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equality</td>
<td>direct democracy</td>
<td>14th Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slavery</td>
<td>living Constitution</td>
<td>15th Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abolition</td>
<td>politics</td>
<td>black codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morality</td>
<td>administration</td>
<td>Jim Crow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority tyranny</td>
<td>expertise</td>
<td>segregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sectionalism</td>
<td>bureaucracy</td>
<td>“separate but equal”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statesmanship</td>
<td>delegation</td>
<td>discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas-Nebraska Act</td>
<td>16th Amendment</td>
<td>civil rights movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dred Scott v. Sandford</td>
<td>17th Amendment</td>
<td>“promissory note”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“a house divided”</td>
<td>The New Deal</td>
<td>color-blind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>popular sovereignty</td>
<td>Second Bill of Rights</td>
<td>Civil Rights Act of 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moral relativism</td>
<td>Great Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>welfare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PRIMARY SOURCES

Explain the main arguments in each of the following sources and their significance to our understanding of challenges to and defenses of America’s principles.

- Statements on slavery, George Washington, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, James Madison
- “The Constitution of the United States: Is It Pro-Slavery or Anti-Slavery?,” Frederick Douglass
- The Emancipation Proclamation, Abraham Lincoln
- Gettysburg Address, Abraham Lincoln
- 13th Amendment to the Constitution
- “What Is Progress?” Woodrow Wilson
- Seneca Falls “Declaration of Sentiments and Resolutions,” Elizabeth Cady Stanton
- 14th Amendment to the Constitution
- 15th Amendment to the Constitution
- “I Have a Dream,” Martin Luther King Jr.
**QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND**

*Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.*

**Lesson 1 | The Founding: The Exception to the Rule**

- What was unique about America regarding religion?
- What was unique about America regarding private property?
- What was unique about America regarding immigration?
- What was unique about America regarding who makes law and who is subject to law?
- What was unique about America regarding voting?
- What was the nature of the Founders’ compromise with slavery at the time of the founding for the sake of the union? Would it have been possible to abolish slavery in the southern colonies without union?
- Why did many in the founding generation expect that slavery would eventually die out so long as it was not allowed to expand?
- What efforts did some founders make to abolish slavery?
- How was the Three-Fifth Compromise a partial victory for slaveholders and a partial victory for abolitionists?
- How did Frederick Douglass’s views on the founding with respect to slavery change during his work for abolition?

**Lesson 2 | Abolitionism vs. Slavery**

- What were the unforeseen consequences of the cotton gin, invented in 1793, four years after the adoption of the Constitution?
- How did the idea of slavery as a “positive good” challenge the Constitution’s stance on slavery and the path on which the founding generation had set slavery?
- How did John C. Calhoun reject the Founders on equality, natural rights, and the social contract?
- What did the Kansas-Nebraska Act and *Dred Scott v. Sandford* do, both in law and as a threat to public opinion on slavery at the time?
- How did Abraham Lincoln try to halt the expansion of slavery and win the moral battle against it?
- What were Abraham Lincoln’s arguments against moral neutrality or relativism (“don’t care”) on the question of slavery?
- What were the arguments for and against the Union fighting to keep the South from seceding?
- In what ways did Abraham Lincoln manifest the ideal qualities of a statesman and the virtue of prudence?
- How did Abraham Lincoln manage to accomplish his competing goals to maintain the union, preserve the Constitution and the rule of law, and end slavery?
- What did the Emancipation Proclamation do? How was Abraham Lincoln able to justify, issue, and enforce it successfully?
- How does Abraham Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address assert that freedom and self-government require devotion—and even a willingness to sacrifice for—the country and its principles of justice?
- As presented in his second inaugural address, how did Abraham Lincoln view the Civil War as a tragedy?
Lesson 3 | Progressive Government

☐ How did Progressives explain their argument that human nature, truth, and politics were inevitably evolving and improving over the course of history?
☐ What were the Progressives’ conceptions of freedom, equality, and the role of government?
☐ Why did Progressives think about the power of special interests, monopolies, and the wealthy in politics?
☐ What were Progressives’ goals in foreign policy? Why did they hold these views?
☐ In what ways did Progressives critique the Constitution as being too slow, mechanical, and at odds with itself?
☐ What were Progressives’ arguments for a “living Constitution”?
☐ Why did the Progressives critique the separation of powers and checks and balances?
☐ Why did Progressives believe that many of the Founders’ worries over the dangers of tyranny, and majority tyranny, were outdated, and thus that limits and checks on the government’s power were outdated?
☐ What was government by expertise, and why did the Progressives think it was a good idea?
☐ How does the administrative bureaucracy often claim the formerly separated legislative, executive, and judicial branches all for itself?
☐ How has Congress delegated its legislative power to the administrative state?
☐ How did Progressives reimagine the presidency?
☐ Why did Franklin Roosevelt argue that rights are to be granted by the government according to the social conditions of the historical moment?
☐ How does this view of rights and their origin differ from the Founders’ understanding of rights?
☐ What were the main ideas of Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society?
☐ How did Reaganism attempt to answer Progressivism?

Lesson 4 | Civil Rights vs. Discriminatory Laws

☐ How has suffrage been expanded since the founding?
☐ To what did Elizabeth Cady Stanton appeal in the Seneca Falls Declaration?
☐ Regarding the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments, what did each do?
☐ What kinds of gains did African Americans attain during Reconstruction after slavery was explicitly abolished via the 13th Amendment?
☐ What forms of discrimination were present during much of the twentieth century?
☐ What did Plessy v. Ferguson rule? To what did Justice Harlan appeal in his dissent?
☐ What did Brown v. Board of Education rule?
☐ How did Martin Luther King Jr. justify the civil rights movement with the Declaration of Independence and the principles of the American founding?
☐ What did King mean by the “promissory note”?
☐ In what ways did the civil rights movement seek to change laws?
☐ In what ways did the civil rights movement seek to change the private consciences of individuals?
Test — Challenging and Defending America’s Principles

TERMS AND TOPICS

Explain each of the following and the context in which it was discussed during this unit's lessons.

1. property rights

2. statesmanship

3. “a house divided”

4. living Constitution

5. bureaucracy

6. The New Deal

7. Reaganism

8. segregation
PRIMARY SOURCES

Explain the main arguments in each of the following sources and their significance to our understanding of the challenges to and defenses of America’s principles.


10. “I Have a Dream,” Martin Luther King Jr.

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and writing should be employed, and responses must fully answer each question.

11. What was the nature of the Founders’ compromise with slavery at the time of the founding for the sake of the union? Would it have been possible to abolish slavery in the southern colonies without union?

12. What efforts did some founders make to abolish slavery?
13. How did Abraham Lincoln try to halt the expansion of slavery and win the moral battle against it?

14. How did Abraham Lincoln manage to accomplish his competing goals to maintain the union, preserve the Constitution and the rule of law, and end slavery?

15. What were the Progressives’ conceptions of freedom, equality, and the role of government?

16. Why did Progressives believe that many of the Founders’ worries over the dangers of tyranny, and majority tyranny, were outdated, and thus that limits and checks on the government’s power were outdated?

17. How does the administrative bureaucracy often claim the formerly separated legislative, executive, and judicial branches all for itself?

18. What forms of discrimination were present during much of the twentieth century?

19. How did Martin Luther King Jr. justify the civil rights movement with the Declaration of Independence and the principles of the American founding?

20. In what ways and by what means did the civil rights movement seek to change the private consciences of individuals?
Writing Assignment — Challenging and Defending America’s Principles

DIRECTIONS

Citing primary sources and conversations from class in your argument, write a 4–5 paragraph essay answering the question:

How have America’s principles been challenged throughout its history and how have Americans appealed to the American founding in order to defend these principles against such challenges?
APPENDIX B

Primary Sources

George Washington

The Virginia General Assembly

Thomas Jefferson

James Madison

Alexander Hamilton

John Adams

Benjamin Franklin

The American People

The United States Congress

Frederick Douglass

John C. Calhoun

Abraham Lincoln

Woodrow Wilson

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

Calvin Coolidge

Elizabeth Cady Stanton

Martin Luther King Jr.
PRESIDENT GEORGE WASHINGTON

To the Hebrew Congregation in Newport

LETTER

August 18, 1790
Newport, Rhode Island

BACKGROUND

In his response to a congratulatory note sent by the congregation on the occasion of his election, George Washington expresses his gratitude and discusses religious liberty.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What has "toleration" been replaced with? What is the distinction Washington makes?

2. What natural rights does Washington refer to, and how are they to be protected?

Gentlemen:

While I receive, with much satisfaction, your Address replete with expressions of esteem; I rejoice in the opportunity of assuring you, that I shall always retain grateful remembrance of the cordial welcome I experienced in my visit to Newport, from all classes of Citizens.

The reflection on the days of difficulty and danger which are past is rendered the more sweet, from a consciousness that they are succeeded by days of uncommon prosperity and security. If we have wisdom to make the best use of the advantages with which we are now favored, we cannot fail, under the just administration of a good Government, to become a great and happy people.

The Citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy: a policy worthy of imitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that toleration is spoken of, as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people, that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural rights. For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support.

It would be inconsistent with the frankness of my character not to avow that I am pleased with your favorable opinion of my Administration and fervent wishes for my felicity. May the Children of the Stock of Abraham, who dwell in this land, continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other Inhabitants; while every one shall sit in safety under his own vine and figtree, and there shall be none to make him afraid. May the father of all mercies scatter light and not darkness in our paths, and make us all in our several vocations useful here, and in his own due time and way everlastingly happy.
THOMAS JEFFERSON
Statute for Religious Freedom
DRAFT BILL
1777
Virginia

BACKGROUND

This 1777 draft bill was the blueprint for one eventually passed in Virginia in 1786, and was one of three actions for which Thomas Jefferson wanted credited mentioned on his tombstone, in addition to being author of the Declaration of Independence and founder of the University of Virginia.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What has Almighty God given man with respect to his mind?
2. What does this statute say are the problems with compelled contributions of money to religion?
3. What particular right of man does this statute protect?

I. Well aware that the opinions and belief of men depend not on their own will but follow involuntarily the evidence proposed to their minds; that Almighty God hath created the mind free; and manifested his supreme will that free it shall remain by making it altogether insusceptible of restraint; that all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments, or burdens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the plan of the holy author of our religion, who being lord both of body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercions on either, as was in his Almighty power to do but to extend it by its influence on reason alone; that the impious presumption of legislators and rulers, civil as well as ecclesiastical, who, being themselves but fallible and uninspired men, have assumed dominion over the faith of others, setting up their own opinions and modes of thinking as the only true and infallible, and as such endeavoring to impose them on others, hath established and maintained false religions over the greatest part of the world and through all time: That to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves and abhors, is sinful and tyrannical; that even the forcing him to support this or that teacher of his own religious persuasion, is depriving him of the comfortable liberty of giving his contributions to the particular pastor whose morals he would make his pattern, and whose powers he feels most persuasive to righteousness and is withdrawing from the ministry those temporary rewards, which proceeding from an approbation of their personal conduct, are an additional incitement to earnest and unremitting labors for the instruction of mankind; that our civil rights have no dependence on our religious opinions, any more than our opinions in physics or geometry; that therefore the proscribing any citizen as unworthy the public confidence by laying upon him an incapacity of being called to offices of trust and emolument, unless he profess or renounce this or that religious opinion, is depriving him injuriously of those privileges and advantages to which, in common with his fellow citizens, he has a natural right; that it tends also to corrupt the principles of that religion it is meant to encourage, by bribing, with a monopoly of worldly honors and emoluments, those who will externally profess and conform to it; that though indeed these are criminal who do not withstand such temptation, yet neither are those innocent who lay the bait in their way that the opinions of men are not the object of civil government, nor under its jurisdiction; that to suffer
the civil magistrate to intrude his powers into the field of opinion and to restrain the profession or propagation of principles on supposition of their ill tendency is a dangerous fallacy, which at once destroys all religious liberty, because he being of course judge of that tendency will make his opinions the rule of judgement, and approve or condemn the sentiments of others only as they shall square with or differ from his own; that it is time enough for the rightful purposes of civil government for its officers to interfere when principles break out into overt acts against peace and good order; and finally, that truth is great and will prevail if left to herself; that she is the proper and sufficient antagonist to error, and has nothing to fear from the conflict unless by human interposition disarmed of her natural weapons, free argument and debate; errors ceasing to be dangerous when it is permitted freely to contradict them.

II. We the General Assembly of Virginia do enact, that no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burdened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer, on account of his religious opinions or belief; but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities.

And though we well know that this Assembly, elected by the people for the ordinary purposes of legislation only, have no power to restrain the acts of succeeding Assemblies, constituted with powers equal to our own, and that therefore to declare this act to be irrevocable would be of no effect in law; yet we are free to declare, and do declare, that the rights hereby asserted are of the natural rights of mankind, and that if any act shall be hereafter passed to repeal the present or to narrow its operation, such act will be an infringement of natural right.
PRESIDENT THOMAS JEFFERSON (DEMOCRATIC-REPUBLICAN)

To the Danbury Baptist Association

LETTER

January 1, 1802
Danbury, Connecticut

BACKGROUND

President Thomas Jefferson responds to the Danbury Baptist Association's request that as president, he aid them in overcoming laws inhibiting religious liberty in Connecticut.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. How does Jefferson interpret the First Amendment’s Establishment and Free Exercise clauses?

2. Given the principle of federalism, what, as president, is Jefferson able to do for the Association?

Gentlemen:

The affectionate sentiments of esteem and approbation which you are so good as to express towards me, on behalf of the Danbury Baptist Association, give me the highest satisfaction. My duties dictate a faithful and zealous pursuit of the interests of my constituents, and in proportion as they are persuaded of my fidelity to those duties, the discharge of them becomes more and more pleasing. Believing with you that religion is a matter which lies solely between man and his God, that he owes account to none other for his faith or his worship, that the legislative powers of government reach actions only, and not opinions, I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should "make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," thus building a wall of separation between Church and State. Adhering to this expression of the supreme will of the nation in behalf of the rights of conscience, I shall see with sincere satisfaction the progress of those sentiments which tend to restore to man all his natural rights, convinced he has no natural right in opposition to his social duties.

I reciprocate your kind prayers for the protection and blessing of the common Father and Creator of man, and tender you for yourselves and your religious association, assurances of my high respect and esteem.
**REPUBLICAN JAMES MADISON (VA)**

“Property”

**ESSAY**

March 27, 1792

*The National Gazette* | Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

**BACKGROUND**

James Madison included this essay as part of a series of articles he wrote for *The National Gazette* in the early years of American government under the Constitution.

**GUIDING QUESTIONS**

1. What are the two senses of the word "property" according to Madison?

2. In what way can man’s rights, opinions, and the use of his faculties be his property?

3. According to Madison, what must a government do to secure the various senses of property?

---

This term in its particular application means “that dominion which one man claims and exercises over the external things of the world, in exclusion of every other individual.”

In its larger and juster meaning, it embraces every thing to which a man may attach a value and have a right; and which leaves to every one else the like advantage.

In the former sense, a man’s land, or merchandise, or money is called his property.

In the latter sense, a man has a property in his opinions and the free communication of them.

He has a property of peculiar value in his religious opinions, and in the profession and practice dictated by them.

He has a property very dear to him in the safety and liberty of his person.

He has an equal property in the free use of his faculties and free choice of the objects on which to employ them.

In a word, as a man is said to have a right to his property, he may be equally said to have a property in his rights.

Where an excess of power prevails, property of no sort is duly respected. No man is safe in his opinions, his person, his faculties, or his possessions.

Where there is an excess of liberty, the effect is the same, though from an opposite cause.

Government is instituted to protect property of every sort; as well that which lies in the various rights of individuals, as that which the term particularly expresses. This being the end of government, that alone is a just government, which impartially secures to every man, whatever is his own.

According to this standard of merit, the praise of affording a just securing to property, should be sparingly bestowed on a government which, however scrupulously guarding the possessions of individuals, does not protect them in the enjoyment and communication of
their opinions, in which they have an equal, and in the estimation of some, a more valuable property.

More sparingly should this praise be allowed to a government, where a man’s religious rights are violated by penalties, or fettered by tests, or taxed by a hierarchy. Conscience is the most sacred of all property; other property depending in part on positive law, the exercise of that, being a natural and unalienable right. To guard a man’s house as his castle, to pay public and enforce private debts with the most exact faith, can give no title to invade a man’s conscience which is more sacred than his castle, or to withhold from it that debt of protection, for which the public faith is pledged, by the very nature and original conditions of the social pact.

That is not a just government, nor is property secure under it, where the property which a man has in his personal safety and personal liberty, is violated by arbitrary seizures of one class of citizens for the service of the rest. A magistrate issuing his warrants to a press gang, would be in his proper functions in Turkey or Indostan, under appellations proverbial of the most complete despotism.

That is not a just government, nor is property secure under it, where arbitrary restrictions, exemptions, and monopolies deny to part of its citizens that free use of their faculties, and free choice of their occupations, which not only constitute their property in the general sense of the word; but are the means of acquiring property strictly so called. What must be the spirit of legislation where a manufacturer of linen cloth is forbidden to bury his own child in a linen shroud, in order to favor his neighbour who manufactures woolen cloth; where the manufacturer and wearer of woolen cloth are again forbidden the economical use of buttons of that material, in favor of the manufacturer of buttons of other materials!

A just security to property is not afforded by that government, under which unequal taxes oppress one species of property and reward another species: where arbitrary taxes invade the domestic sanctuaries of the rich, and excessive taxes grind the faces of the poor; where the keenness and competitions of want are deemed an insufficient spur to labor, and taxes
are again applied, by an unfeeling policy, as another spur; in violation of that sacred prop-
erty, which Heaven, in decreeing man to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow, kindly
reserved to him, in the small repose that could be spared from the supply of his necessities.

If there be a government then which prides itself in maintaining the inviolability of prop-
erty; which provides that none shall be taken directly even for public use without indemni-
fication to the owner, and yet directly violates the property which individuals have in their
opinions, their religion, their persons, and their faculties; nay more, which indirectly vio-
lates their property, in their actual possessions, in the labor that acquires their daily sub-
sistence, and in the hallowed remnant of time which ought to relieve their fatigues and
soothe their cares, the influence will have been anticipated, that such a government is not
a pattern for the United States.

If the United States mean to obtain or deserve the full praise due to wise and just govern-
ments, they will equally respect the rights of property, and the property in rights; they will
rival the government that most sacrely guards the former; and by repelling its example in
violating the latter, will make themselves a pattern to that and all other governments.
LUCIUS CRASSUS (ALEXANDER HAMILTON)
The Examination Number VII
ARTICLE

New-York Evening Post | New York City, New York

BACKGROUND

Alexander Hamilton wrote this article examining President Thomas Jefferson's message to Congress at the beginning of his presidency.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. According to Hamilton, what are the several principles that ought to govern immigration?

The next exceptionable feature in the Message, is the proposal to abolish all restriction on naturalization, arising from a previous residence. In this the President is not more at variance with the concurrent maxims of all commentators on popular governments, than he is with himself. The Notes on Virginia are in direct contradiction to the Message, and furnish us with strong reasons against the policy now recommended. The passage alluded to is here presented: Speaking of the population of America, Mr. Jefferson there says, “Here I will beg leave to propose a doubt. The present desire of America, is to produce rapid population, by as great importations of foreigners as possible. But is this founded in good policy?” “Are there no inconveniences to be thrown into the scale, against the advantage expected from a multiplication of numbers, by the importation of foreigners? It is for the happiness of those united in society, to harmonize as much as possible, in matters which they must of necessity transact together. Civil government being the sole object of forming societies, its administration must be conducted by common consent. Every species of government has its specific principles: Ours, perhaps, are more peculiar than those of any other in the universe. It is a composition of the freest principles of the English Constitution, with others, derived from natural right and reason. To these, nothing can be more opposed than the maxims of absolute monarchies. Yet from such, we are to expect the greatest number of emigrants. They will bring with them the principles of the governments they leave, imbibed in their early youth; or if able to throw them off, it will be in exchange for an unbounded licentiousness, passing as is usual, from one extreme to another. It would be a miracle were they to stop precisely at the point of temperate liberty. Their principles with their language, they will transmit to their children. In proportion to their numbers, they will share with us in the legislation. They will infuse into it their spirit, warp and bias its direction, and render it a heterogeneous, incoherent, distracted mass. I may appeal to experience, during the present contest, for a verification of these conjectures: but if they be not certain in event, are they not possible, are they not probable? Is it not safer to wait with patience for the attainment of any degree of population desired or expected? May not our government be more homogeneous, more peaceable, more durable? Suppose 20 millions of republican Americans, thrown all of a sudden into France, what would be the condition of that kingdom? If it would be more turbulent, less happy, less strong, we may believe that the addition of half a
million of foreigners, to our present numbers, would produce a similar effect here.” Thus wrote Mr. Jefferson in 1781.

…The impolicy of admitting foreigners to an immediate and unreserved participation in the right of suffrage, or in the sovereignty of a Republic, is as much a received axiom as any thing in the science of politics, and is verified by the experience of all ages. Among other instances, it is known, that hardly any thing contributed more to the downfall of Rome, than her precipitate communication of the privileges of citizenship to the inhabitants of Italy at large. And how terribly was Syracuse scourged by perpetual seditions, when, after the overthrow of the tyrants, a great number of foreigners were suddenly admitted to the rights of citizenship? Not only does ancient but modern, and even domestic history furnish evidence of what may be expected from the dispositions of foreigners, when they get too early footing in a country. Who wields the sceptre of France, and has erected a Despotism on the ruins of a Republic? A foreigner. Who rules the councils of our own ill-fated, unhappy country? And who stimulates persecution on the heads of its citizens, for daring to maintain an opinion, and for exercising the rights of suffrage? A foreigner! Where is the virtuous pride that once distinguished Americans? Where the indignant spirit which in defence of principle, hazarded a revolution to attain that independence now insidiously attacked?

LUCIUS CRASSUS
Statements on Slavery

EXCERPTS FROM FIVE FOUNDERS

1786-1819

BACKGROUND

The following excerpts catalog views of five leading Founders on the slave trade and the institution of slavery in America during the first few decades of the country’s existence.

ANNOTATIONS

George Washington

Letter to Robert Morris, April 12, 1786

"...[T]here is not a man living who wishes more sincerely than I do, to see a plan adopted for the abolition of it...."

John Adams

Letter to Robert J. Evans, June 8, 1819

"...Every measure of prudence, therefore, ought to be assumed for the eventual total extirpation of slavery from the United States.... I have, through my whole life, held the practice of slavery in...abhorrence...."

Statements on Slavery

Benjamin Franklin

An Address to the Public from the Pennsylvania Society, November 9, 1789

"...Slavery is such an atrocious debasement of human nature, that its very extirpation, if not performed with solicitous care, may sometimes open a source of serious evils...."

5

Alexander Hamilton

Philo Camillus no. 2, August 1795

"...The laws of certain states which give an ownership in the service of negroes as personal property, constitute a similitude between them and other articles of personal property, and thereby subject them to the right of capture by war. But being men, by the laws of God and nature, they were capable of acquiring liberty—and when the captor in war, to whom by the capture the ownership was transferred, thought fit to give them liberty, the gift was not only valid, but irrevocable...."

10

James Madison

Speech at the Constitutional Convention, June 6, 1787

"...We have seen the mere distinction of color made in the most enlightened period of time, a ground of the most oppressive dominion ever exercised by man over man...."
ANONYMOUS (THOMAS JEFFERSON)

Query XVIII: Manners
CHAPTER FROM NOTES ON THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

May 1785
Paris, France

BACKGROUND


GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. How did the institution of slavery harm both the enslaved and their masters?

2. Why does Jefferson fear God’s wrath?

3. What does Jefferson think of the prospects for an end to slavery?

The particular customs and manners that may happen to be received in that state?

It is difficult to determine on the standard by which the manners of a nation may be tried, whether *catholic* or *particular*. It is more difficult for a native to bring to that standard the manners of his own nation, familiarized to him by habit. There must doubtless be an unhappy influence on the manners of our people produced by the existence of slavery among us. The whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions, the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submissions on the other. Our children see this, and learn to imitate it; for man is an imitative animal. This quality is the germ of all education in him. From his cradle to his grave he is learning to do what he sees others do. If a parent could find no motive either in his philanthropy or his self-love, for restraining the intemperance of passion towards his slave, it should always be a sufficient one that his child is present. But generally it is not sufficient. The parent storms, the child looks on, catches the lineaments of wrath, puts on the same airs in the circle of smaller slaves, gives a loose to the worst of passions, and thus nursed, educated, and daily exercised in tyranny, cannot but be stamped by it with odious peculiarities. The man must be a prodigy who can retain his manners and morals undepraved by such circumstances. And with what execration should the statesman be loaded, who, permitting one half the citizens thus to trample on the rights of the other, transforms those into despots, and these into enemies, destroys the morals of the one part, and the *amor patriae* of the other. For if a slave can have a country in this world, it must be any other in preference to that in which he is born to live and labor for another; in which he must lock up the faculties of his nature, contribute as far as depends on his individual endeavors to the evanishment of the human race, or entail his own miserable condition on the endless generations proceeding from him. With the morals of the people, their industry also is destroyed. For in a warm climate, no man will labor for himself who can make another labor for him. This is so true, that of the proprietors of slaves a very small proportion indeed are ever seen to labor. And can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are of the gift of God? That they are not to be violated but with His wrath? Indeed I tremble for
my country when I reflect that God is just; that his justice cannot sleep forever; that con-
sidering numbers, nature and natural means only, a revolution of the wheel of fortune, an
echange of situation is among possible events; that it may become probable by supernat-
ural interference! The Almighty has no attribute which can take side with us in such a con-
test. But it is impossible to be temperate and to pursue this subject through the various
considerations of policy, of morals, of history natural and civil. We must be contented to
hope they will force their way into every one's mind. I think a change already perceptible,
since the origin of the present revolution. The spirit of the master is abating, that of the
slave rising from the dust, his condition mollifying, the way I hope preparing, under the
auspices of heaven, for a total emancipation, and that this is disposed, in the order of events,
to be with the consent of the masters, rather than by their extirpation.
A DECLARATION By the REPRESENTATIVES of the UNITED STATES of AMERICA,
in «GENERAL» CONGRESS ASSEMBLED

When in the Course of human Events it becomes necessary for one People to dissolve the Political Bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the Powers of the Earth the separate & equal Station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent Respect to the Opinions of Mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the Separation.

We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with inherent and unalienable Rights, that among these are Life,
Liberty, & the Pursuit of Happiness: —That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the Consent of the governed; that whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these Ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or abolish it, & to institute new Government, laying it's Foundation on such Principles, & organizing it's Powers in such Form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety & Happiness. Prudence indeed will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light & transient Causes; and accordingly all Experience hath shown that Mankind are more disposed to suffer, while Evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the Forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long Train of Abuses & Usurpations begun at a distinguished period and pursuing invariably the same Object, evinces a Design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their Right, it is their Duty to throw off such Government, & to provide new Guards for their future Security. Such has been the patient Sufferance of these Colonies; & such is now the Necessity which constrains them to expunge «alter» their former Systems of Government. The History of the present King of Great-Britain is a History of unremitting «repeated» Injuries & Usurpations, among which appears no solitary fact to contradict the uniform tenor of the rest but all have«all having» in direct Object the Establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid World for the truth of which we pledge a faith yet unsullied by falsehood.

20 He has refused his Assent to Laws, the most wholesome & necessary for the public Good.

He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly, & continually for opposing with manly Firmness his Invasions on the Rights of the People.

He has refused for a long Time, after such Dissolutions, to cause others to be elected, whereby the Legislative Powers, incapable of Annihilation, have returned to the People at large for their exercise; the State remaining in the meantime exposed to all the Dangers of Invasion from without, & Convulsions within.
He has endeavored to prevent the Population of these states; for that Purpose obstructing the laws for Naturalization of Foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their Migrations hither, & raising the Conditions of new Appropriations of Lands.

He has made our Judges dependent on his Will alone, for the Tenure of their Offices, & the Amount & payment of their Salaries.

He has erected a Multitude of new Offices by a self assumed power and sent hither Swarms of new Officers to harass our People and eat out their Substance.

He has kept among us in Times of Peace, Standing Armies, and ships of war without the consent of our Legislatures.

He has affected to render the Military independent of, & superior to the Civil power.

He has combined with others to subject us to a Jurisdiction foreign to our Constitution, & unacknowledged by our Laws; giving his Assent to their Acts of pretended Legislation:

For quartering large Bodies of Armed Troops among us:
For protecting them, by a mock-Trial, from Punishment for any Murders which they should commit on the Inhabitants of these States:
For cutting off our Trade with all Parts of the World:
For imposing Taxes on us without our consent:
For depriving us «, in many Cases,» of the Benefits of Trial by Jury:
For transporting us beyond Seas to be tried for pretended Offences:
For abolishing the free System of English Laws in a neighboring Province, establishing therein an arbitrary Government, and enlarging it's Boundaries, so as to render it at once an Example and fit Instrument for introducing the same absolute Rule into these states «Colonies»:
For taking away our Charters, abolishing our most valuable Laws, and altering fundamentally the Forms of our Governments:
For suspending our own Legislatures, & declaring themselves invested with Power to legislate for us in all Cases whatsoever.
He has abdicated Government here by withdrawing his governors, and declaring us out of his allegiance & protection «declaring us out of his Protection, and Waging war against us.» He has plundered our Seas, ravaged our Coasts, burnt our towns, & destroyed the Lives of our People.

5 He is, at this time Transporting large Armies of foreign Mercenaries to complete the works of Death, Desolation & Tyranny, already begun with circumstances of Cruelty and Perfidy «scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous Ages, & totally» unworthy the Head of a civilized Nation. He has constrained our fellow Citizens taken Captive on the high Seas to bear Arms against their Country, to become the Executioners of their Friends & Brethren, or to fall themselves by their Hands. He has «excited domestic Insurrections amongst us, & has» endeavored to bring on the Inhabitants of our Frontiers, the merciless Indian Savages, whose known Rule of Warfare, is an undistinguished Destruction, of all Ages, Sexes, & Conditions of existence. He has incited treasonable insurrections of our fellow citizens, with the allurements of forfeiture & confiscation of our property. He has waged cruel war against human nature itself, violating it's most sacred rights of life and liberty in the persons of a distant people who never offended him, captivating & carrying them into slavery in another hemisphere, or to incur miserable death in their transportation thither. This piratical warfare, the opprobrium of INFIDEL powers, is the warfare of the CHRISTIAN king of Great Britain. Determined to keep open a market where MEN should be bought & sold, he has prostituted his negative for suppressing every legislative attempt to prohibit or to restrain this execrable commerce. And that this assemblage of horrors might want no fact of distinguished die, he is now exciting those very people to rise in arms among us, and to purchase that liberty of which he has deprived them, by murdering the people on whom he also obtruded them: thus paying off former crimes committed against the LIBERTIES of one people, with crimes which he urges them to commit against the LIVES of another. In every stage of these Oppressions we have Petitioned for Redress in the most humble Terms: Our repeated Petitions have been answered only by repeated Injury. A Prince whose Character is thus marked by every act which may define a Tyrant, is unfit to be the Ruler of a «free» People who mean to be free. Future ages will scarcely believe that the hardness of
one man adventured, within the short compass of twelve years only, to lay a foundation so broad & so undisguised for tyranny over a people fostered & fixed in principles of freedom.

Nor have we been wanting in Attentions to our British Brethren. We have warned them from Time to Time of Attempts by their Legislature to extend a «an unwarrantable» jurisdiction over these our states «us». We have reminded them of the Circumstances of our Emigration & Settlement here, no one of which could warrant so strange a pretension: that these were effected at the expense of our own blood & treasure, unassisted by the wealth or the strength of Great Britain: that in constituting indeed our several forms of government, we had adopted one common king, thereby laying a foundation for perpetual league & amity with them: but that submission to their parliament was no part of our constitution, nor ever in idea, if history may be credited: and. We have appealed to their native Justice and Magnanimity as well as to «, and we have conjured them by» the Ties of our common Kindred to disavow these Usurpations, which were likely to«, would inevitably» interrupt our Connection and Correspondence. They too have been deaf to the Voice of Justice & of Consanguinity, and when occasions have been given them, by the regular course of their laws, of removing from their councils the disturbers of our harmony, they have, by their free election, re-established them in power. At this very time too they are permitting their chief magistrate to send over not only soldiers of our common blood, but Scotch & foreign mercenaries to invade & destroy us. These facts have given the last stab to agonizing affection, and manly spirit bids us to renounce forever these unfeeling brethren. We must endeavor to forget our former love for them, and hold them as we hold the rest of mankind, enemies in war, in peace friends. We might have been a free and a great people together; but a communication of grandeur & of freedom it seems is below their dignity. Be it so, since they will have it. The road to happiness & to glory is open to us too. We will tread it apart from them, and «. We must therefore» acquiesce in the Necessity which denotes our eternal Separation «, and hold them, as we hold the rest of Mankind, Enemies in War, in Peace, Friends!»

We, therefore, the Representatives of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA in General Congress Assembled, «appealing to the Supreme Judge of the World for the Rectitude of our Intentions,» do, in the name, & by the Authority of the good People of these states
reject and renounce all allegiance and subjection to the kings of Great Britain and all others who may hearafter claim by, through or under them; we utterly dissolve all political con-
nection which may heretofore have subsided between us and the people or parliament of Great Britain; and finally we do assert and declare these colonies to be free and independent states; «Colonies, solemnly Publish and Declare, That these United Colonies are, and are of Right to be, Free and Independent States; that they are absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political Connection between them and the State of Great-
Britain is and ought to be totally dissolved;» & that as Free & Independent States, they have full Power to levy War, conclude Peace, contract Alliances, establish Commerce & to do all other Acts & Things which Independent States may of right do. And for the support of this declaration, «with a firm Reliance on the Protection of divine Providence,» we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our Fortunes, & our sacred Honor.
The U.S. Congress of the Confederation

An Ordinance for the Government of the
Territory of the United States
Northwest of the River Ohio

BACKGROUND

Congress passed the Northwest Ordinance to provide the governing structure for all of the territories of the young United States, lands that would later become the states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin.

ANNOTATIONS

Article III

Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged. The utmost good faith shall always be observed towards the Indians; their lands and property shall never be taken from them without their consent; and in their property, rights, and liberty they never shall be invaded or disturbed unless in just and lawful wars authorized by Congress; but laws founded in justice and humanity shall, from time to time, be made, for preventing wrongs being done to them, and for preserving peace and friendship with them....

THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Constitution

LAW

March 4, 1789

United States of America

BACKGROUND

Delegates to the Constitutional Convention drafted and the states ratified this Constitution, forming the second national government for the United States of America.

ANNOTATIONS

Preamble

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

Article I

Section 1. All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Section 2. The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States, and the Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature.

No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the Age of twenty five Years, and been seven Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected,

be an Inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons, including those bound to Service for a Term of Years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three fifths of all other Persons. The actual Enumeration shall be made within three Years after the first Meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent Term of ten Years, in such Manner as they shall by Law direct. The Number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every thirty Thousand, but each State shall have at Least one Representative; and until such enumeration shall be made, the State of New Hampshire shall be entitled to choose three, Massachusetts eight, Rhode-Island and Providence Plantations one, Connecticut five, New-York six, New Jersey four, Pennsylvania eight, Delaware one, Maryland six, Virginia ten, North Carolina five, South Carolina five, and Georgia three.

When vacancies happen in the Representation from any State, the Executive Authority thereof shall issue Writs of Election to fill such Vacancies.

The House of Representatives shall choose their Speaker and other Officers; and shall have the sole Power of Impeachment.

Section 3. The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the Legislature thereof, for six Years; and each Senator shall have one Vote.

Immediately after they shall be assembled in Consequence of the first Election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three Classes. The Seats of the Senators of the first Class shall be vacated at the Expiration of the second Year, of the second Class at the Expiration of the fourth Year, and of the third Class at the Expiration of the sixth Year, so that one third may be chosen every second Year; and if Vacancies happen by Resignation, or otherwise, during the Recess of the Legislature of any State, the Executive thereof may make temporary Appointments until the next Meeting of the Legislature, which shall then fill such Vacancies.
No Person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty Years, and been nine Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen.

The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no Vote, unless they be equally divided.

The Senate shall choose their other Officers, and also a President pro tempore, in the Absence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the Office of President of the United States.

The Senate shall have the sole Power to try all Impeachments. When sitting for that Purpose, they shall be on Oath or Affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside: And no Person shall be convicted without the Concurrence of two thirds of the Members present.

Judgment in Cases of Impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from Office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any Office of honor, Trust or Profit under the United States: but the Party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to Indictment, Trial, Judgment and Punishment, according to Law.

Section 4. The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of choosing Senators.

The Congress shall assemble at least once in every Year, and such Meeting shall be on the first Monday in December, unless they shall by Law appoint a different Day.

Section 5. Each House shall be the Judge of the Elections, Returns and Qualifications of its own Members, and a Majority of each shall constitute a Quorum to do Business; but a smaller Number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the Attendance of absent Members, in such Manner, and under such Penalties as each House may provide.
Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behavior, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.

Each House shall keep a Journal of its Proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such Parts as may in their Judgment require Secrecy; and the Yeas and Nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the Desire of one fifth of those Present, be entered on the Journal.

Neither House, during the Session of Congress, shall, without the Consent of the other, adjourn for more than three days, nor to any other Place than that in which the two Houses shall be sitting.

Section 6. The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States. They shall in all Cases, except Treason, Felony and Breach of the Peace, be privileged from Arrest during their Attendance at the Session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any Speech or Debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other Place.

No Senator or Representative shall, during the Time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil Office under the Authority of the United States, which shall have been created, or the Emoluments whereof shall have been encreased during such time; and no Person holding any Office under the United States, shall be a Member of either House during his Continuance in Office.

Section 7. All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills.

Every Bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a Law, be presented to the President of the United States; If he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his Objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the Objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If after such Reconsideration two thirds of that House shall agree to pass the Bill, it shall be sent, together with the Objections, to the other House, by which it shall
likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two thirds of that House, it shall become a Law. But in all such Cases the Votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and Nays, and the Names of the Persons voting for and against the Bill shall be entered on the Journal of each House respectively. If any Bill shall not be returned by the President within ten days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the Same shall be a Law, in like Manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress by their Adjournment prevent its Return in which Case it shall not be a Law.

Every Order, Resolution, or Vote to which the Concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of Adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the Same shall take Effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the Rules and Limitations prescribed in the Case of a Bill.

Section 8. The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow Money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and post Roads;
To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;—And

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.
Section 9. The Migration or Importation of such Persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the Year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a Tax or duty may be imposed on such Importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each Person.

5  The Privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it.

No Bill of Attainder or ex post facto Law shall be passed.

No Capitation, or other direct, Tax shall be laid, unless in Proportion to the Census or Enumeration herein before directed to be taken.

10  No Tax or Duty shall be laid on Articles exported from any State.

No Preference shall be given by any Regulation of Commerce or Revenue to the Ports of one State over those of another: nor shall Vessels bound to, or from, one State, be obliged to enter, clear, or pay Duties in another.

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.

Section 10. No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts; pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, or Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts, or grant any Title of Nobility.

25  No State shall, without the Consent of the Congress, lay any Imposts or Duties on Imports or Exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection Laws: and
the net Produce of all Duties and Imposts, laid by any State on Imports or Exports, shall be for the Use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such Laws shall be subject to the Revision and Control of the Congress.

No State shall, without the Consent of Congress, lay any duty of Tonnage, keep Troops, or Ships of War in time of Peace, enter into any Agreement or Compact with another State, or with a foreign Power, or engage in War, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent Danger as will not admit of delay.

Article II

Section 1. The executive Power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his Office during the Term of four Years, and, together with the Vice-President chosen for the same Term, be elected as follows:

Each State shall appoint, in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors, equal to the whole Number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress: but no Senator or Representative, or Person holding an Office of Trust or Profit under the United States, shall be appointed an Elector.

The Electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by Ballot for two Persons, of whom one at least shall not be an Inhabitant of the same State with themselves. And they shall make a List of all the Persons voted for, and of the Number of Votes for each; which List they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the Seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall, in the Presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the Certificates, and the Votes shall then be counted. The Person having the greatest Number of Votes shall be the President, if such Number be a Majority of the whole Number of Electors appointed; and if there be more than one who have such Majority, and have an equal Number of Votes, then the House of Representatives shall immediately choose by Ballot one of them for President; and if no Person have a Majority, then from the five highest on the List the said House shall in like Manner choose the President. But in choosing the President, the Votes shall be taken by States, the Representation from each State having one Vote; a quorum for
this Purpose shall consist of a Member or Members from two thirds of the States, and a Majority of all the States shall be necessary to a Choice. In every Case, after the Choice of the President, the Person having the greatest Number of Votes of the Electors shall be the Vice President. But if there should remain two or more who have equal Votes, the Senate shall choose from them by Ballot the Vice President.

The Congress may determine the Time of choosing the Electors, and the Day on which they shall give their Votes; which Day shall be the same throughout the United States.

No Person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President; neither shall any Person be eligible to that Office who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty-five Years, and been fourteen Years a Resident within the United States.

In Case of the Removal of the President from Office, or of his Death, Resignation, or Inability to discharge the Powers and Duties of the said Office, the Same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by Law provide for the Case of Removal, Death, Resignation or Inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what Officer shall then act as President, and such Officer shall act accordingly, until the Disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

The President shall, at stated Times, receive for his Services, a Compensation, which shall neither be increased nor diminished during the Period for which he shall have been elected, and he shall not receive within that Period any other Emolument from the United States, or any of them.

Before he enter on the Execution of his Office, he shall take the following Oath or Affirmation:—"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States."

Section 2. The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States; he may require the Opinion, in writing, of the principal Officer in each of
the executive Departments, upon any subject relating to the Duties of their respective Offices, and he shall have Power to grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offenses against the United States, except in Cases of Impeachment.

He shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law: but the Congress may by Law vest the Appointment of such inferior Officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the Courts of Law, or in the Heads of Departments.

The President shall have Power to fill up all Vacancies that may happen during the Recess of the Senate, by granting Commissions which shall expire at the End of their next Session.

Section 3. He shall from time to time give to the Congress Information of the State of the Union, and recommend to their Consideration such Measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient; he may, on extraordinary Occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them, and in Case of Disagreement between them, with Respect to the Time of Adjournment, he may adjourn them to such Time as he shall think proper; he shall receive Ambassadors and other public Ministers; he shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed, and shall Commission all the Officers of the United States.

Section 4. The President, Vice President and all civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.

Article III

Section 1. The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good
Behavior, and shall, at stated Times, receive for their Services a Compensation, which shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office.

Section 2. The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority;—to all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls;—to all Cases of admiralty and maritime Jurisdiction; —to Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party; —to Controversies between two or more States; —between a State and Citizens of another State; —between Citizens of different States; —between Citizens of the same State claiming Lands under Grants of different States, and between a State, or the Citizens thereof, and foreign States, Citizens or Subjects.

In all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, and those in which a State shall be Party, the supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction. In all the other Cases before mentioned, the supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make.

The Trial of all Crimes, except in Cases of Impeachment, shall be by Jury; and such Trial shall be held in the State where the said Crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State, the Trial shall be at such Place or Places as the Congress may by Law have directed.

Section 3. Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying War against them, or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort. No Person shall be convicted of Treason unless on the Testimony of two Witnesses to the same overt Act, or on Confession in open Court.

The Congress shall have Power to declare the Punishment of Treason, but no Attainer of Treason shall work Corruption of Blood, or Forfeiture except during the Life of the Person attainted.
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Article IV

Section 1. Full Faith and Credit shall be given in each State to the public Acts, Records, and judicial Proceedings of every other State. And the Congress may by general Laws prescribe the Manner in which such Acts, Records and Proceedings shall be proved, and the Effect thereof.

Section 2. The Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of Citizens in the several States.

A Person charged in any State with Treason, Felony, or other Crime, who shall flee from Justice, and be found in another State, shall on Demand of the executive Authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having Jurisdiction of the Crime.

No Person held to Service or Labor in one State, under the Laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in Consequence of any Law or Regulation therein, be discharged from such Service or Labor, but shall be delivered up on Claim of the Party to whom such Service or Labor may be due.

Section 3. New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the Junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the Consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

Section 4. The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic Violence.
Article V

The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

Article VI

All Debts contracted and Engagements entered into, before the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation.

This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States.
Article VII

The Ratification of the Conventions of nine States, shall be sufficient for the Establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the Same.

Done in Convention by the Unanimous Consent of the States present the Seventeenth Day of September in the Year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and Eighty seven and of the Independence of the United States of America the Twelfth In witness whereof We have hereunto subscribed our Names.

George Washington—
President and deputy from Virginia

Delaware

George Read, Gunning Bedford, Jr., John Dickinson, Richard Bassett, Jacob Broom

Maryland

James McHenry, Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer, Daniel Carroll

Virginia

John Blair, James Madison, Jr.

North Carolina

William Blount, Richard Dobbs Spaight, Hugh Williamson

South Carolina

John Rutledge, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, Charles Pinckney, Pierce Butler
The United States Constitution

ANNOTATIONS

Georgia

William Few, Abraham Baldwin

New Hampshire

John Langdon, Nicholas Gilman

Massachusetts

Nathaniel Gorham, Rufus King

Connecticut

William Samuel Johnson, Roger Sherman

New York

Alexander Hamilton

New Jersey

William Livingston, David Brearley, William Paterson, Jonathan Dayton

Pennsylvania

Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Mifflin, Robert Morris, George Clymer, Thomas FitzSimons, Jared Ingersoll, James Wilson, Gouverneur Morris

Attest William Jackson Secretary
Amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America

Amendment I
Ratified December 15, 1791
Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Amendment II
Ratified December 15, 1791
A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

Amendment III
Ratified December 15, 1791
No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

Amendment IV
Ratified December 15, 1791
The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.
Amendment V

Ratified December 15, 1791

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Amendment VI

Ratified December 15, 1791

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defense.

Amendment VII

Ratified December 15, 1791

In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.
Amendment VIII
Ratified December 15, 1791

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

Amendment IX
Ratified December 15, 1791

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Amendment X
Ratified December 15, 1791

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Amendment XI
Ratified February 7, 1795

The Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State.

Amendment XII
Ratified June 15, 1804

The Electors shall meet in their respective states and vote by ballot for President and Vice-President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same state with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice-President, and they shall make distinct lists of all per-
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sons voted for as President, and of all persons voted for as Vice-President, and of the number of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of the government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate;—the President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted;—The person having the greatest number of votes for President, shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of Electors appointed; and if no person have such majority, then from the persons having the highest numbers not exceeding three on the list of those voted for as President, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President.

But in choosing the President, the votes shall be taken by states, the representation from each state having one vote; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or members from two-thirds of the states, and a majority of all the states shall be necessary to a choice. And if the House of Representatives shall not choose a President whenever the right of choice shall devolve upon them, before the fourth day of March next following, then the Vice-President shall act as President, as in the case of the death or other constitutional disability of the President.—The person having the greatest number of votes as Vice-President, shall be the Vice-President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of Electors appointed, and if no person have a majority, then from the two highest numbers on the list, the Senate shall choose the Vice-President; a quorum for the purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice. But no person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice-President of the United States.

Amendment XIII

Ratified December 6, 1865

Section 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

Section 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.
Amendment XIV

Ratified July 9, 1868

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

Section 3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice-President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.
Section 4. The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.

Section 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

Amendment XV

Ratified February 3, 1870

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment XVI

Ratified February 3, 1913

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

Amendment XVII

Ratified April 8, 1913

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.
When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive au-
- thority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: Provided, That the
- legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appoint-
- ments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.

This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator
chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.

Amendment XVIII

Ratified January 16, 1919

Section 1. After one year from the ratification of this article the manufacture, sale, or trans-
- portation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation
thereof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof for bev-
- erage purposes is hereby prohibited.

Section 2. The Congress and the several States shall have concurrent power to enforce this
article by appropriate legislation.

Section 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amend-
ment to the Constitution by the legislatures of the several States, as provided in the Consti-
tution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Con-
gress.

Amendment XIX

Ratified August 18, 1920

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the
United States or by any State on account of sex.

Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.
Amendment XX

Ratified January 23, 1933

Section 1. The terms of the President and the Vice President shall end at noon on the 20th  
day of January, and the terms of Senators and Representatives at noon on the 3rd day of  
January, of the years in which such terms would have ended if this article had not been  
ratified; and the terms of their successors shall then begin.

Section 2. The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall  
begin at noon on the 3rd day of January, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.

Section 3. If, at the time fixed for the beginning of the term of the President, the President  
elect shall have died, the Vice President elect shall become President. If a President shall  
not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or if the President  
elect shall have failed to qualify, then the Vice President elect shall act as President until a  
President shall have qualified; and the Congress may by law provide for the case wherein  
neither a President elect nor a Vice President shall have qualified, declaring who shall then  
act as President, or the manner in which one who is to act shall be selected, and such person  
shall act accordingly until a President or Vice President shall have qualified.

Section 4. The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons  
from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of  
choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons  
from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have  
developed upon them.

Section 5. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect on the 15th day of October following the ratifi-  
cation of this article.

Section 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amend-  
ment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within  
seven years from the date of its submission.
Amendment XXI

Ratified December 5, 1933

Section 1. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

Section 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited.

Section 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress.

Amendment XXII

Ratified February 27, 1951

Section 1. No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than two years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of President more than once. But this Article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President when this Article was proposed by the Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this Article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term.

Section 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.
Amendment XXIII

Ratified March 29, 1961

Section 1. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct:

A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the twelfth article of amendment.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment XXIV

Ratified January 23, 1964

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment XXV

Ratified February 10, 1967

Section 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

Section 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.
Section 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

Section 4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session.

If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office.
Amendment XXVI

Ratified July 1, 1971

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States, who are eighteen years of age or older, to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment XXVII

Ratified May 7, 1992

No law varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives shall take effect, until an election of Representatives shall have intervened.
**Frederick Douglass**

The Constitution of the United States: Is It Pro-Slavery or Anti-Slavery

**Speech**

March 26, 1860
Scottish Anti-Slavery Society | Glasgow, Scotland

**Background**

Former slave and abolitionist Frederick Douglass delivered this speech before the Scottish Anti-Slavery Society responding to the question of whether the U.S. Constitution supported or opposed slavery.

**Guiding Questions**

1. In which ways does Douglass disagree with other abolitionists, such as William Lloyd Garrison?
2. What evidence does Douglass cite from the founding that has formed his understanding?
3. What is Douglass’ main argument against dissolving the Union over the issue of slavery?

---

I proceed to the discussion. And first a word about the question. Much will be gained at the outset if we fully and clearly understand the real question under discussion. Indeed, nothing is or can be understood. This are often confounded and treated as the same, for no better reason than that they resemble each other, even while they are in their nature and character totally distinct and even directly opposed to each other. This jumbling up things is a sort of dust-throwing which is often indulged in by small men who argue for victory rather than for truth.

Thus, for instance, the American Government and the American Constitution are spoken of in a manner which would naturally lead the hearer to believe that one is identical with the other; when the truth is, they are distinct in character as is a ship and a compass. The one may point right and the other steer wrong. A chart is one thing, the course of the vessel is another. The Constitution may be right, the Government is wrong. If the Government has been governed by mean, sordid, and wicked passions, it does not follow that the Constitution is mean, sordid, and wicked.

What, then, is the question?...

The real and exact question between myself and the class of persons represented by the speech at the City Hall may be fairly stated thus: — 1st, Does the United States Constitution guarantee to any class or description of people in that country the right to enslave, or hold as property, any other class or description of people in that country? 2nd, Is the dissolution of the union between the slave and free States required by fidelity to the slaves, or by the just demands of conscience? Or, in other words, is the refusal to exercise the elective franchise, and to hold office in America, the surest, wisest, and best way to abolish slavery in America?

To these questions the Garrisonians say Yes. They hold the Constitution to be a slaveholding instrument, and will not cast a vote or hold office, and denounce all who vote or hold office, no matter how faithfully such persons labour to promote the abolition of slavery. I, on the other hand, deny that the Constitution guarantees the right to hold property in man, and believe that the way to abolish slavery in America is to vote such men into power as
will use their powers for the abolition of slavery. This is the issue plainly stated, and you
shall judge between us…. It should also be borne in mind that the intentions of those who
framed the Constitution, be they good or bad, for slavery or against slavery, are so respected
so far, and so far only, as we find those intentions plainly stated in the Constitution. It
would be the wildest of absurdities, and lead to endless confusion and mischiefs, if, instead
of looking to the written paper itself, for its meaning, it were attempted to make us search
it out, in the secret motives, and dishonest intentions, of some of the men who took part in
writing it. It was what they said that was adopted by the people, not what they were ashamed
or afraid to say, and really omitted to say…. 

I repeat, the paper itself, and only the paper itself, with its own plainly written purposes, is
the Constitution. It must stand or fall, flourish or fade, on its own individual and self-de-
clared character and objects. Again, where would be the advantage of a written Constitu-
tion, if, instead of seeking its meaning in its words, we had to seek them in the secret inten-
tions of individuals who may have had something to do with writing the paper?...What
then? Shall we condemn the righteous law because wicked men twist it to the support of
wickedness? Is that the way to deal with good and evil? Shall we blot out all distinction
between them, and hand over to slavery all that slavery may claim on the score of long
practice?...

It so happens that no such words as “African slave trade,” no such words as “slave insur-
rections,” are anywhere used in that instrument…. Here then are several provisions of the
Constitution to which reference has been made. I read them word for word just as they
stand in the paper, called the United States Constitution, Art. I, sec. 2. “Representatives and
direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included in this
Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the
whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term years, and ex-
cluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons; Art. I, sec. 9. The migration or
importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think fit to admit, shall
not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight,
but a tax or duty may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding tend dollars for each
person; Art. 4, sec. 2. No person held to service or labour in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from service or labour; but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labour may be due; Art. I, sec. 8. To provide for calling for the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions.” Here then, are those provisions of the Constitution, which the most extravagant defenders of slavery can claim to guarantee a right of property in man. These are the provisions which have been pressed into the service of the human fleshmongers of America. Let us look at them just as they stand, one by one. Let us grant, for the sake of the argument, that the first of these provisions, referring to the basis of representation and taxation, does refer to slaves. We are not compelled to make that admission, for it might fairly apply to aliens — persons living in the country, but not naturalized. But giving the provisions the very worse construction, what does it amount to? I answer — It is a downright disability laid upon the slaveholding States; one which deprives those States of two-fifths of their natural basis of representation. A black man in a free State is worth just two-fifths more than a black man in a slave State, as a basis of political power under the Constitution. Therefore, instead of encouraging slavery, the Constitution encourages freedom by giving an increase of “two-fifths” of political power to free over slave States. So much for the three-fifths clause; taking it at is worst, it still leans to freedom, not slavery; for, be it remembered that the Constitution nowhere forbids a coloured man to vote. I come to the next, that which it is said guaranteed the continuance of the African slave trade for twenty years. I will also take that for just what my opponent alleges it to have been, although the Constitution does not warrant any such conclusion. But, to be liberal, let us suppose it did, and what follows? Why, this — that this part of the Constitution, so far as the slave trade is concerned, became a dead letter more than 50 years ago, and now binds no man’s conscience for the continuance of any slave trade whatsoever. Mr. Thompson is just 52 years too late in dissolving the Union on account of this clause. He might as well dissolve the British Government, because Queen Elizabeth granted to Sir John Hawkins to import Africans into the West Indies 300 years ago! But there is still more to be said about this abolition of the slave trade. Men, at that time, both in England and in America, looked upon the slave trade as the life of slavery.
The abolition of the slave trade was supposed to be the certain death of slavery. Cut off the
stream, and the pond will dry up, was the common notion at the time.

Wilberforce and Clarkson, clear-sighted as they were, took this view; and the American
statesmen, in providing for the abolition of the slave trade, thought they were providing for
the abolition of the slavery. This view is quite consistent with the history of the times. All
regarded slavery as an expiring and doomed system, destined to speedily disappear from
the country. But, again, it should be remembered that this very provision, if made to refer
to the African slave trade at all, makes the Constitution anti-slavery rather than for slavery;
for it says to the slave States, the price you will have to pay for coming into the American
Union is, that the slave trade, which you would carry on indefinitely out of the Union, shall
be put an end to in twenty years if you come into the Union. Secondly, if it does apply, it
expired by its own limitation more than fifty years ago. Thirdly, it is anti-slavery, because
it looked to the abolition of slavery rather than to its perpetuity. Fourthly, it showed that
the intentions of the framers of the Constitution were good, not bad. I think this is quite
enough for this point.

I go to the “slave insurrection” clause, though, in truth, there is no such clause. The one
which is called so has nothing whatever to do with slaves or slaveholders any more than
your laws for suppression of popular outbreaks has to do with making slaves of you and
your children. It is only a law for suppression of riots or insurrections. But I will be gener-
ous here, as well as elsewhere, and grant that it applies to slave insurrections. Let us suppose
that an anti-slavery man is President of the United States (and the day that shall see this the
case is not distant) and this very power of suppressing slave insurrections would put an end
to slavery. The right to put down an insurrection carries with it the right to determine the
means by which it shall be put down. If it should turn out that slavery is a source of insur-
rection, that there is no security from insurrection while slavery lasts, why, the Constitution
would be best obeyed by putting an end to slavery, and an anti-slavery Congress would do
the very same thing. Thus, you see, the so-called slave-holding provisions of the American
Constitution, which a little while ago looked so formidable, are, after all, no defence or
guarantee for slavery whatever. But there is one other provision. This is called the “Fugitive
Slave Provision.” It is called so by those who wish to make it subserve the interest of slavery in America, and the same by those who wish to uphold the views of a party in this country…. But it may be asked — if this clause does not apply to slaves, to whom does it apply?

I answer, that when adopted, it applies to a very large class of persons — namely, redemptioners — persons who had come to America from Holland, from Ireland, and other quarters of the globe — like the Coolies to the West Indies — and had, for a consideration duly paid, become bound to “serve and labour” for the parties two whom their service and labour was due. It applies to indentured apprentices and others who have become bound for a consideration, under contract duly made, to serve and labour, to such persons this provision applies, and only to such persons. The plain reading of this provision shows that it applies, and that it can only properly and legally apply, to persons “bound to service.” Its object plainly is, to secure the fulfillment of contracts for “service and labour.” It applies to indentured apprentices, and any other persons from whom service and labour may be due. The legal condition of the slave puts him beyond the operation of this provision. He is not described in it. He is a simple article of property. He does not owe and cannot owe service. He cannot even make a contract. It is impossible for him to do so. He can no more make such a contract than a horse or an ox can make one. This provision, then, only respects persons who owe service, and they only can owe service who can receive an equivalent and make a bargain. The slave cannot do that, and is therefore exempted from the operation of this fugitive provision…. Let us look at the objects for which the Constitution was framed and adopted, and see if slavery is one of them. Here are its own objects as set forth by itself: — “We, the people of these United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America.” The objects here set forth are six in number: union, defence, welfare, tranquility, justice, and liberty. These are all good objects, and slavery, so far from being among them, is a foe of them all. But it has been said that Negroes are not included within the benefits sought under this declaration. This is said by the slaveholders in America — it is said by the City Hall orator — but it is not said by
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the Constitution itself. Its language is “we the people;” not we the white people, not even we the citizens, not we the privileged class, not we the high, not we the low, but we the people; not we the horses, sheep, and swine, and wheel-barrows, but we the people, we the human inhabitants; and, if Negroes are people, they are included in the benefits for which the Constitution of America was ordained and established. But how dare any man who pretends to be a friend to the Negro thus gratuitously concede away what the Negro has a right to claim under the Constitution? Why should such friends invent new arguments to increase the hopelessness of his bondage? This, I undertake to say, as the conclusion of the whole matter, that the constitutionality of slavery can be made out only by disregarding the plain and common-sense reading of the Constitution itself; by discrediting and casting away as worthless the most beneficent rules of legal interpretation; by ruling the Negro outside of these beneficent rules; by claiming that the Constitution does not mean what it says, and that it says what it does not mean; by disregarding the written Constitution, and interpreting it in the light of a secret understanding. It is in this mean, contemptible, and underhand method that the American Constitution is pressed into the service of slavery.…

My argument against the dissolution of the American Union is this: It would place the slave system more exclusively under the control of the slaveholding States, and withdraw it from the power in the Northern States which is opposed to slavery. Slavery is essentially barbarous in its character. It, above all things else, dreads the presence of an advanced civilization. It flourishes best where it meets no reproving frowns, and hears no condemning voices. While in the Union it will meet with both. Its hope of life, in the last resort, is to get out of the Union. I am, therefore, for drawing the bond of the Union more completely under the power of the Free States. What they most dread, that I most desire. I have much confidence in the instincts of the slaveholders. They see that the Constitution will afford slavery no protection when it shall cease to be administered by slaveholders. They see, moreover, that if there is once a will in the people of America to abolish slavery, this is no word, no syllable in the Constitution to forbid that result. They see that the Constitution has not saved slavery in Rhode Island, in Connecticut, in New York, or Pennsylvania; that the Free States have only added three to their original number. There were twelve Slave
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States at the beginning of the Government: there are fifteen now. The dissolution of the Union would not give the North a single advantage over slavery, but would take from it many. Within the Union we have a firm basis of opposition to slavery. It is opposed to all the great objects of the Constitution. The dissolution of the Union is not only an unwise but a cowardly measure — 15 millions running away from three hundred and fifty thousand slaveholders. Mr. Garrison and his friends tell us that while in the Union we are responsible for slavery. He and they sing out “No Union with slaveholders,” and refuse to vote. I admit our responsibility for slavery while in the Union but I deny that going out of the Union would free us from that responsibility. There now clearly is no freedom from responsibility for slavery to any American citizen short to the abolition of slavery. The American people have gone quite too far in this slaveholding business now to sum up their whole business of slavery by singing out the cant phrase, “No union with slaveholders.” To desert the family hearth may place the recreant husband out of the presence of his starving children, but this does not free him from responsibility. If a man were on board of a pirate ship, and in company with others had robbed and plundered, his whole duty would not be preformed simply by taking the longboat and singing out, “No union with pirates.” His duty would be to restore the stolen property. The American people in the Northern States have helped to enslave the black people. Their duty will not have been done till they give them back their plundered rights. Reference was made at the City Hall to my having once held other opinions, and very different opinions to those I have now expressed. An old speech of mine delivered fourteen years ago was read to show — I know not what. Perhaps it was to show that I am not infallible. If so, I have to say in defence, that I never pretended to be. Although I cannot accuse myself of being remarkably unstable, I do not pretend that I have never altered my opinion both in respect to men and things. Indeed, I have been very much modified both in feeling and opinion within the last fourteen years. When I escaped from slavery, and was introduced to the Garrisonians, I adopted very many of their opinions, and defended them just as long as I deemed them true. I was young, had read but little, and naturally took some things on trust. Subsequent experience and reading have led me to examine for myself. This had brought me to other conclusions. When I was a child, I thought and spoke as a child. But the question is not as to what were my opinions fourteen
years ago, but what they are now. If I am right now, it really does not matter what I was
fourteen years ago. My position now is one of reform, not of revolution. I would act for the
abolition of slavery through the Government — not over its ruins. If slaveholders have
ruled the American Government for the last fifty years, let the anti-slavery men rule the
nation for the next fifty years. If the South has made the Constitution bend to the purposes
of slavery, let the North now make that instrument bend to the cause of freedom and jus-
tice. If 350,000 slaveholders have, by devoting their energies to that single end, been able to
make slavery the vital and animating spirit of the American Confederacy for the last 72
years, now let the freemen of the North, who have the power in their own hands, and who
can make the American Government just what they think fit, resolve to blot out for ever
the foul and haggard crime, which is the blight and mildew, the curse and the disgrace of
the whole United States.
Sen. John C. Calhoun (D-SC)
On the Reception of Abolition Petitions

Speech Excerpt

February 6, 1837
U.S. Senate | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

John C. Calhoun delivered this speech in the U.S. Senate in response to petitions submitted by abolitionists demanding an end to slavery in the District of Columbia and the abolition of the slave trade across state lines.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What does Calhoun argue to be the effect of enslavement in America on African Americans? Why?

2. In which ways does Calhoun take exception to northern criticism of the effects of slavery on European Americans?

3. What does Calhoun mean by a “positive good”? What evidence does he claim to support his assertion?

4. How does Calhoun argue that slaves are treated better than laborers in the north?

…Abolition and Union cannot co-exist. As the friend of the Union I openly proclaim it, and the sooner it is known the better. The former may now be controlled, but in a short time it will be beyond the power of man to arrest the course of events. We of the South will not, cannot, surrender our institutions. To maintain the existing relations between the two races, inhabiting that section of the Union, is indispensable to the peace and happiness of both. It cannot be subverted without drenching the country in blood, and extirpating one or the other of the races. Be it good or bad, it has grown up with out society and institutions, and is so interwoven with them, that to destroy it would be to destroy us as a people. But let me not be understood as admitting, even by implication, that the existing relations between the two races in slaveholding States is an evil—far otherwise; I hold it to be a good, as it has thus far proved itself to be to both, and will continue to prove so if not disturbed by the fell spirit of abolition. I appeal to facts. Never before has the black race of Central Africa, from the dawn of history to the present day, attained a condition so civilized and so improved, not only physically, but morally and intellectually. It came among us in a low, degraded, and savage condition, and in the course of a few generations it has grown up under the fostering care of our institutions, reviled as they have been to its present comparatively civilized condition. This, with the rapid increase of numbers, is conclusive proof of the general happiness of the race, in spite of all the exaggerated tales to the contrary. In the mean time, the white or European race has not degenerated. It has kept pace with its brethren in other sections of the Union where slavery does not exist…. But I take higher ground. I hold that in the present state of civilization, where two races of different origin, and distinguished by color, and other physical differences, as well as intellectual, are brought together, the relation now existing in the slaveholding States between the two, is, instead of an evil, a good—a positive good. I feel myself called upon to speak freely upon the subject where the honor and interests of those I represent are involved. I hold then that there never has yet existed a wealthy and civilized society in which one portion of the community did not, in point of fact, live on the labor of the other. Broad and general as is this assertion, it is fully borne out by history. This is not the proper occasion, but if it were, it would not be difficult to trace the various devices by which the wealth of all civilized communities has been so unequally divided, and to show by what means so small a share has
been allotted to those by whose labor it was produced, and so large a share given to the non-producing classes. The devices are almost innumerable, from the brute force and gross superstition of ancient times, to the subtle and artful fiscal contrivances of modern. I might well challenge a comparison between them and the more direct, simple, and patriarchal mode by which the labor of the African race is, among us, commanded by the European. I may say with truth, that in few countries so much is left to the share of the laborer, and so little exacted from him, or where there is more kind attention paid to him in sickness or infirmities of age. Compare his condition with the tenants of the poor houses in the more civilized portions of Europe—look at the sick, and the old and infirm slave, on one hand, in the midst of his family and friends, under the kind superintending care of his master and mistress, and compare it with the forlorn and wretched condition of the pauper in the poor house….
Senator John C. Calhoun (D-SC)  
On the Oregon Bill  
Speech Excerpts

June 27, 1848  
U.S. Senate | Washington, D.C.

Background

Senator John C. Calhoun gave this speech in response to the Oregon Bill, which sought to organize the new territory along anti-slavery principles.

Guiding Questions

1. How does Calhoun portray the conflict between the North and the South?

2. How does Calhoun use the Constitution to justify his argument?

3. What theoretical proposition is the cause of the Union's destruction, according to Calhoun?

4. According to Calhoun, what is the relationship between the government and individual liberty?

…Now, let me say, Senators, if our Union and system of government are doomed to perish, and we to share the fate of so many great people who have gone before us, the historian, who, in some future day, may record the events ending in so calamitous a result, will devote his first chapter to the ordinance of 1787, lauded as it and its authors have been, as the first of that series which led to it. His next chapter will be devoted to the Missouri compromise, and the next to the present agitation. Whether there will be another beyond, I know not. It will depend on what we may do.

If he should possess a philosophical turn of mind, and be disposed to look to more remote and recondite causes, he will trace it to a proposition which originated in a hypothetical truism, but which, as now expressed and now understood, is the most false and dangerous of all political errors. The proposition to which I allude, has become an axiom in the minds of a vast many on both sides of the Atlantic, and is repeated daily from tongue to tongue, as an established and incontrovertible truth; it is,—that “all men are born free and equal.”

I am not afraid to attack error, however deeply it may be intrenched, or however widely extended, whenever it becomes my duty to do so, as I believe it to be on this subject and occasion.

Taking the proposition literally (it is in that sense it is understood), there is not a word of truth in it. It begins with “all men are born,” which is utterly untrue. Men are not born. Infants are born. They grow to be men. And concludes with asserting that they are born “free and equal,” which is not less false. They are not born free. While infants they are incapable of freedom, being destitute alike of the capacity of thinking and acting, without which there can be no freedom. Besides, they are necessarily born subject to their parents, and remain so among all people, savage and civilized, until the development of their intellect and physical capacity enables them to take care of themselves. They grow to all the freedom of which the condition in which they were born permits, by growing to be men. Nor is it less false that they are born “equal.” They are not so in any sense in which it can be regarded; and thus, as I have asserted, there is not a word of truth in the whole proposition, as expressed and generally understood.
If we trace it back, we shall find the proposition differently expressed in the Declaration of Independence. That asserts that “all men are created equal.” The form of expression, though less dangerous, is not less erroneous. All men are not created. According to the Bible, only two—a man and a woman—ever were—and of these one was pronounced subordinate to the other. All others have come into the world by being born, and in no sense, as I have shown, either free or equal. But this form of expression being less striking and popular, has given way to the present, and under the authority of a document put forth on so great an occasion, and leading to such important consequences, has spread far and wide, and fixed itself deeply in the public mind. It was inserted in our Declaration of Independence without any necessity. It made no necessary part of our justification in separating from the parent country, and declaring ourselves independent. Breach of our chartered privileges, and lawless encroachment on our acknowledged and well-established rights by the parent country, were the real causes,—and of themselves sufficient, without resorting to any other, to justify the step. Nor had it any weight in constructing the governments which were substituted in the place of the colonial. They were formed of the old materials and on practical and well-established principles, borrowed for the most part from our own experience and that of the country from which we sprang.

If the proposition be traced still further back, it will be found to have been adopted from certain writers in government who had attained much celebrity in the early settlement of these States, and with whose writings all the prominent actors in our revolution were familiar. Among these, Locke and Sydney were prominent. But they expressed it very differently. According to their expression, “all men in the state of nature were free and equal.” From this the others were derived; and it was this to which I referred when I called it a hypothetical truism;—to understand why, will require some explanation.

Man, for the purpose of reasoning, may be regarded in three different states: in a state of individuality; that is, living by himself apart from the rest of his species. In the social; that is, living in society, associated with others of his species. And in the political; that is, living under government. We may reason as to what would be his rights and duties in either, without taking into consideration whether he could exist in it or not. It is certain, that in
the first, the very supposition that he lived apart and separated from all others would make him free and equal. No one in such a state could have the right to command or control another. Every man would be his own master, and might do just as he pleased. But it is equally clear, that man cannot exist in such a state; that he is by nature social, and that society is necessary, not only to the proper development of all his faculties, moral and intellectual, but to the very existence of his race. Such being the case, the state is a purely hypothetical one; and when we say all men are free and equal in it, we announce a mere hypothetical truism; that is, a truism resting on a mere supposed stake that cannot exist, and of course one of little or no practical value.

But to call it a state of nature was a great misnomer, and has led to dangerous errors; for that cannot justly be called a state of nature which is so opposed to the constitution of man as to be inconsistent with the existence of his race and the development of the high faculties, mental and moral, with which he is endowed by his Creator....

We now begin to experience the danger of admitting so great an error to have a place in the declaration of our independence. For a long time it lay dormant; but in the process of time it began to germinate, and produce its poisonous fruits. It had strong hold on the mind of Mr. Jefferson, the author of that document, which caused him to take an utterly false view of the subordinate relation of the black to the white race in the South; and to hold, in consequence, that the latter, though utterly unqualified to possess liberty, were as fully entitled to both liberty and equality as the former; and that to deprive them of it was unjust and immoral. To this error, his proposition to exclude slavery from the territory northwest of the Ohio may be traced,—and to that of the ordinance of 1787,—and through it the deep and dangerous agitation which now threatens to engulf, and will certainly engulf, if not speedily settled, our political institutions, and involve the country in countless woes.
ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Speech at Peoria

SPEECH EXCERPT

October 16, 1854

Lawn of the Peoria County Courthouse | Peoria, Illinois

On the Kansas-Nebraska Act

BACKGROUND

Abraham Lincoln responded to the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act and its principal proponent, Stephen A. Douglas, with this address at Peoria.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Is Lincoln in favor or against self-governance?

2. In what way can the right of self-governance be abused according to Lincoln?

3. What principles does Lincoln take to be more essential than the right to self-governance?

4. What are the results of the violation of the Missouri Compromise both in the north and in the south?

5. How does Lincoln think the founders viewed slavery?

I trust I understand, and truly estimate the right of self-government. My faith in the proposition that each man should do precisely as he pleases with all which is exclusively his own, lies at the foundation of the sense of justice there is in me. I extend the principles to communities of men, as well as to individuals. I so extend it, because it is politically wise, as well as naturally just; politically wise, in saving us from broils about matters which do not concern us. Here, or at Washington, I would not trouble myself with the oyster laws of Virginia, or the cranberry laws of Indiana.

The doctrine of self-government is right—absolutely and eternally right—but it has no just application, as here attempted. Or perhaps I should rather say that whether it has such just application depends upon whether a negro is *not* or *is* a man. If he *is* a man, why in that case, he who *is* a man may, as a matter of self-government, do just as he pleases with him. But if the negro is a man, is it not to that extent, a total destruction of self-government, to say that he too shall not govern himself? When the white man governs himself that is self-government; but when he governs himself, and also governs another man, that is more than self-government—that is despotism. If the negro is a man, why then my ancient faith teaches me that “all men are created equal;” and that there can be no moral right in connection with one man’s making a slave of another....

What I do say is, that no man is good enough to govern another man, without that other’s consent. I say this is the leading principle—the sheet anchor of American republicanism.

Our Declaration of Independence says:

“We hold these truths to be self evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.”

….I particularly object to the new position which the avowed principle of this Nebraska law gives to slavery in the body politic. I object to it because it assumes that there can be moral right in the enslaving of one man by another. I object to it as a dangerous dalliance
for a few people—a sad evidence that, feeling prosperity we forget right—that liberty, as a principle, we have ceased to revere. I object to it because the fathers of the republic eschewed, and rejected it. The argument of "Necessity" was the only argument they ever admitted in favor of slavery; and so far, and so far only as it carried them, did they ever go. They found the institution existing among us, which they could not help; and they cast blame upon the British King for having permitted its introduction. Before the constitution, they prohibited its introduction into the north-western Territory—the only country we owned, then free from it. At the framing and adoption of the constitution, they forbore to so much as mention the word "slave" or "slavery" in the whole instrument. In the provision for the recovery of fugitives, the slave is spoken of as a "person held to service or labor." In that prohibiting the abolition of the African slave trade for twenty years, that trade is spoken of as "The migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing, shall think proper to admit," etc. These are the only provisions alluding to slavery. Thus, the thing is hid away, in the constitution, just as an afflicted man hides away a wen or a cancer, which he dares not cut out at once, lest he bleed to death; with the promise, nevertheless, that the cutting may begin at the end of a given time. Less than this our fathers could not do; and now they would not do. Necessity drove them so far, and farther, they would not go. But this is not all. The earliest Congress, under the constitution, took the same view of slavery. They hedged and hemmed it in to the narrowest limits of necessity.

In 1794, they prohibited an out-going slave-trade—that is, the taking of slaves from the United States to sell.

In 1798, they prohibited the bringing of slaves from Africa, into the Mississippi Territory—this territory then comprising what are now the States of Mississippi and Alabama. This was ten years before they had the authority to do the same thing as to the States existing at the adoption of the constitution.

In 1800 they prohibited American citizens from trading in slaves between foreign countries—as, for instance, from Africa to Brazil.
In 1803 they passed a law in aid of one or two State laws, in restraint of the internal slave trade.

In 1807, in apparent hot haste, they passed the law, nearly a year in advance, to take effect the first day of 1808—the very first day the constitution would permit—prohibiting the African slave trade by heavy pecuniary and corporal penalties.

In 1820, finding these provisions ineffectual, they declared the trade piracy, and annexed to it, the extreme penalty of death. While all this was passing in the general government, five or six of the original slave States had adopted systems of gradual emancipation; and by which the institution was rapidly becoming extinct within these limits.

Thus we see, the plain unmistakable spirit of that age, towards slavery, was hostility to the principle, and toleration, only by necessity....

Our republican robe is soiled, and trailed in the dust. Let us repurify it. Let us turn and wash it white, in the spirit, if not the blood, of the Revolution. Let us turn slavery from its claims of “moral right,” back upon its existing legal rights, and its arguments of “necessity.”

Let us return it to the position our fathers gave it; and there let it rest in peace. Let us re-adopt the Declaration of Independence, and with it, the practices, and policy, which harmonize with it. Let north and south—let all Americans—let all lovers of liberty everywhere—join in the great and good work. If we do this, we shall not only have saved the Union; but we shall have so saved it, as to make, and to keep it, forever worthy of the saving.

We shall have so saved it, that the succeeding millions of free happy people, the world over, shall rise up, and call us blessed, to the latest generations....
ABRAHAM LINCOLN (R)
Seventh Debate in the 1858 Election Campaign
DEBATE RESPONSE EXCERPTS
October 15, 1858
Outside Alton City Hall | Alton, Illinois

BACKGROUND
Incumbent senator from Illinois, Democrat Stephen Douglas, debated Abraham Lincoln, the Republican candidate, for the seventh and final time in the 1858 election campaign. The candidates were not directly running for U.S. Senate, as senators were still appointed by the state legislature at the time, but their arguments were meant to bolster votes for their respective parties in the state legislature, which would then appoint one of them as U.S. Senator. Lincoln offered this reply to Douglas’s opening remarks.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Why does Lincoln think that history is on his side with respect to the meaning of “equality” in the Declaration of Independence?

2. According to Lincoln, how should one interpret the language of the Constitution with regard to slavery? What is the view of the founders on slavery, according to Lincoln?

3. What is the primary dividing line between Republicans and Democrats at this time, according to Lincoln?

4. In Lincoln’s view, why is the existence of the Union threatened?

5. On what grounds does Lincoln base the struggle between him and Douglas as the struggle between right and wrong?

Abraham Lincoln's Reply to Senator Stephen Douglas

...Language is used not suggesting that slavery existed or that the black race were among us. And I understand the contemporaneous history of those times to be that covert language was used with a purpose, and that purpose was that in our Constitution, which it was hoped and is still hoped will endure forever—when it should be read by intelligent and patriotic men, after the institution of slavery had passed from among us—there should be nothing on the face of the great charter of liberty suggesting that such a thing as negro slavery had ever existed among us. This is part of the evidence that the fathers of the Government expected and intended the institution of slavery to come to an end. They expected and intended that it should be in the course of ultimate extinction. And when I say that I desire to see the further spread of it arrested I only say I desire to see that done which the fathers have first done. When I say I desire to see it placed where the public mind will rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction, I only say I desire to see it placed where they placed it. It is not true that our fathers, as Judge Douglas assumes, made this government part slave and part free. Understand the sense in which he puts it. He assumes that slavery is a rightful thing within itself,—was introduced by the framers of the Constitution. The exact truth is, that they found the institution existing among us, and they left it as they found it. But in making the government they left this institution with many clear marks of disapprobation upon it. They found slavery among them and they left it among them because of the difficulty— the absolute impossibility of its immediate removal. And when Judge Douglas asks me why we cannot let it remain part slave and part free as the fathers of the government made, he asks a question based upon an assumption which is itself a falsehood; and I turn upon him and ask him the question, when the policy that the fathers of the government had adopted in relation to this element among us was the best policy in the world—the only wise policy—the only policy that we can ever safely continue upon—that will ever give us peace unless this dangerous element masters us all and becomes a national institution—I turn upon him and ask him why he could not let it alone? I turn and ask him why he was driven to the necessity of introducing a new policy in regard to it? He has himself said he introduced a new policy. He said so in his speech on the 22nd of March of the present year, 1858. I ask him why he could not let it remain where our
fathers placed it? I ask too of Judge Douglas and his friends why we shall not again place this institution upon the basis on which the fathers left it? I ask you when he infers that I am in favor of setting the free and slave States at war, when the institution was placed in that attitude by those who made the constitution, *did they make any war?* If we had no war out of it when thus placed, wherein is the ground of belief that we shall have war out of it if we return to that policy? Have we had any peace upon this matter springing from any other basis? I maintain that we have not. I have proposed nothing more than a return to the policy of the fathers....

The real issue in this controversy—the one pressing upon every mind—is the sentiment on the part of one class that looks upon the institution of slavery *as a wrong*, and of another class that *does not* look upon it as a wrong. The sentiment that contemplates the institution of slavery in this country as a wrong is the sentiment of the Republican party. It is the sentiment around which all their actions—all their arguments circle—from which all their propositions radiate. They look upon it as being a moral, social and political wrong; and while they contemplate it as such, they nevertheless have due regard for its actual existence among us, and the difficulties of getting rid of it in any satisfactory way and to all the constitutional obligations thrown about it. Yet having a due regard for these, they desire a policy in regard to it that looks to its not creating any more danger. They insist that it should as far as may be, *be treated* as a wrong, and one of the methods of treating it as a wrong is to *make provision that it shall grow no larger*. They also desire a policy that looks to a peaceful end of slavery at sometime, as being wrong....

On the other hand, I have said there is a sentiment which treats it as *not* being wrong. That is the Democratic sentiment of this day.... The Democratic policy in regard to that institution will not tolerate the merest breath, the slightest hint, of the least degree of wrong about it. Try it by some of Judge Douglas' arguments. He says he "don't care whether it is voted up or voted down" in the Territories. I do not care myself in dealing with that expression, whether it is intended to be expressive of his individual sentiments on the subject, or only of the national policy he desires to have established. It is alike valuable for my purpose. Any man can say that who does not see anything wrong in slavery, but no man can logically say
it who does see a wrong in it; because no man can logically say he don’t care whether a wrong is voted up or voted down. He may say he don’t care whether an indifferent thing is voted up or down, but he must logically have a choice between a right thing and a wrong thing. He contends that whatever community wants slaves has a right to have them. So they have if it is not a wrong. But if it is a wrong, he cannot say people have a right to do wrong. He says that upon the score of equality, slaves should be allowed to go in a new Territory, like other property. This is strictly logical if there is no difference between it and other property. If it and other property are equal, his argument is entirely logical. But if you insist that one is wrong and the other right, there is no use to institute a comparison between right and wrong. You may turn over everything in the Democratic policy from beginning to end, whether in the shape it takes on the statute book, in the shape it takes in the Dred Scott decision, in the shape it takes in conversation or the shape it takes in short maxim-like arguments—it everywhere carefully excludes the idea that there is anything wrong in it.

That is the real issue. That is the issue that will continue in this country when these poor tongues of Judge Douglas and myself shall be silent. It is the eternal struggle between these two principles—right and wrong—throughout the world. They are the two principles that have stood face to face from the beginning of time; and will ever continue to struggle. The one is the common right of humanity and the other the divine right of kings. It is the same principle in whatever shape it develops itself. It is the same spirit that says, “You work and toil and earn bread, and I’ll eat it.” No matter in what shape it comes, whether from the mouth of a king who seeks to b estride the people of his own nation and live by the fruit of their labor, or from one race of men as an apology for enslaving another race, it is the same tyrannical principle.
PRESIDENT ABRAHAM LINCOLN (R)
First Inaugural Address
SPEECH EXCERPTS

March 4, 1861
U.S. Capitol | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND
Abraham Lincoln delivered this speech at his inauguration amidst declarations of secession by southern states.

GUIDING QUESTIONS
1. How does Lincoln try to assuage the fears of Southerners?
2. Why does Lincoln believe that the Union is perpetual?
3. What is "the only substantial dispute," and what are its possible resolutions as Lincoln sees them?

…I take the official oath today, with no mental reservations, and with no purpose to con-
strue the Constitution or laws, by any hypercritical rules. And while I do not choose now
to specify particular acts of Congress as proper to be enforced, I do suggest, that it will be
much safer for all, both in official and private stations, to conform to, and abide by, all those
acts which stand unrepealed, than to violate any of them, trusting to find impunity in hav-
ing them held to be unconstitutional.

It is seventy-two years since the first inauguration of a President under our national Con-
stitution. During that period fifteen different and greatly distinguished citizens, have, in
succession, administered the executive branch of the government. They have conducted it
through many perils; and, generally, with great success. Yet, with all this scope for prece-
dent, I now enter upon the same task for the brief constitutional term of four years, under
great and peculiar difficulty. A disruption of the Federal Union heretofore only menaced,
is now formidably attempted.

I hold, that in contemplation of universal law, and of the Constitution, the Union of these
States is perpetual. Perpetuity is implied, if not expressed, in the fundamental law of all
national governments. It is safe to assert that no government proper, ever had a provision
in its organic law for its own termination. Continue to execute all the express provisions of
our national Constitution, and the Union will endure forever—it being impossible to de-
stroy it, except by some action not provided for in the instrument itself.

Again, if the United States be not a government proper, but an association of States in the
nature of contract merely, can it, as a contract, be peaceably unmade, by less than all the
parties who made it? One party to a contract may violate it—break it, so to speak; but does
it not require all to lawfully rescind it?

Descending from these general principles, we find the proposition that, in legal contem-
plation, the Union is perpetual, confirmed by the history of the Union itself. The Union is
much older than the Constitution. It was formed in fact, by the Articles of Association in
1774. It was matured and continued by the Declaration of Independence in 1776. It was further matured and the faith of all the then thirteen States expressly plighted and engaged that it should be perpetual, by the Articles of Confederation in 1778. And finally, in 1787, one of the declared objects for ordaining and establishing the Constitution, was "to form a more perfect union."

But if destruction of the Union, by one, or by a part only, of the States, be lawfully possible, the Union is less perfect than before the Constitution, having lost the vital element of perpetuity.

It follows from these views that no State, upon its own mere motion, can lawfully get out of the Union,—that resolves and ordinances to that effect are legally void; and that acts of violence, within any State or States, against the authority of the United States, are insurrectionary or revolutionary, according to circumstances.

I therefore consider that, in view of the Constitution and the laws, the Union is unbroken; and, to the extent of my ability, I shall take care, as the Constitution itself expressly enjoins upon me, that the laws of the Union be faithfully executed in all the States. Doing this I deem to be only a simple duty on my part; and I shall perform it, so far as practicable, unless my rightful masters, the American people, shall withhold the requisite means, or, in some authoritative manner, direct the contrary. I trust this will not be regarded as a menace, but only as the declared purpose of the Union that it will constitutionally defend, and maintain itself.

In doing this there needs to be no bloodshed or violence; and there shall be none, unless it be forced upon the national authority. The power confided to me, will be used to hold, occupy, and possess the property, and places belonging to the government, and to collect the duties and imposts; but beyond what may be necessary for these objects, there will be no invasion—no using of force against, or among the people anywhere....
One section of our country believes slavery is right, and ought to be extended, while the other believes it is wrong, and ought not to be extended. This is the only substantial dispute. The fugitive slave clause of the Constitution, and the law for the suppression of the foreign slave trade, are each as well enforced, perhaps, as any law can ever be in a community where the moral sense of the people imperfectly supports the law itself. The great body of the people abide by the dry legal obligation in both cases, and a few break over in each. This, I think, cannot be perfectly cured; and it would be worse in both cases after the separation of the sections, than before. The foreign slave trade, now imperfectly suppressed, would be ultimately revived without restriction, in one section; while fugitive slaves, now only partially surrendered, would not be surrendered at all, by the other.

Physically speaking, we cannot separate. We cannot remove our respective sections from each other, nor build an impassable wall between them. A husband and wife may be divorced, and go out of the presence, and beyond the reach of each other; but the different parts of our country cannot do this. They cannot but remain face to face; and intercourse, either amicable or hostile, must continue between them. Is it possible then to make that intercourse more advantageous, or more satisfactory, after separation than before? Can aliens make treaties easier than friends can make laws? Can treaties be more faithfully enforced between aliens, than laws can among friends? Suppose you go to war, you cannot fight always; and when, after much loss on both sides, and no gain on either, you cease fighting, the identical old questions, as to terms of intercourse, are again upon you.

This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember, or overthrow it. I can not be ignorant of the fact that many worthy, and patriotic citizens are desirous of having the national constitution amended. While I make no recommendation of amendments, I fully recognize the rightful authority of the people over the whole subject, to be exercised in either of the modes prescribed in the instrument itself; and I should, under existing circumstances, favor, rather than oppose, a fair opportunity being afforded the people to act upon it....
My countrymen, one and all, think calmly and well, upon this whole subject. Nothing valuable can be lost by taking time. If there be an object to hurry any of you, in hot haste, to a step which you would never take deliberately, that object will be frustrated by taking time; but no good object can be frustrated by it. Such of you as are now dissatisfied, still have the old Constitution unimpaired, and, on the sensitive point, the laws of your own framing under it; while the new administration will have no immediate power, if it would, to change either. If it were admitted that you who are dissatisfied, hold the right side in the dispute, there still is no single good reason for precipitate action. Intelligence, patriotism, Christianity, and a firm reliance on Him, who has never yet forsaken this favored land, are still competent to adjust, in the best way, all our present difficulty.

In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The government will not assail you. You can have no conflict, without being yourselves the aggressors. You have no oath registered in Heaven to destroy the government, while I shall have the most solemn one to "preserve, protect and defend it."

I am loath to close. We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battle-field, and patriot grave, to every living heart and hearthstone, all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.
PRESIDENT ABRAHAM LINCOLN (R-IL)

A Proclamation

AN ORDER

January 1, 1863
Executive Mansion | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

On September 22, 1862 after the Union victory in the Battle of Antietam, Abraham Lincoln announced this order concerning property in slaves in the rebelling states, which took effect January 1, 1863.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Whom did the proclamation free?
2. In which places did this order apply?
3. By what authority did Lincoln issue this order?
4. What military purpose did the order serve?
5. What did Lincoln implore of slaves freed by the order?

By the President of the United States of America: A Proclamation.

Whereas, on the twenty-second day of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-two, a proclamation was issued by the President of the United States, containing, among other things, the following, to wit:

"That on the first day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, all persons held as slaves within any State or designated part of a State, the people whereof shall then be in rebellion against the United States, shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free; and the Executive Government of the United States, including the military and naval authority thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of such persons, and will do no act or acts to repress such persons, or any of them, in any efforts they may make for their actual freedom.

"That the Executive will, on the first day of January aforesaid, by proclamation, designate the States and parts of States, if any, in which the people thereof, respectively, shall then be in rebellion against the United States; and the fact that any State, or the people thereof, shall on that day be, in good faith, represented in the Congress of the United States by members chosen thereto at elections wherein a majority of the qualified voters of such State shall have participated, shall, in the absence of strong countervailing testimony, be deemed conclusive evidence that such State, and the people thereof, are not then in rebellion against the United States."

Now, therefore I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, by virtue of the power in me vested as Commander-in-Chief, of the Army and Navy of the United States in time of actual armed rebellion against authority and government of the United States, and as a fit and necessary war measure for suppressing said rebellion, do, on this first day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, and in accordance with my purpose so to do publicly proclaimed for the full period of one hundred days, from the day first above mentioned, order and designate as the States and parts of States wherein
The people thereof respectively, are this day in rebellion against the United States, the following, to wit:

Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana, (except the Parishes of St. Bernard, Plaquemines, Jefferson, St. Johns, St. Charles, St. James, Ascension, Assumption, Terrebonne, Lafourche, St. Mary, St. Martin, and Orleans, including the City of New Orleans) Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South-Carolina, North-Carolina, and Virginia, (except the forty-eight counties designated as West Virginia, and also the counties of Berkley, Accomac, Northampton, Elizabeth-City, York, Princess Ann, and Norfolk, including the cities of Norfolk and Portsmouth); and which excepted parts are, for the present, left precisely as if this proclamation were not issued.

And by virtue of the power, and for the purpose aforesaid, I do order and declare that all persons held as slaves within said designated States, and parts of States, are, and henceforward shall be free; and that the Executive government of the United States, including the military and naval authorities thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of said persons.

And I hereby enjoin upon the people so declared to be free to abstain from all violence, unless in necessary self-defense; and I recommend to them that, in all cases when allowed, they labor faithfully for reasonable wages.

And I further declare and make known, that such persons of suitable condition, will be received into the armed service of the United States to garrison forts, positions, stations, and other places, and to man vessels of all sorts in said service.

And upon this act, sincerely believed to be an act of justice, warranted by the Constitution, upon military necessity, I invoke the considerate judgment of mankind, and the gracious favor of Almighty God.
In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington, this first day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the eighty-seventh.

By the President:

Abraham Lincoln

William H. Seward, Secretary of State.
PRESIDENT ABRAHAM LINCOLN (R)
On the Consecration of the
Soldiers’ National Cemetery

SPEECH

November 19, 1863
Soldiers’ National Cemetery | Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

Gettysburg Address

BACKGROUND

Abraham Lincoln delivered these remarks at the dedication of the Union cemetery for those soldiers killed in the Battle of Gettysburg in the summer of 1863.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. For Lincoln, what is the central idea of the American Founding?
2. For what cause did the soldiers buried in Gettysburg give their lives?
3. What were they fighting to defend?
4. To what cause does Lincoln wish for listeners to dedicate themselves?

Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth, on this continent, a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived, and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battle-field of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting-place for those who here gave their lives, that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But, in a larger sense, we can not dedicate—we can not consecrate—we can not hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they here gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.
PRESIDENT ABRAHAM LINCOLN (R)

Second Inaugural Address

SPEECH

March 4, 1865
U.S. Capitol | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

Having been reelected and with the end of the Civil War in sight, Abraham Lincoln delivered this speech at his inauguration to a second term as president.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. According to Lincoln, who caused the Civil War?

2. What role in the war does Lincoln ascribe to God?

3. How does Lincoln think the North should treat the South when the war ends?

Fellow Countrymen:

At this second appearing to take the oath of the presidential office, there is less occasion for an extended address than there was at the first. Then a statement, somewhat in detail, of a course to be pursued, seemed fitting and proper. Now, at the expiration of four years, during which public declarations have been constantly called forth on every point and phase of the great contest which still absorbes the attention, and engrosses the energies of the nation, little that is new could be presented. The progress of our arms, upon which all else chiefly depends, is as well known to the public as to myself; and it is, I trust, reasonably satisfactory and encouraging to all. With high hope for the future, no prediction in regard to it is ventured.

On the occasion corresponding to this four years ago, all thoughts were anxiously directed to an impending civil-war. All dreaded it—all sought to avert it. While the inaugural address was being delivered from this place, devoted altogether to saving the Union without war, insurgent agents were in the city seeking to destroy it without war—seeking to dissolve the Union, and divide effects, by negotiation. Both parties deprecated war; but one of them would make war rather than let the nation survive; and the other would accept war rather than let it perish. And the war came.

One eighth of the whole population were colored slaves, not distributed generally over the Union, but localized in the Southern part of it. These slaves constituted a peculiar and powerful interest. All knew that this interest was, somehow, the cause of the war. To strengthen, perpetuate, and extend this interest was the object for which the insurgents would rend the Union, even by war; while the government claimed no right to do more than to restrict the territorial enlargement of it. Neither party expected for the war, the magnitude, or the duration, which it has already attained. Neither anticipated that the cause of the conflict might cease with, or even before, the conflict itself should cease. Each looked for an easier triumph, and a result less fundamental and astounding. Both read the same Bible, and pray to the same God; and each invokes His aid against the other. It may seem strange that any men should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of
other men’s faces; but let us judge not that we be not judged. The prayers of both could not be answered; that of neither has been answered fully. The Almighty has His own purposes. "Woe unto the world because of offenses! for it must needs be that offenses come; but woe to that man by whom the offense cometh!" If we shall suppose that American Slavery is one of those offenses which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which, having continued through His appointed time, He now wills to remove, and that He gives to both North and South, this terrible war, as the woe due to those by whom the offense came, shall we discern therein any departure from those divine attributes which the believers in a Living God always ascribe to Him? Fondly do we hope—fervently do we pray—that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue, until all the wealth piled by the bond-man's two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash, shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so still it must be said "the judgments of the Lord, are true and righteous altogether."

With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just, and a lasting peace, among ourselves, and with all nations.
U.S. CONGRESS AND STATES

Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution

AMENDMENT

December 18, 1865
United States of America

BACKGROUND

The U.S. Congress passed and three-quarters of states ratified the Thirteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution by December 6, 1865, and the amendment was acknowledged as effective by Secretary of State William Seward on December 18, 1865.

ANNOTATIONS

Section 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

Section 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

NOTES & QUESTIONS

U.S. Const. amend. XIII.
GOVERNOR WOODROW WILSON (D-NJ)
What is Progress?
SPEECH
1912

BACKGROUND
Woodrow Wilson delivered versions of this speech on several occasions during his campaign for the presidency in 1912.

GUIDING QUESTIONS
1. What problems does America now face, according to Wilson?
2. What is the issue with the Founders’ view of government and how they structured it?
3. How must government change, in Wilson’s view?

What is Progress?
Woodrow Wilson

...The laws of this country have not kept up with the change of economic circumstances in this country; they have not kept up with the change of political circumstances; and therefore we are not even where we were when we started. We shall have to run, not until we are out of breath, but until we have caught up with our own conditions, before we shall be where we were when we started; when we started this great experiment which has been the hope and the beacon of the world. And we should have to run twice as fast as any rational program I have seen in order to get anywhere else.

I am, therefore, forced to be a progressive, if for no other reason, because we have not kept up with our changes of conditions, either in the economic field or in the political field. We have not kept up as well as other nations have. We have not kept our practices adjusted to the facts of the case, and until we do, and unless we do, the facts of the case will always have the better of the argument; because if you do not adjust your laws to the facts, so much the worse for the laws, not for the facts, because law trails along after the facts. Only that law is unsafe which runs ahead of the facts and beckons to it and makes it follow the will-o’-the-wisps of imaginative projects.

Business is in a situation in America which it was never in before; it is in a situation to which we have not adjusted our laws. Our laws are still meant for business done by individuals; they have not been satisfactorily adjusted to business done by great combinations, and we have got to adjust them. I do not say we may or may not; I say we must; there is no choice. If your laws do not fit your facts, the facts are not injured, the law is damaged; because the law, unless I have studied it amiss, is the expression of the facts in legal relationships. Laws have never altered the facts; laws have always necessarily expressed the facts; adjusted interests as they have arisen and have changed toward one another.

Politics in America is in a case which sadly requires attention. The system set up by our law and our usage doesn’t work,—or at least it can’t be depended on; it is made to work only by a most unreasonable expenditure of labor and pains. The government, which was designed for the people, has got into the hands of bosses and their employers, the special interests. An invisible empire has been set up above the forms of democracy....
But what is progress going to do with the past, and with the present? How is it going to treat them? With ignominy, or respect? Should it break with them altogether, or rise out of them, with its roots still deep in the older time? What attitude shall progressives take toward the existing order, toward those institutions of conservatism, the Constitution, the laws, and the courts?...

The makers of our Federal Constitution read Montesquieu with true scientific enthusiasm. They were scientists in their way,—the best way of their age,—those fathers of the nation. Jefferson wrote of "the laws of Nature,"—and then by way of afterthought,—"and of Nature's God." And they constructed a government as they would have constructed an orrery,—to display the laws of nature. Politics in their thought was a variety of mechanics. The Constitution was founded on the law of gravitation. The government was to exist and move by virtue of the efficacy of "checks and balances."

The trouble with the theory is that government is not a machine, but a living thing. It falls, not under the theory of the universe, but under the theory of organic life. It is accountable to Darwin, not to Newton. It is modified by its environment, necessitated by its tasks, shaped to its functions by the sheer pressure of life. No living thing can have its organs offset against each other, as checks, and live. On the contrary, its life is dependent upon their quick cooperation, their ready response to the commands of instinct or intelligence, their amicable community of purpose. Government is not a body of blind forces; it is a body of men, with highly differentiated functions, no doubt, in our modern day, of specialization, with a common task and purpose. Their cooperation is indispensable, their warfare fatal. There can be no successful government without the intimate, instinctive coordination of the organs of life and action. This is not theory, but fact, and displays its force as fact, whatever theories may be thrown across its track. Living political constitutions must be Darwinian in structure and in practice. Society is a living organism and must obey the laws of life, not of mechanics; it must develop.
What is Progress?
Woodrow Wilson

All that progressives ask or desire is permission—in an era when "development," "evolution," is the scientific word—to interpret the Constitution according to the Darwinian principle; all they ask is recognition of the fact that a nation is a living thing and not a machine.

Some citizens of this country have never got beyond the Declaration of Independence, signed in Philadelphia, July 4th, 1776. Their bosoms swell against George III, but they have no consciousness of the war for freedom that is going on today.

The Declaration of Independence did not mention the questions of our day. It is of no consequence to us unless we can translate its general terms into examples of the present day and substitute them in some vital way for the examples it itself gives, so concrete, so intimately involved in the circumstances of the day in which it was conceived and written. It is an eminently practical document, meant for the use of practical men; not a thesis for philosophers, but a whip for tyrants; not a theory of government, but a program of action. Unless we can translate it into the questions of our own day, we are not worthy of it, we are not the sons of the sires who acted in response to its challenge.

What form does the contest between tyranny and freedom take today? What is the special form of tyranny we now fight? How does it endanger the rights of the people, and what do we mean to do in order to make our contest against it effectual? What are to be the items of our new declaration of independence?

By tyranny, as we now fight it, we mean control of the law, of legislation and adjudication, by organizations which do not represent the people, by means which are private and selfish. We mean, specifically, the conduct of our affairs and the shaping of our legislation in the interest of special bodies of capital and those who organize their use. We mean the alliance, for this purpose, of political machines with selfish business. We mean the exploitation of the people by legal and political means. We have seen many of our governments under these influences cease to be representative governments, cease to be governments representative of the people, and become governments representative of special interests, controlled by machines, which in their turn are not controlled by the people....
President Woodrow Wilson (D)
War Message to Congress

Speech Excerpts
February 3, 1917
Congress | Washington, D.C.

Background

President Woodrow Wilson delivered this address to Congress regarding the relationship between the United States and Germany.

Annotations

...There is one choice we cannot make, we are incapable of making: we will not choose the path of submission and suffer the most sacred rights of our Nation and our people to be ignored or violated. The wrongs against which we now array ourselves are no common wrongs; they cut to the very roots of human life.

5 With a profound sense of the solemn and even tragical character of the step I am taking and of the grave responsibilities which it involves, but in unhesitating obedience to what I deem my constitutional duty, I advise that the Congress declare the recent course of the Imperial German Government to be in fact nothing less than war against the government and people of the United States; that it formally accept the status of belligerent which has thus been thrust upon it, and that it take immediate steps not only to put the country in a more thorough state of defense but also to exert all its power and employ all its resources to bring the Government of the German Empire to terms and end the war....

10 We are accepting this challenge of hostile purpose because we know that in such a Government, following such methods, we can never have a friend; and that in the presence of its organized power, always lying in wait to accomplish we know not what purpose, there can

be no assured security for the democratic Governments of the world. We are now about to accept gauge of battle with this natural foe to liberty and shall, if necessary, spend the whole force of the nation to check and nullify its pretensions and its power. We are glad, now that we see the facts with no veil of false pretense about them to fight thus for the ultimate peace of the world and for the liberation of its peoples, the German peoples included: for the rights of nations great and small and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of life and of obedience. The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty. We have no selfish ends to serve.

We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make. We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind. We shall be satisfied when those rights have been made as secure as the faith and the freedom of nations can make them. Just because we fight without rancor and without selfish object, seeking nothing for ourselves but what we shall wish to share with all free peoples, we shall, I feel confident, conduct our operations as belligerents without passion and ourselves observe with proud punctilio the principles of right and of fair play we profess to be fighting for….

It is a distressing and oppressive duty, Gentlemen of the Congress, which I have performed in thus addressing you. There are, it may be many months of fiery trial and sacrifice ahead of us. It is a fearful thing to lead this great peaceful people into war, into the most terrible and disastrous of all wars, civilization itself seeming to be in the balance.

But the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts,—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own Governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free. To such a task we can dedicate our lives and our fortunes, every thing that we are and everything that we have, with the pride of those who know that the day has come when America is privileged to
spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace which she has treasured. God helping her, she can do no other.
WOODROW WILSON
“The Study of Administration”

ESSAY EXCERPTS

November 2, 1886
Political Science Quarterly

BACKGROUND

Bryn Mawr College political science professor Woodrow Wilson wrote this essay proposing independent regulatory agencies insulated from the political process.

ANNOTATIONS

...The field of administration is a field of business. It is removed from the hurry and strife of politics; it at most points stands apart even from the debatable ground of constitutional study. It is a part of political life only as the methods of the counting-house are a part of the life of society; only as machinery is part of the manufactured product. But it is, at the same time, raised very far above the dull level of mere technical detail by the fact that through its greater principles it is directly connected with the lasting maxims of political wisdom, the permanent truths of political progress.

The object of administrative study is to rescue executive methods from the confusion and costliness of empirical experiment and set them upon foundations laid deep in stable principle....

Public administration is detailed and systematic execution of public law. Every particular application of general law is an act of administration. The assessment and raising of taxes, for instance, the hanging of a criminal, the transportation and delivery of the mails, the equipment and recruiting of the army and navy, etc., are all obviously acts of administra

tion; but the general laws which direct these things to be done are as obviously outside of
and above administration. The broad plans of governmental action are not administrative;
the detailed execution of such plans is administrative.…

Just here we manifestly emerge upon the field of that still larger question,—the proper re-
lations between public opinion and administration.

To whom is official trustworthiness to be disclosed, and by whom is it to be rewarded? Is
the official to look to the public for his need of praise and his push of promotion, or only
to his superior in office? Are the people to be called in to settle administrative discipline as
they are called in to settle constitutional principles? These questions evidently find their
root in what is undoubtedly the fundamental problem of this whole study. That problem
is: What part shall public opinion take in the conduct of administration?

The right answer seems to be, that public opinion shall play the part of authoritative
critic.…

The problem is to make public opinion efficient without suffering it to be meddlesome.

Directly exercised, in the oversight of the daily details and in the choice of the daily means
of government, public criticism is of course a clumsy nuisance, a rustic handling delicate
machinery. But as superintending the greater forces of formative policy alike in politics and
administration, public criticism is altogether safe and beneficent, altogether indispensable.
Let administrative study find the best means for giving public criticism this control and for
shutting it out from all other interference.…
PRESIDENT FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT (D)
Message on the State of the Union

SPEECH

January 11, 1944
Congress | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

President Franklin Roosevelt outlined his second or “economic Bill of Rights” while delivering his state of the union address to Congress looking forward to post-war policies.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What does Roosevelt consider our “political rights”?

2. Why are those political rights no longer adequate, according to Roosevelt?

3. How would the government go about securing things such as a right to a decent living or recreation?

4. What or who in America does Roosevelt label as Fascistic?

5. Who is the source for all these rights?

It is our duty now to begin to lay the plans and determine the strategy for the winning of a lasting peace and the establishment of an American standard of living higher than ever before known. We cannot be content, no matter how high that general standard of living may be, if some fraction of our people—whether it be one-third or one-fifth or one-tenth—is ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed, and insecure.

This Republic had its beginning, and grew to its present strength, under the protection of certain inalienable political rights—among them the right of free speech, free press, free worship, trial by jury, freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures. They were our rights to life and liberty.

As our Nation has grown in size and stature, however—as our industrial economy expanded—these political rights proved inadequate to assure us equality in the pursuit of happiness.

We have come to a clear realization of the fact that true individual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence. "Necessitous men are not free men." People who are hungry and out of a job are the stuff of which dictatorships are made.

In our day these economic truths have become accepted as self-evident. We have accepted, so to speak, a second Bill of Rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all—regardless of station, race, or creed.

Among these are:

The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the Nation;

The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation;

The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living;
The right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad;

The right of every family to a decent home;

The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;

The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment;

The right to a good education.

All of these rights spell security. And after this war is won we must be prepared to move forward, in the implementation of these rights, to new goals of human happiness and well-being.

America’s own rightful place in the world depends in large part upon how fully these and similar rights have been carried into practice for our citizens. For unless there is security here at home there cannot be lasting peace in the world.

One of the great American industrialists of our day—a man who has rendered yeoman service to his country in this crisis—recently emphasized the grave dangers of "rightist reaction" in this Nation. All clear-thinking businessmen share his concern. Indeed, if such reaction should develop—if history were to repeat itself and we were to return to the so-called "normalcy" of the 1920's—then it is certain that even though we shall have conquered our enemies on the battlefields abroad, we shall have yielded to the spirit of Fascism here at home.

I ask the Congress to explore the means for implementing this economic bill of rights—for it is definitely the responsibility of the Congress so to do. Many of these problems are already before committees of the Congress in the form of proposed legislation. I shall from time to time communicate with the Congress with respect to these and further proposals.
In the event that no adequate program of progress is evolved, I am certain that the Nation will be conscious of the fact.

Our fighting men abroad—and their families at home—expect such a program and have the right to insist upon it. It is to their demands that this Government should pay heed rather than the whining demands of selfish pressure groups who seek to feather their nests while young Americans are dying.

The foreign policy that we have been following—the policy that guided us at Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran—is based on the common sense principle which was best expressed by Benjamin Franklin on July 4, 1776: "We must all hang together, or assuredly we shall all hang separately."

I have often said that there are no two fronts for America in this war. There is only one front. There is one line of unity which extends from the hearts of the people at home to the men of our attacking forces in our farthest outposts. When we speak of our total effort, we speak of the factory and the field, and the mine as well as of the battleground—we speak of the soldier and the civilian, the citizen and his Government.

Each and every one of us has a solemn obligation under God to serve this Nation in its most critical hour—to keep this Nation great—to make this Nation greater in a better world.
The Hillsdale 1776 Curriculum

PRESIDENT CALVIN COOLIDGE (R)
The Inspiration of the
Declaration of Independence

SPEECH

July 5, 1926
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

BACKGROUND

President Calvin Coolidge delivered this speech at Philadelphia to celebrate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence and the founding of the United States.

ANNOTATIONS

...There is something beyond the establishment of a new nation, great as that event would be, in the Declaration of Independence which has ever since caused it to be regarded as one of the great charters that not only was to liberate America but was everywhere to ennoble humanity.

It was not because it was proposed to establish a new nation, but because it was proposed to establish a nation on new principles, that July 4, 1776, has come to be regarded as one of the greatest days in history. Great ideas do not burst upon the world unannounced. They are reached by a gradual development over a length of time usually proportionate to their importance. This is especially true of the principles laid down in the Declaration of Independence. Three very definite propositions were set out in its preamble regarding the nature of mankind and therefore of government. These were the doctrine that all men are created equal, that they are endowed with certain inalienable rights, and that therefore the source of the just powers of government must be derived from the consent of the governed.

If no one is to be accounted as born into a superior station, if there is to be no ruling class, and if all possess rights which can neither be bartered away nor taken from them by any earthly power, it follows as a matter of course that the practical authority of the Government has to rest on the consent of the governed. While these principles were not altogether new in political action, and were very far from new in political speculation, they had never been assembled before and declared in such a combination. But remarkable as this may be, it is not the chief distinction of the Declaration of Independence. The importance of political speculation is not to be underestimated, as I shall presently disclose. Until the idea is developed and the plan made there can be no action.

It was the fact that our Declaration of Independence containing these immortal truths was the political action of a duly authorized and constituted representative public body in its sovereign capacity, supported by the force of general opinion and by the armies of Washington already in the field, which makes it the most important civil document in the world. It was not only the principles declared, but the fact that therewith a new nation was born which was to be founded upon those principles and which from that time forth in its development has actually maintained those principles, that makes this pronouncement an incomparable event in the history of government. It was an assertion that a people had arisen determined to make every necessary sacrifice for the support of these truths and by their practical application bring the War of Independence to a successful conclusion and adopt the Constitution of the United States with all that it has meant to civilization.

The idea that the people have a right to choose their own rulers was not new in political history. It was the foundation of every popular attempt to depose an undesirable king.... But we should search these charters in vain for an assertion of the doctrine of equality. This principle had not before appeared as an official political declaration of any nation. It was profoundly revolutionary. It is one of the corner stones of American institutions....

Placing every man on a plane where he acknowledged no superiors, where no one possessed any right to rule over him, he must inevitably choose his own rulers through a system of self-government. This was their theory of democracy. In those days such doctrines would
scarcely have been permitted to flourish and spread in any other country. This was the purpose which the fathers cherished. In order that they might have freedom to express these thoughts and opportunity to put them into action, whole congregations with their pastors had migrated to the colonies. These great truths were in the air that our people breathed. Whatever else we may say of it, the Declaration of Independence was profoundly American.

If this apprehension of the facts be correct, and the documentary evidence would appear to verify it, then certain conclusions are bound to follow. A spring will cease to flow if its source be dried up; a tree will wither if its roots be destroyed. In its main features the Declaration of Independence is a great spiritual document. It is a declaration not of material but of spiritual conceptions. Equality, liberty, popular sovereignty, the rights of man—these are not elements which we can see and touch. They are ideals. They have their source and their roots in the religious convictions. They belong to the unseen world. Unless the faith of the American people in these religious convictions is to endure, the principles of our Declaration will perish. We can not continue to enjoy the result if we neglect and abandon the cause....

About the Declaration there is a finality that is exceedingly restful. It is often asserted that the world has made a great deal of progress since 1776, that we have had new thoughts and new experiences which have given us a great advance over the people of that day, and that we may therefore very well discard their conclusions for something more modern. But that reasoning can not be applied to this great charter. If all men are created equal, that is final. If they are endowed with inalienable rights, that is final. If governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, that is final. No advance, no progress can be made beyond these propositions. If anyone wishes to deny their truth or their soundness, the only direction in which he can proceed historically is not forward, but backward toward the time when there was no equality, no rights of the individual, no rule of the people. Those who wish to proceed in that direction can not lay claim to progress. They are reactionary. Their ideas are not more modern, but more ancient, than those of the Revolutionary fathers.
In the development of its institutions America can fairly claim that it has remained true to the principles which were declared 150 years ago. In all the essentials we have achieved an equality which was never possessed by any other people. Even in the less important matter of material possessions we have secured a wider and wider distribution of wealth. The rights of the individual are held sacred and protected by constitutional guarantees, which even the Government itself is bound not to violate. If there is any one thing among us that is established beyond question, it is self-government—the right of the people to rule. If there is any failure in respect to any of these principles, it is because there is a failure on the part of individuals to observe them. We hold that the duly authorized expression of the will of the people has a divine sanction. But even in that we come back to the theory of John Wise that “Democracy is Christ’s government....” The ultimate sanction of law rests on the righteous authority of the Almighty.

On an occasion like this a great temptation exists to present evidence of the practical success of our form of democratic republic at home and the ever-broadening acceptance it is securing abroad. Although these things are well known, their frequent consideration is an encouragement and an inspiration. But it is not results and effects so much as sources and causes that I believe it is even more necessary constantly to contemplate. Ours is a government of the people. It represents their will. Its officers may sometimes go astray, but that is not a reason for criticizing the principles of our institutions. The real heart of the American Government depends upon the heart of the people. It is from that source that we must look for all genuine reform. It is to that cause that we must ascribe all our results....

No other theory is adequate to explain or comprehend the Declaration of Independence. It is the product of the spiritual insight of the people. We live in an age of science and of abounding accumulation of material things. These did not create our Declaration. Our Declaration created them. The things of the spirit come first. Unless we cling to that, all our material prosperity, overwhelming though it may appear, will turn to a barren scepter in our grasp. If we are to maintain the great heritage which has been bequeathed to us, we must be like-minded as the fathers who created it. We must not sink into a pagan materialism. We must cultivate the reverence which they had for the things that are holy. We
must follow the spiritual and moral leadership which they showed. We must keep replenished, that they may glow with a more compelling flame, the altar fires before which they worshipped.
WOMEN’S RIGHTS CONVENTION

Declarations of Sentiments and Resolutions

DECLARATION

July 19, 1848

Wesleyan Chapel | Seneca Falls, New York

BACKGROUND

Early suffragist leader Elizabeth Cady Stanton drafted this statement at the 1848 Women’s Rights Convention at Seneca Falls.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Who is the "he" referred to in the document?

2. What do the women demand from American society?

When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one portion of the family of man to assume among the people of the earth a position different from that which they have hitherto occupied, but one to which the laws of nature and of nature’s God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes that impel them to such a course.

We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men and women are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of those who suffer from it to refuse allegiance to it, and to insist upon the institution of a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they were accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their duty to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security. Such has been the patient sufferance of the women under this government, and such is now the necessity which constrains them to demand the equal station to which they are entitled.

The history of mankind is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations on the part of man toward woman, having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over her. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world.

He has never permitted her to exercise her inalienable right to the elective franchise.

He has compelled her to submit to laws, in the formation of which she had no voice.
He has withheld from her rights which are given to the most ignorant and degraded men—both natives and foreigners.

Having deprived her of this first right of a citizen, the elective franchise, thereby leaving her without representation in the halls of legislation, he has oppressed her on all sides.

He has made her, if married, in the eye of the law, civilly dead.

He has taken from her all right in property, even to the wages she earns.

He has made her, morally, an irresponsible being, as she can commit many crimes with impunity, provided they be done in the presence of her husband. In the covenant of marriage, she is compelled to promise obedience to her husband, he becoming, to all intents and purposes, her master—the law giving him power to deprive her of her liberty, and to administer chastisement.

He has so framed the laws of divorce, as to what shall be the proper causes, and in case of separation, to whom the guardianship of the children shall be given, as to be wholly regardless of the happiness of women—the law, in all cases, going upon a false supposition of the supremacy of man, and giving all power into his hands.

After depriving her of all rights as a married woman, if single, and the owner of property, he has taxed her to support a government which recognizes her only when her property can be made profitable to it.

He has monopolized nearly all the profitable employments, and from those she is permitted to follow, she receives but a scanty remuneration. He closes against her all the avenues to wealth and distinction which he considers most honorable to himself. As a teacher of theology, medicine, or law, she is not known.

He has denied her the facilities for obtaining a thorough education, all colleges being closed against her.
He allows her in Church, as well as State, but a subordinate position, claiming Apostolic authority for her exclusion from the ministry, and, with some exceptions, from any public participation in the affairs of the Church.

He has created a false public sentiment by giving to the world a different code of morals for men and women, by which moral delinquencies which exclude women from society, are not only tolerated, but deemed of little account in man.

He has usurped the prerogative of Jehovah himself, claiming it as his right to assign for her a sphere of action, when that belongs to her conscience and to her God.

He has endeavored, in every way that he could, to destroy her confidence in her own powers, to lessen her self-respect, and to make her willing to lead a dependent and abject life.

Now, in view of this entire disfranchisement of one-half the people of this country, their social and religious degradation—in view of the unjust laws above mentioned, and because women do feel themselves aggrieved, oppressed, and fraudulently deprived of their most sacred rights, we insist that they have immediate admission to all the rights and privileges which belong to them as citizens of the United States.

In entering upon the great work before us, we anticipate no small amount of misconception, misrepresentation, and ridicule; but we shall use every instrumentality within our power to effect our object. We shall employ agents, circulate tracts, petition the State and National legislatures, and endeavor to enlist the pulpit and the press in our behalf. We hope this Convention will be followed by a series of Conventions embracing every part of the country.
U.S. CONGRESS AND STATES

Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution

BACKGROUND

The U.S. Congress passed and three-quarters of states ratified the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution by July 21, 1868, and the amendment was acknowledged as effective by Secretary of State William Seward on July 28, 1868.

ANNOTATIONS

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of

U.S. Const. amend. XIV.
such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

Section 3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice-President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

Section 4. The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.

Section 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.
U.S. CONGRESS AND STATES

Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution

BACKGROUND

The U.S. Congress passed and three-quarters of states ratified the Fifteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution by February 3, 1870, and the amendment was acknowledged as effective by Secretary of State Hamilton Fish on March 30, 1870.

ANNOTATIONS

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

U.S. Const. amend. XV.
MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.
At the March on Washington
SPEECH
August 28, 1963
Lincoln Memorial | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND
Martin Luther King, Jr., delivered this address at the March on Washington from the steps of the Lincoln Memorial.

GUIDING QUESTIONS
1. What historical documents does King refer to in his speech?
2. What is the "promissory note"?
3. What is King’s dream?
4. What is the significance of King’s ending the speech quoting “My Country Tis of Thee”?

Martin Luther King, Jr., "I Have A Dream," in I Have A Dream: Writings and Speeches that Changed the World (San Francisco: Harper, 1986).
I am happy to join with you today in what will go down in history as the greatest demonstration for freedom in the history of our nation.

Five score years ago, a great American, in whose symbolic shadow we stand today, signed the Emancipation Proclamation. This momentous decree came as a great beacon light of hope to millions of Negro slaves who had been seared in the flames of withering injustice. It came as a joyous daybreak to end the long night of their captivity.

But one hundred years later, the Negro still is not free; one hundred years later, the life of the Negro is still sadly crippled by the manacles of segregation and the chains of discrimination; one hundred years later, the Negro lives on a lonely island of poverty in the midst of a vast ocean of material prosperity; one hundred years later, the Negro is still languished in the corners of American society and finds himself in exile in his own land.

So we've come here today to dramatize a shameful condition. In a sense we've come to our nation's capital to cash a check. When the architects of our republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was the promise that all men, yes, black men as well as white men, would be guaranteed the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory note in so far as her citizens of color are concerned. Instead of honoring this sacred obligation, America has given the Negro people a bad check, a check which has come back marked “insufficient funds.”

But we refuse to believe that the bank of justice is bankrupt. We refuse to believe that there are insufficient funds in the great vaults of opportunity of this nation. And so we have come to cash this check, a check that will give us upon demand the riches of freedom and the security of justice.

We have also come to this hallowed spot to remind America of the fierce urgency of now.
This is no time to engage in the luxury of cooling off or to take the tranquilizing drug of gradualism.

Now is the time to make real the promises of democracy; now is the time to rise from the dark and desolate valley of segregation to the sunlit path of racial justice; now is the time to lift our nation from the quicksands of racial injustice to the solid rock of brotherhood; now is the time to make justice a reality for all of God’s children.

It would be fatal for the nation to overlook the urgency of the moment.

This sweltering summer of the Negro’s legitimate discontent will not pass until there is an invigorating autumn of freedom and equality. Nineteen sixty-three is not an end, but a beginning. And those who hope that the Negro needed to blow off steam and will now be content, will have a rude awakening if the nation returns to business as usual. There will be neither rest nor tranquility in America until the Negro is granted his citizenship rights. The whirlwinds of revolt will continue to shake the foundations of our nation until the bright day of justice emerges.

But there is something that I must say to my people, who stand on the worn threshold which leads into the palace of justice. In the process of gaining our rightful place, we must not be guilty of wrongful deeds. Let us not seek to satisfy our thirst for freedom by drinking from the cup of bitterness and hatred.

We must forever conduct our struggle on the high plane of dignity and discipline. We must not allow our creative protests to degenerate into physical violence. Again and again we must rise to the majestic heights of meeting physical force with soul force. The marvelous new militancy, which has engulfed the Negro community, must not lead us to a distrust of all white people. For many of our white brothers, as evidenced by their presence here today, have come to realize that their destiny is tied up with our destiny. And they have come to realize that their freedom is inextricably bound to our freedom.

We cannot walk alone. And as we walk, we must make the pledge that we shall always march ahead. We cannot turn back.
There are those who are asking the devotees of Civil Rights, “When will you be satisfied?”

We can never be satisfied as long as the Negro is the victim of the unspeakable horrors of police brutality; we can never be satisfied as long as our bodies, heavy with the fatigue of travel, cannot gain lodging in the motels of the highways and the hotels of the cities; we cannot be satisfied as long as the Negro’s basic mobility is from a smaller ghetto to a larger one; we can never be satisfied as long as our children are stripped of their selfhood and robbed of their dignity by signs stating “For Whites Only”; we cannot be satisfied as long as the Negro in Mississippi cannot vote, and the Negro in New York believes he has nothing for which to vote.

No! no, we are not satisfied, and we will not be satisfied until “justice rolls down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream.”

I am not unmindful that some of you have come here out of great trials and tribulations. Some of you have come fresh from narrow jail cells. Some of you have come from areas where your quest for freedom left you battered by the storms of persecution and staggered by the winds of police brutality.

You have been the veterans of creative suffering.

Continue to work with the faith that unearned suffering is redemptive.

Go back to Mississippi. Go back to Alabama. Go back to South Carolina. Go back to Georgia. Go back to Louisiana. Go back to the slums and ghettos of our Northern cities, knowing that somehow this situation can and will be changed. Let us not wallow in the valley of despair.

I say to you today, my friends, so even though we face the difficulties of today and tomorrow, I still have a dream.

It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream.
I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed, “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal.”

I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia, sons of former slaves and the sons of former slaveowners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood.

I have a dream that one day even the state of Mississippi, a state sweltering with the heat of injustice, sweltering with the heat of oppression, will be transformed into an oasis of freedom and justice.

I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character.

I have a dream today!

I have a dream that one day down in Alabama — with its vicious racists, with its Governor having his lips dripping with the words of interposition and nullification — one day right there in Alabama, little black boys and black girls will be able to join hands with little white boys and white girls as sisters and brothers.

I have a dream today!

I have a dream that one day every valley shall be exalted, and every hill and mountain shall be made low. The rough places will be plain and the crooked places will be made straight, “and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together.”

This is our hope. This is the faith that I go back to the South with. With this faith we will be able to hew out of the mountain of despair a stone of hope.

With this faith we will be able to transform the jangling discords of our nation into a beautiful symphony of brotherhood. With this faith we will be able to work together, to pray together, to struggle together, to go to jail together, to stand up for freedom together, knowing that we will be free one day.
And this will be the day.

This will be the day when all of God’s children will be able to sing with new meaning, “My country ’tis of thee, sweet land of liberty, of thee I sing. Land where my father died, land of the pilgrim’s pride, from every mountainside, let freedom ring.” And if America is to be a great nation, this must become true.

So let freedom ring from the prodigious hilltops of New Hampshire; let freedom ring from the mighty mountains of New York; let freedom ring from the heightening Alleghenies of Pennsylvania; let freedom ring from the snow-capped Rockies of Colorado; let freedom ring from the curvaceous slopes of California.

But not only that.

Let freedom ring from Stone Mountain of Georgia; let freedom ring from Lookout Mountain of Tennessee; let freedom ring from every hill and mole hill of Mississippi. “From every mountainside, let freedom ring.”

And when this happens, and when we allow freedom to ring, when we let it ring from every village and every hamlet, from every state and every city, we will be able to speed up that day when all of God’s children, black men and white men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual:

“Free at last. Free at last. Thank God Almighty, we are free at last.”
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### Unit 1 | The British Colonies of North America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LESSON</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Lesson Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Lands, Waters, and Peoples of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1492–1630</td>
<td>Exploration and Settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1630–1732</td>
<td>The Colonies in Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1607–1763</td>
<td>Major Events in the Colonies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unit 2 | The American Founding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LESSON</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Lesson Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1763–1776</td>
<td>Self-Government or Tyranny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>The Declaration of Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1776–1783</td>
<td>The War of Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1783–1789</td>
<td>The United States Constitution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unit 3 | The Early Republic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LESSON</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Lesson Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1789–1801</td>
<td>The New Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1801–1815</td>
<td>Prospects, Uncertainties, and War</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lesson 3  1815–1829  The American Way

Lesson 4  1829–1848  Manifest Destiny

Unit 4 | The American Civil War  14-18 classes

Lesson 1  1848–1854  The Expansion of Slavery

Lesson 2  1854–1861  Toward Civil War

Lesson 3  1861–1865  The Civil War

Lesson 4  1865–1877  Reconstruction

Unit 5 | The Turn of the Century  13-16 classes

Lesson 1  1877–1901  The Gilded Age

Lesson 2  1901–1914  The Progressive Era

Lesson 3  1914–1919  The Great War

Unit 6 | The Interwar Years & World War II  14-17 classes

Lesson 1  1919–1929  The Roaring Twenties

Lesson 2  1929–1939  The Great Depression

Lesson 3  1939–1945  World War II

Unit 7 | Post-War America  Coming Soon!

Unit 8 | Recent American History  Coming Soon!
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Why Teach the British Colonies of North America

Christopher Columbus’s discovery of what was then termed “The New World” is one of the most consequential events in all of recorded history. It was as if another half of Earth was being opened to the peoples of Europe, Africa, and Asia, and the changes that followed this momentous discovery were immense. Students should be especially aware of the profound effects of the initial contact of European explorers with the indigenous peoples of North America. They should understand the ways of life characteristic of Native American tribes, the exploits of European explorers and settlers, and the triumphs
and tragedies that defined the relationships between settlers and natives. Students should also study closely the manner in which the British colonies of North America were established, since those first settlements would be the seedbed of our country. Our unique American heritage began here, on these coasts, among scattered settlements of men and women pursuing economic independence or religious freedom, leaving behind their familiar lives to seek liberty and opportunity at what to them was the edge of the world. With the promise of freedom at these far reaches also came untold hardships and daily dangers. The American story begins with those few who braved these risks for the freedom to pursue what all human beings desire to attain: happiness.

Enduring Ideas from This Unit

1. America’s varied and wondrous geography has played a crucial role in many of America’s successes.
2. The discovery, exploration, and settlement of the Western Hemisphere was one of the most consequential series of events in human history.
3. The contact between indigenous North American and European civilizations resulted in both benefits and afflictions for natives and colonists alike.
4. The British colonies of North America were unique, and their circumstances gradually shaped the character of the colonists into something unprecedented: the American.
5. The freedom afforded to the American colonists resulted in a degree of successful self-government unknown to the rest of the world in 1763.

What Teachers Should Consider

Imagine two more continents, an eighth and a ninth, with different terrain, untouched resources, seemingly limitless lands, and complete openness to any sort of political regime. This is the vision teachers might consider adopting in preparing students to learn American history. In other words, one can adopt an outlook similar to that of the people who began the first chapter in the story of America. Such an outlook will help students to see the origins of America as something that was fluid and not at all inevitable.

In the same way the explorers, settlers, and indigenous Native Americans keenly fixed their attention on the contours of the North American landscape, so should students of American history at the outset of their studies. A close study of American geography sets the stage on which Americans of every generation would act out their lives.

Europeans’ exploration and settlement of the Western Hemisphere is an extraordinary era in terms of historical impact, but it also contains engaging stories of intrepid discoverers and of the conditions they found and helped to shape. It is important to find the proper balance in conveying the story of that era. Students ought to step into the lives of these explorers and settlers and understand not only their motivations for undertaking such hazardous trips and ways of living but also their experiences on the Atlantic and on the fringes of an unknown continent. They should also think carefully and honestly about the interactions between Native Americans, explorers, and settlers. They will encounter a mixed picture. At times, they will see cooperation, care, and mutual respect; at other times they will see all the duplicity and
injustice that human nature is capable of. They will see these traits exhibited by all parties at various moments and in different circumstances.

Teachers should also focus on making clear the differences between England’s North American colonies and those of other emerging New World empires, such as Spain, France, and Portugal. They should bring out what was unique among the English settlers, from the form of their colonies’ settlements to the social and economic ventures of the colonists themselves, as well as their varied relationships to the mother country. Each English colony may be taught separately, each offering a distinct social and economic profile, while a final lesson may be devoted to studying the major events and movements in shared colonial American history. Together, students should come to see that an unplanned experiment was unfolding in the British colonies of North America: one that was shaping a unique society and citizenry, one that would be equipped for great accomplishments in the coming centuries.

How Teachers Can Learn More

**TEXTS**

*Albion’s Seed*, David Hackett Fischer  
*Voyagers to the West*, Bernard Bailyn  
*Peripheries and Center*, Jack P. Greene  
*American Slavery, American Freedom*, Edmund Morgan  
*African Founders*, David Hackett Fischer  
*The Formative Years, 1607–1763*, Clarence Ver Steeg  
*The Roots of American Order*, Russell Kirk  
*Freedom Just Around the Corner*, Walter McDougall  
*The French and Indian War*, Walter Borneman  
*American Heritage: A Reader*, ed. Hillsdale College History Faculty

**ONLINE COURSES** | Online.Hillsdale.edu

*The Great American Story*  
*American Heritage*
Lesson Planning Resources

**TEACHER RESOURCES**

*A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope*, Wilfred McClay and John McBride  
*A Student Workbook for Land of Hope*, Wilfred McClay and John McBride

**STUDENT RESOURCES**

*Land of Hope*, Wilfred McClay

**PRIMARY SOURCES**

Letter to Raphael Sanchez, Christopher Columbus  
Letter to King Ferdinand II, Christopher Columbus  
Laws of Virginia  
The Mayflower Compact  
“A Modell of Christian Charity,” John Winthrop  
Fundamental Orders of Connecticut  
Preface to the Frame of Government of Pennsylvania  
An Act for Freedom of Conscience in Pennsylvania  
Magna Carta  
Act of the General Court of Massachusetts  
English Bill of Rights  
*Second Treatise of Government*, John Locke  
Albany Plan of Union
LESSON PLANS, ASSIGNMENTS, AND QUIZZES
Lesson 1 — The Lands, Waters, and Peoples of America

**Lesson Objective**

Students learn about the geography of what would become the United States of America, including its physical contours, climate, advantages for civilization, and its Native American inhabitants, as well as the present-day political map of the United States.

**Teacher Preparation**

Create a note outline based on the following:

**Student Texts**
- *Land of Hope* Pages xi–xiv, 2–7
- Primary Sources See below.

**Teacher Texts**
- *A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope* Pages 1–7
- *A Student Workbook for Land of Hope* Pages 1–5

**Online.Hillsdale.edu**
- *The Great American Story* Lectures 1 and 2
- *American Heritage* Lecture 1

**Student Preparation**

** Assignment:** Students read *Land of Hope*, pages xi–xiv, 2–7, and either complete the reading questions handout in the *Student Workbook for Land of Hope* (pages 1–5) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

**Core Content in This Lesson**

**Topographic Geography**
- Atlantic Ocean
- Caribbean Sea
- San Salvador
- Bahamas
- Puerto Rico
- U.S. Virgin Islands
- Bering Strait
- St. Lawrence River
- Appalachian Mountains
- Acadia National Park
- Mount Washington
- Green Mountains
- Lake Champlain
- Adirondack Mountains
- Finger Lakes
- Lake Ontario
- Niagara River
- Niagara Falls
- Lake Erie
- Charles River
Cape Cod
Nantucket
Mohegan Bluffs
Dinosaur Trackway
Long Island Sound
Long Island
Manhattan Island
Hudson River
Catskill Mountains
Whitesbog
Ganoga Falls
Allegheny River
Allegheny Mountains
Great Cypress Swamp
Assateague Island
District of Columbia
Potomac River
Chesapeake Bay
James River
Blue Ridge Mountains
Shenandoah Valley
Seneca Rocks
Outer Banks
The Sandhills
Great Smoky Mountains
Stone Mountain
Lake Okeechobee
The Everglades
Straitsof Florida
Florida Keys
Gulf of Mexico
Noccalula Falls
Mississippi River
Mississippi Delta
Lake Pontchartrain
Ohio River
Ohio River Valley
Great Serpent Mound
Detroit/St. Clair Rivers
Lake St. Clair
Lake Huron
Lake Michigan
Straits of Mackinac
Michigan’s Lower Peninsula
Sleeping Bear Dunes
Indiana Dunes
Cave-in-Rock
Michigan’s Upper Peninsula
Lake Superior
Apostle Islands
Great Lakes
Mammoth Caves
Cumberland Gap
Tennessee River
49th Parallel
Lake of the Woods
Theodore Roosevelt National Park
Badlands
Great Plains
Maquoketa Caves
Platte River
Chimney Rock
Missouri River
Onondaga Cave
Little Jerusalem (Kansas)
Arkansas River
Hot Springs National Park
Great Salt Plains
Red River
Rio Grande
Rocky Mountains
Continental Divide
Glacier National Park
Yellowstone National Park
Old Faithful
Snake River
Cassia Silent City of Rocks
Colorado Dunes
Bryce Canyon
Arches National Park
Great Salt Lake
Lake Tahoe
Valley of Fire
Hoover Dam
Oklahoma Panhandle
Texas Panhandle
Big Bend
Colorado Canyon
Carlsbad Caverns
White Sands
Colorado River
Grand Canyon
Gadsden Purchase
Puget Sound
Columbia River
Mount Rainier
Mount St. Helens
Olympic National Park
Hall of Marshes
Thor’s Well
Crater Lake
San Francisco Bay
Sierra Nevada
San Joaquin Valley
Big Sur
Sequoia National Park
Yosemite National Park

Political Geography
Virginia
  Richmond
  Arlington
  Charlottesville
Massachusetts
  Boston
  Plymouth
  Salem
New Hampshire
  Concord
  Portsmouth
Maryland
  Annapolis
  Baltimore
Connecticut
  Hartford
Rhode Island
  Providence
Delaware
  Dover
  Wilmington
North Carolina
  Raleigh
  Charlotte
South Carolina
  Columbia
  Charleston
New Jersey
  Trenton

Death Valley
Mojave Desert
Pacific Ocean
Yukon River
Mount McKinley/Denali
Bering Sea
Bering Strait
Hawaiian Islands
Maui
Oahu
Kilauea Volcano
American Samoa
Guam
Northern Mariana Islands

New York
  Albany
  New York City
  Brooklyn
  Buffalo
Pennsylvania
  Harrisburg
  Philadelphia
  Pittsburgh
Georgia
  Atlanta
  Savannah
District of Columbia
  Washington
Vermont
  Montpelier
  Burlington
Kentucky
  Frankfort
  Louisville
Tennessee
  Nashville
  Memphis
Ohio
  Columbus
  Cleveland
  Cincinnati
Louisiana
  Baton Rouge
  New Orleans

Indiana
  Indianapolis

Mississippi
  Jackson

Illinois
  Springfield
  Chicago

Alabama
  Montgomery
  Mobile

Maine
  Augusta
  Portland

Missouri
  Jefferson City
  St. Louis
  Springfield
  Kansas City

Arkansas
  Little Rock
  Bentonville

Michigan
  Lansing
  Detroit
  Grand Rapids

Florida
  Tallahassee
  Tampa
  Miami
  Jacksonville
  Orlando
  St. Augustine

Texas
  Austin
  Dallas
  Houston
  Lubbock
  San Antonio

Iowa
  Des Moines

Wisconsin
  Madison
  Green Bay

California
  Sacramento
  Los Angeles
  San Diego
  San Francisco
  San Jose

Minnesota
  St. Paul
  Minneapolis
  Duluth

Oregon
  Salem
  Portland

Kansas
  Topeka
  Kansas City

West Virginia
  Charleston

Nevada
  Carson City
  Las Vegas

Nebraska
  Lincoln
  Omaha

Colorado
  Denver
  Colorado Springs

North Dakota
  Bismarck

South Dakota
  Pierre
  Rapid City

Montana
  Helena

Washington
  Olympia
  Seattle

Idaho
  Boise

Wyoming
  Cheyenne

Utah
  Salt Lake City

Oklahoma
  Oklahoma City
  Tulsa
New Mexico  
  Santa Fe  
  Albuquerque

Arizona  
  Phoenix  
  Tucson

Alaska  
  Juneau  
  Anchorage

Hawaii  
  Honolulu

## Terms and Topics

- glaciers
- continental shelf
- land bridge
- Mayas
- Aztecs
- Incas
- Hopewell
- Adena
- Apache
- Cherokee
- Cheyenne
- Chippewa
- Choctaw
- Creek
- Delaware
- Hopi
- Huron
- Lakota
- Mohawk
- Mohican
- Navajo
- Oneida
- Ottawa
- New England Region
- Mid-Atlantic Region
- Southern Region
- Midwest Region
- Great Lakes States
- Plains States
- Rocky Mountain States
- Southwestern Region
- Four Corners
- Pacific Northwest
- Ojibwa
- Pueblo
- Potawatomi
- Powhatan
- Seminole
- Shawnee
- Sioux
- Susquehanna
- urban
- cities
- suburbs
- towns
- rural
- Welland Canal
- Erie Canal
- Brooklyn Bridge
- Tennessee Valley Authority
- Florida State Road A1A
- Mackinac Bridge
- Soo Locks
- Golden Gate Bridge
- Interstate Highway System

## Images

- Maps
- Famous or exemplar landscapes, landmarks, bodies of water, present-day cities, and other geographic features
- Illustrations of indigenous peoples, civilizations, and life
- Photographs of Aztec, Maya, Inca, Hopewell, and Ancestral Pueblo ruins
Story for the American Heart

- Christopher Columbus's crew on their voyage and sighting land

Questions for the American Mind

- What words best describe the topography of the United States?
- What resources and advantages does this land afford for the flourishing of a developed civilization? How does it compare to other places in the world?
- What are the various regions, and what are the topographical features that define each of them?
- How have Americans distributed themselves across the continent in the present day? What accounts for this distribution, in both the past and the present?
- Where did the indigenous peoples of North and South America come from? How do we believe they came?
- What kinds of civilizations did different groups of indigenous peoples establish in different parts of the Americas?
- How did European and indigenous cultures differ from one another? Is there evidence of conflict among indigenous tribes?

Keys to the Lesson

Every story has a setting, and the true story of history is no different. To tell and to teach this story effectively requires first introducing students to the stage on which Americans would act. Thus, American history should begin with a study of American geography. This inaugural lesson does not seek to inundate students with facts to memorize (though they will learn many). Rather, it seeks to transport them to the different places of America, not through an online virtual map but through the use of their own imaginations. Geography instruction is an excellent way to awaken and exercise the imaginations of students, priming them for all the other journeys which this course will ask their minds to undertake. Every history lesson will involve a similar setting of the stage in the students’ imaginations, and this lesson establishes that precedent. Of course, the lesson also gives students the “lay of the land” for the entire study of American history, beginning with an immersive trip through the country’s magnificent and diverse landscape and then mapping it onto the modern political map of their country. This geography lesson can be full of simple questions about what students observe, training them in the skill of careful discernment of detail. In addition, the collaborative effort of mapping out the country is an excellent way to build rapport, to learn names, and to ease into the school year. At the end of the lesson, the class may return to the virgin topography of the United States and place the various indigenous civilizations on it, learning the smattering of their history that has survived, and then return to the Atlantic and to the Spanish caravels and carracks just over the eastern horizon.

Teachers might best plan and teach The Lands, Waters, and Peoples of America with emphasis on the following approaches:

- The year of teaching history may begin with a number of brief conversations, introductions, procedures, and assessments of students’ prior knowledge of the historical period. It can include discussing the meaning of history and why we study it. It should help students to see that the
reasons for studying history are various. Knowing the history of one’s country is an essential component of good citizenship. But history also can have value as a form of reflection on human nature and on the requirements of a good society. And like any subject, knowing history is good for its own sake, i.e., for the enjoyment and pleasure that comes with knowing. Being made aware of their motivations may allow students to ascend from “Because I have to” to this highest reason as the year proceeds.

- Begin by telling a story that will encourage students to use their imaginations and set the precedent for the way class will normally be taught. The story of Christopher Columbus’s crew sighting land is an excellent example. The story may be picked up when Columbus’s three ships are already en route. Paint the scene. Provide descriptions of the ship. Help students get a sense of what sailing was like in those days, and the dangers it involved. Draw out the sounds and smells onboard the ships. Introduce the kind of men on board, the letters and instructions they had with them, and what they may have been thinking from moment to moment. Talk about their captain: his appearance, thoughts, and comportment. Share the story of how recently the crew had nearly mutinied against him, and how he quelled their fears. Describe the sudden appearance of a large flock of birds the previous day. Finally, bring students to the very early morning of October 12, 1492, after the view from the ship’s rail had not changed for weeks, when the call came from the masts, “La tierra!” Land!

- Next should come a lesson on the geography of what would become the United States. First go backwards and talk about the geological changes that shaped the continent over time using maps readily available online.

- Treat the physical topography of the United States, following the path that settlers would travel from the Atlantic seaboard westward to the Pacific Ocean. Introduce landmarks, bodies of water, and other physical characteristics, moving from east to west. The items listed under “Topographic Geography” follow in roughly this order. This list includes several more obscure natural landmarks to ensure that each state has at least one of its natural wonders highlighted. Students should not be expected to recall all of these (the sample “Study Guide” scales back this list considerably). The goal is instead to make sure students are at least aware of these landmarks during the class period in order to develop an appreciation for the beauty and diversity of their country’s landscape.

- Call upon students’ imaginations by describing the settings of what you introduce with vivid language that engages all their senses. Place them in particular climates with the correct weather depending on the season, including types of natural disasters to which an area is subject. Record all this information with the class on a physical map handed out to them and on its projection on the board. As the class proceeds from coast to coast, label the map together. Ask plenty of questions in the process. For review, project images of key areas discussed on the map and have students try to identify what is being projected. Show a map that reflects this topography, such as a raised relief map, and the distribution of natural resources and future trade routes connected with these resources.

- Emphasize with students the tremendous advantages America’s land offers to human flourishing. America had excellent and untouched soils for cultivation, temperature and rainfall averages were ideal, and timber was plentiful. Native plants and animals suitable for human consumption were abundant, while imported livestock thrived. The virgin forests provided all the fuel needed for fires, heating, and cooking, as well as for building. Waterways were plentiful and mostly navigable; their importance cannot be overstated, and students should appreciate that the colonial-era Atlantic world imagined the world primarily in terms of water flow, especially in
North America. Most of the country had mild winters with long, warm growing seasons and few areas subject to drought. As for security from foreign powers, the United States would have two massive oceans separating it from most of the rest of the world.

- After thoroughly covering topography, transition to the modern political map with a new projected map and a corresponding political map handout. In teaching the political map, proceed in the order in which the first thirteen states were settled as colonies, and then in the order in which the remaining thirty-seven became states in the Union. Note special topographical, population, and trade characteristics of each state, including capitals, major cities, and special attractions or landmarks. Review the topography, weather, climate, and seasons in the process. Discuss how population is distributed in the states and across the country, and then group the states into different regions.

- Show students images from each state. In order not to stereotype, show an image of a major city, a rural scene, and a beautiful natural landmark or feature from each state, highlighting the diversity abundant not only in America as a whole but also within individual states. And help students to appreciate that in terms of land area, American states are about the size of most countries in the world.

- Show a map that reflects population density using color, and one that shows the majority ancestry of Americans based on counties to see how immigrants and their descendants have settled across the United States. Mark general population trends over history as citizens and immigrants have shifted from place to place. Include a map that shows America’s Interstate Highway System, major airports, and major ports. Note the historic prominence of railroads.

- After covering the modern political United States, return to the topographical map and place the indigenous tribes onto the map of North America and into the environments in which the various tribes lived. The diversity of tribes is astounding, and highlighting several communities, particularly on the eastern seaboard, will put students in the right historical context and assist with teaching the events in subsequent lessons.

- Show the range of different Western Hemisphere civilizations through the millennia prior to Christopher Columbus, including their ways of life, customs, beliefs, and interactions between different tribes or civilizations. In conjunction with state and local history, explore the history and traditions of historical Native Americans from the school’s locality or state.

- Conclude this first lesson by reminding students that to Columbus, his crew, and the peoples of Europe, Africa, and Asia in 1492 (and for millennia before), none of this was known to them, and discovering the entirety of the New World would take hundreds of years, even after Columbus’s voyages.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Complete the topographical map of the United States together as a class and study it for a future map assessment.

**Assignment 2:** Complete the political map of the United States together as a class and study it for a future map assessment.
DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. Why did the author title his book “Land of Hope” with respect to American history?

2. According to the author, should it be surprising to discover that some great people in history also had great flaws? Why or why not?

3. Why, according to the author, is it difficult to determine when to begin teaching a historical topic?

4. Name one indigenous group that was in North or South America prior to the arrival of Europeans.

5. Name one example of Europeans imagining an ideal civilization across the Atlantic in “the west.”
Lesson 2 — Exploration and Settlement

1492–1630

2–3 classes

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the European exploration of North America and the first English settlement efforts at Roanoke, Jamestown, Plymouth, and Massachusetts Bay.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

**Student Texts**

*Land of Hope*  
Pages 7–13, 20–28

*Primary Sources*  
See below.

**Teacher Texts**

*A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope*  
Pages 7–9, 13–14, 20–22, 24–25, 27–28

*A Student Workbook for Land of Hope*  
Pages 5–6, 10–14

**Online.Hillsdale.edu**

*The Great American Story*  
Lecture 2

*American Heritage*  
Lecture 2

STUDENT PREPARATION

**Assignment 1:** Students read *Land of Hope*, pages 7–13 and either complete the reading questions handout in the *Student Workbook for Land of Hope* (pages 12–14) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

**Assignment 2:** Students read *Land of Hope*, pages 20–28, and either complete the reading questions handout in the *Student Workbook for Land of Hope* (pages 12–14) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

**Assignment 3:** Students read and annotate the Laws of Virginia and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).

**Assignment 4:** Students read and annotate excerpts from John Winthrop’s “A Modell of Christian Charity” and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).
**Core Content in This Lesson**

**Geography & Places**
- Genoa
- San Salvador/Watling Island
- “The New World”
- La Florida
- St. Augustine
- Virginia
- Roanoke
- Chesapeake Bay
- Jamestown
- Cape Cod
- Plymouth
- Massachusetts Bay
- Boston

**Persons**
- Leif Erikson
- Ferdinand and Isabella
- Christopher Columbus
- Ponce de Leon
- Amerigo Vespucci
- John Smith
- Pocahontas
- Thomas Gates
- Lord De La Warr
- John Rolfe
- William Bradford
- Miles Standish
- Massasoit
- John Winthrop

**Terms and Topics**
- Silk Road
- Renaissance
- humanism
- caravel
- dry magnetic compass
- astrolabe
- merchants
- nation-states
- *NíñA, Pinta, and Santa María*
- Taino
- “Indians”
- conquistadors
- Columbian Exchange
- smallpox
- mercantilism
- privateers
- Spanish Armada
- joint-stock companies
- Virginia Company
- indentured servants
- Powhatan
- “Starving Time”
- freehold
- tobacco
- House of Burgesses
- Separatist Puritans
- Pilgrims
- Mayflower
- commoner
- religious freedom
- state of nature
- social contract
- rule of law
- self-government
- Wampanoag
- Puritans

**Primary Sources**
- Letter to Raphael Sanchez, Christopher Columbus
- Letter to King Ferdinand II, Christopher Columbus
- Laws of Virginia
- The Mayflower Compact
“A Modell of Christian Charity,” John Winthrop

To Know by Heart
“Today these parts of the earth have been explored more extensively than a fourth part of the world…. and that has been discovered by Amerigo Vespucci…. I can see no reason why anyone would object to calling this fourth part Amerige, the land of Amerigo, or America, after the man of great ability who discovered it.” —Martin Waldseemüller
“We must consider that we shall be as a city upon a hill. The eyes of all people are upon us.” —John Winthrop

Timeline
1453 Fall of Constantinople
Oct. 12, 1492 Columbus lands on San Salvador Island
1507 First use of the name “America” on a map
1517 Martin Luther publishes his Ninety-Five Theses
1585–90 Roanoke Colony
1588 Defeat of the Spanish Armada
1607 Jamestown settled
1619 Africans disembark at Jamestown; first meeting of the Virginia House of Burgesses
1620 Pilgrims settle Plymouth
1630 Puritans settle Massachusetts Bay
1632 Establishment of Maryland

4th Thursday in November Thanksgiving Day

Images
Historical figures and events
World map prior to Columbus
Caravel and carrack
Maps of Columbus’s voyages and other exploration
Dress of Native Americans, explorers, and settlers
Waldseemüller and Ringmann map
Illustrated map of Jamestown
Mayflower
Mayflower Compact facsimile
First Thanksgiving

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Christopher Columbus’s account of making landfall
- Christopher Columbus’s voyages and interactions with natives
- Christopher Columbus’s death in poverty and believing he had failed
- The Lost Colony of Roanoke
- John Smith’s account of the founding of Jamestown
- The "Starving Time" at Jamestown
- Pocahontas, John Smith, and John Rolfe
- Excerpts from the diary of John Rolfe
- John Twine’s account of the first meeting of the Virginia House of Burgesses
- The arrival of Africans at Jamestown
- The voyage of the *Mayflower*
- Excerpts from William Bradford’s *Of Plimoth Plantation*
- William Bradford’s account of going ashore at Plymouth
- The first winter at Plymouth
- Accounts of the First Thanksgiving by Edward Winslow and William Bradford

**Questions for the American Mind**

- What events “unsettled” European civilization and influenced the decision to explore the seas beyond Europe? How so?
- How was exploration connected to the ideas and circumstances of the Renaissance?
- What technologies allowed for farther sailing on the oceans?
- What was Christopher Columbus’s theory?
- What were some of the ways in which Christopher Columbus’s voyages changed the world?
- In which ways was Christopher Columbus successful, and in which did he fail?
- From where do we get the name “America”?
- How did most European monarchs explore, settle, and manage their claimed possessions in the New World? How was England’s approach different?
- What were the characteristics of the settlers in England’s first successful colonies?
- What motivated settlers to establish Jamestown?
- What problems did Jamestown’s settlers create and face? How did they manage to succeed?
- What two things happened in Jamestown in 1619?
- What motivated the Pilgrims to settle at Plymouth? What were their goals?
- Why did the Pilgrims draft and sign the Mayflower Compact?
- What is so extraordinary about the Mayflower Compact?
- How did the First Thanksgiving come about? Why?
- How were the Puritans at Massachusetts Bay distinct from the Pilgrims at Plymouth?
- What kind of governments did settlers establish in New England?
- Based on John Winthrop’s writings, how did the Puritans at Massachusetts Bay envision their lives and the task before them in North America?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 73: The colonists came to America for many reasons. Name one.
  - Question 74: Who lived in America before the Europeans arrived?
  - Question 75: What group of people was taken and sold as slaves?

**Keys to the Lesson**

Christopher Columbus’s discovery of the New World was one of the signal achievements of the age of exploration. The ideas of Renaissance humanism fostered confidence in the capacities of man and led monarchs to sponsor expensive and risky voyages to the uncharted waters and lands an ocean away. Enterprising commoners braved the seas and these wild lands for their own fortunes and opportunity. Nearly one hundred years would pass before the English would attempt a permanent settlement in North America.
America and another two decades before they found any success. Yet while Jamestown was founded chiefly on economic motives, the next two decades would see the Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay colonies founded, at least in part for religious and cultural ends. What was common to all these efforts was the desire for freedom to better their conditions—both the quality of earthly life and the preparation for eternal life. Put differently, they desired the freedom to seek happiness, made available to the common man in ways that had no parallel in the Old World.

Teachers might best plan and teach Exploration and Settlement with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Begin the teaching of American history by helping students gain historical perspective. Using the following reference points, ask them to compare today’s way of life with life in the centuries prior to the 1600s.
  - a political body based on natural rights and their equal protection
  - ability to believe and act on one’s beliefs without fear of arrest—or worse
  - ability to go about daily life without fear of being injured, killed, or having property taken
  - ability to possess the tools necessary to protect one’s food, shelter, family, and life
  - ability to put one’s thoughts into print without fear of arrest—or worse
  - ability to receive an education paid for, in part, by one’s neighbors
  - ability to speak one’s mind without fear of arrest—or worse
  - ability to vote for those who determine by law what one may or may not do
  - acquisition of clothing, food, and shelter
  - communication by internet, text, phone, mail
  - control of one’s ideas and inventions unless willingly shared with another
  - criticism or protest against those in power without fear of arrest—or worse
  - electricity, plumbing, heating, cooling
  - family structure
  - legal presumption of innocence when accused of a crime
  - literacy and numeracy
  - possession of one’s own land for food and shelter
  - religious practices
  - risk of disease and injury
  - slavery
  - the distance of one’s physical travels
  - the role of most men in family life and the community (working at home or out of doors; defending the family and community)
  - the role of most women in family life and the community (working at home indoors; caring for the family and neighbors)
  - the rule of law
  - travel by plane, car, boat, horse and buggy, walking
  - trial by a jury of one’s neighbors
  - trial for crimes effected quickly and publicly

- Offer students some background on the reasons why Europeans began exploring in the first place. If students have previously studied European history, then a brief review will be sufficient. For
this course, students should generally understand the Renaissance idea of humanism and the confidence it offered European governments and merchants to leverage the full capacities of man. Humanism intersected with other cultural currents: trade interests in Asia, Muslim control of land routes, newly emerging and competing monarchs, growing prosperity among an expanding middle class, and new maritime technology. Riding these currents, those inspired by humanist ideas turned to the seas in search of what was beyond, first along the African coast, and then across the Atlantic. A review of explorers who predated Christopher Columbus may be helpful.

- Relay to students the background to Christopher Columbus. Of important note is the attention he gave to new theories of navigation and the size, but not the shape, of the world.
- Of Columbus’s first voyage, help students to imagine what he was doing and what his crew was undertaking as well. It was far from certain that they would find the route Columbus sought, or that they would survive trying. Even then, Columbus was confident of his theories and of his ability.
- Share the stories of each of Columbus’s four voyages, marking the gradual decline in success, based on the stated goals of each trip.
- Consider Columbus’s specific actions and what they might suggest about his overall character. On the one hand, he was intrepid and determined in pursuit of his theories. He was also a mariner of great skill. Read with students letters in which he claims to have initially secured the respectful treatment of the natives his crew encountered, mindful that we do not have an account from the natives themselves. On the other hand, he was sometimes an incompetent leader whom his men did not listen to or respect, particularly when he took to imposing severe punishments and permitting cruel actions against certain native groups. Columbus’s importance in American history is that he established the first enduring links between the Old and New Worlds, initiating European civilization’s influence on the Western Hemisphere.
- Use this opportunity to address with students the history of interactions between the indigenous peoples of North and South America and European explorers and settlers. Of paramount importance is that students not paint with too broad of a brush. The relationships varied widely. Many interactions and relationships were mutually respectful and cooperative. Others were brutal and unjust. Often the relations between the same groups ebbed and flowed between friendship and conflict over time. Ask why misunderstandings, duplicity, and conflict between very different peoples and cultures—and between fallible individuals of all sorts—might arise.
- In addition to conflicts, discuss how the indigenous people’s lack of acquired immunity to diseases—notably smallpox, which most Europeans had been conditioned to survive—was a leading cause of the decline in the Native American population.
- Highlight the later years of Columbus’s life, including his removal as commander in Spanish-claimed territories, his shipwreck and stranding on Jamaica for a year, and Spain’s unwillingness to commission any further expeditions under his command. Columbus died as an abject failure in the eyes of the world and likely in his own eyes, as he never did find a passage to Asia yet also did not understand that what he had discovered was another half of planet Earth. Note how his sailings along the isthmus of Panama left him, unknowingly, just a few dozen miles from the vast Pacific Ocean, the existence of which he knew nothing.
- Explain that Italian mapmaker Amerigo Vespucci, after joining an outfit to the Western Hemisphere, asserted only after Columbus’s death that what Columbus had discovered were not parts of Asia but entirely “new” continents. German mapmakers Latinized and feminized his name into “America” on one of their first maps depicting the New World.
- Review other explorations between Columbus and the beginning of English settlement efforts in the late 1500s. Study Ponce de Leon’s discovery of Florida and the eventual settlement at St. Augustine, marking the first European presence in the future United States. Students need not study all of these events in detail, but they should grasp the overall strategy that Spain, Portugal, and even France adopted toward exploring and settling the New World, namely, a top-down, economically motivated approach under the direct centralized control of their respective monarchies. It will be important to contrast this approach with that of the English in the next lesson. Have students study maps of the Western Hemisphere and the domains these various powers had claimed for their respective crowns. It should also be noted that, as revealed in the history of exploration by Hernando Cortés and Francisco Pizarro, there was often a gulf between the monarchs’ directives to deal with natives justly and humanely and the ability to enforce such restraints across an ocean.

- Trace the paths of various explorers into the future states of America, particularly in Florida and the West. The presence of Catholic missionaries is of special note, highlighting one motivation for exploration.

- Explain how the conflicts between Protestants and Catholics for the English throne, England’s relative distance from continental Europe, and its growing naval strength delayed its interests in exploration beyond the commissioning of voyages by John Cabot. The English largely contented themselves through much of the sixteenth century with preying on Spanish ships returning from the New World with spices and bullion.

- Recount the first English effort to establish a permanent settlement in North America in the colony of Roanoke, which famously disappeared with barely a trace after a brief four-year existence.

- Set up the founding of Jamestown as emblematic of one important motivation for the English to establish a colony: material opportunity for the lower classes. Land ownership by common folk was extremely rare in almost all of Europe, and economic mobility itself was a relatively new and rare phenomenon. The organizers and settlers of Jamestown embodied the enterprising spirit that would come to define emigrants from England to North America, and, for that matter, millions of immigrants throughout America’s history. This degree of opportunity for the ordinary person was unprecedented. It partly explains why so many European commoners left what was familiar and risked the greater likelihood of an earlier death to pursue it. The Jamestown settlers exemplified the idea of pursuing “the American dream.”

- Help students to appreciate the several periods when Jamestown was on the verge of failing and the many deaths incurred despite its eventual success. Of particular note was Jamestown’s original experiment with a form of communism. This collectivism, plus rampant disease, helped produce a disastrous first year and a half for the fledgling settlement. John Smith’s requirement that settlers earn their bread by their work and his guarantee of private property ownership, along with some much-needed assistance from the local Native Americans, not only saved the settlement but also became quintessentially American traits, both in law and in the character of the people. But even this near disaster paled in comparison to what was known as the “Starving Time,” in which failure was averted only by a return to the rule of law under Lord De La Warr. Read with students the Laws of Virginia to discuss the rule of law at Jamestown. The turning point for Jamestown was the successful cultivation of tobacco by John Rolfe. While not the gold many settlers had originally envisioned, the crop would both shore up Jamestown’s existence and spread the news among the English and other Europeans that opportunities were present and realizable in English Virginia.
Consider how the year 1619 at Jamestown offers a profound insight into colonial America:

- On the one hand, it was in 1619 that the first enslaved Africans, having been taken from a Portuguese slave ship en route to Mexico by an English privateer, landed at Jamestown.
- On the other hand, it was also in 1619 at Jamestown that the Virginia House of Burgesses first convened, marking the beginning of representative self-government in the colonies. This self-government would flourish for more than 150 years as the British colonists of North America largely governed themselves and developed the thoughts, practices, and habits of a self-governing people.

Show how the founding of Plymouth was emblematic of the other important motivation for Englishmen to establish a colony: religion. In the wake of the Protestant Reformation, the Christian world was divided, with various forms of strife and severe restrictions on religious belief and practice. In England, these divisions were within Protestantism itself, with Puritans wishing to purify the Church of England of remaining Catholic trappings and Separatist-Puritans (whom we call Pilgrims) seeking to establish a new, true Church of England. It was this latter group that sought not only the freedom to practice their form of Anglicanism but also to re-found the Church in the New World. This band of settlers had the marks of a utopian mindset, even when the English crown required a number of prisoners to embark with them on the Mayflower. And unlike the all-male group that originally settled Jamestown, the Mayflower’s passengers included dozens of families.

Spend some time with the Mayflower Compact, signed off the coast of Cape Cod before the settlers went ashore. Emphasize the English tradition of the rule of law and of forms of democratic expression traced back at least to the Magna Carta. While it would still be decades before Thomas Hobbes and John Locke formulated the idea of the social contract, these Pilgrims made the social contract a reality. That is, facing a lawless wilderness (a state of nature) with families to protect and ex-convicts in their midst, the Pilgrims resorted to that English tradition of self-government under the rule of law—a social contract among themselves—with God as its ultimate judge. Both the Pilgrims at Plymouth in 1620 and the convening of the Virginia House of Burgesses down the coast at Jamestown in 1619, the first two successful English settlements, almost immediately practiced self-government. Self-government under law was therefore present at the very inception of America, a fact that makes America unique.

Note the terrible first winter the Pilgrims suffered at Plymouth, and how the Wampanoag Indians truly saved those who did survive. The next year, with the help of the Wampanoag, was a tremendous success, which Pilgrims and Native Americans together celebrated, and for which they gave thanks to God in what is considered America’s First Thanksgiving (notwithstanding a similar celebration in Spanish Florida in the previous century). Share accounts of this festive Thanksgiving from Edward Winslow and William Bradford.

Finally, discuss the founding of Massachusetts Bay Colony and the leadership of its first governor, John Winthrop. Like the Pilgrims, these Puritans were fierce critics of the Church of England. And like the Pilgrims, they saw the founding of a colony in New England as a sort of religious utopia. Unlike the Pilgrims, however, the Puritans at Massachusetts Bay sought not to separate from the Church of England but to establish a community that would help purify and correct the Church of England while remaining a part of it. As evident in Winthrop’s “A Modell of Christian Charity,” New England would convert Old England by its example. This settlement around Boston would be more of a theocracy than even its neighbor on Cape Cod. Together with Jamestown and Plymouth, the English had a beachhead in the New World, and the news spread far and wide across the Atlantic.
STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS

Assignment: Explain the ways in which the settlers of England’s first three successful settlements in North America were similar and different, being mindful of their motivations, their characteristics, and the challenges they faced once in the New World (1–2 paragraphs).
DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. After whom was America named?

2. Complete this sentence from the text: “The settlement of America had its origins in the ________________ of Europe.”

3. What does the “Silk Road” Asia have to do with European exploration of the Atlantic?

4. Which country under Prince Henry the Navigator took the lead in first exploring the Atlantic along the west coast of Africa?

5. Which Italian navigator landed on what he called “San Salvador Island” in 1492?
DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. Which nation’s colonization of the New World in the sixteenth century was marked for its heavy-handed administration and its brutality toward the indigenous population?

2. What naval victory shifted the balance of power in Europe and set England on the ascent?

3. What was the first successful English colony in the New World?

4. What became the historical name for the individuals who founded Plymouth Colony?

5. Who wrote that the Puritans at Massachusetts Bay would be like “a city upon a hill”?
Unit 1 | Formative Quiz

Covering Lessons 1–2
10–15 minutes

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. What words best describe the topography of the United States?

2. Where did the indigenous peoples of North and South America come from? How do we believe they came?

3. What kinds of civilizations did different groups of indigenous peoples establish in different parts of the Americas?

4. What events “unsettled” European civilization and influenced the decision to explore the seas beyond Europe? How so?

5. In what ways was Christopher Columbus successful, and in what ways did he fail?

6. What motivated settlers to establish Jamestown?

7. Why did the Pilgrims draft and sign the Mayflower Compact?
Lesson 3 — The Colonies in Profile

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about each of the thirteen colonies that would become the United States of America, including their foundings, topography, law, and economies, as well as the presence of indentured servitude and slavery.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
- Land of Hope
- Primary Sources

Teacher Texts
- A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope
- A Student Workbook for Land of Hope

Online.Hillsdale.edu
- The Great American Story
- American Heritage

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students read Land of Hope, pages 28–30, and either complete the reading questions handout in A Student Workbook for Land of Hope (pages 14–15) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 2: Students read and annotate the Fundamental Orders of Connecticut, the Preface to the Frame of Government for Pennsylvania, and An Act for Freedom of Conscience from Pennsylvania and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places
- New Hampshire
- Maryland
- Connecticut
- Rhode Island
- Delaware
- Carolina
- Charles Town
- New Sweden
- New Jersey
- Hudson River
- Manhattan Island
- New Amsterdam
New York
Pennsylvania
Philadelphia
Georgia
New England Colonies
Middle Colonies
Southern Colonies

West Indies
Jamaica
Barbados
The Congo
Gold Coast
Anomabu

Persons
Lord Baltimore
Thomas Hooker
Roger Williams
Henry Hudson
Peter Stuyvesant
William Penn
Jacques Marquette
James Oglethorpe
Anne Bradstreet
Olaudah Equiano

Terms and Topics
proprietary charter
royal charter
Harvard College
public education
Catholics
Toleration Act
Fundamental Orders
of Connecticut
religious freedom
township
county
piracy
Quakers
self-government
colonial assemblies
colonial governors

Roman Republic
mercantilism
free market
Navigation Acts
militia
Triangle Trade
indentured servitude
chattel slavery
Asante Empire
Fante
slave ships
Middle Passage
individualism
aristocracy

Primary Sources
Fundamental Orders of Connecticut
Preface to the Frame of Government of Pennsylvania
An Act for Freedom of Conscience in Pennsylvania

Timeline
1607  Jamestown founded
1620  Pilgrims found Plymouth
1630  Puritans found Massachusetts Bay
1664  English seize New Amsterdam from the Dutch
1732  James Oglethorpe founds Georgia
Images

- Historical figures and events
- Landscape pictures of geographic places featured in this lesson
- Map of the Triangle Trade
- Blueprint of a slave ship
- Depictions of indentured servants and then slaves in the colonies

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- The establishment of each of the colonies
- Roger Williams’s statements and efforts to establish religious toleration in Rhode Island
- Lord Baltimore’s efforts to establish a Catholic colony with religious freedom
- The successful English takeover of New Amsterdam from the Dutch
- Adriaen van der Donck’s account of Peter Stuyvesant’s governance in New York
- James Oglethorpe’s attempts and failure to establish a debtors’ haven in Georgia
- Accounts from the Salem Witch Trials
- Select poems from Anne Bradstreet, particularly “To My Dear and Loving Husband”
- Anthony and Mary Johnson’s accumulation of significant property
- Selections from Olaudah Equiano’s *The Interesting Narrative of the Life of Olaudah Equiano*
- The lives and accomplishments of Cuffee Slocum and Paul Cuffe in New England
- Jean Bion’s account of life on a French slave ship

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What factors (geographic, demographic, climatological, etc.) contributed to differences between the colonies of England, France, and Spain?
- How may the English approach to settlement and colonization be best described?
- In what ways did the settlers and later colonists express a hope for renewal and restoration in the New World?
- What is meant by historian Daniel Boorstin’s observation that “the colonies were a disproving ground for utopias”?
- What were the main religious beliefs of the colonists, based on their various churches?
- What was unique about religion in the colonies and in the eyes of the law?
- What were the roles of literacy and learning among the colonists?
- What is meant by self-government? How might it be said that the colonists governed themselves?
- What was distinctive about property ownership in the colonies?
- How did the various colonial economies function?
- What was indentured servitude? How is it similar to and different from slavery?
- What are the origins of slavery in world history?
- How were Africans first enslaved, before being brought to the Western Hemisphere?
- What was it like to be an African on the Middle Passage and then a slave in the New World?
- How were African slaves distributed in the New World? What proportions of Africans were taken to which parts?
- How did slavery gradually expand and become sanctioned in law?
- How and why did slavery in the eighteenth century supplant the indenture system of the seventeenth century?
What were the chief characteristics of the “American” colonists? What gave them these characteristics?

In what sense was there an “unofficial aristocracy” in the colonies? What made it “unofficial” and how was it distinct from the aristocracies of Europe?

Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
- Question 14: Many documents influenced the U.S. Constitution. Name one.
- Question 73: The colonists came to America for many reasons. Name one.
- Question 75: What group of people was taken and sold as slaves?

**Keys to the Lesson**

Teaching the histories of each colony helps students to understand and appreciate the humble origins of the future United States. It is also very revealing. Students can see in the early histories of many colonies the beginnings of traits that would eventually be hallmarks of American society, law, and citizenry.

Teachers might best plan and teach The Colonies in Profile with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Try to teach the colonies in the order in which they were founded (i.e., as listed above in “Geography and Places”). A map may be projected and distributed to students for reference as the lesson proceeds from colony to colony.
- Compare with students the basic structural differences between French, Spanish, and English colonies; i.e., the native fur trade (France), tributary native labor and precious metals (Spain), and settlement agriculture (England). There are mostly accidental historical reasons for why these three powers’ empires developed as they did, and these factors then had determinative long-term consequences.
- Note the seemingly haphazard approach the English took to colonization, largely shaped by the monarch and parliamentary politics in England at the time of each colonial settlement. For one, colonization was decentralized, and most of the original colonies were established as private property ventures, often sanctioned by the crown but really in the possession of private individuals through joint-stock companies. These were then populated not with government officials or hired agents but with men of all ranks who were also seeking their own opportunity, freedom, and plot of land. Both of these features accounted for the lack of an overall master plan for colonizing North America and marked important departures from the approaches taken by Spain, Portugal, and France. This lack of a plan would become a problem later when England would seek to centralize the administration of the colonies, largely in an effort to raise revenue and enforce the sovereignty of Parliament.
- Help students to understand the importance of these traits. Not only did the English approach to colonization trend toward greater independence from the monarchy, it also attracted and encouraged individuals and families who were independent-minded and determined. What the settlers did not bring with them from Europe were the legal class distinctions that defined the aristocratic and monarchial nations they left behind. These individuals (except for their British governors) were common people who immigrated to America seeking their freedom and to better their station in life. The rugged individualism, practice of personal independence, work ethic, and ingenuity to succeed would become well-known American characteristics and in some cases would result in the formation of new colonies by separation from an existing colony, as was the case in New England.
Spend time on what it meant to make a living and survive in the daunting wilderness and how such perseverance shaped the character and mind of the colonists. This would include looking at lifestyles and kinds of work done in the colonies, the type of self-reliance necessary for such lives, and the ways in which Christian religious beliefs contributed to how communities functioned.

Consider how strongly matters of religious faith defined colonial culture, largely because so many came to America to escape the religious persecutions or limitations of the Old World. From the Pilgrims and the Puritans to Roman Catholics and Jews, a wide variety of faiths (most of them Christian and many of whom were intolerant of one another in the Old World) permeated colonial settlements, and their adherents increasingly came to respect one another as neighbors. Establishing this religious freedom in law, moreover, was widespread and exceptional compared to the rest of the world, even while events such as the persecution of the Quakers in Massachusetts still occurred.

Note also for the students that the diversity of religious belief was accompanied by the diversity of immigrants. New York and Rhode Island, for example, were well known for the number of people who had migrated there from many countries other than the British Isles.

Help students appreciate that colonial America was highly literate and that the leading members of colonial society and government were educated in classical thought, ancient and contemporary history, and philosophy and politics (including thinkers of the moderate Enlightenment). Such high levels of literacy and learning were unheard of anywhere else in the world. Important factors that contributed to this high degree of literacy among the people was the insistence on being able to read the Bible, broad support for education, and collegiate preparation.

Emphasize with students the degree of self-government that the colonists exercised. Include in this discussion the meaning of self-government. In brief, the colonists largely governed their own internal affairs (rule over local matters, including taxation, as opposed to international trade and security) through local legislatures and governance structures chosen by the people. This was partly due to the English tradition of legislative authority and the rule of law, the loose and decentralized pattern of British colonial settlements and rule compared to other empires. Another factor at play here was the great distance between London and the American eastern seaboard, which led to long periods of “benign neglect” of the colonies and the further development of local institutions of self-government. While all of the colonies would eventually become official royal colonies with royal governors, colony-wide legislative bodies were prolific, as were local governments such as townships, counties, and cities. Unlike almost every place in the world at that time and in history, the people were to a large extent ruling themselves. Read with students the various examples of self-government as enacted by colonial legislatures, such as the Fundamental Orders of Connecticut, the Preface to the Frame of Government of Pennsylvania, and an Act for Freedom of Conscience in Pennsylvania.

Outline for students the near universal ownership of firearms among the colonists for self-defense, for hunting, and, when necessary, for the common self-defense.

Discuss how private property opportunities and protections enabled commoners to earn their livelihood in freedom and contributed to the characteristics of Americans as industrious and independent.

Explain to students the several kinds of trade and vocational trades present in the various colonies. Farming was, of course, the main livelihood, but manufacturing, fishing, whaling, shipbuilding, and other trades (particularly in New England) rapidly emerged as key colonial contributions. Trade was principally with England, but the British colonies of North America developed robust trade among one another and with the colonies of other nations as well.
Share with students the complex patterns of relationship between the colonists and Native Americans. The relationships ran the gamut from friendly to violent, varying widely depending on the tribe involved, with misunderstandings and clashes of cultures and languages. Disagreements abounded over the concepts of communal versus private property. Violent clashes occurred along the edges of the colonial frontier, and cross-frontier retaliations by both sides were not uncommon. Colonists could be caught in conflicts between various Native American tribes, and likewise, Native Americans were often caught in conflicts between European powers. Systematic displacement of Native Americans was usually limited to localities during this period (such as after King Philip’s War in southern New England and through the Indian slave trade on the South Carolina frontier). Displacement over time was primarily due to devastation from disease and gradual, individual settlement westward.

Mention that a number of colonists criticized some of the ways that colonial governments dealt with Native Americans. These also condemned and sought to remove slavery from their colonies. Arguments for justice toward Native Americans and Africans often cited Christian religious beliefs and moral philosophy.

Review with students the emergence of chattel slavery during the Renaissance in Europe and through colonization, then address slavery in what would become the future United States. When teaching students about the history of slavery in the British colonies of North America, be mindful of the following:

- Help students to understand why a full understanding of the human person, of equality, and of justice all make slavery an evil action and practice, violating the principle that all people are equal in their humanity and possession of natural rights. Therefore, no one person may automatically infringe on the humanity or rights of another unless some initial violation of another’s rights has occurred.
- Discuss with students how racism is the belief that some people are superior or inferior to others based on race, racial characteristics, or ancestry, how racism arises from a failure to recognize the equal dignity and value of each human being, and how racism manifests itself through the voluntary acts of individual people, both private words and actions and public speech and actions, such as laws and regulations.
- Discuss the history of slavery in world history, from ancient times through the middle ages and in different places worldwide, leading up to the transatlantic slave trade. Portugal first began using African slaves on their sugar plantations off the west African coast, manifesting the chattel and race-based aspects of slavery in European colonies. The slave trade gradually made its way to the various colonies established throughout the Western Hemisphere, particularly with the cultivation of sugar cane in the Caribbean.
- Ask students to imagine the Middle Passage and the barbarities of slavery and the slave trade. Overall, of the nearly 11 million Africans who survived being brought to the Western Hemisphere, around 3 percent, or about 350,000, were brought to the North American continent, with the rest going to other colonies in the Caribbean and South America.
- As mentioned in the previous lesson, the first Africans were brought to Jamestown by an English privateer who had captured a Portuguese slave ship en route from Africa, likely headed for Portugal’s South American colonies.
- Discuss the similarities and differences between slavery and indentured servitude. Indentured servitude was a common way for those who could not afford passage or to establish themselves in the New World to tie themselves to a sponsor for a number of
years, offering free labor in exchange for passage across the Atlantic and shelter in the colonies. Oftentimes indentured servitude was sometimes little different from slavery, as shown in transcripts from court cases of indentured servants claiming relief from a cruel master.

It would be several decades before a law emerged in the southern colonies that concerned African colonists in particular or the practice of slavery. In 1662, forty-three years after the arrival of the first Africans at Jamestown, Virginia’s commanding general determined that a child born to an enslaved woman would also be a “servant for life,” and in 1668, corporal punishment for slaves was permitted in law. These appear to be the first laws regarding slavery in colonial America.

The transatlantic slave trade grew with the sugar cane plantations of the Caribbean as far back as the early 1500s—plantations which also happened to become England’s most valuable colonies. At the same time, the source of labor shifted away from indigenous peoples, European convicts, and indentured servants to slaves. Although slavery was more widespread in the southern colonies (to grow tobacco and rice) and almost universal in England’s Caribbean sugar plantations, few laws explicitly prohibited the practice in most colonies, at least at certain times in their histories. Consider also the early abolitionist efforts of some colonists, the Quakers, for example.

- Show students maps of the colonies around 1630, 1700, and 1730 that illustrate the real extent of settlement. They should see that the colonists mostly resided only along the Atlantic coast, still hardly a foothold compared to the vastness of the continental interior, the extent of which they did not yet fathom.

- Reflect with students on the unique American character that emerged among the free British colonists in North America. The harshness and risk of settling the New World gave them a certain grit and determination, along with an enterprising mind and innovative skill set. The universal demand for trade skills and farming in establishing a new civilization placed the vast majority of colonists within what we would call today the “working class.” In New England especially, colonists’ Protestantism made them widely literate for the sake of reading the Bible, skeptical of human sources of authority, and focused on individual improvement. At the same time, it made them highly idealistic, with many seeking to re-found Christendom. For many colonists, previous persecution granted them a deeper and more passionate sense of justice, of right and wrong. It also made them highly attuned to the politics on which freedom depended. A certain rugged, enterprising, and justice-loving individualism defined the colonists.

- Explain how a sort of unofficial aristocracy emerged throughout the colonies, but an aristocracy open to promotion by the meritorious; that is, based on merit, talent, and virtue instead of mere heredity. This unofficial class of leading citizens was also modeled more on the English gentleman rather than on the courts of continental Europe. Their stations in life ranged from planters in the south, where the aristocratic element was most prevalent, to clergy, merchants, professors, and manufacturers in the north. And in general, all of them were highly learned.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment:** Explain what it was about the American colonies that made them historically exceptional; that is, the *exception* compared to the rest of the world and the normal course of human history (1–2 paragraphs).
Reading Quiz 1.4

The British Colonies of North America | Lesson 3
Land of Hope, Pages 28-30

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. Which colony was founded as a haven for religious dissenters, breaking away from Massachusetts Bay Colony?

2. Pennsylvania was established by ______________ for members of his religious group, the Quakers.

3. Historian Daniel Boorstin characterized the colonies as “a disproving ground for ____________.”
Lesson 4 — Major Events in the Colonies

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the major events and movements in colonial America and further study the ideas and experiences that were shaping the colonists during what Edmund Burke called the period of “salutary neglect.”

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts

*Land of Hope*

Pages 14–20, 31–42

Primary Sources

See below.

Teacher Texts

*A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope*

Pages 15–19, 29–32

*A Student Workbook for Land of Hope*

Pages 12 and 20

Online.Hillsdale.edu

*The Great American Story*  Lectures 2 and 3

*American Heritage*  Lectures 2 and 3

STUDENT PREPARATION

**Assignment 1:** Students read *Land of Hope*, pages 14–20, and either complete the reading questions handout in *A Student Workbook for Land of Hope* (pages 12 and 20) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

**Assignment 2:** Students read *Land of Hope*, pages 31–42, and either complete the reading questions handout in *A Student Workbook for Land of Hope* (pages 12 and 20) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

**Assignment 3:** Students read and annotate excerpts from John Locke’s *Second Treatise of Government* and from the Albany Plan of Union and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

**Geography & Places**

Appalachian Mountains  
Ohio River Valley

Allegheny Mountains  
The Great Lakes
Lake Champlain          New Orleans
Canada                    Detroit
Nova Scotia               Quebec
St. Lawrence River        Montreal
Niagara Falls             Potomac River
Mississippi River         Duquesne

**Persons**
- Thomas Hobbes
- John Locke
- William Blackstone
- Montesquieu
- Jonathan Edwards
- George Whitefield
- George III
- William Pitt
- George Washington
- Edward Braddock
- Benjamin Franklin

**Terms and Topics**
- Beaver Wars
- King Philip’s War
- The Old French War
- Queen Anne’s War
- Navigation Acts
- English Civil War
- The Enlightenment
- Bacon’s Rebellion
- Glorious Revolution
- English Bill of Rights
- “salutary neglect”
- representation
- self-government
- township
- The Great Awakening
- Methodists
- Baptists
- *Poor Richard’s Almanac*
- French and Indian War
- Iroquois Confederacy
- “Rules of Civility”
- Battle of Jumonville Glen
- Albany Congress
- rifle
- Fort Duquesne
- Treaty of Paris

**Primary Sources**
- Magna Carta
- Act of the General Court of Massachusetts
- English Bill of Rights
- *Second Treatise of Government*, John Locke
- Albany Plan of Union

**To Know by Heart**

Selections from Benjamin Franklin’s *Poor Richard’s Almanac*.

Selections from George Washington’s “Rules of Civility & Decent Behavior in Company and Conversation,” such as:
- “Be not apt to relate news if you know not the truth thereof.”
- “ Undertake not what you cannot perform but be careful to keep your promise.”
“Speak not evil of the absent for it is unjust.”
“Think before you speak, pronounce not imperfectly nor bring out your words too hastily but orderly & distinctly.”
“When you see a Crime punished, you may be inwardly Pleased; but always shew Pity to the Suffering Offender.”
“Use no Reproachfull Language against any one neither Curse nor Revile.”

Timeline
1688 Glorious Revolution; English Bill of Rights
1730s The Great Awakening
1754–63 The French and Indian War

Images
Historical figures and events
Dress of colonists from different periods and places
Uniforms and munitions of soldiers in the various wars
Depictions of battles and battlefields, including strategy and tactics, such as the Siege of Louisbourg
Colonial assembly buildings
Depictions of Great Awakening gatherings and revival scenes

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART
- A sermon by Jonathan Edwards
- George Washington and the cherry tree (legend)
- George Washington’s time as a surveyor
- George Washington’s first battles in the Virginia militia, including his survival and Braddock’s death
- John Winslow’s account of the Acadians during the French and Indian War
- Benjamin Franklin’s autobiography

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND
- What was it like to wage war in North America during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries?
- How did each colony reflect English government and legal developments during the seventeenth century?
- What did the colonists learn from the English Civil War?
- Which ancient and Enlightenment figures and ideas influenced the leading colonists?
- What were John Locke’s ideas on natural law, natural rights, and the social contract? To what extent had these already been reflected in English law and, therefore, in colonial law?
- What is “salutary neglect”? In what senses were the colonists neglected and how was this neglect actually beneficial to them?
- What did self-government look like in the colonies?
- Who was permitted to vote, in general, in the colonies? How does this practice compare to the present day? How does it compare to the world at that time and in previous centuries?
- How had the ideas of the Protestant Reformation shaped the colonists’ religious beliefs?
- How did the Great Awakening affect religious belief and especially practice among the colonists?
- How did the Great Awakening contribute to a greater sense of unity between the colonies?
- What were the causes of the French and Indian War?
- What were the major battles and moments in the French and Indian War?
- In what ways did the French and Indian War foster a greater unity among the colonies?
- What was the Albany Plan of Union? What did it reveal about the relationships among the colonies?
- Why did the British defeat the French in the French and Indian War?
- How did the Treaty of Paris reshape North America?
- What challenges and opportunities did the British and the British colonists face with the changes wrought by the Treaty of Paris?

Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
- Question 13: What is the rule of law?
- Question 85: Benjamin Franklin is famous for many things. Name one.
- Question 86: George Washington is famous for many things. Name one.

KEYS TO THE LESSON

Having learned about the establishment and characteristics of each colony, students should consider the major influences and events that shaped colonial history. These include, of course, events that occurred within the colonies themselves, but also certain ideas and events in Europe that had significant influence on the colonists, too. Treatment of the Enlightenment and the English Civil War does not need to be extensive in an American history class, but students should understand how these events affected and informed the colonists. Once the lesson enters the eighteenth century, special focus should be placed on the events that created in the colonists a sense of independence from Great Britain and of greater dependence on one another, even as they themselves did not fully recognize or articulate these trends. In general, this lesson should help students see what the colonists and colonies had become before they learn about the American founding.

Teachers might best plan and teach Major Events in the Colonies with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Review with students the relationships between Native Americans and the settlers. Note the variety of relationships and circumstances over time, helping students to recognize how much time colonial history spans. Disease was the main factor that sent the Native Americans into decline. When significant conflict did occur, it often involved an entangling of rivalries among Native American tribes and those of European powers and their colonies. In light of such conflicts, American colonists in particular were well versed in defending themselves with their own arms and in locally assembled citizen militias.

- Teach students about the various wars that occurred in the New World, either between settlers and Native Americans or with colonies of other countries. A lot of detail is not necessary, but students should appreciate that these wars were significant for those who were endangered by them and left largely to their own defenses. Students should also be introduced to the style, strategy, and tactics of seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century warfare, particularly as waged in North America.
• For a time, it was the Puritans who wound up in power in England. As Englishmen, the colonists followed the events of strife from across the ocean. Discuss with students the English Civil War, which involved and influenced some of the main political thought of the colonists, as well as the Glorious Revolution a few decades later. These political developments informed the colonists and drew their careful attention to political considerations.

• Read and discuss with students the Magna Carta and the English Bill of Rights to show that there is a long history of understanding that a “fundamental law” exists above, and that regardless of particular political institutions (such as the King or Parliament), that fundamental law grants rights and liberties. Read also Act of the General Court of Massachusetts that demonstrated the influence of English law and events in England on concepts of self-government in the colonies.

• Review or discuss the intellectual influences on the Americans, particularly those who were the colonists’ unofficial aristocracy. In addition to a Judeo-Christian faith tradition and Greco-Roman philosophy and law, the Enlightenment also influenced leading colonists. Students should understand some of the Enlightenment’s main principles and thinkers. In addition to the English Enlightenment’s influence on Britain’s North American colonists in general, Enlightenment ideas on politics were of special interest to a people governing themselves and carefully observing political events taking place back in England.

• Read with students some of the emblematic thought of John Locke—especially the social contract theory and his arguments on the supremacy of the legislature—that leading colonists would entertain in the mid-eighteenth century.

• Consider with students the English statesman Edmund Burke’s idea that the colonists in British North America enjoyed a relationship of “salutary neglect” with respect to the English government. They were “neglected” in the sense that they were a month away by sea from England, which meant poor communication and the near impossibility of governing directly. The English also largely overlooked their colonies in North America, sometimes viewing the colonists merely as poor tradesmen, former criminals, religious radicals, and commoners of no noble birth. Compared to England’s Caribbean colonies, they were also far less profitable. England’s preoccupation with rivals Spain and France and her own civil war also left English kings and Parliament with relatively little thought to give the colonies. The mercantilist restrictions on trade, moreover, were seldom fully enforced or even capable of being completely enforced, and the colonies largely traded freely with the world.

• Help students understand why this relationship of neglect was not, in Burke’s view, a disadvantage but actually healthy for the colonists. Overall, the colonists were still protected, especially on the seas, by the English. At the same time, however, they were not regulated or administratively directed beyond the general forms of governance; e.g., a royal governor and a local legislature. The colonists were largely free to take the enterprising, individualist spirit of common English settlers and, forced by necessity, to innovate and work hard to pursue livelihoods and security within their own spheres. Laws, moreover, could not wait for a two- or three-month lapse in communication. Colonists were both permitted and forced by circumstances to practice the elements of English law they had brought with them, including a recognition of certain rights and the limits of authority. The colonists had ample talent and opportunity to govern themselves: they had education and a group of leading colonists who were learned in classical thought; they had the English rule of law tradition; and they had general Enlightenment ideas. This tradition of self-government would allow for many generations of practice in self-rule as a feature of daily life. The colonists, therefore, were both used to and deeply
practiced in locally governing themselves, replete with the ideas and habits that this process cultivated.

- Briefly spend time reviewing the institutional forms that self-government took in the colonies. In general, representation by election determined the composition of the various colonial assemblies, beginning with the Virginia House of Burgesses in 1619. That representative self-government was the norm in the colonies was astonishing compared to the rest of the world and human history. The creation of the township was also a uniquely colonial American establishment, and the participation by the average colonist in local government was widespread.

- Students should gain a clear perspective on voting in America and in human history. In brief, this privilege has been exceptionally rare, making the American citizen’s right to vote a remarkable achievement. And nearly all of the groundbreaking moments in this achievement occurred in American history. The American colonies, for instance, were one of the few places where most ordinary male citizens of European descent were permitted to vote. Even though still restricted to those of European descent who maintained some property, this expansion of the right to vote in the American colonies was a consequential development in world history—a significant step toward universal suffrage. As Land of Hope puts it, “A greater proportion of the American population could participate in elections and have a role in selecting their representatives than anywhere else on the planet.”

- Clarify for students that each colony originally did not see itself as part of a shared English colonial political state. Although their own proprietary charters were eventually replaced with royal charters, each colony viewed itself as its own separate entity, only loosely bound to the others by a common mother country and overall shared culture. This view would persist up to the eve of the Revolution.

- Share with students one of the greatest contributors both to the unification of the colonies and to religious belief in America: the Great Awakening. Combine this discussion with Land of Hope’s account of the Protestant Reformation (pages 14–20) to understand the roots of American religion and settlement. The Great Awakening cultivated a distinctly American experience and a distinctly American sort of religious belief and practice. The presence of the Great Awakening throughout the colonies provided the separate and distinct colonies with something they could hold in common. At the same time, it awakened a passion for right moral conduct and justice that could be attached to any cause. Read with students excerpted sermons from Jonathan Edwards and George Whitefield, helping students to be attentive to these kinds of historical effects.

- Teach students about the various conflicts in which the British colonists of North America found themselves. Spend some time in particular with the French and Indian War. Of special note here is the presence of a young George Washington and the Virginia militia fighting alongside the British regulars. This is a good opportunity to introduce Washington, including his boyhood biography and his exploits in the war, and especially his actions during the attack on General Braddock. The French and Indian War was also important for providing the colonists another shared experience, this time amidst the adversities of war, and for demonstrating increased cooperation and a sense of unity, as evidenced by the Albany Congress. The Albany Plan for Union may be read to see the forerunners of unification and independence in the coming decade. This is also a good place to introduce the architect of the Albany congress and plan, Benjamin Franklin, including teaching about his biography up to this juncture and reading selections from Poor Richard’s Almanac. In addition to fostering advances toward and experiences in united
action, the French and Indian War is also of great importance for understanding the circumstances that would lead to the American Revolution.

- Share with students maps showing the transfer of territory to the British Empire through the Treaty of Paris. Discuss with students what this meant for the relative power of Great Britain and France and the new challenges and opportunities inherent in such a sudden change of territory and power.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Explain how the English law tradition and the developments and final outcomes of the English Civil War shaped the colonists’ views and practice of self-government (1–2 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Explain how England neglected the colonists and how this neglect was actually salutary (1–2 paragraphs).
DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. What does the author argue to be the first major disruption to European civilization that would influence the future British colonies in North America?

2. Who was the monk who first successfully broke with the Roman Catholic Church?

3. Who was John Calvin?

4. Which leader led the English Reformation?

5. What happened within the Church of England in the years following its initial break with the Roman Catholic Church?
Reading Quiz 1.6

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. What was different about how England went about colonization?

2. What issues plagued England during the 1600s?

3. What war between England and France in North America resulted from disputes over control of the Ohio River Valley and the lands west of the Allegheny Mountains?

4. What religious phenomenon occurred in the colonies in the 1730s?

5. What philosophical phenomenon that originated in Europe found fertile ground among the colonies’ leading citizens?
APPENDIX A

Study Guide

Test

Writing Assignment
Unit 1 Test — Study Guide

**TIMELINE**

When given dates, match events from a list to the years or dates that they happened.

- Oct. 12, 1492  Columbus lands on San Salvador Island
- 1585–90  Roanoke Colony
- 1607  Jamestown settled
- 1619  Africans disembark at Jamestown; first meeting of the Virginia House of Burgesses
- 1620  Pilgrims settle Plymouth
- 1630  Puritans settle Massachusetts Bay
- 1688  Glorious Revolution; English Bill of Rights
- 1730s  The Great Awakening
- 1754–63  The French and Indian War

**GEOGRAPHY AND PLACES**

Identify each on a map and/or tell where it is and explain its significance.

- Genoa
- San Salvador/Watling’s Island
- “The New World”
- La Florida
- St. Augustine
- Virginia
- Roanoke
- Chesapeake Bay
- Jamestown
- Cape Cod
- Plymouth
- Massachusetts Bay
- Boston
- Hudson River
- Manhattan Island
- New England Colonies
- Middle Colonies
- Southern Colonies
- West Indies
- Jamaica
- Barbados
- The Congo
- Anomabu
- Appalachian Mountains
- Allegheny Mountains
- Ohio River Valley
- The Great Lakes
- Lake Champlain
- Canada
- Mississippi River
- New Orleans
- Detroit
- Quebec
- Montreal
- Potomac River
- Duquesne

**PERSONS**

Identify each, provide biographical details, and explain what he or she thought or did in specific periods or events.

- Ferdinand and Isabella
- Christopher Columbus
- Ponce de Leon
- Amerigo Vespucci
- John Smith
- Pocahontas
- Thomas Gates
- Lord De La Warr
- John Rolfe
- William Bradford
- Miles Standish
- Massasoit
- John Winthrop
- Lord Baltimore
- Thomas Hooker
TERMS AND TOPICS

Identify each and explain its significance to the period of history studied.

- glaciers
- continental shelf
- land bridge
- Mayas
- Aztecs
- Incas
- Hopewell
- Silk Road
- Renaissance
- humanism
- nation-states
- Taiño
- Columbian Exchange
- smallpox
- mercantilism
- joint-stock companies
- Virginia Company
- indentured servants
- Powhatan
- “Starving Time”
- tobacco
- House of Burgesses
- Separatist Puritans
- Pilgrims
- Mayflower
- state of nature
- social contract
- self-government
- Wampanoag
- Puritans
- proprietary charter
- royal charter
- Harvard College
- public education
- Toleration Act
- Fundamental Orders
- of Connecticut
- religious freedom
- county
- township
- Quakers
- colonial assemblies
- colonial governors
- Navigation Acts
- militia
- Triangle Trade
- chattel slavery
- Asante Empire
- Middle Passage
- King Philip’s War
- English Civil War
- The Enlightenment
- Bacon’s Rebellion
- Glorious Revolution
- English Bill of Rights
- “salutary neglect”
- representation
- Roman Republic
- The Great Awakening
- French and Indian War
- Albany Congress
- Treaty of Paris

PRIMARY SOURCES

Based on annotations and notes from seminar conversations, be able to answer questions on each primary source. While you will not necessarily be asked why each primary source was created, what it did or argued, and what its effects were, being able to answer these kinds of questions will make you well-prepared.

Letter to Raphael Sanchez, Christopher Columbus
Letter to King Ferdinand II, Christopher Columbus
Laws of Virginia
The Mayflower Compact
“A Modell of Christian Charity,” John Winthrop
Fundamental Orders of Connecticut

Copyright © 2022 Hillsdale College. All Rights Reserved.
Preface to the Frame of Government of Pennsylvania
An Act for Freedom of Conscience in Pennsylvania
Magna Carta
English Bill of Rights
Second Treatise of Government, John Locke

TO KNOW BY HEART

Be prepared to fill in missing words and/or identify the speaker and context.

“We must consider that we shall be as a city upon a hill. The eyes of all people are upon us.” —John Winthrop

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be middle school students.

- Christopher Columbus’s voyages and interactions with natives
- The “Starving Time” at Jamestown
- Pocahontas, John Smith, and John Rolfe
- The voyage of the Mayflower
- Accounts of the First Thanksgiving by Edward Winslow and William Bradford
- Roger Williams’s statements and efforts to establish religious toleration in Rhode Island
- Select poems from Anne Bradstreet, particularly “To My Dear and Loving Husband”
- Jean Bion’s account of life on a French slave ship
- George Washington and the cherry tree (legend)
- George Washington’s time as a surveyor
- George Washington’s first battles in the Virginia militia, including his survival and Braddock’s death
- Benjamin Franklin’s autobiography

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.

Lesson 1 | The Lands, Waters, and Peoples of America

☐ What resources and advantages does North America afford for the flourishing of a developed civilization? How does it compare to other places in the world?
☐ How have Americans distributed themselves across the continent in the present day? What accounts for this distribution, in both the past and the present?
☐ Where did the indigenous peoples of North and South America come from? How do we believe they came?
☐ What kinds of civilizations did different groups of indigenous peoples establish in different parts of the Americas?
How did European and indigenous cultures differ from one another? Is there evidence of conflict among indigenous tribes?

Lesson 2 | Exploration and Settlement

What events “unsettled” European civilization and influenced the decision to explore the seas beyond Europe? How so?

How was exploration connected to the ideas and circumstances of the Renaissance?

What was Christopher Columbus’s theory?

What were some of the ways in which Christopher Columbus’s voyages changed the world?

In which ways was Christopher Columbus successful, and in which did he fail?

From where do we get the name “America”?

How did most European monarchs explore, settle, and manage their claimed possessions in the New World? How was England’s approach different?

What motivated settlers to establish Jamestown?

What two things happened in Jamestown in 1619?

What motivated the Pilgrims to settle at Plymouth? What were their goals?

Why did the Pilgrims draft and sign the Mayflower Compact?

What is so extraordinary about the Mayflower Compact?

Based on John Winthrop’s writings, how did the Puritans at Massachusetts Bay envision their lives and the task before them in North America?

Lesson 3 | The Colonies in Profile

What factors (geographic, demographic, climatological, etc.) contributed to differences between the colonies of England, France, and Spain?

How may the English approach to settlement and colonization be best described?

In what ways did the settlers and later colonists express a hope for renewal and restoration in the New World?

What is meant by historian Daniel Boorstin’s observation that “the colonies were a disproving ground for utopias”?

What were the main religious beliefs of the colonists, based on their various churches?

What was unique about religion in the colonies and in the eyes of the law?

What were the roles of literacy and learning among the colonists?

What is meant by self-government? How might it be said that the colonists governed themselves?

What was distinctive about property ownership in the colonies?

What was indentured servitude? How is it similar to and different from slavery?

What are the origins of slavery in world history?

How were Africans first enslaved, before being brought to the Western Hemisphere?

What was it like to be an African on the Middle Passage and then a slave in the New World?

How did slavery gradually expand and become sanctioned in law?

How and why did slavery in the eighteenth century supplant the indenture system of the seventeenth century?

What were the chief characteristics of the “American” colonists? What gave them these characteristics?
In what sense was there an “unofficial aristocracy” in the colonies? What made it “unofficial” and how was it distinct from the aristocracies of Europe?

Lesson 4 | Major Events in the Colonies

How did each colony reflect English government and legal developments during the seventeenth century?

What did the colonists learn from the English Civil War?

Which ancient and Enlightenment figures and ideas influenced the leading colonists?

What were John Locke’s ideas on natural law, natural rights, and the social contract? To what extent had these ideas already been reflected in English law and, therefore, in colonial law?

What is “salutary neglect”? In what senses were the colonists neglected, and how was this neglect actually beneficial to them?

What did self-government look like in the colonies?

Who was permitted to vote, in general, in the colonies? How does this practice compare to the present day? How does it compare to the world at that time and in previous centuries?

How did the Great Awakening affect religious belief and especially practice among the colonists?

How did the Great Awakening contribute to a greater sense of unity between the colonies?

What were the causes of the French and Indian War?

In what ways did the French and Indian War foster a greater unity among the colonies?

What was the Albany Plan of Union? What did it reveal about the relationships among the colonies?

Why did the British defeat the French in the French and Indian War?

How did the Treaty of Paris reshape North America?

What challenges and opportunities did the British and the British colonists face with the changes wrought by the Treaty of Paris?
Unit 1 | Test — The British Colonies of North America

**TIMELINE**

Write the letter of each event next to the date or years it took place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 12, 1492</td>
<td>A. Africans disembark at Jamestown; first meeting of the Virginia House of Burgesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585–90</td>
<td>B. Columbus lands on San Salvador Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>C. Glorious Revolution; English Bill of Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1619</td>
<td>D. Jamestown settled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620</td>
<td>E. Pilgrims settle Plymouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630</td>
<td>F. Puritans settle Massachusetts Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688</td>
<td>G. Roanoke Colony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730s</td>
<td>H. The French and Indian War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1754–63</td>
<td>I. The Great Awakening</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GEOGRAPHY AND PLACES**

1. Label with dots and/or circle:
   - St. Augustine
   - Roanoke
   - Chesapeake Bay
   - Jamestown
   - Cape Cod
   - Plymouth
   - Boston
   - Hudson River
   - Manhattan Island
   - West Indies
   - Appalachian Mountains
   - Ohio River Valley
   - The Great Lakes
   - Lake Champlain
   - Mississippi River
   - New Orleans
   - Detroit
   - Quebec
   - Montreal
   - Duquesne

Map courtesy of A Student Workbook for Land of Hope.
**PERSONS, TERMS, AND TOPICS**

*Fill in the blank.*

2. The year after Christopher Columbus died, an Italian naval observer sailing for Portugal came to realize and claim that what Columbus had discovered and subsequent explorers explored was not merely outlying islands of Asia but in fact an entirely new continent, the size of which was still unknown. The Latin feminine form of the first name of this person found its way onto a map of the New World. Thus was “America” named after ________________________.

3. Lasting only four years and disappearing without a trace, the ________________________ in present-day North Carolina was England’s rather late and first attempt to colonize the New World.

4. England’s second attempt at colonization nearly failed on two occasions, and the settlers had a fraught relationship with the local Powhatan tribe. The eventual success of ________________ came largely from John Rolfe’s successful cultivation of ________________, which was exported to Europe at a great profit.

5. The Separatist Puritans had little hope for a satisfactory removal of Catholic remnants within the Church of England. Not tolerated in England, these ________________ were dismissed on a religious journey to Virginia under the leadership of William Bradford. Instead of settling in Virginia, however, their old wine ship, the ________________, landed far to the north on the North American coast at Cape Cod.

6. Having disagreed multiple times with the Puritan rule in and around Boston and with special zeal for religious toleration and the treatment of Native Americans, ________________________ sought refuge from the Narragansett Native Americans and founded the colony Providence Plantations (Rhode Island) based on religious freedom.

7. Originally founded by the Dutch, ________________________ was seized by the British in 1664. This meager but ideal harbor town at the mouth of the Hudson River, with commerce moving between Manhattan Island and Long Island, would become the largest city in the Americas.

8. Pennsylvania was named after its founder, who received the lands for this “Bread Colony” as payment for debt from the king to his father upon the latter’s death. “Penn’s Woods” was intended as a haven for Quakers, and its inhabitants practiced religious freedom under its founder and leader named ________________________.

9. Although founded by Catholic-convert John Calvert, Lord of Baltimore, Ireland, and intended as a refuge for persecuted Catholics from England, ________________________ very quickly had a minority of Catholics. Before they became a minority, however, they prudently passed laws allowing for religious tolerance.

10. With an economy based on the large plantation farming of tobacco, indigo, and rice, the ________________________ colonies developed an aristocratic society and culture of leisure dependent upon a lower class of slaves and yeoman farmers.
11. The British colonies in North America were part of a trade pattern that included England, Caribbean colonies, and African colonies. The American colonies exported cod, ships, lumber, rum, iron, whale oil, tobacco, indigo, and other raw materials to England, and they imported guns, clothes, furniture, paper, and tea from England and slaves from Africa. Historians named this trade system after the shape its trade routes made on a map of the Atlantic: the __________________________.

12. As the colonists settled farther west, they gradually removed the Native Americans from their ancestral grounds through sheer numbers, by spreading diseases that the Native Americans were not used to, and through outright warfare. Native Americans often resisted, as was the case in the Pequot War in Connecticut and Opechancanough’s Massacre at Jamestown. Had it not been for longstanding Native American rivalries and disunion, they may have successfully expelled colonists from Boston itself during ________________’s War in 1675–76.

13. The colonists’ relationship with England left them both free to establish their own governmental structures and in need of doing so. While the emergence of government institutions did not follow any set pattern, such institutions were all based on the English law tradition, they developed organically, and they epitomized American rule by the people, called __________________________.

14. Power struggles often arose within colonial governments between the elected assemblies and the royally appointed ____________. There thus emerged a long pattern of colonial power challenging and usually proving superior to English authority within the colonies, partly due to claims of power originating from the people themselves.

15. Local self-government was widespread among the colonies but assumed different forms, depending on the region. In the Middle and Southern colonies, the county, situated with a central meeting town and a courthouse, was a powerful judiciary institution; in New England, a new arrangement called a ____________ spread the population of a town over thirty-six square miles. These institutions trained common colonists in political participation and patriotism.

16. Agreed to in 1215 by King John and the English barons, the ________________, or “Great Charter,” was the first English pronouncement of the rule of law. Together with the Mayflower Compact and the English ________________, which concluded the Glorious Revolution, the colonists drew many ideas and much language from these principal English legal precedents.

17. The philosophy of the British Enlightenment thinker __________________________ defined an increasingly popular idea in England and in the colonies: that of a ____________ that would allot power in a political body beholden to the people in order to preserve and protect the natural rights human beings equally enjoyed by virtue of their humanity.

18. Of the ancient Greek and Roman political philosophers, the American aristocracy was influenced far more by the ancient __________________________, especially regarding their understanding that a republic ultimately rests on the virtue of its citizens.
19. Considered the “friend of the colonies,” ________________ was a member of the English Parliament from Ireland who championed continuity, tradition, prudence, moderation, and compromise toward the colonies, whose neglect by England, he believed, was responsible for the colonists’ successful governance of themselves.

20. As the population of the colonies doubled every generation, westward expansion beyond the Appalachian Mountains brought the British into conflict not only with Native Americans but also with the French in Canada, especially over who controlled the very fertile and wild lands west of the Appalachians known as the ________ River Valley.

21. This area beyond the Appalachians was first charted by a sixteen-year-old surveyor-aristocrat from Virginia named _________________. His experience mapping and camping in the uncharted wilderness motivated him at age nineteen to join the Virginia militia, in which he rose to the rank of Major General.

22. To gain a secure alliance with the Iroquois Confederacy and to foster inter-colony cooperation during the French and Indian War, the seven most northern colonies met at the ________________ under the direction of the accomplished printer, thinker, statesman, and inventor from Philadelphia named Benjamin Franklin. While their plan for union was not adopted by the colonies, it was the first instance of united action among the several American colonies, and it became a model for future colonial cooperation.

Know By Heart

Fill in the missing words and identify the source.

23. “We must consider that we shall be as a _________________. The eyes of all people are upon us.”

Source: ____________________________

Stories for the American Heart

In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be middle school students.

24. George Washington’s first battles in the Virginia militia, including his survival and Braddock’s death
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and writing should be employed, and responses must fully answer each question.

25. What resources and advantages does North America afford for the flourishing of a developed civilization? How does it compare to other places in the world?

26. How did European and indigenous cultures differ from one another? Is there evidence of conflict among indigenous tribes?

27. What events “unsettled” European civilization and influenced the decision to explore the seas beyond Europe? How so?

28. What were some of the ways in which Christopher Columbus’s voyages changed the world?

29. How did most European monarchs explore, settle, and manage their claimed possessions in the New World? How was England’s approach different?

30. What two things happened in Jamestown in 1619?

31. In what ways did the settlers and later colonists express a hope for renewal and restoration in the New World?

32. What is meant by historian Daniel Boorstin’s observation that “the colonies were a disproving ground for utopias”? 
33. What was unique about religion in the colonies and in the eyes of the law?

34. What were the roles of literacy and learning among the colonists?

35. What was distinctive about property ownership in the colonies?

36. How did slavery gradually expand and become sanctioned in law?

37. What were the chief characteristics of the “American” colonists? What gave them these characteristics?

38. In what sense was there an “unofficial aristocracy” in the colonies? What made it “unofficial,” and how was it distinct from the aristocracies of Europe?

39. Which ancient and Enlightenment figures and ideas influenced the leading colonists?

40. What is “salutary neglect”? In what senses were the colonists neglected, and how was this neglect actually beneficial to them?

41. What did self-government look like in the colonies?

42. Why did the British defeat the French in the French and Indian War?

43. How did the Treaty of Paris reshape North America?
Unit 1 | Writing Assignment — The British Colonies of North America

DIRECTIONS

Citing events and primary sources in your argument, write a 500–800-word essay answering this question:

To what extents and in which ways was the settlement and establishment of European civilization in the thirteen colonies the exception in human history up until the eighteenth century?
APPENDIX B

Primary Sources

Christopher Columbus

Thomas Gates

The Pilgrims

John Winthrop

Colonists of the Connecticut River Colony

William Penn

First Pennsylvania Provincial Assembly

John of England

Great and General Court of Massachusetts Bay Colony

Parliament of England

John Locke

Delegates of Connecticut, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island Colonies
ADMIRAL CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS

To King Ferdinand II of Aragon and Queen Isabella I of Castile

LETTER

February 15, 1493

The Niña | The Atlantic Ocean

BACKGROUND

Christopher Columbus informed King Ferdinand II of the discoveries on his first voyage in this letter from early 1493.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What does Christopher Columbus find on his voyage?

2. How does Columbus describe the islands?

3. How do the Native Americans treat Columbus and his crew?

4. What is the culture of the Native Americans as described by Columbus?

5. Why does Columbus believe his voyage was important?

Christopher Columbus, “Letter to King Ferdinand II,” American Studies at the University of Virginia, https://xroads.virginia.edu/~Hyper/HNS/Garden/columbus.html.
SIR: Since I know that you will be pleased at the great victory with which Our Lord has crowned my voyage, I write this to you, from which you will learn how in thirty-three days I passed from the Canary Islands to the Indies, with the fleet which the most illustrious King and Queen, our Sovereigns, gave to me. There I found very many islands, filled with innumerable people, and I have taken possession of them all for their Highnesses, done by proclamation and with the royal standard unfurled, and no opposition was offered to me.

To the first island which I found I gave the name "San Salvador," in remembrance of the Divine Majesty, Who had marvellously bestowed all this…To the second, I gave the name the island of "Santa Maria de Concepcion," to the third, "Fernandina," to the fourth, "Isabella," to the fifth island, "Juana," and so each received from me a new name.

When I came to Juana, I followed its coast to the westward, and I found it to be so extensive that I thought that it must be the mainland, the province of Cathay. And since there were neither towns nor villages on the seashore, but small hamlets only, with the people of which I could not have speech because they all fled immediately, I went forward on the same course, thinking that I could not fail to find great cities or towns. At the end of many leagues, seeing that there was no change and that the coast was bearing me northwards, which I wished to avoid, since winter was already approaching and I proposed to make from it to the south, and as, moreover, the wind was carrying me forward, I determined not to wait for a change in the weather and retraced my path as far as a remarkable harbour known to me. From that point, I sent two men inland to learn if there were a king or great cities. They travelled three days' journey, finding an infinity of
small hamlets and people without number, but nothing of importance. For this reason, they returned.

I understood sufficiently from other Indians, whom I had already taken, that this land was nothing but an island, and I therefore followed its coast eastward for one hundred and seven leagues to the point where it ended. From that point, I saw another island, distant about eighteen leagues from the first, to the east, and to it I at once gave the name "Espanola." I went there and followed its northern coast, as I had followed that of Juana, to the eastward for one hundred and eighty-eight great leagues in a straight line. This island and all the others are very fertile to a limitless degree, and this island is extremely so. In it there are many harbours on the coast of the sea, beyond comparison with others that I know in Christendom, and many rivers, good and large, which is marvellous. Its lands are high; there are in it many sierras and very lofty mountains, beyond comparison with that of Tenerife. All are most beautiful, of a thousand shapes; all are accessible and are filled with trees of a thousand kinds and tall, so that they seem to touch the sky. I am told that they never lose their foliage, and this I can believe, for I saw them as green and lovely as they are in Spain in May, and some of them were flowering, some bearing fruit, and some at another stage, according to their nature. The nightingale was singing and other birds of a thousand kinds, in the month of November, there where I went. There are six or eight kinds of palm, which are a wonder to behold on account of their beautiful variety, but so are the other trees and fruits and plants. In it are marvellous pine groves; there are very wide and fertile plains, and there is honey; and there are birds
of many kinds and fruits in great diversity. In the interior, there are mines of metals, and
the population is without number.

Espanola is a marvel. The sierras and the mountains, the plains, the champaigns, are so
lovely and so rich for planting and sowing, for breeding cattle of every kind, for building
towns and villages. The harbours of the sea here are such as cannot be believed to exist
unless they have been seen, and so with the rivers, many and great, and of good water, the
majority of which contain gold. In the trees, fruits and plants, there is a great difference
from those of Juana. In this island, there are many spices and great mines of gold and of
other metals.

The people of this island and of all the other islands which I have found and of which I
have information, all go naked, men and women, as their mothers bore them, although
some of the women cover a single place with the leaf of a plant or with a net of cotton
which they make for the purpose. They have no iron or steel or weapons, nor are they
fitted to use them. This is not because they are not well built and of handsome stature, but
because they are very marvellously timorous. They have no other arms than spears made
of canes, cut in seeding time, to the ends of which they fix a small sharpened stick. Of
these they do not dare to make use, for many times it has happened that I have sent
ashore two or three men to some town to have speech with them, and countless people
have come out to them, and as soon as they have seen my men approaching, they have
fled, a father not even waiting for his son. This is not because ill has been done to any one
of them; on the contrary, at every place where I have been and have been able to have
speech with them, I have given to them of that which I had, such as cloth and many other
things, receiving nothing in exchange. But so they are, incurably timid. It is true that, after
they have been reassured and have lost this fear, they are so guileless and so generous
with all that they possess, that no one would believe it who has not seen it. They refuse
nothing that they possess, if it be asked of them; on the contrary, they invite any one to
share it and display as much love as if they would give their hearts. They are content with
whatever trifle of whatever kind that may be given to them, whether it be of value or
valueless. I forbade that they should be given things so worthless as fragments of broken
crockery, scraps of broken and lace tips, although when they were able to get them, they
fancied that they possessed the best jewel in the world…They took even the pieces of the
broken hoops of the wine barrels and, like savages, gave what they had, so that it seemed
to me to be wrong and I forbade it. I gave them a thousand handsome good things, which
I had brought, in order that they might conceive affection for us and, more than that,
might become Christians and be inclined to the love and service of Your Highnesses and
of the whole Castilian nation, and strive to collect and give us of the things which they
have in abundance and which are necessary to us.

They do not hold any creed nor are they idolaters; but they all believe that power and
good are in the heavens and were very firmly convinced that I, with these ships and men,
came from the heavens, and in this belief they everywhere received me after they had
mastered their fear. This belief is not the result of ignorance, for they are, on the contrary,
of a very acute intelligence and they are men who navigate all those seas, so that it is
amazing how good an account they give of everything. It is because they have never seen
people clothed or ships of such a kind.
As soon as I arrived in the Indies, in the first island which I found, I took some of the natives by force, in order that they might learn and might give me information of whatever there is in these parts. And so it was that they soon understood us, and we them, either by speech or by signs, and they have been very serviceable. At present, those I bring with me are still of the opinion that I come from Heaven, for all the intercourse which they have had with me. They were the first to announce this wherever I went, and the others went running from house to house, and to the neighbouring towns, with loud cries of, "Come! Come! See the men from Heaven!" So all came, men and women alike, when their minds were set at rest concerning us, not one, small or great, remaining behind, and they all brought something to eat and drink, which they gave with extraordinary affection.

In all the islands, they have very many canoes, which are like rowing fustas, some larger and some smaller; some are greater than a fusta of eighteen benches. They are not so broad, because they are made of a single log of wood, but a fusta would not keep up with them in rowing, since their speed is an incredible thing. In these they navigate among all those islands, which are innumerable, and carry their goods. I have seen one of these canoes with seventy or eighty men in it, each one with his paddle.

In all these islands, I saw no great diversity in the appearance of the people or in their manners and language. On the contrary, they all understand one another, which is a very curious thing, on account of which I hope that their Highnesses will determine upon their conversion to our holy faith, towards which they are very inclined.
I have already said how I went one hundred and seven leagues in a straight line from west to east along the seashore of the island of Juana, and as a result of this voyage I can say that this island is larger than England and Scotland together, for, beyond these one hundred and even leagues, there remain to the westward two provinces to which I have not gone. One of these provinces they call “Avan,” and there people are born with tails. These provinces cannot have a length of less than fifty or sixty leagues, as I could understand from those Indians whom I have and who know all the islands.

The other island, Espanola, has a circumference greater than all Spain from Colliouere by the seacoast to Fuenterabia in Vizcaya, for I voyaged along one side for one hundred and eighty-eight great leagues in a straight line from west to east. It is a land to be desired and, when seen, never to be left. I have taken possession of all for their Highnesses, and all are more richly endowed than I know how or am able to say, and I hold all for their Highnesses, so that they may dispose of them as they do of the kingdoms of Castile and as absolutely. But especially, in this Espanola, in the situation most convenient and in the best position for the mines of gold and for all trade as well with the mainland here as with that there, belonging to the Grand Khan, where will be great trade and profit, I have taken possession of a large town, to which I gave the name “Villa de Navidad,” and in it I have made fortifications and a fort, which will now by this time be entirely completed. In it I have left enough men for such a purpose with arms and artillery and provisions for more than a year, and a fusta, and one a master of all seacraft, to build others, and I have established great friendship with the king of that land, so much so, that he was proud to call me “brother” and to treat me as such. And even were he to change his attitude to one
of hostility towards these men, he and his do not know what arms are. They go naked, as I
have already said, and they are the most timorous people in the world, so that the men
whom I have left there alone would suffice to destroy all that land, and the island is
without danger for their persons, if they know how to govern themselves.

5 In all these islands, it seems to me that all men are content with one woman, and to their
chief or king they give as many as twenty.

It appears to me that the women work more than do the men. I have been able to learn if
they hold private property; it seemed to me to be that all took a share in whatever any one
had, especially of eatable things.

10 In these islands I have so far found no human monstrosities, as many expected, but on
the contrary the whole population is very well tried, nor are they negroes as in Guinea,
but their hair is flowing and they are not born where there is intense force in the rays of
the sun… In these islands, where there are high mountains, the cold was severe this
winter, but they endure it, being used to it and with the help of meats which they
consume with many and extremely hot spices. Thus I have found no monsters, nor had a
report of any, except in an island "Carib," which is the second at the coming into the
Indies, and which is inhabited by people who are regarded in all the islands as very fierce
and who eat human flesh. They have many canoes with which they range through all the
islands of India and pillage and take whatever they can. They are no more malformed
than are the others, except that they have the custom of wearing their hair long like
women, and they use bows and arrows of the same cane stems, with a small piece of wood
at end, owing to their lack of iron which they do not possess. They are ferocious among these other people who are cowardly to an excessive degree, but I make no more account of them than of the rest. These are they who have intercourse with the women of "Matinino," which is the first island met on the way from Spain to the Indies, in which there is not a man. These women engage in no feminine occupation, but use bows and arrows of cane, like those already mentioned, and they arm and protect themselves with plates of copper, of which they have much.

In another island, which they assure me is larger than Espanola, the people have no hair. In it there is incalculable gold, and from it and from the other islands I bring with me Indians as evidence.

In conclusion, to speak only of what has been accomplished on this voyage, which was so hasty, their Highnesses can see that I will give them as much gold as they may need, if their Highnesses will render me very slight assistance; presently, I will give them spices and cotton, as much as their Highnesses shall command; and mastic, as much as they shall order to be shipped and which, up to now, has been found only in Greece, in the island of Chios, and the Seignory sells it for what it pleases; and aloe, as much as they shall order to be shipped; and slaves, as many as they shall order, and who will be from the idolaters. I believe also that I have found rhubarb and cinnamon, and I shall find a thousand other things of value, which the people whom I have left there will have discovered, for I have not delayed at any point, so far as the wind allowed me to sail, except in the town of Navidad, in order to leave it secured and well established, and in truth I should have done much more if the ships had served me as reason demanded.
This is enough. And thus the eternal God, Our Lord, gives to all those who walk in His way triumph over things which appear to be impossible, and this was notably one. For, although men have talked or have written of these lands, all was conjectural, without ocular evidence, but amounted only to this, that those who heard for the most part listened and judged rather by hearsay than from even a small something tangible. So that, since Our Redeemer has given the victory to our most illustrious King and Queen, and to their renowned kingdoms, in so great a matter, for this all Christendom ought to feel delight and make great feasts and give solemn thanks to the Holy Trinity, with many solemn prayers for the great exaltation which they shall have in the turning of so many peoples to our holy faith, and afterwards for the temporal benefits, because not only Spain but all Christendom will have hence refreshment and gain.

This is an account of the facts, thus abridged.

Done in the caravel, on the Canary Islands, on the fifteenth day of February, in the year one thousand four hundred and ninety-three.

At your orders.

THE ADMIRAL.
ADMIRAL CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS

To Lord Raphael Sanchez

LETTER

March 14, 1493
Lisbon, Portugal

BACKGROUND

After discovering the islands of India, Christopher Columbus addressed this letter to Lord Raphael Sanchez, the Treasurer to the King and Queen of Spain.

ANNOTATIONS

Knowing that it will afford you pleasure to learn that I have brought my undertaking to a successful termination, I have decided upon writing you this letter to acquaint you with all the events which have occurred in my voyage, and the discoveries which have resulted from it.

Thirty-three days after my departure from Cadiz I reached the Indian sea, where I discovered many islands, thickly peopled, of which I took possession without resistance in the name of our most illustrious Monarch, by public proclamation and with unfurled banners. To the first of these islands, which is called by the Indians Guanahani, I gave the name of the blessed Saviour (San Salvador), relying upon whose protection I had reached this as well as the other islands; to each of these I also gave a name, ordering that one should be called Santa Maria de la Concepcion, another Fernandina, the third Isabella, the fourth Juana, and so with all the rest respectively.

As soon as we arrived at that, which as I have said was named Juana, I proceeded along its coast a short distance westward, and found it to be so large and apparently

___________________________________________

without termination, that I could not suppose it to be an island, but the continental province of Cathay. Seeing, however, no towns or populous places on the sea coast, but only a few detached houses and cottages, with whose inhabitants I was unable to communicate, because they fled as soon as they saw us, I went further on, thinking that in my progress I should certainly find some city or village. At length, after proceeding a great way and finding that nothing new presented itself, and that the line of coast was leading us northwards (which I wished to avoid, because it was winter, and it was my intention to move southwards; and because moreover the winds were contrary), I resolved not to attempt any further progress, but rather to turn back and retrace my course to a certain bay that I had observed, and from which I afterwards dispatched two of our men to ascertain whether there were a king or any cities in that province. These men reconnoitered the country for three days, and found a most numerous population, and great numbers of houses, though small, and built without any regard to order: with which information they returned to us.

In the mean time I had learned from some Indians whom I had seized, that that country was certainly an island: and therefore I sailed towards the east, coasting to the distance of three hundred and twenty-two miles, which brought us to the extremity of it; from this point I saw lying eastwards another island, fifty-four miles distant from Juana, to which I gave the name of Espanola: I went thither, and steered my course eastward as I had done at Juana, even to the distance of five hundred and sixty-four miles along the north coast.

This said island of Juana is exceedingly fertile, as indeed are all the others; it is surrounded with many bays, spacious, very secure, and surpassing any that I have ever seen; numerous large and healthful rivers intersect it, and it also contains many very lofty mountains. All these islands are very beautiful, and distinguished by a diversity of scenery; they are filled with a great variety of trees of immense height, and which I believe to retain their foliage in all seasons; for when I saw them they were as verdant and luxuriant as they usually are in Spain in the month of May,—some of them were blossoming, some bearing fruit, and all flourishing in the greatest perfection, according to
their respective stages of growth, and the nature and quality of each: yet the islands are not so thickly wooded as to be impassable. The nightingale and various birds were singing in countless numbers, and that in November, the month in which I arrived there. There are besides in the same island of Juana seven or eight kinds of palm trees, which, like all the other trees, herbs, and fruits, considerably surpass ours in height and beauty. The pines also are very handsome, and there are very extensive fields and meadows, a variety of birds, different kinds of honey, and many sorts of metals, but no iron.

In that island also which I have before said we named Espanola, there are mountains of very great size and beauty, vast plains, groves, and very fruitful fields, admirably adapted for tillage, pasture, and habitation. The convenience and excellence of the harbours in this island, and the abundance of the rivers, so indispensable to the health of man, surpass anything that would be believed by one who had not seen it. The trees, herbage, and fruits of Espanola are very different from those of Juana, and moreover it abounds in various kinds of spices, gold, and other metals.

The inhabitants of both sexes in this island, and in all the others which I have seen, or of which I have received information, go always naked as they were born, with the exception of some of the women, who use the covering of a leaf, or small bough, or an apron of cotton which they prepare for that purpose. None of them, as I have already said, are possessed of any iron, neither have they weapons, being unacquainted with, and indeed incompetent to use them, not from any deformity of body (for they are well-formed), but because they are timid and full of fear. They carry however in lieu of arms, canes dried in the sun, on the ends of which they fix heads of dried wood sharpened to a point, and even these they dare not use habitually; for it has often occurred when I have sent two or three of my men to any of the villages to speak with the natives, that they have come out in a disorderly troop, and have fled in such haste at the approach of our men, that the fathers forsook their children and the children their fathers. This timidity did not arise from any loss or injury that they had received from us; for, on the contrary, I gave to all I approached whatever articles I had about me, such as cloth and many other things, taking
nothing of theirs in return: but they are naturally timid and fearful. As soon however as
they see that they are safe, and have laid aside all fear, they are very simple and honest,
and exceedingly liberal with all they have; none of them refusing any thing he may
possess when he is asked for it, but on the contrary inviting us to ask them. They exhibit
great love towards all others in preference to themselves: they also give objects of great
value for trifles, and content themselves with very little or nothing in return. I however
forbad that these trifles and articles of no value (such as pieces of dishes, plates, and glass,
keys, and leather straps) should be given to them, although if they could obtain them,
they imagined themselves to be possessed of the most beautiful trinkets in the world.

It even happened that a sailor received for a leather strap as much gold as was worth three
golden nobles, and for things of more trifling value offered by our men, especially newly
coined blancas, or any gold coins, the Indians would give whatever the seller required; as,
for instance, an ounce and a half or two ounces of gold, or thirty or forty pounds of
cotton, with which commodity they were already acquainted. Thus they bartered, like
idiots, cotton and gold for fragments of bows, glasses, bottles, and jars; which I forbad as
being unjust, and myself gave them many beautiful and acceptable articles which I had
brought with me, taking nothing from them in return; I did this in order that I might the
more easily conciliate them, that they might be led to become Christians, and be inclined
to entertain a regard for the King and Queen, our Princes and all Spaniards, and that I
might induce them to take an interest in seeking out, and collecting, and delivering to us
such things as they possessed in abundance, but which we greatly needed.

They practice no kind of idolatry, but have a firm belief that all strength and power, and
indeed all good things, are in heaven, and that I had descended from thence with these
ships and sailors, and under this impression was I received after they had thrown aside
their fears. Nor are they slow or stupid, but of very clear understanding; and those men
who have crossed to the neighbouring islands give an admirable description of everything
they observed; but they never saw any people clothed, nor any ships like ours.
On my arrival at that sea, I had taken some Indians by force from the first island that I came to, in order that they might learn our language, and communicate to us what they knew respecting the country; which plan succeeded excellently, and was a great advantage to us, for in a short time, either by gestures and signs, or by words, we were enabled to understand each other. These men are still travelling with me, and although they have been with us now a long time, they continue to entertain the idea that I have descended from heaven; and on our arrival at any new place they published this, crying out immediately with a loud voice to the other Indians, "Come, come and look upon beings of a celestial race": upon which both women and men, children and adults, young men and old, when they got rid of the fear they at first entertained, would come out in throngs, crowding the roads to see us, some bringing food, others drink, with astonishing affection and kindness…

…In all these islands there is no difference of physiognomy, of manners, or of language, but they all clearly understand each other, a circumstance very propitious for the realization of what I conceive to be the principal wish of our most serene King, namely, the conversion of these people to the holy faith of Christ, to which indeed, as far as I can judge, they are very favourable and well-disposed…

…These provinces extend to a hundred and fifty-three miles in length, as I have learnt from the Indians whom I have brought with me, and who are well acquainted with the country. But the extent of Espanola is greater than all Spain from Catalonia to Fontarabia, which is easily proved, because one of its four sides which I myself coasted in a direct line, from west to east, measures five hundred and forty miles. This island is to be regarded with especial interest, and not to be slighted; for although as I have said I took possession of all these islands in the name of our invincible King, and the government of them is unreservedly committed to his said Majesty, yet there was one large town in Espanola of which especially I took possession, situated in a remarkably favourable spot, and in every way convenient for the purposes of gain and commerce.
To this town I gave the name of Navidad del Senor, and ordered a fortress to be built there, which must by this time be completed, in which I left as many men as I thought necessary, with all sorts of arms, and enough provisions for more than a year. I also left them one caravel, and skilful workmen both in ship-building and other arts, and engaged the favor and friendship of the King of the island in their behalf, to a degree that would not be believed, for these people are so amiable and friendly that even the King took a pride in calling me his brother. But supposing their feelings should become changed, and they should wish to injure those who have remained in the fortress, they could not do so, for they have no arms, they go naked, and are moreover too cowardly; so that those who hold the said fortress, can easily keep the whole island in check, without any pressing danger to themselves, provided they do not transgress the directions and regulations which I have given them.

As far as I have learned, every man throughout these islands is united to but one wife, with the exception of the kings and princes, who are allowed to have twenty: the women seem to work more than the men. I could not clearly understand whether the people possess any private property, for I observed that one man had the charge of distributing various things to the rest, but especially meat and provisions and the like. I did not find, as some of us had expected, any cannibals amongst them, but on the contrary men of great deference and kindness. Neither are they black, like the Ethiopians: their hair is smooth and straight: for they do not dwell where the rays of the sun strike most vividly, and the sun has intense power there, the distance from the equinoctial line being, it appears, but six-and-twenty degrees. On the tops of the mountains the cold is very great, but the effect of this upon the Indians is lessened by their being accustomed to the climate, and by their frequently indulging in the use of very hot meats and drinks. Thus, as I have already said, I saw no cannibals, nor did I hear of any, except in a certain island called Charis, which is the second from Espanola on the side towards India, where dwell a people who are considered by the neighbouring islanders as most ferocious: and these feed upon human flesh. The same people have many kinds of canoes, in which they cross to all the surrounding islands and rob and plunder wherever they can; they are not
different from the other islanders, except that they wear their hair long, like women, and make use of the bows and javelins of cane, with sharpened spear-points fixed on the thickest end, which I have before described, and therefore they are looked upon as ferocious, and regarded by the other Indians with unbounded fear; but I think no more of them than of the rest. These are the men who form unions with certain women, who dwell alone in the island Matenin, which lies next to Espanola on the side towards India; these latter employ themselves in no labour suitable to their own sex, for they use bows and javelins as I have already described their paramours as doing, and for defensive armour have plates of brass, of which metal they possess great abundance. They assure me that there is another island larger than Espanola, whose inhabitants have no hair, and which abounds in gold more than any of the rest. I bring with me individuals of this island and of the others that I have seen, who are proofs of the facts which I state.

Finally, to compress into few words the entire summary of my voyage and speedy return, and of the advantages derivable therefrom, I promise, that with a little assistance afforded me by our most invincible sovereigns, I will procure them as much gold as they need, as great a quantity of spices, of cotton, and of mastic (which is only found in Chios), and as many men for the service of the navy as their Majesties may require. I promise also rhubarb and other sorts of drugs, which I am persuaded the men whom I have left in the aforesaid fortress have found already and will continue to find; for I myself have tarried no where longer than I was compelled to do by the winds, except in the city of Navidad, while I provided for the building of the fortress, and took the necessary precautions for the perfect security of the men I left there. Although all I have related may appear to be wonderful and unheard of, yet the results of my voyage would have been more astonishing if I had had at my disposal such ships as I required. But these great and marvellous results are not to be attributed to any merit of mine, but to the holy Christian faith, and to the piety and religion of our Sovereigns; for that which the unaided intellect of man could not compass, the spirit of God has granted to human exertions, for God is wont to hear the prayers of his servants who love his precepts even to the performance of apparent impossibilities. Thus it has happened to me in the present instance, who have
accomplished a task to which the powers of mortal men had never hitherto attained; for if there have been those who have anywhere written or spoken of these islands, they have done so with doubts and conjectures, and no one has ever asserted that he has seen them, on which account their writings have been looked upon as little else than fables.

Therefore let the king and queen, our princes and their most happy kingdoms, and all the other provinces of Christendom, render thanks to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who has granted us so great a victory and such prosperity. Let processions be made, and sacred feasts be held, and the temples be adorned with festive boughs. Let Christ rejoice on earth, as he rejoices in heaven in the prospect of the salvation of the souls of so many nations hitherto lost. Let us also rejoice, as well on account of the exaltation of our faith, as on account of the increase of our temporal prosperity, of which not only Spain, but all Christendom will be partakers.

Such are the events which I have briefly described.

Farewell.

Lisbon, the 14th of March.

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS,
Admiral of the Fleet of the Ocean.
GOVERNOR SIR THOMAS GATES
For The Colony in Virginea Britannia.
Lawes Divine, Morall and Martiall, &c.
EXCERPTS OF GOVERNOR’S ORDERS
1610
Jamestown, Colony of Virginia

BACKGROUND
Sir Thomas Gates arrived at Jamestown during the Starving Time, finding only 60 of the 240 original settlers in James Fort alive. Appointed by the Virginia Company as Governor of the colony of Virginia, Gates imposed these Laws of Virginia—the first American law code.

GUIDING QUESTIONS
1. What is the ruler of the colony’s “principal care?”
2. What are the duties of the people on the Sabbath?
3. What are the punishments given to those who break these laws?

Whereas His Majesty, like himself a most zealous prince, has in his own realms a principal care of true religion and reverence to God, and has always strictly commanded his generals and governors, with all his forces wheresoever, to let their ways be like his ends, for the glory of God.

And forasmuch as no good service can be performed, or war well managed, where military discipline is not observed, and military discipline cannot be kept where the rules or chief parts thereof, be not certainly set down and generally known, have (with the advice and counsel of Sir Thomas Gates, Knight, Lieutenant-General) adhered unto the laws divine and orders politic and martial of his lordship (the same exemplified) an addition of such others as I have found either the necessity of the present state of the colony to require, or the infancy and weakness of the body thereof as yet able to digest, and do now publish them to all persons in the colony, that they may as well take knowledge of the laws themselves as of the penalty and punishment, which without partiality shall be inflicted upon the breakers of the same.

First, since we owe our highest and supreme duty, our greatest, and all our allegiance to Him from whom all power and authority is derived and flows as from the first, and only, fountain, and being special soldiers impressed in this sacred cause, we must alone expect our success from Him who is only the blesser of all good attempts, the King of kings, the Commander of commanders, and Lord of hosts, I do strictly command and charge all captains and officers, of what quality or nature soever, whether commanders in the field, or in the town, or towns, forts, or fortresses, to have a care that the Almighty God be duly and daily served, and that they call upon their people to hear sermons, as that also they
diligently frequent morning and evening prayer themselves by their own exemplar and
daily life, and duty herein, encouraging others thereunto, and that such who shall often and
willfully absent themselves be duly punished according to the martial law in that case
provided.

5
That no man speak impiously or maliciously against the holy and blessed Trinity, or any of
the three persons, that is to say, against God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy
Ghost, or against the known articles of the Christian faith, upon pain of death.

That no man blaspheme God’s holy name, upon pain of death, or use unlawful oaths, taking
the name of God in vain, curse, or ban, upon pain of severe punishment for the first offence
so committed, and for the second, to have a bodkin thrust through his tongue, and if he
continue blaspheming of God’s holy name, for the third time so offending, he shall be
brought to a martial court, and there receive censure of death for his offence.

No man shall use any traitorous words against His Majesty’s person or royal authority,
upon pain of death.

15
No man shall speak any word, or do any act, which may tend to the derision or despite of
God’s holy word, upon pain of death. Nor shall any man unworthily demean himself unto
any preacher or minister of the same, but generally hold them in all reverent regard and
dutiful entreaty, otherwise he, the offender, shall openly be whipped three times, and ask
public forgiveness in the assembly of the congregation three several Sabbath days.

20
Every man and woman duly twice a day upon the first tolling of the bell shall upon the
working days repair unto the Church to hear divine service upon pain of losing his or her
day’s allowance for the first omission, for the second to be whipped, and for the third to be condemned to the galleys for six months. Likewise no man or woman shall dare to violate or break the Sabbath by any gaming, public or private, abroad or at home, but duly sanctify and observe the same, both himself and his family, by preparing themselves at home with private prayer, that they may be the better fitted for the public, according to the commandment of God, and the orders of our Church, as also every man and woman shall repair in the morning to the divine service, and catechizing, upon pain for the first fault to lose their provision and allowance for the whole week following, for the second to lose the said allowance, and also to be whipped, and for the third to suffer death.

All preachers or ministers within this, our colony or colonies, shall in the forts where they are resident after divine service duly preach every Sabbath day in the forenoon, and catechize in the afternoon and weekly say the divine service twice every day, and preach every Wednesday. Likewise every minister where he is resident, within the same fort or fortress, towns or town, shall choose unto him four of the most religious and better disposed as well to inform of the abuses and neglects of the people in their duties and service to God, as also to the due reparation and keeping of the Church handsome and fitted with all reverent observances thereunto belonging. Likewise every minister shall keep a faithful and true record, or church book, of all christenings, marriages, and deaths of such our people as shall happen within their fort or fortresses, towns or town at any time, upon the burden of a neglectful conscience, and upon pain of losing their entertainment.

He that upon pretended malice shall murder or take away the life of any man shall be punished with death.
No man shall commit the horrible and detestable sins of sodomy, upon pain of death; and he or she that can be lawfully convicted of adultery shall be punished with death. No man shall ravish or force any woman, maid or Indian, or other, upon pain of death, and know that he or she that shall commit fornication, and evident proof made thereof, for their first fault shall be whipped, for their second they shall be whipped, and for their third they shall be whipped three times a week for one month, and ask public forgiveness in the assembly of the congregation.

No man shall be found guilty of sacrilege, which is a trespass as well committed in violating and abusing any sacred ministry, duty, or office of the Church irreverently or profanely, as by being a church robber, to filch, steal, or carry away anything out of the church appertaining thereunto, or unto any holy and consecrated place, to the divine service of God, which no man should do, upon pain of death. Likewise he that shall rob the store of any commodities therein, of what quality soever, whether provisions of victuals, or of arms, trucking stuff, apparel, linen or woolen, hose or shoes, hats or caps, instruments or tools of steel, iron, etc., or shall rob from his fellow soldier or neighbor anything that is his, victuals, apparel, household stuff, tool, or what necessary else soever, by water or land, out of boat, house, or knapsack, shall be punished with death.

He that shall take an oath untruly, or bear false witness in any cause, or against any man whatsoever, shall be punished with death.
"Every minister or preacher shall every Sabbath day before catechizing read all these laws and ordinances, publicly in the assembly of the congregation, upon pain of his entertainment checked for that week."
THE UNDERSIGNED SUBJECTS OF KING JAMES

Agreement Between
the Settlers of New Plymouth

LAW

November 11, 1620

Mayflower | Off the Coast of Cape Cod, Colony of Virginia

BACKGROUND

The settlers who traveled to the British possession of Virginia on the Mayflower drafted and signed this agreement pertaining to their governance before disembarking in the New World.

ANNOTATIONS

IN THE NAME OF GOD, AMEN. We, whose names are underwritten, the Loyal Subjects of our dread Sovereign Lord King James, by the Grace of God, of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, King, Defender of the Faith, &c. Having undertaken for the Glory of God, and Advancement of the Christian Faith, and the Honour of our King and Country, a Voyage to plant the first Colony in the northern Parts of Virginia; Do by these Presents, solemnly and mutually, in the Presence of God and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil Body Politick, for our better Ordering and Preservation, and Furtherance of the Ends aforesaid: And by Virtue hereof do enact, constitute, and frame, such just and equal Laws, Ordinances, Acts, Constitutions, and Officers, from time to time, as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the general Good of the Colony; unto which we promise all due Submission and Obedience.

IN WITNESS whereof we have hereunto subscribed our names at Cape-Cod the eleventh of November, in the Reign of our Sovereign Lord King James, of England, France, and Ireland, the eighteenth, and of Scotland the fifty-fourth, Anno Domini; 1620.

GOVERNOR JOHN WINTHROP

A Modell of Christian Charity

SPEECH

April 8, 1630

The Arabella | The Atlantic Ocean

BACKGROUND

John Winthrop, governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, delivered these remarks aboard the Arabella toward the end of its voyage across the Atlantic Ocean.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Why does John Winthrop say God gives different conditions to different people?

2. By what two rules should people treat each other?

3. What are the work, end, and means of the Massachusetts Bay Colony?

4. What does it mean to be “a city on the hill,” according to Winthrop?

“A Model of Christian Charity,” Hanover Historical Texts Collection, https://history.hanover.edu/texts/winthmod.html
[Original Source: Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society (Boston, 1838), 3rd Series 7:31-48.]
A Model of Christian Charity
John Winthrop

A Model hereof.

GOD ALMIGHTY in his most holy and wise providence, hath so disposed of the condition of mankind, as in all times some must be rich, some poor, some high and eminent in power and dignity; others mean and in submission.

The Reason hereof.

1 Reas. First to hold conformity with the rest of his world, being delighted to show forth the glory of his wisdom in the variety and difference of the creatures, and the glory of his power in ordering all these differences for the preservation and good of the whole; and the glory of his greatness, that as it is the glory of princes to have many officers, so this great king will have many stewards, Counting himself more honored in dispensing his gifts to man by man, than if he did it by his own immediate hands.

2 Reas. Secondly that he might have the more occasion to manifest the work of his Spirit: first upon the wicked in moderating and restraining them: so that the rich and mighty should not eat up the poor nor the poor and despised rise up against and shake off their yoke. 2ly In the regenerate, in exercising his graces in them, as in the great ones, their love, mercy, gentleness, temperance etc., in the poor and inferior sort, their faith, patience, obedience etc.

3 Reas. Thirdly, that every man might have need of others, and from hence they might be all knit more nearly together in the Bonds of brotherly affection. From hence it appears plainly that no man is made more honorable than another or more wealthy etc., out of any particular and singular respect to himself, but for the glory of his creator and the common good of the creature, man. Therefore God still reserves the property of these gifts to himself as Ezek. 16. 17. he there calls wealth, his gold and his silver, and Prov. 3. 9. he claims their service as his due, honor the Lord with thy riches etc.--All men being thus (by divine providence) ranked into two sorts, rich and poor; under the first are comprehended all such as are able to live comfortably by their own means duly improved;
and all others are poor according to the former distribution. There are two rules whereby we are to walk one towards another: Justice and Mercy. These are always distinguished in their act and in their object, yet may they both concur in the same subject in each respect; as sometimes there may be an occasion of showing mercy to a rich man in some sudden danger or distress, and also doing of mere justice to a poor man in regard of some particular contract etc. There is likewise a double Law by which we are regulated in our conversation towards another; in both the former respects, the law of nature and the law of grace, or the moral law or the law of the gospel, to omit the rule of justice as not properly belonging to this purpose otherwise than it may fall into consideration in some particular cases. By the first of these laws man as he was enabled so with all is commanded to love his neighbor as himself. Upon this ground stands all the precepts of the moral law, which concerns our dealings with men. To apply this to the works of mercy; this law requires two things. First that every man afford his help to another in every want or distress. Secondly, that he perform this out of the same affection which makes him careful of his own goods, according to that of our Savior, (Math.) \textit{Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you.} This was practiced by Abraham and Lot in entertaining the angels and the old man of Gibea. The law of Grace or of the Gospel hath some difference from the former; as in these respects, First the law of nature was given to man in the estate of innocency; this of the Gospel in the estate of regeneracy. 2ly, the former propounds one man to another, as the same flesh and image of God; this as a brother in Christ also, and in the communion of the same Spirit, and so teaches to put a difference between Christians and others. \textit{Do good to all, especially to the household of faith;} upon this ground the Israelites were to put a difference between the brethren of such as were strangers though not of the Canaanites.

3ly. The Law of nature would give no rules for dealing with enemies, for all are to be considered as friends in the state of innocency, but the Gospel commands love to an enemy. Proof. \textit{If thine Enemy hunger, feed him; Love your Enemies, do good to them that hate you.} Math. 5. 44.
This law of the Gospel propounds likewise a difference of seasons and occasions. There is a time when a Christian must sell all and give to the poor, as they did in the Apostles’ times. There is a time also when Christians (though they give not all yet) must give beyond their ability, as they of Macedonia, Cor. 2, 6. Likewise community of perils calls for extraordinary liberality, and so does community in some special service for the church. Lastly, when there is no other means whereby our Christian brother may be relieved in his distress, we must help him beyond our ability rather than tempt God in putting him upon help by miraculous or extraordinary means…

…The definition which the Scripture gives us of love is this. *Love is the bond of perfection,* first it is a bond or ligament. 2ly it makes the work perfect. There is no body but consists of parts and that which knits these parts together, gives the body its perfection, because it makes each part so contiguous to others as thereby they do mutually participate with each other, both in strength and infirmity, in pleasure and pain. To instance in the most perfect of all bodies; Christ and his Church make one body; the several parts of this body considered a part before they were united, were as disproportionate and as much disordered as so many contrary qualities or elements, but when Christ comes, and by his spirit and love knits all these parts to himself and each to other, it is become the most perfect and best proportioned body in the world, Eph. 4. 16. *Christ, by whom all the body being knit together by every joint for the furniture thereof, according to the effectual power which is in the measure of every perfection of parts, a glorious body without spot or wrinkle;* the ligaments hereof being Christ, or his love, for Christ is love, 1 John 4. 8. So this definition is right. *Love is the bond of perfection.*

From hence we may frame these conclusions.

First of all, true Christians are of one body in Christ, 1 Cor. 12. 12. 13. 17. *Ye are the body of Christ and members of their part…*2ly. The ligaments of this body which knit together are love. 3ly. No body can be perfect which wants its proper ligament. 4ly. All the parts of this body being thus united are made so contiguous in a special relation as they must need partake of each other’s strength and infirmity, joy, and sorrow, weal, and woe…5ly. This
sensibleness and sympathy of each other’s conditions will necessarily infuse into each part a native desire and endeavor, to strengthen, defend, preserve and comfort the other...

…It rests now to make some application of this discourse, by the present design, which gave the occasion of writing of it. Herein are 4 things to be propounded: first the persons, 2ly the work, 3ly the end, 4thly the means. 1. For the persons. We are a company professing ourselves fellow members of Christ, in which respect only though we were absent from each other many miles, and had our employments as far distant, yet we ought to account ourselves knit together by this bond of love, and, live in the exercise of it, if we would have comfort of our being in Christ. This was notorious in the practice of the Christians in former times; as is testified of the Waldenses, from the mouth of one of the adversaries Aeneas Sylvius “mutuo ament pere antequam norunt,” they use to love any of their own religion even before they were acquainted with them. 2nly for the work we have in hand. It is by a mutual consent, through a special overruling providence and a more than an ordinary approbation of the Churches of Christ, to seek out a place of Cohabitation and Consortship under a due form of Government both civil and ecclesiastical. In such cases as this, the care of the public must over sway all private respects, by which, not only conscience, but mere civil policy, does bind us. For it is a true rule that particular Estates cannot subsist in the ruin of the public. 3ly The end is to improve our lives to do more service to the Lord; the comfort and increase of the body of Christ, whereof we are members; that ourselves and posterity may be the better preserved from the common corruptions of this evil world, to serve the Lord and work out our Salvation under the power and purity of his holy ordinances. 4thly for the means whereby this must be effected. They are twofold, a conformity with the work and end we aim at. These we see are extraordinary, therefore we must not content ourselves with usual ordinary means. Whatsoever we did, or ought to have, done, when we lived in England, the same must we do, and more also, where we go. That which the most in their churches maintain as truth in profession only, we must bring into familiar and constant practice; as in this duty of love, we must love brotherly without dissimulation, we must love one another with a pure heart fervently. We must bear one another’s burdens. We must not
look only on our own things, but also on the things of our brethren. Neither must we think that the Lord will bear with such failings at our hands as he does from those among whom we have lived…

When God gives a special commission he looks to have it strictly observed in every article; When he gave Saul a commission to destroy Amalek, He indented with him upon certain articles, and because he failed in one of the least, and that upon a fair pretense, it lost him the kingdom, which should have been his reward, if he had observed his commission. Thus stands the cause between God and us. We are entered into Covenant with Him for this work. We have taken out a commission. The Lord hath given us leave to draw our own articles. We have professed to enterprise these and those accounts, upon these and those ends. We have hereupon besought Him of favor and blessing. Now if the Lord shall please to hear us, and bring us in peace to the place we desire, then hath he ratified this Covenant and sealed our Commission, and will expect a strict performance of the articles contained in it; but if we shall neglect the observation of these articles which are the ends we have propounded, and, dissembling with our God, shall fall to embrace this present world and prosecute our carnal intentions, seeking great things for ourselves and our posterity, the Lord will surely break out in wrath against us; be revenged of such a [sinful] people and make us know the price of the breach of such a Covenant.

Now the only way to avoid this shipwreck, and to provide for our posterity, is to follow the counsel of Micah, to do justly, to love mercy, to walk humbly with our God. For this end, we must be knit together, in this work, as one man. We must entertain each other in brotherly affection. We must be willing to abridge ourselves of our superfluities, for the supply of other’s necessities. We must uphold a familiar commerce together in all meekness, gentleness, patience, and liberality. We must delight in each other; make other’s conditions our own; rejoice together, mourn together, labor and suffer together, always having before our eyes our commission and community in the work, as members of the same body. So shall we keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. The Lord will be our God, and delight to dwell among us, as his own people, and will command a
blessing upon us in all our ways. So that we shall see much more of his wisdom, power, goodness and truth, than formerly we have been acquainted with. We shall find that the God of Israel is among us, when ten of us shall be able to resist a thousand of our enemies; when he shall make us a praise and glory that men shall say of succeeding plantations, "the Lord make it likely that of New England." For we must consider that we shall be as a city upon a hill. The eyes of all people are upon us. So that if we shall deal falsely with our God in this work we have undertaken, and so cause him to withdraw his present help from us, we shall be made a story and a by-word through the world. We shall open the mouths of enemies to speak evil of the ways of God, and all professors for God's sake. We shall shame the faces of many of God's worthy servants, and cause their prayers to be turned into curses upon us till we be consumed out of the good land whither we are a going.

I shall shut up this discourse with that exhortation of Moses, that faithful servant of the Lord, in his last farewell to Israel, Deut. 30. Beloved there is now set before us life and good, Death and evil, in that we are commanded this day to love the Lord our God, and to love one another, to walk in his ways and to keep his Commandments and his Ordinance and his laws, and the articles of our Covenant with him, that we may live and be multiplied, and that the Lord our God may bless us in the land whither we go to possess it. But if our hearts shall turn away, so that we will not obey, but shall be seduced, and worship and serve other Gods, our pleasure and profits, and serve them; it is propounded unto us this day, we shall surely perish out of the good land whither we pass over this vast sea to possess it;

Therefore let us choose life that we, and our seed may live, by obeying His voice and cleaving to Him, for He is our life and our prosperity.
THE INHABITANTS AND RESIDENTS OF WINDSOR, HARTFORD, AND WETHERSFIELD

The Fundamental Orders

Constitution

January 14, 1639

Connecticut River Colony

BACKGROUND

After disputes with the Massachusetts Bay Colony, Roger Ludlow and other leading residents along the Connecticut River drafted this frame of government for inhabitants along the river, which was adopted for the community by anonymous leaders in 1639.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. On what is government to be based?

2. How is the government to ensure the rights of individuals?

3. How does one come to be a magistrate?

4. What kinds of limits are placed on the power of the government?

For as much as it hath pleased Almighty God by the wise disposition of his divine providence so to order and dispose of things that we the Inhabitants and Residents of Windsor, Hartford and Wethersfield are now cohabiting and dwelling in and upon the River of Connectecotte and the lands thereunto adjoining; and well knowing where a people are gathered together the word of God requires that to maintain the peace and union of such a people there should be an orderly and decent Government established according to God, to order and dispose of the affairs of the people at all seasons as occasion shall require; do therefore associate and conjoin ourselves to be as one Public State or Commonwealth; and do for ourselves and our successors and such as shall be adjoined to us at any time hereafter, enter into Combination and Confederation together, to maintain and preserve the liberty and purity of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus which we now profess, as also, the discipline of the Churches, which according to the truth of the said Gospel is now practiced amongst us; as also in our civil affairs to be guided and governed according to such Laws, Rules, Orders and Decrees as shall be made, ordered, and decreed as followeth:

1. It is Ordered, sentenced, and decreed, that there shall be yearly two General Assemblies or Courts, the one the second Thursday in April, the other the second Thursday in September following; the first shall be called the Court of Election, wherein shall be yearly chosen from time to time, so many Magistrates and other public Officers as shall be found requisite: Whereof one to be chosen Governor for the year ensuing and until another be chosen, and no other Magistrate to be chosen for more than one year: provided always there be six chosen besides the Governor, which being chosen and sworn according to an Oath recorded for that purpose, shall have the power to administer justice according to the Laws here established, and for want thereof, according to the Rule of the Word of God; which choice shall be made by all that are admitted freemen and have taken the Oath of Fidelity, and do cohabit within this Jurisdiction having been admitted Inhabitants by the major part of the Town wherein they live or the major part of such as shall be then present.
2. It is Ordered, sentenced, and decreed, that the election of the aforesaid Magistrates shall be in this manner: every person present and qualified for choice shall bring in (to the person deputed to receive them) one single paper with the name of him written in it whom he desires to have Governor, and that he that hath the greatest number of papers shall be Governor for that year. And the rest of the Magistrates or public officers to be chosen in this manner: the Secretary for the time being shall first read the names of all that are to be put to choice and then shall severally nominate them distinctly, and every one that would have the person nominated to be chosen shall bring in one single paper written upon, and he that would not have him chosen shall bring in a blank; and every one that hath more written papers than blanks shall be a Magistrate for that year; which papers shall be received and told by one or more that shall be then chosen by the court and sworn to be faithful therein; but in case there should not be six chosen as aforesaid, besides the Governor, out of those which are nominated, than he or they which have the most written papers shall be a Magistrate or Magistrates for the ensuing year, to make up the aforesaid number.

3. It is Ordered, sentenced, and decreed, that the Secretary shall not nominate any person, nor shall any person be chosen newly into the Magistracy which was not propounded in some General Court before, to be nominated the next election; and to that end it shall be lawful for each of the Towns aforesaid by their deputies to nominate any two whom they conceive fit to be put to election; and the Court may add so many more as they judge requisite.

4. It is Ordered, sentenced, and decreed, that no person be chosen Governor above once in two years, and that the Governor be always a member of some approved Congregation, and formerly of the Magistracy within this Jurisdiction; and that all the Magistrates, Freemen of this Commonwealth; and that no Magistrate or other public officer shall execute any part of his or their office before they are severally sworn, which shall be done in the face of the court if they be present, and in case of absence by some deputed for that purpose.
5. It is Ordered, sentenced, and decreed, that to the aforesaid Court of Election the several Towns shall send their deputies, and when the Elections are ended they may proceed in any public service as at other Courts. Also the other General Court in September shall be for making of laws, and any other public occasion, which concerns the good of the Commonwealth.

6. It is Ordered, sentenced, and decreed, that the Governor shall, either by himself or by the Secretary, send out summons to the Constables of every Town for the calling of these two standing Courts one month at least before their several times: And also if the Governor and the greatest part of the Magistrates see cause upon any special occasion to call a General Court, they may give order to the Secretary so to do within fourteen days' warning: And if urgent necessity so required, upon a shorter notice, giving sufficient grounds for it to the deputies when they meet, or else be questioned for the same; And if the Governor and major part of Magistrates shall either neglect or refuse to call the two General standing Courts or either of them, as also at other times when the occasions of the Commonwealth require, the Freemen thereof, or the major part of them, shall petition to them so to do; if then it be either denied or neglected, the said Freemen, or the major part of them, shall have the power to give order to the Constables of the several Towns to do the same, and so may meet together, and choose to themselves a Moderator, and may proceed to do any act of power which any other General Courts may.

7. It is Ordered, sentenced, and decreed, that after there are warrants given out for any of the said General Courts, the Constable or Constables of each Town, shall forthwith give notice distinctly to the inhabitants of the same, in some public assembly or by going or sending from house to house, that at a place and time by him or them limited and set, they meet and assemble themselves together to elect and choose certain deputies to be at the General Court then following to agitate the affairs of the Commonwealth; which said deputies shall be chosen by all that are admitted Inhabitants in the several Towns and have taken the oath of fidelity; provided that none be chosen a Deputy for any General Court which is not a Freeman of this Commonwealth…
8. It is Ordered, sentenced, and decreed, that Windsor, Hartford, and Wethersfield shall have power, each Town, to send four of their Freemen as their deputies to every General Court; and Whatsoever other Town shall be hereafter added to this Jurisdiction, they shall send so many deputies as the Court shall judge meet, a reasonable proportion to the number of Freemen that are in the said Towns being to be attended therein; which deputies shall have the power of the whole Town to give their votes and allowance to all such laws and orders as may be for the public good, and unto which the said Towns are to be bound.

9. It is Ordered, sentenced, and decreed, that the deputies thus chosen shall have power and liberty to appoint a time and a place of meeting together before any General Court, to advise and consult of all such things as may concern the good of the public, as also to examine their own Elections, whether according to the order, and if they or the greatest part of them find any election to be illegal they may seclude such for present from their meeting, and return the same and their reasons to the Court; and if it be proved true, the Court may fine the party or parties so intruding, and the Town, if they see cause, and give out a warrant to go to a new election in a legal way, either in part or in whole. Also the said deputies shall have power to fine any that shall be disorderly at their meetings, or for not coming in due time or place according to appointment; and they may return the said fines into the Court if it be refused to be paid, and the Treasurer to take notice of it, and to escheat or levy the same as he does other fines.

10. It is Ordered, sentenced, and decreed, that every General Court, except such as through neglect of the Governor and the greatest part of the Magistrates the Freemen themselves do call, shall consist of the Governor, or some one chosen to moderate the Court, and four other Magistrates at least, with the major part of the deputies of the several Towns legally chosen; and in case the Freemen, or major part of them, through neglect or refusal of the Governor and major part of the Magistrates, shall call a Court, it shall consist of the major part of Freemen that are present or their deputies, with a Moderator chosen by them: In which said General Courts shall consist the supreme
power of the Commonwealth, and they only shall have power to make laws or repeal them, to grant levies, to admit of Freemen, dispose of lands undisposed of, to several Towns or persons, and also shall have power to call either Court or Magistrate or any other person whatsoever into question for any misdemeanor, and may for just causes displace or deal otherwise according to the nature of the offense; and also may deal in any other matter that concerns the good of this Commonwealth, except election of Magistrates, which shall be done by the whole body of Freemen.

In which Court the Governor or Moderator shall have power to order the Court, to give liberty of speech, and silence unseasonable and disorderly speakings, to put all things to vote, and in case the vote be equal to have the casting voice. But none of these Courts shall be adjourned or dissolved without the consent of the major part of the Court.

11. It is Ordered, sentenced, and decreed, that when any General Court upon the occasions of the Commonwealth have agreed upon any sum, or sums of money to be levied upon the several Towns within this Jurisdiction, that a committee be chosen to set out and appoint what shall be the proportion of every Town to pay of the said levy, provided the committee be made up of an equal number out of each Town.

14th January 1639 the 11 Orders above said are voted.
Preface to the Frame of Government

BACKGROUND

William Penn, Founder of the Province of Pennsylvania, wrote this preface for the colony’s first constitution.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. According to William Penn, does God desire a government for mankind?

2. What is the purpose of government?

3. Are the people meant to participate in government?

4. What is the importance of good men to a community?

5. What is the relationship between liberty and obedience?

---
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When the great and wise God had made the world, of all his creatures, it pleased him to choose man his Deputy to rule it: and to fit him for so great a charge and trust, he did not only qualify him with skill and power, but with integrity to use them justly. This native goodness was equally his honor and his happiness, and whilst he stood here, all went well; there was no need of coercive or compulsive means; the precept of divine love and truth, in his bosom, was the guide and keeper of his innocency. But lust prevailing against duty, made a lamentable breach upon it; and the law, that before had no power over him, took place upon him, and his disobedient posterity, that such as would not live comformable to the holy law within, should fall under the reproof and correction of the just law without, in a Judicial administration.

This the Apostle teaches in divers of his epistles: "The law," says he, "was added because of transgression." In another place, "knowing that the law was not made for the righteous man; but for the disobedient and ungodly, for sinners, for unholy and prophane, for murderers, for whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, and for man-stealers, for liars, for perjured persons," etc., but this is not all; he opens and carries the matter of government a little further: "let every soul be subject to the higher powers; for there is no power but of God. The powers that be are ordained of God: whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to evil: wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same." "He is the minister of God to thee for good." "Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but for conscience sake."

This settles the divine right of government beyond exception, and that for two ends: first, to terrify evil doers: secondly, to cherish those that do well; which gives government a life beyond corruption, and makes it as durable in the world, as good men shall be. So that government seems to me a part of religion itself, a filing sacred in its institution and end. For, if it does not directly remove the cause, it crushes the effects of evil, and is as such, though a lower, yet an emanation of the same Divine Power, that is both author and object of pure religion; the difference lying here, that the one is more free and mental, the
other more corporal and compulsive in its operations: but that is only to evil doers; government itself being otherwise as capable of kindness, goodness and charity, as a more private society. They weakly err, that think there is no other use of government than correction, which is the coarsest part of it: daily experience tells us that the care and regulation of many other affairs, more soft, and daily necessary, make up much of the greatest part of government; and which must have followed the peopling of the world, had Adam never fell, and will continue among men, on earth, under the highest attainments they may arrive at, by the coming of the blessed Second Adam, the Lord from heaven. Thus much of government in general, as to its rise and end.

For particular frames and models, it will become me to say little; and comparatively I will say nothing. My reasons are:

First. That the age is too nice and difficult for it; there being nothing the wits of men are more busy and divided upon. It is true, they seem to agree to the end, to wit, happiness; but, in the means, they differ, as to divine, so to this human felicity; and the cause is much the same, not always want of light and knowledge, but want of using them rightly. Men side with their passions against their reason, and their sinister interests have so strong a bias upon their minds, that they lean to them against the good of the things they know.

Secondly. I do not find a model in the world, that time, place, and some singular emergences have not necessarily altered; nor is it easy to frame a civil government, that shall serve all places alike.

Thirdly. I know what is said by the several admirers of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy, which are the rule of one, a few, and many, and are the three common ideas of government, when men discourse on the subject. But I choose to solve the controversy with this small distinction, and it belongs to all three: Any government is free to the people under it, whatever be the frame, where the laws rule, and the people are a party to those laws, and more than this is tyranny, oligarchy, or confusion.
But lastly, when all is said, there is hardly one frame of government in the world so ill designed by its first founders that in good hands, [it] would not do well enough; and story tells us, the best in ill ones can do nothing that is great or good; witness the Jewish and Roman states. Governments, like clocks, go from the motion men give them; and as governments are made and moved by men, so by them they are ruined too. Wherefore governments rather depend upon men, than men upon governments. Let men be good, and the government cannot be bad; if it be ill, they will cure it. But if men be bad, let the government be never so good, they will endeavor to warp and spoil it to their turn.

I know some say, let us have good laws, and no matter for the men that execute them: but let them consider, that though good laws do well, good men do better: for good laws may want good men, and be abolished or evaded by ill men, but good men will never want good laws nor suffer ill ones. It is true, good laws have some awe upon-ill ministers, but that is where they have not power to escape or abolish them and the people are generally wise and good: but a loose and depraved people (which is the question) love laws and an administration like themselves. That, therefore, which makes a good constitution, must keep it, vie: men of wisdom and virtue, qualities, that because they descend not with worldly inheritances, must be carefully propagated by a virtuous education of youth; for which after ages will owe more to the care and prudence of founders and the successive magistracy than to their parents for their private patrimonies.

These considerations of the weight of government and the nice and various opinions about it made it uneasy to me to think of publishing the ensuing frame and conditional laws, foreseeing both the censures they will meet with from men of differing humors and engagements and the occasion they may give of discourse beyond my design.

But, next to the power of necessity, (which is a solicitor that will take no denial) this induced me to a compliance, that we have (with reverence to God and good conscience to men) to the best of our skill contrived and composed the frame and laws of this government to the great end of all government; viz., to support power in reverence with the people and to secure the people from the almost of power; that they may be free by
their just obedience, and the magistrates honorable for their just administration; for liberty without obedience is confusion, and obedience without liberty is slavery. To carry this evenness is partly owing to the constitution, and partly to the magistracy. Where either of these fail, government will be subject to convulsions, but where both are wanting, it must be totally subverted; then where both meet, the government is like to endure, which I humbly pray and hope God will please to make the lot of this of Pennsylvania. Amen.

WILLIAM PENN.
FIRST PENNSYLVANIA PROVINCIAL ASSEMBLY
An Act for Freedom of Conscience

LAW

December 7, 1682
Province of Pennsylvania | Chester, Pennsylvania

BACKGROUND

William Penn, Governor of Pennsylvania, insisted upon this law, which the Pennsylvania Provincial Assembly passed in 1682.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What is the proper end of government?

2. Why are there laws?

3. What is the freedom of conscience?

4. What are its limits?

5. What are the punishments given for breaking this law?

Whereas the glory of almighty God and the good of mankind is the reason and end of government and, therefore, government in itself is a venerable ordinance of God. And forasmuch as it is principally desired and intended by the Proprietary and Governor and the freemen of the province of Pennsylvania and territories thereunto belonging to make and establish such laws as shall best preserve true Christian and civil liberty in opposition to all unchristian, licentious, and unjust practices, whereby God may have his due, Caesar his due, and the people their due, from tyranny and oppression on the one side and insolence and licentiousness on the other, so that the best and firmest foundation may be laid for the present and future happiness of both the Governor and people of the province and territories aforesaid and their posterity.

Be it, therefore, enacted by William Penn, Proprietary and Governor, by and with the advice and consent of the deputies of the freemen of this province and counties aforesaid in assembly met and by the authority of the same, that these following chapters and paragraphs shall be the laws of Pennsylvania and the territories thereof.

Chap. i. Almighty God, being only Lord of conscience, father of lights and spirits, and the author as well as object of all divine knowledge, faith, and worship, who can only enlighten the mind and persuade and convince the understandings of people, in due reverence to his sovereignty over the souls of mankind:

Be it enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that no person now or at any time hereafter living in this province, who shall confess and acknowledge one almighty God to be the creator, upholder, and ruler of the world, and who professes him or herself obliged in conscience to live peaceably and quietly under the civil government, shall in any case be molested or prejudiced for his or her conscientious persuasion or practice. Nor shall he or she at any time be compelled to frequent or maintain any religious worship, place, or ministry whatever contrary to his or her mind, but shall freely and fully enjoy his, or her, Christian liberty in that respect, without any interruption or reflection. And if any person shall abuse or deride any other for his or her different persuasion and practice in matters
of religion, such person shall be looked upon as a disturber of the peace and be punished accordingly.

But to the end that looseness, irreligion, and atheism may not creep in under pretense of conscience in this province, be it further enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that, according to the example of the primitive Christians and for the ease of the creation, every first day of the week, called the Lord’s day, people shall abstain from their usual and common toil and labor that, whether masters, parents, children, or servants, they may the better dispose themselves to read the scriptures of truth at home or frequent such meetings of religious worship abroad as may best suit their respective persuasions.

Chap. ii. And be it further enacted by, etc., that all officers and persons commissioned and employed in the service of the government in this province and all members and deputies elected to serve in the Assembly thereof and all that have a right to elect such deputies shall be such as profess and declare they believe in Jesus Christ to be the son of God, the savior of the world, and that are not convicted of ill-fame or unsober and dishonest conversation and that are of twenty-one years of age at least.

Chap. iii. And be it further enacted, etc., that whosoever shall swear in their common conversation by the name of God or Christ or Jesus, being legally convicted thereof, shall pay, for every such offense, five shillings or suffer five days imprisonment in the house of correction at hard labor to the behoove of the public and be fed with bread and water only during that time.

Chap. v. And be it further enacted, etc., for the better prevention of corrupt communication, that whosoever shall speak loosely and profanely of almighty God, Christ Jesus, the Holy Spirit, or the scriptures of truth, and is legally convicted thereof, shall pay, for every such offense, five shillings or suffer five days imprisonment in the house of correction at hard labor to the behoove of the public and be fed with bread and water only during that time.
Chap. vi. And be it further enacted, etc., that whosoever shall, in their conversation, at any time curse himself or any other and is legally convicted thereof shall pay for every such offense five shillings or suffer five days imprisonment as aforesaid.
**KING JOHN OF ENGLAND**

*Magna Carta Libertatum*

**ROYAL CHARTER**

June 15, 1215

The Meadow of Runnymede | Windsor, England

**BACKGROUND**

Following the loss of English territory in France, England was left weak and vulnerable. In order to regain power, King John attempted to assert total authority over all the barons of England. Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, attempted to prevent the potential civil war by drafting the Magna Carta, which was signed by King John.

**ANNOTATIONS**

JOHN, by the grace of God King of England, Lord of Ireland, Duke of Normandy and Aquitaine, and Count of Anjou, to his archbishops, bishops, abbots, earls, barons, justices, foresters, sheriffs, stewards, servants, and to all his officials and loyal subjects, Greeting.

KNOW THAT BEFORE GOD, for the health of our soul and those of our ancestors and heirs, to the honour of God, the exaltation of the holy Church, and the better ordering of our kingdom, at the advice of our reverend fathers…and other loyal subjects:

(1) FIRST, THAT WE HAVE GRANTED TO GOD, and by this present charter have confirmed for us and our heirs in perpetuity, that the English Church shall be free, and shall have its rights undiminished, and its liberties unimpaired. That we wish this so to be observed, appears from the fact that of our own free will, before the outbreak of the

---

present dispute between us and our barons, we granted and confirmed by charter the freedom of the Church’s elections – a right reckoned to be of the greatest necessity and importance to it – and caused this to be confirmed by Pope Innocent III. This freedom we shall observe ourselves, and desire to be observed in good faith by our heirs in perpetuity.

TO ALL FREE MEN OF OUR KINGDOM we have also granted, for us and our heirs for ever, all the liberties written out below, to have and to keep for them and their heirs, of us and our heirs: ...

(4) The guardian of the land of an heir who is under age shall take from it only reasonable revenues, customary dues, and feudal services. He shall do this without destruction or damage to men or property. If we have given the guardianship of the land to a sheriff, or to any person answerable to us for the revenues, and he commits destruction or damage, we will exact compensation from him, and the land shall be entrusted to two worthy and prudent men of the same ‘fee’, who shall be answerable to us for the revenues, or to the person to whom we have assigned them. If we have given or sold to anyone the guardianship of such land, and he causes destruction or damage, he shall lose the guardianship of it, and it shall be handed over to two worthy and prudent men of the same ‘fee’, who shall be similarly answerable to us.

(5) For so long as a guardian has guardianship of such land, he shall maintain the houses, parks, fish preserves, ponds, mills, and everything else pertaining to it, from the revenues of the land itself. When the heir comes of age, he shall restore the whole land to him, stocked with plough teams and such implements of husbandry as the season demands and the revenues from the land can reasonably bear.

(6) Heirs may be given in marriage, but not to someone of lower social standing. Before a marriage takes place, it shall be made known to the heir’s next-of-kin.
(7) At her husband’s death, a widow may have her marriage portion and inheritance at once and without trouble. She shall pay nothing for her dower, marriage portion, or any inheritance that she and her husband held jointly on the day of his death…

(8) No widow shall be compelled to marry, so long as she wishes to remain without a husband. But she must give security that she will not marry without royal consent, if she holds her lands of the Crown, or without the consent of whatever other lord she may hold them of.

(9) Neither we nor our officials will seize any land or rent in payment of a debt, so long as the debtor has movable goods sufficient to discharge the debt…

(12) No ‘scutage’ or ‘aid’ may be levied in our kingdom without its general consent, unless it is for the ransom of our person, to make our eldest son a knight, and (once) to marry our eldest daughter. For these purposes only a reasonable ‘aid’ may be levied…

(13) The city of London shall enjoy all its ancient liberties and free customs, both by land and by water. We also will and grant that all other cities, boroughs, towns, and ports shall enjoy all their liberties and free customs.

(14) To obtain the general consent of the realm for the assessment of an ‘aid’ – except in the three cases specified above – or a ‘scutage’, we will cause the archbishops, bishops, abbots, earls, and greater barons to be summoned individually by letter…

(16) No man shall be forced to perform more service for a knight’s ‘fee’, or other free holding of land, than is due from it.

(17) Ordinary lawsuits shall not follow the royal court around, but shall be held in a fixed place…
(20) For a trivial offence, a free man shall be fined only in proportion to the degree of his offence, and for a serious offence correspondingly, but not so heavily as to deprive him of his livelihood. In the same way, a merchant shall be spared his merchandise, and a villein the implements of his husbandry, if they fall upon the mercy of a royal court. None of these fines shall be imposed except by the assessment on oath of reputable men of the neighbourhood.

(21) Earls and barons shall be fined only by their equals, and in proportion to the gravity of their offence.

(22) A fine imposed upon the lay property of a clerk in holy orders shall be assessed upon the same principles, without reference to the value of his ecclesiastical benefice…

(24) No sheriff, constable, coroners, or other royal officials are to hold lawsuits that should be held by the royal justices…

(30) No sheriff, royal official, or other person shall take horses or carts for transport from any free man, without his consent.

(31) Neither we nor any royal official will take wood for our castle, or for any other purpose, without the consent of the owner.

(32) We will not keep the lands of people convicted of felony in our hand for longer than a year and a day, after which they shall be returned to the lords of the ‘fees’ concerned…

(38) In future no official shall place a man on trial upon his own unsupported statement, without producing credible witnesses to the truth of it.

(39) No free man shall be seized or imprisoned, or stripped of his rights or possessions, or outlawed or exiled, or deprived of his standing in any way, nor will we proceed with force
against him, or send others to do so, except by the lawful judgment of his equals or by the law of the land.

(40) To no one will we sell, to no one deny or delay right or justice…

(45) We will appoint as justices, constables, sheriffs, or other officials, only men that know the law of the realm and are minded to keep it well…

(51) As soon as peace is restored, we will remove from the kingdom all the foreign knights, bowmen, their attendants, and the mercenaries that have come to it, to its harm, with horses and arms.

(52) To any man whom we have deprived or dispossessed of lands, castles, liberties, or rights, without the lawful judgment of his equals, we will at once restore these. In cases of dispute the matter shall be resolved by the judgment of the twenty-five barons…

(55) All fines that have been given to us unjustly and against the law of the land, and all fines that we have exacted unjustly, shall be entirely remitted or the matter decided by a majority judgment of the twenty-five barons referred to below in the clause for securing the peace together with Stephen, archbishop of Canterbury, if he can be present…

(60) All these customs and liberties that we have granted shall be observed in our kingdom in so far as concerns our own relations with our subjects. Let all men of our kingdom, whether clergy or laymen, observe them similarly in their relations with their own men.

(61) SINCE WE HAVE GRANTED ALL THESE THINGS for God, for the better ordering of our kingdom, and to allay the discord that has arisen between us and our barons, and since we desire that they shall be enjoyed in their entirety, with lasting strength, for ever, we give and grant to the barons the following security:
The barons shall elect twenty-five of their number to keep, and cause to be observed with all their might, the peace and liberties granted and confirmed to them by this charter.

If we, our chief justice, our officials, or any of our servants offend in any respect against any man, or transgress any of the articles of the peace or of this security, and the offence is made known to four of the said twenty-five barons, they shall come to us – or in our absence from the kingdom to the chief justice – to declare it and claim immediate redress. If we, or in our absence abroad the chief justice, make no redress within forty days, reckoning from the day on which the offence was declared to us or to him, the four barons shall refer the matter to the rest of the twenty-five barons, who may distress upon and assail us in every way possible, with the support of the whole community of the land, by seizing our castles, lands, possessions, or anything else saving only our own person and those of the queen and our children, until they have secured such redress as they have determined upon. Having secured the redress, they may then resume their normal obedience to us…

If one of the twenty-five barons dies or leaves the country, or is prevented in any other way from discharging his duties, the rest of them shall choose another baron in his place, at their discretion, who shall be duly sworn in as they were.

In the event of disagreement among the twenty-five barons on any matter referred to them for decision, the verdict of the majority present shall have the same validity as a unanimous verdict of the whole twenty-five, whether these were all present or some of those summoned were unwilling or unable to appear.

The twenty-five barons shall swear to obey all the above articles faithfully, and shall cause them to be obeyed by others to the best of their power.

We will not seek to procure from anyone, either by our own efforts or those of a third party, anything by which any part of these concessions or liberties might be revoked or
diminished. Should such a thing be procured, it shall be null and void and we will at no
time make use of it, either ourselves or through a third party…

(63) IT IS ACCORDINGLY OUR WISH AND COMMAND that the English Church
shall be free, and that men in our kingdom shall have and keep all these liberties, rights,
and concessions, well and peaceably in their fullness and entirety for them and their heirs,
of us and our heirs, in all things and all places for ever.

Both we and the barons have sworn that all this shall be observed in good faith and
without deceit. Witness the abovementioned people and many others.

Given by our hand in the meadow that is called Runnymede, between Windsor and
Staines, on the fifteenth day of June in the seventeenth year of our reign.
GREAT AND GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS BAY COLONY

An Act

LAW

June 10, 1661
The Colony of Massachusetts Bay

BACKGROUND

The colonial legislature in Massachusetts enacted this declaration in 1661 after the restoration of Charles II to the English throne.

ANNOTATIONS

Concerning our liberties

1. We conceive the patent (under God) to be the first and main foundation of our civil polity here, by a Governor and Company, according as is therein expressed.

2. The Governor and Company are, by the patent, a body politic, in fact and name.

3. This body politic is vested with power to make freemen.

4. These freemen have power to choose annually a governor, deputy governor, assistants, and their select representatives or deputies.

5. This government has power also to set up all sorts of officers, as well superior as inferior, and point out their power and places.

6. The governor, deputy governor, assistants, and select representatives or deputies have full power and authority, both legislative and executive, for the government of

all the people here, whether inhabitants or strangers, both concerning ecclesiastics and in civils, without appeal, excepting law or laws repugnant to the laws of England.

7. The government is privileged by all fitting means (yea, if need be, by force of arms) to defend themselves, both by land and sea, against all such person or persons as shall at any time attempt or enterprise the destruction, invasion, detriment, or annoyance of this plantation, or the inhabitants therein, besides other privileges mentioned in the patent, not here expressed.

8. We conceive any imposition prejudicial to the country contrary to any just law of ours, not repugnant to the laws of England, to be an infringement of our right.

**Concerning our duties of allegiance to our sovereign lord, the king**

1. We ought to uphold and, to our power, maintain his place, as of right belonging to Our Sovereign Lord, The King, as holden of His Majesty’s manor of East Greenwich, and not to subject the same to any foreign prince or potentate whatsoever.

2. We ought to endeavor the preservation of His Majesty’s royal person, realms, and dominions, and so far as lies in us, to discover and prevent all plots and conspiracies against the same.

3. We ought to seek the peace and prosperity of Our King and nation by a faithful discharge in the governing of his people committed to our care.
First, by punishing all such crimes (being breaches of the First or Second Table) as are committed against the peace of Our Sovereign Lord, The King, his Royal Crown, and dignity.

Second, in propagating the Gospel, defending and upholding the true Christian or Protestant religion according to the faith given by our Lord Christ in His word; our dread sovereign being styled “defender of the faith.”

The premises considered, it may well stand with the loyalty and obedience of such subjects as are thus privileged by their rightful sovereign (for Himself, His Heirs, and Successors forever) as cause shall require, to plead with their prince against all such as shall at any time endeavor the violation of their privileges ... And, also, that the General Court may do safely to declare that in case (for the future) any legally obnoxious, and flying from the civil justice of the state of England, shall come over to these parts, they may not here expect shelter.
PARLIAMENT OF ENGLAND

An Act Declaring the Rights and Liberties of the Subject and Settling the Succession of the Crown

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

February 13, 1689
Parliament | London, England

BACKGROUND

Following a civil war, revolution, the Cromwell Protectorate, and a second, bloodless revolution, the English Parliament enacted this law in 1689.

ANNOTATIONS

An Act Declaring the Rights and Liberties of the Subject and Settling the Succession of the Crown.

Whereas the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons assembled at Westminster, lawfully, fully and freely representing all the estates of the people of this realm, did upon the thirteenth day of February in the year of our Lord one thousand six hundred eighty-eight present unto their Majesties, then called and known by the names and style of William and Mary, prince and princess of Orange, being present in their proper persons, a certain declaration in writing made by the said Lords and Commons in the words following, viz.:

Whereas the late King James the Second, by the assistance of diverse evil counsellors, judges and ministers employed by him, did endeavor to subvert and extirpate the Protestant religion and the laws and liberties of this kingdom;

By assuming and exercising a power of dispensing with and suspending of laws and the execution of laws without consent of Parliament…

By levying money for and to the use of the Crown by pretense of prerogative for other time and in other manner than the same was granted by Parliament;

By raising and keeping a standing army within this kingdom in time of peace without consent of Parliament, and quartering soldiers contrary to law;

By causing several good subjects being Protestants to be disarmed at the same time when papists were both armed and employed contrary to law;

By violating the freedom of election of members to serve in Parliament;

By prosecutions in the Court of King's Bench for matters and causes cognizable only in Parliament, and by diverse other arbitrary and illegal courses;

And whereas of late years partial corrupt and unqualified persons have been returned and served on juries in trials, and particularly diverse jurors in trials for high treason which were not freeholders;

And excessive bail hath been required of persons committed in criminal cases to elude the benefit of the laws made for the liberty of the subjects;

And excessive fines have been imposed;

And illegal and cruel punishments inflicted;

And several grants and promises made of fines and forfeitures before any conviction or judgment against the persons upon whom the same were to be levied;

All which are utterly and directly contrary to the known laws and statutes and freedom of this realm;
And whereas the said late King James the Second having abdicated the government and the throne being thereby vacant, his Highness the prince of Orange (whom it hath pleased Almighty God to make the glorious instrument of delivering this kingdom from popery and arbitrary power) did (by the advice of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and diverse principal persons of the Commons) cause letters to be written to the Lords Spiritual and Temporal being Protestants, and other letters to the several counties, cities, universities, boroughs and cinque ports, for the choosing of such persons to represent them as were of right to be sent to Parliament, to meet and sit at Westminster upon the two and twentieth day of January in this year one thousand six hundred eighty and eight [old style date], in order to such an establishment as that their religion, laws and liberties might not again be in danger of being subverted, upon which letters elections having been accordingly made;

And thereupon the said Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons, pursuant to their respective letters and elections, being now assembled in a full and free representative of this nation, taking into their most serious consideration the best means for attaining the ends aforesaid, do in the first place (as their ancestors in like case have usually done) for the vindicating and asserting their ancient rights and liberties declare

That the pretended power of suspending the laws or the execution of laws by regal authority without consent of Parliament is illegal;

That the pretended power of dispensing with laws or the execution of laws by regal authority, as it hath been assumed and exercised of late, is illegal…

That levying money for or to the use of the Crown by pretence of prerogative, without grant of Parliament, for longer time, or in other manner than the same is or shall be granted, is illegal;

That it is the right of the subjects to petition the king, and all commitments and prosecutions for such petitioning are illegal;
That the raising or keeping a standing army within the kingdom in time of peace, unless it be with consent of Parliament, is against law;

That the subjects which are Protestants may have arms for their defense suitable to their conditions and as allowed by law;

That election of members of Parliament ought to be free;

That the freedom of speech and debates or proceedings in Parliament ought not to be impeached or questioned in any court or place out of Parliament;

That excessive bail ought not to be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted;

That jurors ought to be duly impaneled and returned, and jurors which pass upon men in trials for high treason ought to be freeholders;

That all grants and promises of fines and forfeitures of particular persons before conviction are illegal and void;

And that for redress of all grievances, and for the amending, strengthening and preserving of the laws, Parliaments ought to be held frequently.

…Having therefore an entire confidence that his said Highness the prince of Orange will perfect the deliverance so far advanced by him, and will still preserve them from the violation of their rights which they have here asserted, and from all other attempts upon their religion, rights and liberties, the said Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons assembled at Westminster do resolve that William and Mary, prince and princess of Orange, be and be declared king and queen of England, France and Ireland and the dominions thereunto belonging, to hold the crown and royal dignity of the said kingdoms and dominions to them, the said prince and princess, during their lives and the life of the survivor to them, and that the sole and full exercise of the regal power be only in and
executed by the said prince of Orange in the names of the said prince and princess during their joint lives, and after their deceases the said crown and royal dignity of the same kingdoms and dominions to be to the heirs of the body of the said princess, and for default of such issue to the Princess Anne of Denmark and the heirs of her body, and for default of such issue to the heirs of the body of the said prince of Orange. And the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons do pray the said prince and princess to accept the same accordingly...

…Now in pursuance of the premises the said Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons in Parliament assembled, for the ratifying, confirming and establishing the said declaration and the articles, clauses, matters and things therein contained by the force of law made in due form by authority of Parliament, do pray that it may be declared and enacted that all and singular the rights and liberties asserted and claimed in the said declaration are the true, ancient and indubitable rights and liberties of the people of this kingdom, and so shall be esteemed, allowed, adjudged, deemed and taken to be; and that all and every the particulars aforesaid shall be firmly and strictly holden and observed as they are expressed in the said declaration, and all officers and ministers whatsoever shall serve their Majesties and their successors according to the same in all time to come…And for preventing all questions and divisions in this realm by reason of any pretended titles to the crown, and for preserving a certainty in the succession thereof, in and upon which the unity, peace, tranquility and safety of this nation doth under God wholly consist and depend, the said Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons do beseech their Majesties that it may be enacted, established and declared, that the crown and regal government of the said kingdoms and dominions, with all and singular the premises thereunto belonging and appertaining, shall be and continue to their said Majesties and the survivor of them during their lives and the life of the survivor of them, and that the entire, perfect and full exercise of the regal power and government be only in and executed by his Majesty in the names of both their Majesties during their joint lives; and after their deceases the said crown and premises shall be and remain to the heirs of the body of her Majesty…and thereunto the said Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons do in the name of all the
people aforesaid most humbly and faithfully submit themselves, their heirs and posterities for ever, and do faithfully promise that they will stand to, maintain and defend their said Majesties, and also the limitation and succession of the crown herein specified and contained, to the utmost of their powers with their lives and estates against all persons whatsoever that shall attempt anything to the contrary. And whereas it hath been found by experience that it is inconsistent with the safety and welfare of this Protestant kingdom to be governed by a popish prince, or by any king or queen marrying a papist, the said Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons do further pray that it may be enacted, that all and every person and persons that is, are or shall be reconciled to or shall hold communion with the see or Church of Rome, or shall profess the popish religion, or shall marry a papist, shall be excluded and be for ever incapable to inherit, possess or enjoy the crown and government of this realm and Ireland and the dominions thereunto belonging or any part of the same, or to have, use or exercise any regal power, authority or jurisdiction within the same…

...Provided that no charter or grant or pardon granted before the three and twentieth day of October in the year of our Lord one thousand six hundred eighty-nine shall be any ways impeached or invalidated by this Act, but that the same shall be and remain of the same force and effect in law and no other than as if this Act had never been made.
BACKGROUND

English doctor and political thinker John Locke published this work on government during the time of Glorious Revolution in England, which was read and influential among colonial leaders in the British North American colonies during the following century.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Why do men form political societies according to Locke?
2. What are the two powers man possesses in the state of nature?

123. If man in the state of nature be so free, as has been said; if he be absolute lord of his own person and possessions, equal to the greatest, and subject to nobody, why will he part with his freedom? Why will he give up his empire, and subject himself to the dominion and control of any other power? To which it is obvious to answer, that though in the state of nature he hath such a right, yet the enjoyment of it is very uncertain, and constantly exposed to the invasion of others; for all being kings as much as he, every man his equal, and the greater part no strict observers of equity and justice, the enjoyment of the property he has in this state is very unsafe, very unsecure. This makes him willing to quit a condition, which, however free, is full of fears and continual dangers: and it is not without reason, that he seeks out, and is willing to join in society with others, who are already united, or have a mind to unite, for the mutual preservation of their lives, liberties, and estates, which I call by the general name, property.

124. The great and chief end, therefore, of men’s uniting into commonwealths, and putting themselves under government, is the preservation of their property. To which in the state of nature there are many things wanting. First, There wants an established, settled, known law, received and allowed by common consent to be the standard of right and wrong, and the common measure to decide all controversies between them: for though the law of nature be plain and intelligible to all rational creatures; yet men being biased by their interest, as well as ignorant for want of studying it, are not apt to allow of it as a law binding to them in the application of it to their particular cases.

125. Secondly, In the state of nature there wants a known and indifferent judge, with authority to determine all differences according to the established law: for every one in that state being both judge and executioner of the law of nature, men being partial to themselves, passion and revenge is very apt to carry them too far, and with too much heat, in their own cases; as well as negligence, and unconcernedness, to make them too remiss in other men’s.
126. Thirdly, In the state of nature there often wants power to back and support the sentence when right, and to give it due execution. They who by any injustice offend, will seldom fail, where they are able, by force to make good their injustice; such resistance many times makes the punishment dangerous, and frequently destructive, to those who attempt it.

127. Thus mankind, notwithstanding all the privileges of the state of nature, being but in an ill condition, while they remain in it, are quickly driven into society. Hence it comes to pass that we seldom find any number of men live any time together in this state. The inconveniences that they are therein exposed to, by the irregular and uncertain exercise of the power every man has of punishing the transgressions of others, make them take sanctuary under the established laws of government, and therein seek the preservation of their property. It is this makes them so willingly give up every one his single power of punishing, to be exercised by such alone, as shall be appointed to it amongst them; and by such rules as the community, or those authorized by them to that purpose, shall agree on. And in this we have the original right of both the legislative and executive power, as well as of the governments and societies themselves.

128. For in the state of nature, to omit the liberty he has of innocent delights, a man has two powers. The first is to do whatsoever he thinks fit for the preservation of himself and others within the permission of the law of nature: by which law, common to them all, he and all the rest of mankind are one community, make up one society, distinct from all other creatures. And, were it not for the corruption and viciousness of degenerate men, there would be no need of any other; no necessity that men should separate from this great and natural community, and by positive agreements combine into smaller and divided associations. The other power a man has in the state of nature, is the power to punish the crimes committed against that law. Both these he gives up, when he joins in a private, if I may so call it, or particular politic society, and incorporates into any commonwealth, separate from the rest of mankind.
129. The first power, viz. “of doing whatsoever he thought fit for the preservation of himself,” and the rest of mankind, he gives up to be regulated by laws made by the society, so far forth as the preservation of himself and the rest of that society shall require; which laws of the society in many things confine the liberty he had by the law of nature.

130. Secondly, The power of punishing he wholly gives up, and engages his natural force, (which he might before employ in the execution of the law of nature, by his own single authority, as he thought fit) to assist the executive power of the society, as the law thereof shall require: for being now in a new state, wherein he is to enjoy many conveniencies, from the labor, assistance, and society of others in the same community, as well as protection from its whole strength; he is to part also, with as much of his natural liberty, in providing for himself, as the good, prosperity, and safety of the society shall require; which is not only necessary, but just, since the other members of the society do the like....
The Albany Plan of Union was proposed by Pennsylvania delegate Benjamin Franklin to unify the thirteen colonies in common defense at the start of the French and Indian War. It was adopted and proposed to the colonial legislatures by the Albany Congress, which represented seven British colonies: Connecticut, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island.

It is proposed that humble application be made for an act of Parliament of Great Britain, by virtue of which one general government may be formed in America, including all the said colonies, within and under which government each colony may retain its present constitution, except in the particulars wherein a change may be directed by the said act, as hereafter follows.

1. That the said general government be administered by a President-General, to be appointed and supported by the crown; and a Grand Council, to be chosen by the representatives of the people of the several Colonies met in their respective assemblies.

2. That within -- months after the passing such act, the House of Representatives that happen to be sitting within that time, or that shall especially for that purpose convened, may and shall choose members for the Grand Council, in the following proportion, that is to say, Massachusetts Bay, 7; New Hampshire, 2; Connecticut, 5; Rhode Island, 2; New York, 4; New Jersey, 3; Pennsylvania, 6; Maryland, 4; Virginia, 7; North Carolina, 4; South Carolina, 4; 48

https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/albany.asp.
3. -- who shall meet for the first time at the city of Philadelphia, being called by the President-General as soon as conveniently may be after his appointment.

4. That there shall be a new election of the members of the Grand Council every three years; and, on the death or resignation of any member, his place should be supplied by a new choice at the next sitting of the Assembly of the Colony he represented.

5. That after the first three years, when the proportion of money arising out of each Colony to the general treasury can be known, the number of members to be chosen for each Colony shall, from time to time, in all ensuing elections, be regulated by that proportion, yet so as that the number to be chosen by any one Province be not more than seven, nor less than two.

6. That the Grand Council shall meet once in every year, and oftener if occasion require, at such time and place as they shall adjourn to at the last preceding meeting, or as they shall be called to meet at by the President-General on any emergency; he having first obtained in writing the consent of seven of the members to such call, and sent duly and timely notice to the whole.

7. That the Grand Council have power to choose their speaker; and shall neither be dissolved, prorogued, nor continued sitting longer than six weeks at one time, without their own consent or the special command of the crown.

8. That the members of the Grand Council shall be allowed for their service ten shillings sterling per diem, during their session and journey to and from the place of meeting; twenty miles to be reckoned a day's journey.

9. That the assent of the President-General be requisite to all acts of the Grand Council, and that it be his office and duty to cause them to be carried into execution.
10. That the President-General, with the advice of the Grand Council, hold or direct all Indian treaties, in which the general interest of the Colonies may be concerned; and make peace or declare war with Indian nations.

11. That they make such laws as they judge necessary for regulating all Indian trade.

12. That they make all purchases from Indians, for the crown, of lands not now within the bounds of particular Colonies, or that shall not be within their bounds when some of them are reduced to more convenient dimensions.

13. That they make new settlements on such purchases, by granting lands in the King's name, reserving a quitrent to the crown for the use of the general treasury.

14. That they make laws for regulating and governing such new settlements, till the crown shall think fit to form them into particular governments.

15. That they raise and pay soldiers and build forts for the defence of any of the Colonies, and equip vessels of force to guard the coasts and protect the trade on the ocean, lakes, or great rivers; but they shall not impress men in any Colony, without the consent of the Legislature.

16. That for these purposes they have power to make laws, and lay and levy such general duties, imposts, or taxes, as to them shall appear most equal and just (considering the ability and other circumstances of the inhabitants in the several Colonies), and such as may be collected with the least inconvenience to the people; rather discouraging luxury, than loading industry with unnecessary burdens.

17. That they may appoint a General Treasurer and Particular Treasurer in each government when necessary; and, from time to time, may order the sums in the treasuries of each government into the general treasury; or draw on them for special payments, as they find most convenient.
18. Yet no money to issue but by joint orders of the President-General and Grand Council; except where sums have been appropriated to particular purposes, and the President-General is previously empowered by an act to draw such sums.

19. That the general accounts shall be yearly settled and reported to the several Assemblies.

20. That a quorum of the Grand Council, empowered to act with the President-General, do consist of twenty-five members; among whom there shall be one or more from a majority of the Colonies.

21. That the laws made by them for the purposes aforesaid shall not be repugnant, but, as near as may be, agreeable to the laws of England, and shall be transmitted to the King in Council for approbation, as soon as may be after their passing; and if not disapproved within three years after presentation, to remain in force.

22. That, in case of the death of the President-General, the Speaker of the Grand Council for the time being shall succeed, and be vested with the same powers and authorities, to continue till the King's pleasure be known.

23. That all military commission officers, whether for land or sea service, to act under this general constitution, shall be nominated by the President-General; but the approbation of the Grand Council is to be obtained, before they receive their commissions. And all civil officers are to be nominated by the Grand Council, and to receive the President-General's approbation before they officiate.

24. But, in case of vacancy by death or removal of any officer, civil or military, under this constitution, the Governor of the Province in which such vacancy happens may appoint, till the pleasure of the President-General and Grand Council can be known.

25. That the particular military as well as civil establishments in each Colony remain in their present state, the general constitution notwithstanding; and that on sudden
emergencies any Colony may defend itself, and lay the accounts of expense thence arising before the President-General and General Council, who may allow and order payment of the same, as far as they judge such accounts just and reasonable.
UNIT 2
The American Founding
1763–1789

45-50-minute classes | 15-19 classes

UNIT PREVIEW

Structure

LESSON 1  1763–1776  Self-Government or Tyranny  4-5 classes  p. 7
LESSON 2  1776  The Declaration of Independence  2-3 classes  p. 14
LESSON 3  1776–1783  The War of Independence  3-4 classes  p. 23
LESSON 4  1783–1789  The United States Constitution  4-5 classes  p. 29
APPENDIX A  Study Guide, Test, and Writing Assignment  p. 41
APPENDIX B  Primary Sources  p. 59

Why Teach the American Founding

The beginning is the most important part of any endeavor, for a small change at the beginning will result in a very different end. How much truer this is of the most expansive of human endeavors: founding and sustaining a free country. The United States of America has achieved the greatest degree of freedom and prosperity for the greatest proportion of any country’s population in the history of humankind. How is it that the common American’s pursuit of happiness has resulted in such exceptional outcomes over time? This phenomenon compels mindful young Americans to seek to understand how their nation has achieved such results. And America’s youth could find no greater source of understanding than the history of their country’s founding, starting with their forefathers’ ideas, words, and deeds.
Enduring Ideas from This Unit

1. The United States is unprecedented in establishing its existence not on grounds of racial origin nor family privilege but on ideas asserted to be true of all people at all times: namely, on the equal human dignity of each person.
2. America was founded on the view that government should be controlled by the people themselves and limited to the purpose of protecting each person’s natural rights and fostering the common good.
3. Regular, ordinary Americans of everyday means sacrificed their security and very lives to defend these truths about human beings and civic life against a tyranny of the most powerful nation of its day.
4. The United States Constitution’s chief quality is that it allows the people to govern themselves with respect for the dignity of each person while both channeling and restraining the natural ambition of human beings to gain power and recognition.
5. The Constitution is a carefully wrought and considered document, and its original intent and structure should be honored both for the sake of our forebears, to whom we and the world owe our freedom and prosperity, and because the events of the last two hundred years have proven the Constitution’s remarkable achievements time and time again.

What Teachers Should Consider

The United States of America is unprecedented in many ways in the course of human history, but most significantly in the opportunity all its citizens have to pursue unmatched conditions of freedom, security, and prosperity. The country owes its unprecedented success to an unprecedented founding, a beginning forged and canonized in the Declaration of Independence, the War of Independence, and the U.S. Constitution.

And yet, never have so many Americans known so little about this founding. As for love of country, one cannot love (or even consider loving) what one does not know.

The teaching of the American founding is perhaps the most necessary series of lessons a teacher can share with his or her students if those students intend to enjoy the benefits of living in America for the duration of their lives.

With this in mind, a teacher ought to take special care to learn the history and ideas of the American founding. Ambiguity in the teacher’s own understanding, or assumptions derived from anywhere but careful scholarship and a deep reading of America’s founding documents, will leave him or her unprepared to help students understand this history accurately.

The teacher might best open the unit with lessons aimed at understanding why the colonists declared independence in the first place. It was not to avoid paying taxes or about wanting to preserve slavery. (These are misconceptions at best, distortions at worst.) It was to choose—between liberty under self-government and servitude under tyranny. Class may proceed at a brisk pace through the years 1763–1776, touching on the many acts of the British and respective colonial responses to those acts. Spend time on the conflicts and battles; students should chart the gradual shift in public sentiment toward independence.
The Declaration of Independence itself deserves careful study. Such lessons may begin with stories of the writing of the Declaration. Students should read the whole document, and teachers can foster extensive conversations about what it says, what it means, and why it says it. The majority of the conversation should dwell on the first, second, and final paragraphs of the Declaration. Understanding what is meant by those words is pivotal to understanding American history, what makes America an exceptional nation, and the responsibilities every American citizen has. The list of grievances should be discussed in light of the previous history that led to the Declaration.

The American War of Independence should be taught so as to fill the moral imaginations of students with images of the heroic characters and actions of its American participants. Strategy, battles, and the general arc of the war should be taught in detail, punctuated with accounts of the key moments and figures who contributed to America’s ultimate victory. The ideas for which the War of Independence was fought are matched in the American memory only by the stories of those who fought for them.

When teaching the aftermath of the War of Independence up to the Constitutional Convention, teachers should make clear that America’s foray into governing itself entirely independent of Great Britain initially trended toward abject failure. The Articles of Confederation ordered public affairs in a reactionary rather than prudent manner. Students should understand that the Constitutional Convention, in many respects, saved the country from another sort of tyranny: majority tyranny.

Finally, the Constitutional Convention and the Constitution itself should be studied in tandem and in detail. A major aid in doing so is to read selections of the Federalist Papers. Students should consider carefully both the structure of the Constitution and the Framers’ intentions in so constructing it. Students should understand that nothing in the Constitution was haphazardly decided. Given the unprecedented long-term success of the Constitution, students should appreciate that any changes to the Constitution warrant careful and complete understanding of why the Framers crafted it the way they did, as explained in their own words.

How Teachers Can Learn More

**TEXTS**

The Creation of the American Republic, Gordon Wood  
We Still Hold These Truths, Matthew Spalding  
The Political Theory of the American Founding, Thomas West  
The Constitutional Convention, James Madison  
African Founders, David Hackett Fischer  
No Property in Man, Sean Wilentz  
The American Heritage: A Reader, ed. Hillsdale College History Faculty  
The U.S. Constitution: A Reader, ed. Hillsdale College Politics Faculty (ConstitutionReader.com)

**ONLINE COURSES** | Online.Hillsdale.edu

The Great American Story  
Introduction to the Constitution  
Civil Rights in American History  
Constitution 101
The Federalist Papers

Lesson Planning Resources

TEACHER RESOURCES

The Glorious Cause, Robert Middlekauff
A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope, Wilfred McClay and John McBride
A Student Workbook for Land of Hope, Wilfred McClay and John McBride
A Short History of the American Revolution, James Stokesbury

STUDENT RESOURCES

Land of Hope, Wilfred McClay

PRIMARY SOURCES

An Inquiry into the Rights of the British Colonies, Richard Bland
Letter to Lord Kaims, Benjamin Franklin
Virginia Resolves of 1769, Virginia House of Burgesses
A History of the Dispute with America, No. VII, John Adams
“Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death!,” Patrick Henry
Speech on Conciliation with the Colonies, Edmund Burke
Common Sense, Thomas Paine
Olive Branch Petition
Declaration of Independence, First Draft
Declaration of Independence
Orders of July 2, George Washington
Resignation Speech, George Washington
“Liberty and Peace,” Phillis Wheatley
The Northwest Ordinance of 1787, Article III
The Articles of Confederation
The United States Constitution
The Federalist, Nos. 9, 10, 51
The Bill of Rights
Lesson Plans, Assignments, and Formative Quiz
Lesson 1 — Self-Government or Tyranny

1763–1776

4–5 classes

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn how new British exertions of authority over the colonists led to the Declaration of Independence.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts

Land of Hope

Pages 42–48

Primary Sources

See below.

Teacher Texts

The Glorious Cause

Pages 7–226

A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope

Pages 29–43

A Student Workbook for Land of Hope

Pages 20–22

Online.Hillsdale.edu

The Great American Story

Lecture 3

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students read Land of Hope, pages 42–48, and either complete the reading questions handout in A Student Workbook for Land of Hope (pages 20–28) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 2: Students read and annotate excerpts from Paine’s Common Sense and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places

Boston

Lexington and Concord

Philadelphia

Lake Champlain

Independence Hall

Fort Ticonderoga

Persons

King George III

John Hancock

Charles Townshend

Lord North

George Washington

Crispus Attucks
Paul Revere
Samuel Adams
Thomas Gage
Benjamin Franklin
Patrick Henry

John Adams
Abigail Adams
Ethan Allen
Thomas Paine
Thomas Jefferson

Terms and Topics
salutary neglect
self-government
representation
consent
French and Indian War
Proclamation of 1763
writs of assistance
Sugar Act
Stamp Act
Sons of Liberty
mob
tar and feather
Declaratory Act
Townshend Acts
nonimportation agreements

Boston Massacre
Committees of Correspondence
Gaspee Affair
Boston Tea Party
Intolerable Acts
Quartering of Soldiers
First Continental Congress
Minutemen
Battles of Lexington & Concord
Siege of Fort Ticonderoga
Second Continental Congress
Battle of Bunker Hill
Olive Branch Petition
Liberation of Boston

Primary Sources
An Inquiry into the Rights of the British Colonies, Richard Bland
Letter to Lord Kaims, Benjamin Franklin
Virginia Resolves of 1769, Virginia House of Burgesses
A History of the Dispute with America, No. VII, John Adams
“Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death!” Patrick Henry
Speech on Conciliation with the Colonies, Edmund Burke
Common Sense, Thomas Paine
Olive Branch Petition

To Know by Heart
“Appeal to Heaven”
“Don’t Tread On Me”
“Join or Die”
“Give me liberty or give me death!” —Patrick Henry
“The shot heard round the world.”
“Don’t fire till you see the whites of their eyes!” —Israel Putnam, William Prescott, or legend

Timeline
1754–1763 French and Indian War
1763 Proclamation Line
1770 Boston Massacre
1773  Boston Tea Party
1774  Intolerable Acts
1775  Lexington and Concord, Ticonderoga, Bunker Hill
July 4, 1776  Declaration of Independence signed

Images
- Historical figures and events
- Revolutionary-era flags
- Nonimportation agreement example
- Paul Revere’s Engraving of Boston Harbor under occupation
- Paul Revere’s Engraving of the Boston Massacre
- Independence Hall (exterior and interior)
- Battle maps and battle scene depictions
- Uniforms and arms of the Minutemen, the Continental Army soldiers, and the Redcoats
- Medical equipment

Stories for the American Heart
- Biographies and the roles of George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, Samuel Adams, Patrick Henry, Thomas Paine, and Thomas Jefferson up through 1776
- Francis Fauquier’s account of the mob and a stamp distributor
- Samuel Adams’s poem, “The Divine Source of Liberty”
- Boston Massacre
- John Adams fair-mindedly representing the British soldiers after the Boston Massacre
- Boston Tea Party
- Patrick Henry’s “Give me liberty or give me death!” speech
- Paul Revere’s ride, especially Henry Wadsworth Longfellow’s poem of that name
- Jonas Clark’s and William Emerson’s accounts of minutemen at the Battles of Lexington and Concord
- Ethan Allen, Henry Knox, and the Green Mountain Boys capturing the guns from Fort Ticonderoga
- Letters of John and Abigail Adams
- John Adams’s nomination of George Washington to command the Continental Army
- Battle of Bunker Hill
- Liberation of Boston
- John Adams’s nomination of Thomas Jefferson to draft the Declaration of Independence

Questions for the American Mind
- Why had the colonies been left mostly to their own devices? Why was this “neglect” “salutary”?
- How had the French and Indian War contributed to the American sense of self and greater unity among the colonists?
- How did the British situation following the French and Indian War lead the British to exert more authority over the colonists?
- In what ways did the British begin to exert control over the colonists without their consent?
- What did the Proclamation Act of 1763 attempt to do? What change did it reveal in the relationship between Parliament and the colonists? How did the colonists respond?
- What was the British Constitution? To what extent did it extend to America? To what extent were colonial charters part of the British Constitution? To what extent were Americans justified in claiming the rights of Englishmen?
- How did inhabitants of England view Parliament’s supremacy differently from the Americans? Which group had a more traditional/authentic understanding of the British Constitution? What are the reasons for the divergence in opinion?
- What did the Stamp Act do? Why did this act in particular undermine the principle of self-government and consent? How did the colonists respond?
- What is self-government? In what ways was the colonists’ freedom to govern themselves threatened and curtailed by the British between 1763 and 1776?
- What is the relationship between this question of representative self-government and liberty? What is its relationship to tyranny?
- In what ways did the colonies cooperate with one another in their resistance to writs of assistance, the Stamp Act, and the Townshend Duties?
- What were the two oftentimes competing approaches the colonists took to addressing Parliament’s actions?
- Why was legislative petition a failure in Massachusetts? Why did Bostonians resort to public protests and riots? How did John Adams and Samuel Adams differ in their views on legitimate forms of protest?
- How did the Boston Massacre change public opinion among the colonists? How did John Adams successfully preserve the rule of law?
- Why did Parliament pass the Intolerable Acts? What did the acts do (five actions)?
- How did the Continental Congress respond to the Coercive (Intolerable) Acts?
- Which offers of reconciliation did the colonists make to Parliament?
- Was war inevitable? Was independence?
- Why did Thomas Paine argue in Common Sense that the debate had changed regarding the relationship between the colonists and British? Why did he argue for war as the path toward independence?
- In what ways did Thomas Paine’s Common Sense influence public opinion?
- What actions by the British in the spring of 1776 prompted Richard Henry Lee of Virginia to introduce a motion for independence?
- To what extent was the American Revolution not made but prevented? To what extent was it revolutionary?
- What crucial strategic military decisions did local British officials make at the outset of the Revolutionary War?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 77: Name one reason why the Americans declared independence from Britain.
  - Question 85: Benjamin Franklin is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 86: George Washington is famous for many things. Name one.
KEYS TO THE LESSON

For more than 150 years, the British colonists of North America rarely quarreled with their countrymen on the other side of the Atlantic. Then in 1763, the British began to claim new control over the colonists. What followed were thirteen years of increased tension and sometimes violent clashes leading to outright war in 1775 and, in 1776, the declaring of independence by the colonists and the formation of a new country separate from British power. This decade and a half gave birth to the nation each American citizen calls home. It is imperative that American students know the people, actions, and stories that led to the founding of their country. The chief aim of teaching these fourteen years, therefore, is to help students to understand the actions by both Great Britain and the colonists that compelled the Americans to such a separation and to found a new, unprecedented kind of country.

Teachers might best plan and teach Self-Government or Tyranny with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Have students consider the issues the British in North America faced following the French and Indian War (in Europe, the Seven Years’ War), namely, the risk of further conflict (and associated costs) with Native Americans as colonists moved westward, and the massive debt that Great Britain had accumulated in the late war.
- Show how Great Britain’s attempted solutions to these problems (prohibiting colonial expansion and the sudden enforcement of lax tax laws) marked the first shift in the relationship between Great Britain and the colonists and heralded the end of the period of “salutary neglect,” during which American colonists had grown accustomed to practicing self-government.
- Help students see the pattern that this initial shift would grow into: attempts by the British (Parliament and, to a certain extent, King George III) to exert more control, alternating with American resistance to what they argued were infringements on their rights as Englishmen.
- Teach about each of the British acts: what they were, why they were passed, how the colonists resisted, and what happened next as a consequence.
- Read aloud with students in class portions of the Virginia Resolves to gain insights into the leading colonists’ understanding of the situation at the time and to presage the same ideas later developed into the Declaration of Independence.
- Consider at length that self-government, or representative self-government, was at the heart of the issue. Emphasize that this was not merely a nice-sounding phrase. Instead, the colonists gradually came to recognize the following as a question of liberty or tyranny: whether they were self-governed through their elected representatives or were dictated to and controlled by a distant government in which they had no consent. Make clear that this was the question: not merely whether the colonists would have representation in Parliament (it was impractical) nor whether they had to pay taxes, but whether or not people must be controlled by the will of others in government without their free consent. Reading portions of Richard Bland’s An Inquiry into the Rights of the British Colonies, Benjamin Franklin’s letter to Lord Kaims, and John Adams’s A History of the Dispute with America, No. VII may best help students grasp these realities.
- Explain how the Americans organized themselves to engage with and resist the British, a capacity born of decades of practice in self-government and a trait of American citizens for subsequent generations. In due course, the Boston Massacre impressed on public opinion the British position’s semblance to tyranny.
- Emphasize for students how there were often two competing approaches to responding to British actions: one that attempted deliberation and petition, and another that resorted to destruction of property and even tarring and feathering. In the end, the former approach prevailed, resorting to arms only as necessary to defend their assertion of rights, self-government, and liberty.
- Highlight that it was the Boston Tea Party, however, that brought issues to a head, prompting the British to respond to various actions in Massachusetts with the Intolerable Acts. Help students to consider that in five separate, odious ways, these acts show how preventing a people from governing themselves in even something as simple as a tax on paper and tea can lead to tyranny if not effectively recognized and resisted.
- Spend time illustrating how it was really across 1774–75, in response to the execution of the Intolerable Acts, that specific Founding Fathers marshaled their talents and ideas, eventually leading to declaring independence and forming a new nation by summer 1776.
- Teach in some detail the open armed conflicts at Lexington and Concord, Fort Ticonderoga, and Bunker Hill. Students should learn how these battles bolstered the patriot cause and transformed public opinion in these final two years of British rule.
- Have students read as a preparatory homework assignment excerpts from Thomas Paine’s *Common Sense*. In class, have a seminar conversation on the text. Target questions at helping students to see how and why Paine’s pamphlet proved decisive in shifting public opinion at the start of 1776. Questions on pages 42–43 of *A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope* may be helpful.
- Finally, emphasize how the news in the spring of 1776—that the British had hired German mercenary soldiers to deploy against British-Americans, and were now selectively encouraging slave rebellions in the colonies, while the Continental Congress recommended that the colonies begin forming their own governments—were key factors in moving a majority of the state delegates at the Second Continental Congress to commission a committee to draft a potential declaration of independence.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Explain what was at the heart of the Americans’ resistance to what they argued to be Great Britain’s infringement of the rights and liberty of British-Americans. Draw connections between specific British actions to which the Americans objected and the fundamental reason(s) for their objections (1–2 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Retell the story between 1773 and 1776 of how the Boston Tea Party and the subsequent Intolerable Acts led to declaring independence (3–4 paragraphs).
Reading Quiz

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question.

1. What did “writs of assistance” allow the British authorities to do to anyone they suspected of smuggling?

2. What did the British Parliament begin to levy on the colonists without their consent?

3. What did Parliament declare about its power over the colonists in the Declaratory Act?

4. Name one of the two towns in which the first battles of the Revolutionary War were fought.

5. Thomas Paine swiftly moved public opinion in favor of independence with his pamphlet entitled __________________ __________________.
Lesson 2 — The Declaration of Independence

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the movement in favor of independence and about the drafting and signing of the Declaration of Independence. They also read the Declaration of Independence and engage in a seminar conversation about its contents and ideas.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

**Student Texts**
- *Land of Hope* Pages 48–51
- Primary Sources See below.

**Teacher Texts**
- *The Glorious Cause* Pages 227–255

**Online.Hillsdale.edu**
- *The Great American Story* Lecture 3
- *Introduction to the Constitution* Lectures 1, 2, 3
- *Constitution 101* Lecture 2
- *Civil Rights in American History* Lectures 1, 2, 3

STUDENT PREPARATION

**Assignment 1:** Students read *Land of Hope*, pages 48–51, and prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

**Assignment 2:** Students read and annotate the Declaration of Independence and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

**Geography & Places**
- Philadelphia Independence Hall

**Persons**
- Benjamin Franklin
- Thomas Jefferson
- John Adams
Terms and Topics

Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God
self-evident equality
natural rights unalienable
liberty license

pursuit of happiness consent of the governed
list of grievances slavery
self-government representation

Primary Sources

Declaration of Independence, First Draft
Declaration of Independence

To Know by Heart

First two paragraphs of the Declaration of Independence

Final paragraph of the Declaration of Independence

“All honor to Jefferson—to the man who, in the concrete pressure of a struggle for national independence by a single people, had the coolness, forecast, and capacity to introduce into a merely revolutionary document, an abstract truth, applicable to all men and all times, and so to embalm it there, that to-day, and in all coming days, it shall be a rebuke and a stumbling-block to the very harbingers of re-appearing tyranny and oppression.”—Abraham Lincoln, Letter to Henry Pierce

Timeline

July 2, 1776 Second Continental Congress votes for independence
July 4, 1776 Declaration of Independence signed

Images

Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and John Adams
Independence Hall (exterior and interior)
Photos or facsimiles of original Declaration of Independence
National Archives Building and Rotunda
Jefferson Memorial
Statue of Thomas Jefferson (Hillsdale College campus)

Stories for the American Heart

- Benjamin Rush’s account of signing the Declaration of Independence
- The first public reading of the Declaration of Independence at the State House Yard, the tolling of the Liberty Bell, and the removal of the royal coat of arms
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What were the various audiences that the Declaration of Independence sought to address?
- In its opening lines, what does the Declaration claim to do, and what does it want its audience to do in response?
- What are “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God”?
- What is a “self-evident” truth?
- What does it mean that “all men are created equal”?
- What is a right?
- According to the Declaration of Independence, from where do rights come?
- What does it mean to say that men are “endowed by their creator” with the rights?
- What does “unalienable” mean?
- What do the words “certain” and “among” imply about the Declaration’s list of rights?
- What is liberty according to the Founders? How is it distinct from license?
- Why did Jefferson use “the pursuit of happiness” instead of “property”?
- What is the purpose of government?
- From where does government derive its just powers?
- What are the people free—and even duty-bound—to do if the government fails in or violates its fundamental purpose?
- Ought it to be an easy or regular affair for people to overthrow and replace their government? If not, under what circumstances may they do so?
- To whom do the colonists appeal to judge the justness of their claims and conduct?
- In what ways did the Second Continental Congress alter Thomas Jefferson’s first draft of the Declaration of Independence? What were the reasons for these various changes?
- Why did Thomas Jefferson’s first draft of the Declaration of Independence include condemnations of King George for perpetuating the Atlantic slave trade?
- Why did many northern delegates, who were opposed to slavery and wanted it abolished, believe that compromising with southern delegates by omitting the issue of slavery from the Declaration’s list of grievances would be more likely to lead to the abolition of slavery than splitting with the southern colonies over the issue in 1776?
- How do the words of the Declaration of Independence mark America’s founding as different from the founding of other countries? Might we say that America’s founding was exceptional?
- America’s existence and purpose, as outlined in the Declaration, rests on the commitment to certain ideas its Founders asserted to be objectively true. What are these truths?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 8: Why is the Declaration of Independence important?
  - Question 9: What founding document said the American colonies were free from Britain?
  - Question 10: Name two important ideas from the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution.
  - Question 11: The words “Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness” are in what founding document?
  - Question 75: What group of people was taken and sold as slaves?
  - Question 77: Name one reason why the Americans declared independence from Britain.
  - Question 78: Who wrote the Declaration of Independence?
  - Question 79: When was the Declaration of Independence adopted?
Question 81: There were 13 original states. Name five.
Question 85: Benjamin Franklin is famous for many things. Name one.
Question 87: Thomas Jefferson is famous for many things. Name one.
Question 125: What is Independence Day?
Question 126: Name three national U.S. holidays.

**Keys to the Lesson**

The Declaration of Independence was not merely a renunciation of dependence on Great Britain. It was, in fact, generative. It created an entity—a nation—that stood on its own, had its own existence, and was independent of other nations. Even today, it offers guiding principles that continue to shape our arguments about the nature and limits of political authority. In brief, the Declaration of Independence created and still defines the United States of America.

Like an organizational mission statement, the Declaration is an indication of the Founders’ intention, a guiding star for our political life, and a benchmark for measuring our public institutions. Americans should consider all questions concerning the public sphere in light of the truths asserted in the Declaration. The Declaration of Independence should be both the beginning and end for students’ understanding of their country, their citizenship, and the benefits and responsibilities of being an American.

Referring questions of our common life to the Declaration of Independence does not mean that Americans should be forced or manipulated to believe the ideas of the Declaration to be true. But this unit asks students at least to consider whether the Declaration’s claims are true. Indeed, Thomas Jefferson and the delegates at the Second Continental Congress addressed the Declaration of Independence not only to Americans in 1776 but also to the critical judgment of American students in the 21st Century, for, as they stated, “a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation” [emphasis added]. The lasting claim of the Declaration is that there are certain truths about all men having unalienable rights. As a historical matter, as well, students should think seriously about how the American founding—and the continuation of the American experiment—has succeeded or failed against its stated objectives.

Students should take it upon themselves to study and consider seriously the Declaration of Independence as the foundation and even the heart of their country’s existence. While a more extensive study of the Declaration should occur in a separate government class, including consideration of the thinkers who influenced the Founders, the historical treatment of the American Revolution deserves several class periods of conversation on the text of the Declaration.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Declaration of Independence with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Help students to see that the Founders intended to speak to them, to posit truths for their consideration and ultimate judgment. “[A] decent respect to the opinions of mankind” means that the Declaration was not merely intended as an argument about the unique situation of the colonists in 1776; the Founders submitted their claims to the judgment of all people in all times
because they were asserting truths about all people in all times. This especially includes future Americans and, in this case, American students.

- Lead students through a complete reading of the Declaration of Independence in the course of a seminar conversation. Pause frequently to ask students questions on the various parts of the text, especially the first two paragraphs. Questions on pages 47–52 of *A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope* may be helpful.

- Help students to consider that the Founders are making assertions of the existence of objective truth by referencing “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God” and by describing the truths as “self-evident.” This abides by the first law of logic, that of contradiction, which is the basis of all reasoning and of our capacity to make sense of reality: i.e., that something cannot both be and not be at the same time in the same way. The use of the words “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God” ties truth to an external reality (nature) with fixed and reliable features (laws). “Self-evident” ties truth to fixed definitions—a “self-evident” claim is one that is true by definition of the idea in question, like the claim that a triangle has three sides. A “self-evident” truth is not merely a matter of perspective; it can be known and understood by anyone at any time.

- Note that for the Founders, the “Laws…of Nature’s God” implied that this understanding of nature was consistent with the Christian tradition within which the American founding occurred. Other references to divine sources of truth in the Declaration include that men are “endowed by their Creator” and its appeals to “the Supreme Judge of the world” and to “the protection of divine Providence.”

- Ask students what the Declaration means by “all men are created equal.” For one thing, “men” means human being not males as opposed to females. Based on the totality of their writings available, the principal authors of the Declaration meant that men and women share equally in human dignity and in possession of natural rights or freedoms that are simply part of being human. A consistent application of equality would make slavery impossible—and the Second Continental Congress could scarcely have missed this point. This meaning of equality did not suggest equality in talent, property, or other accidentals to one’s humanity, qualities that are unique to a particular person and circumstance.

- Note that the mere articulation that all men are created equal was revolutionary. Compared to the degree and universality of equality we take for granted today, such a statement and contemporary limits on the principle in practice leave the Founders open to much potential criticism. For example, in general, women, men without land, and African Americans were not able to vote. But the mere fact that most men *were able* to vote was a significant departure from what was normal in the rest of the world. And even though civil equality was not universal, the statement about inherent and equal dignity of all people was unheard of at the time. Many Founders believed (and the centuries since have proven them correct) that this founding principle would allow for ever greater realizations of equality through history. In brief, were it not for the Founders’ assertion of human equality, albeit imperfectly put into practice, the kind of equality we are used to today likely would never have arisen, or certainly not from American shores.

- Ask students what the Declaration states to be the purpose of government. Students should understand the Declaration’s argument that government is created to secure the natural rights of each person.

- Ask students about the source of a government’s power. The Declaration explains that government power comes from the free consent of the people. Students should also consider the Declaration’s argument that people do not receive their rights from government, nor do they surrender their fundamental rights to it. Instead, the rights to “life, liberty, and the pursuit of
“happiness” are natural—they are inherent in being human—and government is delegated power by the sovereign people to secure their rights and pursue the common good. Rather than surrendering their rights to government, people create government to protect their rights. The Declaration describes these rights as “unalienable,” meaning that they cannot be relinquished or taken away, though they may be forfeited when a person violates the rights of another person, (e.g., the penalty for taking someone else’s life or liberty might be to lose your own life or liberty).

- Help students to understand what is meant by self-government: legitimate government exists to secure rights and derives its “just powers from the consent of the governed,” that is, from the citizen body. The fundamental purpose of government is clear and its powers are limited. As a result, and by design, the people have the liberty to govern themselves in most aspects of their daily lives.

- Read the list of grievances and ask students to connect each grievance to the historical events they studied in the previous lesson. Then ask students to explain how those events violate the statements made in the first two paragraphs of the Declaration.

- Provide students with a copy of the first draft of the Declaration of Independence that tracks the edits made by the Second Continental Congress. Ask students why specific changes were made. Spend time especially with the sections that addressed slavery and were removed.

- When discussing compromises between the principled claims of the Declaration and the brutal matter of slavery, be mindful of the following:

  - Slavery was one of the few matters of disagreement among the colonial revolutionaries in their otherwise generally united challenge to England. Those who opposed slavery as well as those who favored it agreed about the growing threat of British tyranny.

  - Many of the American Founders, especially those from northern colonies, strongly opposed slavery but nevertheless accepted a temporary compromise on the issue, believing that an independent and united country would provide the best prospect for actually abolishing slavery. Without unity between northern and southern colonies, either the colonists would have lost the war, in which case slavery would simply be continued by Great Britain, or the southern colonies would have formed their own separate country, in which case the North would have no power over the South to abolish slavery. The key for the American Founders, especially those who opposed slavery, would be to continue efforts against slavery as a united country—united around the principles of the Declaration of Independence.

  - The idea that a country can be founded on a principle—rather than merely on claims of territory, tribe, or military power—is uniquely American. America’s founding principle that “all men are created equal and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights” was unprecedented. Almost all recognized that the statement of the principles, despite a compromise that allowed for the pre-existing institution’s continuing existence, undermined the legitimacy of slavery.

  - Many northern Founders and even some slaveholding Founders recognized the hypocrisy of claiming the principle of equality in spite of the continuing institution of slavery. Nevertheless, some southern Founders did not believe this phrase to be true for slaves and therefore did not believe it was hypocritical.

  - Many have understood the principle of equality as the enduring object or goal of American political life, with each generation seeking further to expand the conditions of political equality. This was the view of many Founders, as well as of Abraham Lincoln, abolitionists like Frederick Douglass, and civil rights leaders like Martin Luther King Jr.,
who called the Declaration a “promissory note to which every American was to fall heir” in his 1963 “I Have a Dream” speech.

Slavery and the subsequent inequality and violations of the rights of the descendants of slaves, as well as of women and certain immigrants, are glaring ways in which the country has fallen short of its founding idea.

The Declaration’s principle of equality—and the persistence and bravery of Americans of all origins to sacrifice and even die insisting that the nation should live up to the principle—has led to unprecedented achievements of human equality and the protection of equal rights.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Explain the meaning of key lines, phrases, and ideas in the first two paragraphs of the Declaration of Independence (2–3 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Recite by heart the first two paragraphs and the final paragraph of the Declaration of Independence.

**Assignment 3:** Choose three specific grievances and explain how they are connected both to the events between 1763 and 1776 and to the principles asserted in the first two paragraphs of the Declaration of Independence (1–2 paragraphs).
Reading Quiz

The American Founding | Lesson 2
Land of Hope, Pages 48–51

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. Who was the principal author of the Declaration of Independence?

2. Included within the universal assertions of the Declaration of Independence was a long list of ________________ outlining the ways in which the British crown had acted tyrannically toward their own people.

3. According to Captain Levi Preston, the common soldier fought the Revolutionary War because the British would not allow the colonists to do what?
Unit 2 — Formative Quiz

Covering Lessons 1–2
10–15 minutes

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. How did the British situation following the French and Indian War lead the British to exert more authority over the colonists?

2. What did the Stamp Act do? Why did this act in particular undermine the principle of self-government and consent? How did the colonists respond?

3. Which essential roles did Benjamin Franklin and George Washington each play leading up to 1776?

4. Why did Parliament pass the Intolerable Acts? What did they do (5 actions)?

5. How did the colonists organize themselves to engage with and resist the new British infringements on their rights?

6. Which events in 1774–76 especially led the colonists finally to declare their independence?

7. Who were the various audiences that the Declaration of Independence sought to address?
Lesson 3 — The War of Independence

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the major figures, common soldiers, strategy, and specific battles of the American War of Independence.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Text
Land of Hope
Primary Sources

Teacher Texts
The Glorious Cause
A Short History of the American Revolution
A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope
A Student Workbook for Land of Hope

Online.Hillsdale.edu
The Great American Story

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students read Land of Hope, pages 52–58, and either complete the reading questions handout in the A Student Workbook for Land of Hope (pages 34–38) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places
Quebec
Delaware River
Hudson River Valley
Saratoga
Fort West Point
Valley Forge
Yorktown

Persons
George Washington
Phillis Wheatley
John Adams
Abigail Adams
Ethan Allen
Henry Knox
John Paul Jones
Daniel Morgan
Horatio Gates          Nathanael Greene
George Rogers Clark    Benedict Arnold
William Howe           John Burgoyne
Marquis de Lafayette   Charles Cornwallis
Tadeusz Kościuszko     Alexander Hamilton
Baron von Steuben      

Terms and Topics
Patriot/Revolutionary  Betsy Ross Flag
Tory/Loyalist         Yankee Doodle
Articles of Confederation  Battle of Saratoga
Continental Army     guerrilla warfare
privateer            French Treaty of Alliance
Brown Bess Musket    Battle of Monmouth
volley               Battle of Cowpens
Battle of New York    Battle of Yorktown
mercenary            Newburgh Conspiracy
Hessians             American Cincinnatus
 Crossing of the Delaware “E Pluribus Unum”
Battle of Trenton    Treaty of Paris

Primary Sources
Orders of July 2, George Washington
Resignation Speech, George Washington
“Liberty and Peace,” Phillis Wheatley

To Know by Heart
“These are the times that try men’s souls.”—Thomas Paine, The Crisis

Timeline
1776 (1775)–1783     War of Independence
July 4, 1776          Declaration of Independence signed
1776 (Fall)           Battle of New York
Christmas, 1776       Battle of Trenton
1777                   Battle of Saratoga
1777–78               Winter Quarters at Valley Forge
1781 (Fall)           Battle of Yorktown; Cornwallis Surrenders
1783                   Treaty of Paris

June 14              Flag Day

Images
Historical figures
Landscape pictures of geographic places featured in this lesson
Images and uniforms of British and American officers and soldiers
Depictions of figures at various scenes and moments and in battle
Washington Crossing the Delaware painting
Betsy Ross Flag and other flags
Maps: overall strategies, specific battles
Relevant forts
Medical equipment
Reenactment photos
Washington Monument
Statue of George Washington (Hillsdale College campus)
Picture of the original Articles of Confederation

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- The fates of the signers of the Declaration of Independence
- George Washington’s letter to Burwell Bassett, June 1775
- Joseph Hodgkins’s letters as a Continental Army soldier, February 1776
- Stories from the memoir of Joseph Plumb Martin (Private Yankee Doodle)
- David Bushnell’s submarine attack
- Maryland 400 and the Battle of Brooklyn
- Retreat from Manhattan
- George Washington’s Crossing of the Delaware
- Abigail Adams’s letter to John Adams, March 1777
- John Adams’s letter to Abigail Adams, September 1777
- James Mitchell Varnum’s letter to Nathanael Greene
- The American farmers joining the Battle of Saratoga
- John Laurens’s letters to his father, Henry Laurens, January and February 1778
- George Washington encouraging his men at Valley Forge
- The naval campaigns of John Paul Jones
- Stories of Margaret Corbin, Molly Pitcher, Abigail Adams, and Martha Washington during the war
- Alexander Hamilton’s letter to John Jay, March 1779
- George Washington’s letter to Henry Laurens, March 1779
- Alexander Hamilton’s letter to John Laurens, October 1780
- Benedict Arnold’s letter to Lord Germain, October 1780
- George Washington on horseback at the Battle of Monmouth
- The playing of the “World Turned Upside Down” after Yorktown (possibly legend)
- George Washington’s letter to Philip Schuyler, January 1781
- George Washington’s letter to Joseph Jones, March 1783
- George Washington’s dismissal of the Newburgh Conspiracy
- George III’s comments on Washington resigning his command (possibly legend)
- George Washington resigning his commission to Congress

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- How was power structured under the Articles of Confederation? Why did the framers of this first constitution structure it in this way?
- What were the advantages and disadvantages that the Americans and British each faced at the outset of the war?
- What was the style of warfare in the War of Independence, including battlefield strategy, weapons, ammunition, medical care, etc.?
- What were the overall strategies that each side pursued in the course of the war?
- What were the major contributions and moments in George Washington’s generalship during the war?
- How did each of the following battles begin, what happened in them, and what was their significance: New York, Trenton, Saratoga, and Yorktown?
- Why was the situation so dire in winter 1776?
- In what ways did the British plan for 1777 work, and in what ways did it fail?
- Why was the Battle of Saratoga so significant? What did the Americans gain from their newfound ally?
- What happened at Valley Forge over the winter of 1777–78?
- What important contribution did Baron von Steuben make to the Continental Army?
- What happened when the British under Lord Cornwallis moved into the South?
- What were the most significant moments in the War of Independence?
- What factors, figures, moments, etc., led the Americans to victory?
- What were the terms of the Treaty of Paris?
- Why were soldiers on the verge of mutiny in 1783? How did George Washington resolve the crisis?
- What qualities does Phillis Wheatley attribute to Freedom in “Liberty and Peace”? What will the personified Freedom bring to America? What is freedom?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 76: What war did the Americans fight to win independence from Britain?
  - Question 80: The American Revolution had many important events. Name one.
  - Question 86: George Washington is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 89: Alexander Hamilton is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 121: Why does the flag have 13 stripes?
  - Question 122: Why does the flag have 50 stars?
  - Question 124: The Nation’s first moto was “E Pluribus Unum.” What does that mean?

**Keys to the Lesson**

The American Revolution was truly a “David and Goliath” clash: a fledging strand of remote colonies loosely cooperating as one through a continental, mostly citizen army, fought and won independence from the greatest military power in the world. Students should appreciate this about the war of their forefathers. They should also know key stories of the heroic actions of the leaders and the many common folk in that struggle, understand the strategies employed in general and in specific battles, and consider the key moments and factors that led the Americans to victory.

Teachers might best plan and teach the War of Independence with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Discuss how the new states organized themselves in the Articles of Confederation. Students do not need to know the inner workings of this first constitution, as they will learn more about it in
the next lesson. Students should understand, however, the general contours of power and how it operated. They should also understand the ways in which many of its weaknesses were intentional, weaknesses that would manifest themselves as serious problems at various points during the war.

- Ask students to identify and compare the various advantages and disadvantages of each side at the outset of the war and how these shifted over the years. Having students take simple notes as a “T-Chart” can be effective for this part of the lesson.
- Introduce students to the contemporary style of warfare by using images, maps, and artifacts. This approach will provide a foundation for their subsequent study of battles, help them to understand what happens in battle, and allow them to appreciate the bravery of soldiers fighting on both sides.
- Help students to empathize with the common Continental Army soldier and perceive the risk facing all the colonists, especially the leaders. Conditions were truly awful at many points in the war. The prospect of imminent defeat and the dire consequences for all involved weighed heavily upon the colonists throughout the war. The leaders—the men we now consider the American Founders—would most certainly have been shot or hanged if they were captured or the war was lost. In spite of the risks, they risked everything and sacrificed much for the cause of freedom and self-government. Students should appreciate the great debt we owe them.
- Explain each side’s strategy at various stages of the war and the tactics and battle plans employed in specific battles.
- Teach major battles in detail. Students should understand how the battles came to be, the key stories, factors, and moments from the battles themselves, and the significance of their various outcomes on subsequent events. Employ battle maps often. *A Short History of the American Revolution* is a great aid for teaching these battles; students may enjoy reading select accounts of these battles from this work, too.
- As with any conflict, draw attention to the key contributions of both leaders and common soldiers in the war. George Washington should be especially considered, not so much in his battle tactics as in his overall strategy for the war and his stirring leadership of his soldiers. Read aloud Washington’s resignation speech, presenting it as vividly as possible and helping students appreciate the significance of Washington’s character and example.
- Explain how the principles of the Declaration of Independence were already effecting change among the Americans even prior to the resolution of the war. By the end of the war, every northern state except for New York and New Jersey had explicitly outlawed slavery, and some New England colonies had allowed African Americans to vote. Students should also learn of the outsized contributions of African American soldiers in the war, with five thousand serving in the Continental Army over the course of the war and, by some accounts, African Americans composing nearly a quarter of the American forces at Yorktown.
- Read aloud Phyllis Wheatley’s “Liberty and Peace.” Consider Wheatley’s perspective on the revolution, bearing in mind her status as a former slave.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Explain the reasons why the Americans won the War of Independence (1–2 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Retell the history of the War of Independence (4–5 paragraphs).
Reading Quiz

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question.

1. Which side had the overall advantage at the beginning and for much of the War of Independence?

2. Which figure proved indispensable to the American cause?

3. What did the Americans do on Christmas night 1776?

4. The Battle of Saratoga was of great significance in the war because it proved that the Americans could fight in a battle and be victorious. What country decided to ally with the Americans, largely as a result of the Battle of Saratoga?

5. What was the last major battle of the war, in which the Americans defeated the British General Charles Cornwallis?
Lesson 4 — The United States Constitution

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the drafting of the Constitution, the debates within the Constitutional Convention and its ratification by the states, the political thought undergirding the Constitution, and the basic structure and powers of the federal government.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
   Land of Hope Pages 58–78
   Primary Sources

Teacher Texts
   Unto a Good Land, Volume 1 Pages 189–220
   A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope Pages 56–89
   A Student Workbook for Land of Hope Pages 34–38, 45–46

Online.Hillsdale.edu
   The Great American Story Lectures 4 and 5
   Constitution 101 Lectures 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
   Civil Rights in American History Lectures 1, 2, 3
   The Federalist Papers Lectures 1, 2, 3, 4, 5

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students read Land of Hope, pages 58–78, and either complete the reading questions handout in A Student Workbook for Land of Hope (pages 34–38) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 2: Students read and annotate Federalist Nos. 9, 10, and 51 and the Constitution, and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places
   Northwest Territory Independence Hall
   Philadelphia New York City
### Persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Montesquieu</th>
<th>Alexander Hamilton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Madison</td>
<td>John Jay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gouvernour Morris</td>
<td>Publius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Wilson</td>
<td>Brutus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Washington</td>
<td>George Mason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Franklin</td>
<td>Benjamin Banneker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Terms and Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles of Confederation</th>
<th>House of Representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Ordinance of 1785</td>
<td>Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>township</td>
<td>budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debt cancellation laws</td>
<td>impeachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shays' Rebellion</td>
<td>executive powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Ordinance</td>
<td>Electoral College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional Convention</td>
<td>cabinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father of the Constitution</td>
<td>Commander-in-Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution</td>
<td>veto power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God</td>
<td>judicial powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natural rights</td>
<td>coequality of branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equality</td>
<td>criminal case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consent of the governed</td>
<td>civil case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-government</td>
<td>appellate courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faction</td>
<td>Marbury v. Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority tyranny</td>
<td>judicial review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambition</td>
<td>Article IV, Section 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representation</td>
<td>amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>republicanism</td>
<td>The Federalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refine and enlarge</td>
<td>Anti-Federalists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extended sphere</td>
<td>Article I, Section 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>federalism</td>
<td>ratifying conventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limited government</td>
<td>Bill of Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enumerated powers</td>
<td>freedom of religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>separation of powers</td>
<td>free exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>checks and balances</td>
<td>establishment clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Plan</td>
<td>freedom of speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey Plan</td>
<td>freedom of the press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Compromise</td>
<td>right to assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-Fifths Clause</td>
<td>right to keep and bear arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legislative power</td>
<td>due process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress</td>
<td>inauguration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bicameralism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Primary Sources
The Northwest Ordinance of 1787, Article III
The Articles of Confederation
The United States Constitution
*The Federalist*, Nos. 9, 10, 51
The Bill of Rights

To Know by Heart

“Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.”—Northwest Ordinance of 1787, Article 3

Preamble to the U.S. Constitution

“I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.”—Presidential Oath of Office

“A republic, if you can keep it.”—Benjamin Franklin

“If men were angels, no government would be necessary.”—*Federalist* 10

First Amendment

Second Amendment

Tenth Amendment

Timeline

- 1781: Articles of Confederation take effect
- 1786: Shays’ Rebellion
- 1787 (May–Sept.): Constitutional Convention
- 1787 (July): Congress passes the Northwest Ordinance
- September 17, 1787: Constitutional Convention concludes (Constitution Day)
- 1788: New Hampshire ratifies the Constitution (ninth state)
- 1789: Constitution takes effect; George Washington elected president

Images

- Paintings of historical figures and events
- Depictions of scenes from the Constitutional Convention
- Photographs of Independence hall (exterior and interior)
- Photos or facsimiles of the original Articles of Confederation, Northwest Ordinance, Constitution, *The Federalist Papers*, and Bill of Rights
- *The Signing of the American Constitution* painting, Samuel Knecht
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- How the Great Compromise was proposed
- Delegates meeting in City Tavern in Philadelphia to discuss the Constitution-in-making “after hours”
- Benjamin Franklin’s story about the sun on George Washington’s chair being a sunrise for the country
- Benjamin Franklin’s reply to a woman’s question about what the Constitutional Convention had created: “A republic, if you can keep it,” and what this means
- The correspondence between Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Banneker

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What did the Land Ordinance of 1785 do, especially with respect to public vs. private ownership of land and public education?
- What did the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 do, especially with respect to the future of western lands, public education, and preventing the expansion of slavery?
- What were the specific problems of the Articles of Confederation? What issues did they permit to arise and fester?
- What event especially impressed on the Founders, particularly James Madison and George Washington, the need to revisit the Articles of Confederation?
- Who was the intellectual leader among the many very talented men at the Philadelphia convention, known as the “Father of the Constitution”?
- What is the relationship between the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution?
- In what sense is the Constitution a modern, liberal, Enlightenment document? In what sense is it a document that is grounded in an ancient and medieval European past?
- What was The Federalist, what was its purpose, and why do we still read it?
- What did The Federalist argue about each of the following:
  - human nature
  - ambition
  - faction
  - majority tyranny
  - republicanism
  - morality
- What were the major disagreements at the Constitutional Convention?
- Why was there reluctance to create a strong executive? Why did the Framers do so anyway?
- What was the great issue regarding representation? How was it resolved?
- What are the various ways that the Constitution addresses the issue of faction, as outlined in Federalist 10?
- What is federalism? Why is it important?
- What is separation of powers? Why is it a principle for the arrangement of government power, and how does the Constitution achieve this?
- What are the offices and main powers of each branch of government?
- What are checks and balances? How can each branch check the power of the others?
- How was the government organized to counteract the ambitions of powerful men?
- Contrast the character of the House of Representatives to that of the Senate, explaining the purpose for these differences and how their features (method of selection, qualifications, term lengths, percentage of each house up for election at a given time, etc.) contribute to their respective purposes.
- How does a bill become a law?
- What is the Electoral College, how did it originally work, and what is its purpose?
- How did the Constitution balance freedom (majority rule) and justice (preserving minority rights)?
- How did the Founders understand the tension between slavery and the principle of equality in the Declaration of Independence?
- What was the nature of the Founders’ compromise with slavery at the time of the founding for the sake of the union? Would it have been possible to abolish slavery in the southern colonies without union?
- Why did many in the founding generation expect that slavery would eventually die out so long as it was not allowed to expand?
- What efforts did some founders make to abolish slavery?
- What are the three clauses related to slavery in the Constitution? Explain each.
- How was the Three-Fifth Compromise a partial victory for slaveholders and a partial victory for abolitionists?
- Why does the Constitution make it so hard for it to be amended?
- What has been the most common way for proposing and ratifying amendments to the Constitution?
- What were the different views toward the Constitution during the ratification debate?
- What do each of the following amendments in the Bill of Rights guarantee and why: 1st, 2nd, 4th, 5th, 9th, and 10th?
- From where do the rights outlined in the Bill of Rights originate? Are they granted by the Bill of Rights?
- What is due process? Why is it such an important legal guarantor of freedom?
- To whom are elected officials and the Constitution itself ultimately subject?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 1: What is the form of government of the United States?
  - Question 2: What is the supreme law of the land?
  - Question 3: Name one thing the U.S. Constitution does.
  - Question 4: The U.S. Constitution starts with the words “We the People.” What does “We the People” mean?
  - Question 6: What does the Bill of Rights protect?
  - Question 10: Name two important ideas from the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution.
  - Question 13: What is the rule of law?
  - Question 14: Many documents influenced the U.S. Constitution. Name one.
  - Question 82: What founding document was written in 1787?
  - Question 83: The Federalist Papers supported the passage of the U.S. Constitution. Name one of the writers.
Question 84: Why were the Federalist Papers important?

Question 86: George Washington is famous for many things. Name one.

Question 88: James Madison is famous for many things. Name one.

Question 89: Alexander Hamilton is famous for many things. Name one.

KEYS TO THE LESSON

“[I]t seems to have been reserved to the people of this country, by their conduct and example, to decide the important question, whether societies of men are really capable or not of establishing good government from reflection and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend for their political constitutions on accident and force.” Thus wrote Alexander Hamilton in the opening paragraph of Federalist 1 in support of the newly proposed United States Constitution. Indeed, it is the Constitution that gives institutional form to the principles of the Declaration of Independence. It is, as Abraham Lincoln would later express it, the “frame of silver” meant to adorn and, most importantly, to protect the “apple of gold” that is the Declaration of Independence and the truths it asserts. The Constitution is the vehicle for the American experiment in self-government.

Study of the Constitution and of the history of its creation shows students how and that human beings are able to govern themselves in freedom, securing the equal protection of rights and the dignity of each person through reflection, deliberation, and choice. This is a significant thing for students to grasp, for if a constitution cannot achieve these ends, then force and violence are the only alternatives left to mankind.

Students need not study all of the political philosophy that undergirded the Constitutional Convention and the Constitution itself, nor need they understand all the details of the function of government; they will study these facets to the Constitution extensively in a separate American Government and Politics course. They should, however, understand the main principles and structure of the Constitution and the government it established, and know the stories from the Constitutional Convention and the ratification debates. Selections from The Federalist as well as the Bill of Rights will be helpful to accomplish these purposes.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Constitution with emphasis on the following approaches. While the length of this advice is larger than advice for other lessons, it is owing to the ease with which so many features of the Constitution can be taught incorrectly, with significant consequences. Therefore, this advice includes many corrections to common misconceptions that can be quickly addressed in class. As mentioned, the vast majority of the political philosophy and mechanics of the Constitution are reserved for a separate civics course.

- Consider the two major legislative achievements under the Articles of Confederation, the Land Ordinance of 1785 and the Northwest Ordinance of 1787. Students should understand the historic emphasis the Founders placed on public education, private land ownership, and preventing the spread of slavery, as evident in these laws. Questions on pages 78–79 of A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope may be helpful.
- Revisit the structure of the Articles of Confederation and the issues that emerged under such a structure during the War of Independence. Read illustrative sections of the Articles, and consider them against the issues that dominated the 1780s: namely, the debt cancellation laws by states (a
clear example of majority tyranny), varieties of currencies, interstate trade barriers, separate agreements between states and foreign powers, the inability to enforce the Treaty of Paris against the British with respect to western territories, and Shays’ Rebellion.

- Lead students through the process of the Constitutional Convention. Help them see that the Convention was arranged to ensure that all the states were able to speak and be represented. Through stories of the various debates and compromises, explain the difficulty of establishing a government that would satisfy all parties.
- Describe the environment and people of the Constitutional Convention, as well as the history and tone of the ratification debate that followed.
- Require students to read, annotate, and answer guided questions for Federalist 9, 10, and 51, then discuss these in class. These key documents should afford a review of the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the problems of the Articles of Confederation and also illustrate the purposes of the Constitution. The form of the Constitution follows its function with respect to human nature and the purposes for which governments are established, per the Declaration of Independence. The Federalist explains both of these functions and the nature of men. For Federalist 10, questions on pages 97–98 of A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope may be helpful.
- Read, annotate, and discuss the Constitution with particular attention to the Preamble, the structure of government that the Constitution establishes, and the reasons for this structure. Questions on pages 56–62 of A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope may be helpful.
- Clarify that the Constitution establishes a republic, not a democracy. In a pure democracy the people make all legislative decisions by direct majority vote; in a republic, the people elect certain individuals to represent their interests in deliberating and voting. The deliberations and voting record of representatives should usually reflect but should also be more refined than that of the entire people voting directly. Sometimes this distinction is described in terms of direct democracy vs. representative democracy.
- Explain the importance of the principles of separation of powers and federalism, and why these ideas are central to the Constitution’s safeguards against the corrupting tendency of power.
- Consider how the Constitution repeatedly structures federal institutions to refine and enlarge the will of the people.
- Explain how the House of Representatives is meant to be a more dynamic and immediate expression of the people’s will, while the Senate is meant to be more deliberative and circumspect.
- Emphasize that the Framers of the Constitution were chiefly concerned with allowing the will of the majority to rule—thereby guaranteeing the consent of the governed—while still preserving the rights of the minority and thereby securing justice.
- Describe the American Founders’ understanding of human nature. They understood human nature to be fixed and unchanging, good but also flawed and tending toward corrupting power. In response to human nature, government must guard against the opposite dangers of lawlessness and tyranny, accounting for the realities of human nature and rejecting the possibility of utopia.
- Show how the Constitution does not deny, demonize, or elevate human nature, but rather seeks to channel the powers of human beings into constructive institutions while mitigating man’s baser tendencies. In brief, the Constitution is constructed on a deep and accurate understanding of fixed human nature born of the Founders’ knowledge of history, their own experience, and their prudence.
- Ask about the source and purpose of a government’s power. Review how the Declaration of Independence claims that government power comes from the free consent of the people, and ask students to identify whether and how the Constitution accomplishes that goal.
- Distinguish the focus of the federal government compared to the state governments.
- Teach the structure, makeup, and powers of each branch of government and explain why the Founders made them so. Students should understand how each branch works, how they work together, and how the branches check and balance one another.
- Clarify how the Electoral College works and why the Founders chose this process for electing the president. One of the original reasons was to provide a way for the people’s representatives, the electors, to prevent a tyrannical or fraudulent choice, but most states abandoned this purpose when they enacted laws binding electors to the state’s popular vote. Another reason was to ensure that presidential candidates would pay attention to the interests of those to whom it was harder or less politically efficient to travel geographically. This has forced presidential candidates to address the concerns not merely of large population centers like cities but also of rural and more remote populations. Together with equal representation among states in the Senate, the Electoral College has discouraged a majority tyranny of urban interests.
- Take the time to consider, read, and discuss the ways in which slavery was addressed in the Constitution, including the extents to which the Constitution both left slavery in place and also placed new national limits on it. As Frederick Douglass and Abraham Lincoln would later acknowledge, the Declaration’s principle of equality and the Constitution’s arrangements gave the Founders the belief that they had placed slavery on the path to eventual extinction. This of course does not excuse the fact that many of these founders still held African Americans in slavery during their lifetimes.
- Clarify for students the arguments of northerners and southerners concerning the Three-Fifths Clause. The clause was not about the humanity of slaves; it was strictly about how much representation slave-owning states would receive in Congress and the Electoral College. The great hypocrisy of the slaveholders was that while they refused to call a slave a human being, they insisted that each slave be counted as a whole person for purposes of representation. In fact, it was the anti-slavery Founders who did not want slaves counted at all in the Constitution for the purposes of representation. The fact that slaves were only counted as three-fifths for the purposes of representation was a disappointment for southern states, as they had demanded they be counted as a whole person. It was a partial victory for northern opponents to slavery, as it would give the slaveholding states less influence in lawmaking than they wished. Additionally, students should understand that in the mind of those opposed to slavery, this compromise was the only politically viable route if they were to secure southern support for the Constitution, without which the country would become disunited, with the South able to perpetuate slavery indefinitely as their own country without northern abolitionists. Students need not agree with the tenets of the compromise, but they must understand it as the founders themselves understood it.
- Remind students that the slave trade was not formally limited in the states (the Continental Congress had temporarily banned the practice in 1774) until the passage of the Constitution, which allowed for it to be outlawed nationwide in 1808 (which it was) and for Congress to discourage it by imposing tariffs on the slave trade in the meantime. Students should understand that without the compromise that allowed this twenty-year delay, the power to abolish the slave trade would not have been granted by the slaveholding interest in the first place.
- Consider with students the significance of the Constitution not using the word “slave” and instead using “person.” Refusing to use the word “slave” avoided giving legal legitimacy to slavery. Even Article IV, Section 2, Clause 3 emphasizes that slavery was legal based on certain state, not federal, laws. The use of the word “person” forced even slaveholders to recognize the
humanity of the slave: that he or she was in fact a human person, not property. There would be no federally-recognized “property in man.”

- Point out for students that clauses that were not about slavery but which slaveholding interests could use to their benefit were not therefore deliberately pro-slavery clauses. Such a logical fallacy would implicate as morally evil anything hijacked for use in committing a wrong act, for example, a road used by bank robbers in their getaway would be “pro-robbery.”

- Consider with students the sectional nature of views on slavery during the founding. The majority of northerners and northern founders (e.g., John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Benjamin Rush, Gouverneur Morris, and John Jay) spoke and wrote extensively on the immorality of slavery and its need to be abolished. Some northern founders, such as John Jay, Alexander Hamilton, and Benjamin Franklin, founded or served in abolitionist societies.

Consider also that even among the southern founders who supported slavery or held slaves, several leading founders expressed regret and fear of divine retribution for slavery in America, such as Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and George Washington. Some freed their slaves as well, such as George Washington, who by the end of his life freed the slaves in his family estate. And many, like Thomas Jefferson, nevertheless maintained that slaves were men in full possession of the natural rights of all men. Making these observations does not diminish the inhumaneness of slavery or dismiss the wrong of racism by certain colonists or other individual Americans living in other generations.

- Ask students how to judge the Founders who owned slaves and yet supported the Declaration of Independence and Constitution. Students should consider their public and private lives as well as their words and deeds. Taken altogether, students should recognize the difficulty in assigning an absolute moral judgment that a person is entirely bad or entirely good while still being able to pass judgment on specific actions.

- Have students also consider the distinction between judging character absolutely versus judging individual actions. When they do, students will encounter figures who did both much that was good and also some that was bad, and that this contradiction runs through the heart of every person.

- Be careful with the phrase “consider the times,” as this phrase can easily give the impression that truth and morality (good and evil) are merely relative to one’s viewpoint or historical time period. Instead, help students understand that “to consider the times” in which the American colonists and Founders lived is not to excuse moral injustices or to justify relativism. We should consider the circumstances at the time and weigh them against principles that transcend time. It is not whitewashing or rewriting history. It is recognizing the reality of history and honestly assessing how figures at the time acted within their circumstances in light of the truth.

- Have students consider the status of slavery over the initial decades of the country’s history. At the founding, slavery was either openly condemned by northerners or defended (but seldom celebrated) by southerners. Its toleration at the time of the founding was for the sake of a unity that even many abolitionists believed was the only eventual path toward abolition. Based on the evidence at the time, many leading Founders believed slavery was naturally destined for extinction, that public opinion had steadily grown toward seeing slavery for the moral evil that it was, and that the principles of the Declaration of Independence and Revolution helped shape this public opinion and would also be the vehicle for eventual equality. The Founders also believed the Constitution both permitted and yet restricted slavery, created a path to restricting it further (by holding the union together), and kept slavery on the path it was already travelling: to extinction. The Declaration of Independence founded the country on principles of equality that could and
would be used to demand the end of slavery. The Northwest Ordinance had prohibited the expansion of slavery. The Constitution refused to give legal standing to the institution, and many states had abolished slavery outright. Even Founders who held slaves believed the profitability of slavery was gradually but decisively waning and that slavery would die out on its own in a short period of time.

- Note for students the history-changing invention of Eli Whitney’s cotton gin in 1793, four years after the adoption of the Constitution. The cotton gin would greatly increase the profitability of slavery in the cotton-growing states of the South and thereby create a significant (and regional) interest in perpetuating the institution of slavery. The new economics of slavery that would grow out of the cotton gin and the vast cotton industry questioned the assumption and changed the projection of the founding generation concerning the viability and eventual demise of slavery.

- Teach students about the Anti-Federalists’ concerns with the Constitution, the arguments for and against a Bill of Rights, and how the Federalists ultimately convinced states to ratify the Constitution (provided that a Bill of Rights was included).

- Read aloud with students the Bill of Rights. Pause frequently to ask students questions on various parts of the text. Questions on pages 79–84 of A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope may be helpful.

- Help students understand why each of the rights found in the Bill of Rights corresponds to the preservation of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and how these rights answer some of the grievances in the Declaration of Independence as well as the problems under the Articles of Confederation. Especially consider the 1st, 2nd, 5th, and 10th Amendments.

- Explain that the Founders did not believe the Bill of Rights encompassed all the rights of men in society, nor that these rights came from government. Some of the rights enumerated in the Bill of Rights are natural rights. Many are derivative civil rights through which the constitutional process abides by and secures underlying natural rights. Between the Bill of Rights, the limited purposes of government, and the enumerated powers, emphasize for students how America has a limited government.

- Finally, tell about the first elections, meetings of the Electoral College, and George Washington’s inauguration in 1789. If students have already studied the French Revolution, remind them that just a few short months later the French Revolution would commence, leading to a far different outcome than the American Revolution and Constitution.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Explain how the Constitution distributes power among the three branches of government (1–2 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** The Framers designed the Constitution based on certain principles. Explain which two principles you believe are the most important and why (1–2 paragraphs).

**Assignment 3:** Explain what The Federalist argued concerning each of the following: human nature, ambition, faction, majority tyranny, republicanism, and morality (2–3 paragraphs).

**Assignment 4:** Complete the Bill of Rights handout (A Student Workbook for Land of Hope, pages 45–46).
DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. What was the name of the first constitution and government under which the United States attempted to govern itself?

2. In which city did the Constitutional Convention convene?

3. Who was known as “the Father of the Constitution”? 

4. Which practice and institution proved to be a source of great division among the delegates to the Constitutional Convention?

5. What was the name of the collection of newspaper essays written under the pseudonym Publius that explained and argued for the ratification of the Constitution?
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### Study Guide — The American Founding Test

#### TIMELINE

When given chronological dates, match events from a list to the years or dates that they happened.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1754–1763</td>
<td>French &amp; Indian War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>Proclamation Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770</td>
<td>Boston Massacre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1773</td>
<td>Boston Tea Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1774</td>
<td>Intolerable Acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1775) 1776–1783</td>
<td>War of Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Battles of Lexington and Concord and of Bunker Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 4, 1776</td>
<td>Declaration of Independence signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1776 (Fall)</td>
<td>Battle of New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1776 (Christmas)</td>
<td>Battle of Trenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1777</td>
<td>Battle of Saratoga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1777–78</td>
<td>Winter Quarters at Valley Forge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781</td>
<td>Battle of Yorktown; Cornwallis Surrenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1783</td>
<td>Treaty of Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 17, 1787</td>
<td>Constitutional Convention concludes (Constitution Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1789</td>
<td>Constitution takes effect; George Washington elected president</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### GEOGRAPHY AND PLACES

Identify each on a map and/or tell where it is and explain its significance.

- Boston
- Philadelphia
- Independence Hall
- Lexington and Concord
- Ticonderoga
- Quebec
- Delaware River
- Hudson River Valley
- Valley Forge
- Yorktown
- Northwest Territory
- New York City

#### PERSONS

Identify each, provide biographical details, and explain what he or she thought or did in specific periods or events.

- George III
- Charles Townshend
- George Washington
- John Hancock
- Crispus Attucks
- Paul Revere
- Samuel Adams
- Thomas Gage
- Benjamin Franklin
- Patrick Henry
- John Adams
- Abigail Adams
- Ethan Allen
- Thomas Paine
- Thomas Jefferson
- Phillis Wheatley
- Henry Knox
- Horatio Gates
George Rogers Clark  Benedict Arnold  James Wilson
William Howe  John Burgoyne  James Madison
Marquis de Lafayette  Charles Cornwallis  John Jay
Tadeusz Kościuszko  Alexander Hamilton  Publius
Baron von Steuben  Montesquieu  Brutus
Nathanael Greene  Gouvernour Morris  Benjamin Banneker

**TERMS AND TOPICS**

*Identify each and explain its significance to the period of history studied.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>salutary neglect</td>
<td>Consistent with the period of self-government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-government</td>
<td>Permits self-governance of the governed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representation</td>
<td>Establishing and exercising representation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consent</td>
<td>Legal agreement for government action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament</td>
<td>Legislative body for the nation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writs of assistance</td>
<td>Legal Instruments for collection of duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proclamation of 1763</td>
<td>Declaration of rights and duties against Great Britain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar Act</td>
<td>Direct tax on trade with Britain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamp Act</td>
<td>Stamps on every article of writing for tax on trade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sons of Liberty</td>
<td>Identity with the colonists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tar and feather</td>
<td>Punishment of resistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartering of Soldiers</td>
<td>Collection of troops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaratory Act</td>
<td>Declaration of rights and duties against Great Britain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townshend Acts</td>
<td>Title of a law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonimportation Agreements</td>
<td>Prohibiting imports of articles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Massacre</td>
<td>Rebellion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committees of Correspondence</td>
<td>width=100&gt; Committees Correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Tea Party</td>
<td>Protests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intolerable Acts</td>
<td>Repeal of bans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Continental Congress</td>
<td>Establishment of the Continental Congress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutemen</td>
<td>Establishment of the Continental Army.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Continental Congress</td>
<td>width=100&gt; Second Continental Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental Army</td>
<td>Establishment of the Continental Army.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive Branch Petition</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberation of Boston</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-evident</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natural rights</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equality</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unalienable</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liberty</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>license</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pursuit of happiness</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consent of the governed</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>list of grievances</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slavery</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Bell</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriot/Revolutionary</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tory/Loyalist</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles of Confederation</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental Army</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>privateer</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Bess Musket</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mercenary</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessians</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing of the Delaware</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betsy Ross Flag</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yankee Doodle</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guerrilla warfare</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Treaty of Alliance</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newburgh Conspiracy</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Cincinnatus</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treaty of Paris</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Ordinance of 1785</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>township</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debt cancellation laws</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Ordinance</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional Convention</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father of the Constitution</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faction</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority tyranny</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambition</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>republicanism</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extended sphere</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>federalism</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limited government</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enumerated powers</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>separation of powers</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>checks and balances</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Plan</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey Plan</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Compromise</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-Fifths Clause</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legislative power</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bicameralism</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Representatives</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impeachment</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>executive powers</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral College</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commander-in-Chief</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>judicial powers</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coequality of branches</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appellate courts</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marbury v. Madison</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>judicial review</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article IV, Section 2</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amendment</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federalists</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Federalist</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Federalists</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article I, Section 9</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ratifying conventions</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill of Rights</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>free exercise</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>establishment clause</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freedom of speech</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freedom of the press</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right to assembly</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right to keep and bear arms</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>due process</td>
<td>Establishing the Olive Branch Petition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**MAJOR CONFLICTS**

*Explain how each battle began, narrate what happened in it and how, and explain the significance of the battle’s outcome.*

French and Indian War | New York | Cowpens  
Lexington & Concord | Trenton | Yorktown  
Fort Ticonderoga | Saratoga | Shays’ Rebellion  
Bunker Hill | Monmouth |  

**PRIMARY SOURCES**

*Based on annotations and notes from seminar conversations, be able to answer questions on each primary source. While you will not necessarily be asked why each primary source was created, what it did or argued, and what its effects were, being able to answer these kinds of questions will make you well-prepared.*

Virginia Resolves of 1769, Virginia House of Burgesses  
Speech on Conciliation with the Colonies, Edmund Burke  
*Common Sense*, Thomas Paine  
Declaration of Independence, First Draft, Thomas Jefferson  
Declaration of Independence  
Resignation Speech, George Washington  
The Northwest Ordinance of 1787, Article III  
The Articles of Confederation  
The United States Constitution  
The Federalist, Nos. 9, 10, 51  
The Bill of Rights  

**TO KNOW BY HEART**

*Be prepared to fill in missing words and/or identify the speaker and context.*

“Give me liberty or give me death!”—Patrick Henry  
First two paragraphs of the Declaration of Independence  

“And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor.”—Final sentence of the Declaration of Independence  

“Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.”—Northwest Ordinance, Article 3  

Preamble to the U.S. Constitution
“If men were angels, no government would be necessary.”—Federalist 10

First Amendment

Second Amendment

Tenth Amendment

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be middle school students.

- Minutemen at the Battles of Lexington and Concord
- Washington’s Crossing of the Delaware
- The American farmers joining the Battle of Saratoga
- Washington encouraging his men at Valley Forge
- Stories of Margaret Corbin, Molly Pitcher, Abigail Adams, and Martha Washington during the war
- Washington’s dismissal of the Newburgh Conspiracy
- Benjamin Franklin’s reply to a woman’s question about what the Constitutional Convention had created: “A republic, if you can keep it,” and what this means
- The correspondence between Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Banneker

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.

Lesson 1 | Self Government or Tyranny

□ Why had the colonies been mostly left to their own devices? Why was this “neglect” “salutary”?
□ How did the British situation following the French and Indian War lead the British to exert more authority over the colonists?
□ In what ways did the British begin to exert control over the colonists without their consent?
□ What did the Stamp Act do? Why did this act in particular undermine the principle of self-government and consent? How did the colonists respond?
□ What is self-government? In what ways was the colonists’ freedom to govern themselves threatened and curtailed by the British between 1763 and 1776?
□ What is the relationship between this question of representative self-government and that of liberty and tyranny?
□ What were the two oftentimes competing approaches the colonists took to addressing Parliament’s actions?
□ How did the Boston Massacre change public opinion among the colonists?
Why did Parliament pass the Intolerable Acts? What did they do (five actions)?
Was war inevitable? Was independence?
In what ways did Thomas Paine’s *Common Sense* influence public opinion?
What actions by the British in the spring of 1776 prompted Richard Henry Lee of Virginia to introduce a motion for independence?

**Lesson 2 | The Declaration of Independence**

In its opening lines, what is the Declaration claiming to be doing, and what does it want its audience to do in response?
What are “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God”?
What is a “self-evident” truth?
What does it mean that “all men are created equal”?
What is a right?
According to the Declaration of Independence, from where do natural rights come?
What does “unalienable” mean?
What does the word “certain” imply about these rights?
What does the word “among” imply about these rights?
What is liberty according to the Founders? How is it distinct from license?
Why did Jefferson use “the pursuit of happiness” instead of “property”?
What is the purpose of government?
From where does a government derive its just powers?
What are the people free—and even duty-bound—to do if the government fails or violates its purpose?
Ought it to be easy or frequent for a people to overthrow and replace its government? If not, under which circumstances may they do so?
Why did northern delegates, who were opposed to slavery and wanted it abolished, believe that compromising with southern delegates by omitting the issue of slavery from the Declaration’s list of grievances would be more likely to lead to the abolition of slavery than splitting with the southern colonies over the issue in 1776?
How does the fact that America was founded with the words of the Declaration of Independence make America the exception in the history of nations, even exceptional?
America is a country whose existence and purpose for existing rests on belief in and commitment to certain ideas its Founders asserted to be objectively true. What are these truths?

**Lesson 3 | The War of Independence**

What were the advantages and disadvantages that the Americans and British each faced at the outset of the war?
What were the overall strategies that each side pursued in the course of the war?
What were the major contributions and moments in George Washington’s generalship during the war?
Why was the Battle of Saratoga so significant? What did the Americans gain from their newfound ally?
What important contribution did Baron von Steuben make to the Continental Army?
What factors, figures, moments, etc., led the Americans to victory?
Why were soldiers on the verge of mutiny in 1783? How did George Washington resolve the crisis?

Lesson 4 | The U.S. Constitution

What did the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 do, especially with respect to the future of western lands, public education, and preventing the expansion of slavery?

What were the specific problems of the Articles of Confederation? What issues did they permit to arise and fester?

What is the relationship between the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution?

What did The Federalist argue about each of the following:
- human nature
- ambition
- faction
- majority tyranny
- republicanism
- morality

What were the major disagreements at the Constitutional Convention?

What was the great issue regarding representation? How was it resolved?

What are the various ways that the Constitution addresses the issue of faction, as outlined in Federalist 10?

What is federalism? Why is it important?

What is separation of powers, why is it a principle for the arrangement of government power, and how does the Constitution achieve this?

Contrast the character of the House of Representatives to that of the Senate, explaining the purpose for these differences and how their features (method of selection, qualifications, term lengths, percentage of each house up for election at a given time, etc.) contribute to their respective purposes.

What is the Electoral College, how did it originally work, and what is its purpose?

How did the Constitution balance freedom (majority rule) and justice (preserving minority rights)?

What was the nature of the Founders’ compromise with slavery at the time of the founding for the sake of the union? Would it have been possible to abolish slavery in the southern colonies without union?

Why did many in the founding generation expect that slavery would eventually die out so long as it was not allowed to expand?

What efforts did some founders make to abolish slavery?

What are the three clauses related to slavery in the Constitution? Explain each.

How was the Three-Fifth Compromise a partial victory for slaveholders and a partial victory for abolitionists?

Why does the Constitution make it so hard for it to be amended?

What do each of the following amendments in the Bill of Rights guarantee and why: 1st, 2nd, 4th, 5th, 9th, and 10th?

To whom are elected officials and the Constitution itself ultimately subject?
Test — The American Founding

TIMELINE

Write the letter of each event next to the date or years it took place.

1754–63 ______
1763 ______
1770 ______
1773 ______
1774 ______
(1775) 1776–83 ______
1775 ______
July 4, 1776 ______
1776 (Fall) ______
1776 (Christmas) ______
1777 ______
1777–78 ______
1781 ______
1783 ______
Sept. 17, 1787 ______
1789 ______

A. Battle of New York
B. Battle of Saratoga
C. Battle of Trenton
D. Battle of Yorktown; Cornwallis Surrenders
E. Battles of Lexington and Concord and of Bunker Hill
F. Boston Massacre
G. Boston Tea Party
H. Constitutional Convention concludes (Constitution Day)
I. Constitution takes effect; George Washington elected president
J. Declaration of Independence signed
K. French & Indian War
L. Intolerable Acts
M. Proclamation Line
N. Treaty of Paris
O. War of Independence
P. Winter Quarters at Valley Forge

GEOGRAPHY AND PLACES

1. Draw a line indicating the border that the Proclamation of 1763 attempted to establish.

2. Label with dots the locations of Lexington and Concord, Fort Ticonderoga, Philadelphia, New York, Trenton, Saratoga, Valley Forge, and Yorktown.

Map courtesy of A Student Workbook for Land of Hope.
PERSONS, TERMS, AND TOPICS

Fill in the blank.

3. Following the French and Indian War, American colonists were expecting unbridled opportunities to expand westward. To prevent conflict with Native Americans, however, the British Parliament passed the ________________________, which prohibited settlement west of the Appalachian Mountains and signified a subtle but marked shift in British policy away from “salutary neglect.”

4. Parliament’s first act to raise more money for the defense of the colonies, but especially to help pay off Britain’s debt from the French and Indian War, was the ______________________ on products such as molasses, which actually lowered the customs duty but, to the ire of the colonists, enforced the collection thereof, indicating another shift away from “salutary neglect.”

5. In response to the Stamp Act, a group of merchants, smugglers, and ordinary craftsmen formed the Sons of Liberty, led by ________________________. Their actions were more characteristic of a mob and represented one of two simultaneous approaches to addressing British violations of rights.

6. Perhaps the most influential of colonial leaders was _________________________, whose age and fame from his enterprises as a printer, inventor, scientist, writer, deist, pioneer in electricity, and author of *Poor Richard’s Almanac* lent not only superb intellect and experience to the revolutionary mind but also respectability.

7. While the Boston Massacre shifted colonial opinion against the British, ________________________’s devotion to justice led him to defend the British soldiers against charges of murder. As a result of his principled defense of even his would-be enemies, he gained a respected role in colonial leadership and would emerge as one of the most vocal leaders of the colonial cause.

8. The occupation of Boston following the Boston Tea Party aroused sympathy from other colonies and led the secret assemblies of each colony, called _________________________, to meet in the fall of 1774 in Philadelphia in order to form a plan of united, peaceful resistance to Britain. This body of colonial leaders is known by history as the First Continental Congress.

9. In May of 1775, generals Ethan Allen and Benedict Arnold launched a surprise attack on ________________________ on Lake Champlain in upstate New York. The siege was successful without a shot, and it captured cannons which almost a year later would be floated down the lake, carted across muddy spring roads, and erected in the middle of the night to liberate Boston.

10. In the early summer of 1775, colonial leaders meeting in Philadelphia agreed to adopt the New England militia outside of Boston and join to it the militia of other colonies to form the _________________________.

11. Public opinion was still by no means in favor of independence as 1776 began, but such sentiments rapidly began to change with the publication and wide dissemination of *Common Sense* by ________________________, who articulated clearly the situation of the colonists and made strong appeals to a more courageous approach to securing justice and freedom via independence.
12. With the Congress’s Olive Branch Petition having been rejected, in June of 1776, Richard Henry Lee of Virginia moved that the congress vote “[t]hat these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States.” “In case the Congress agreed thereto,” a committee was formed to draft a statement of independence. The primary author of the Declaration of Independence was the young, talented aristocrat from Virginia named ________________________________.

13. The general apathy of the average Englishman toward the war in North America urged Great Britain to hire a number of Hessian ____________________, or soldiers for hire, from the German kingdoms. Using such soldiers against their supposed fellow countrymen convinced many undecided Americans to abandon the British and to support the Patriots’ cause.

14. While the British fought almost exclusively with the European tactic of firing a volley from one line of soldiers across a field toward another line, followed by bayonet combat, the American forces combined this style with what would nowadays be called ____________________, or fighting from cover or by surprise attack.

15. The first battle after the Declaration of Independence was signed was a disaster for Washington’s army. His poor defense of this harbor city led to his army’s quick routing and months-long retreat to Pennsylvania. Thus did the Battle of _______________ bode ill for the American war effort.

16. As a result of a shocking English surrender in upstate New York, the United States was able to secure the alliance with the Netherlands and, most importantly, the ________________ Treaty of Alliance.

17. The American War of Independence, which had informally begun at the battles of Lexington and Concord, was drawn out into its sixth year by 1781. After a successful victory at the Battle of Cowpens, South Carolina, led by the Marquis de Lafayette and ________________, the Americans forced General Cornwallis to retreat north to Virginia, where he made camp twenty-five miles from Jamestown with the Chesapeake Bay at his back.

18. Citing numerous weaknesses in the existing national government, in 1787 Congress called for a ______________________ made up of members appointed by each state to suggest improvements to the existing government. Instead, during the summer months, these fifty-five delegates in Philadelphia crafted an entirely new government as set forth in the document known as the United States Constitution.

19. Known as the Father of the Constitution, __________________ came to Philadelphia in 1787 with many ideas for the Constitution and kept detailed notes of the Convention. One significant area of compromise was over the issue of representation, where his Virginia Plan was combined with the New Jersey Plan to propose a bicameral legislature with two different forms of representation.

20. To convince the people of America to encourage their states’ ratifying conventions toward approving the new plan of government, three men writing under the pseudonym Publius, after the ancient Roman republican statesman, wrote a series of eighty-five newspaper articles defending and explaining the new plan. Collectively, these papers are known as The __________________.
21. Washington’s ablest assistant was Colonel ____________________________, an orphan who became a successful lawyer and pamphlet writer before the Revolution and whose leadership in the artillery regiment earned him a promotion to Washington’s staff. He left Washington’s headquarters to lead a successful and crucial capture of Redoubt No. 10, which hastened an American–French victory in the final battle of the war, and he was a chief proponent of the new Constitution eight years later.

22. The ratification debates ultimately resulted in a compromise between the Federalists and Anti-Federalists, in which a ____________________________ was agreed to be included as amendments to the Constitution. While heavily debated at the time, the insistence by Anti-Federalists to state explicitly fundamental freedoms that the government may not violate has proven to be one of their greatest contributions to the American experiment in self-government.

**MAJOR CONFLICTS**

*Explain how each battle began, narrate what happened in it and how, and explain the significance of the battle’s outcome.*

23. Trenton

24. Saratoga

25. Yorktown

**KNOWN BY HEART**

*Fill in missing words and identify the source.*

26. “We hold these __________________________ to be __________________________, that all men are __________________________, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain __________________________, that among these are __________________________, __________________________ and the pursuit of __________________________.—That to __________________________ these rights, __________________________ are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the __________________________,—That whenever any Form of Government becomes __________________________ of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to __________________________ it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.”

Source: __________________________
27. “__________, ____________, and ____________, being necessary to good ________
__________, and the ____________ of mankind, ____________ and the means
of education shall forever be encouraged.”
Source: _______________________

28. “We the ____________ of the United States, in Order to form a ________________
__, establish ____________, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence,
promote the general Welfare, and secure the ____________ to ourselves and our Posterity,
do ordain and establish this ________________ for the United States of America.”
Source: _______________________

29. “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of ____________ or prohibiting the free
exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of ____________, or of the ________; or the
right of the people peaceably to ____________, and to petition the Government for a
redress of grievances.”
Source: _______________________

30. “A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep
and ____________, shall not be infringed.”
Source: _______________________

31. “…nor shall [any person] be compelled in any criminal case to be- a witness against himself, nor be
deprived of life, liberty, or property, without ________________..”
Source: _______________________

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be middle school
students.

32. Tell the biography of George Washington, from his childhood through the Constitutional
Convention.
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and writing should be employed, and responses must fully answer each question.

33. What is self-government? In what ways was the colonists’ freedom to govern themselves threatened and curtailed by the British between 1763 and 1776?

34. Why did Parliament pass the Intolerable Acts? What did they do (five actions)?

35. What actions by the British in the spring of 1776 prompted Richard Henry Lee of Virginia to introduce a motion for independence?

36. In its opening lines, what is the Declaration claiming to be doing, and what does it want its audience to do in response?

37. What is a “self-evident” truth?

38. What does it mean that “all men are created equal”?

39. According to the Declaration of Independence, from where do natural rights come? What does “unalienable” mean?

40. Why did Jefferson use “the pursuit of happiness” instead of “property”?

41. What is the purpose of government? From whence comes a government’s power?
42. Why did northern delegates to both the Second Continental Congress and the Constitutional Convention who were opposed to slavery and wanted it abolished believe that compromising with southern delegates by limiting but not outlawing slavery was the only way slavery could ever be abolished in the South?

43. What were the overall strategies that each side pursued in the course of the War of Independence?

44. What factors, figures, moments, etc., led the Americans to victory?

45. What did the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 do, especially with respect to the future of western lands, public education, and preventing the expansion of slavery?

46. What is the relationship between the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution?

47. What is separation of powers, why is it a principle for the arrangement of government power, and how does the Constitution achieve this?

48. What are the three clauses related to slavery in the Constitution? Explain each.

49. Why does the Constitution make it so hard for it to be amended?

50. To whom are elected officials and the Constitution itself ultimately subject?
Writing Assignment — The American Founding

UNIT 2

DIRECTIONS

Due on ____________

Citing events and primary sources in your argument, write a 500–800-word essay answering this question:

Based on the documents, thoughts, words, and deeds that founded the United States, what is America, what is its purpose, and how do its people and institutions attempt to fulfill its purpose?
APPENDIX B

Primary Sources

Richard Bland
Benjamin Franklin
The Virginia House of Burgesses
John Adams
Patrick Henry
Edmund Burke
Thomas Paine
The Second Continental Congress
George Washington
Phyllis Wheatley
The United States Congress
The American People
James Madison
Alexander Hamilton
**RICHARD BLAND, MEMBER OF THE VIRGINIA HOUSE OF BURGESSSES**

An Inquiry into the rights of the British colonies

**PAMPHLET EXCERPTS**

**BACKGROUND**

Virginian Richard Bland wrote this pamphlet in the earliest years of the growing conflict between the British Parliament and the British colonists in North America.

**GUIDING QUESTIONS**

1. Upon what principles is the British Constitution founded, according to Bland?

2. Why is the British Constitution imperfect according to Bland?

3. To what do the colonists have recourse when they are deprived of their civil rights?

---

Richard Bland, *An inquiry into the rights of the British colonies, intended as an answer to The regulations lately made concerning the colonies, and the taxes imposed upon them considered. In a letter addressed to the author of that pamphlet* (Williamsburg, VA: Alexander Purdie, & Co., 1766).
The Question is whether the Colonies are represented in the British Parliament or not? You affirm it to be indubitable Fact that they are represented, and from thence you infer a Right in the Parliament to impose Taxes of every Kind upon them. You do not insist upon the Power, but upon the Right of Parliament to impose Taxes upon the Colonies. This is certainly a very proper Distinction, as Right and Power have very different Meanings, and convey very different Ideas: For had you told us that the Parliament of Great Britain have Power, by the Fleets and Armies of the Kingdom, to impose Taxes and to raise Contributions upon the Colonies, I should not have presumed to dispute the Point with you; but as you insist upon the Right only, I must beg Leave to differ from you in Opinion, and shall give my Reasons for it.…

I cannot comprehend how Men who are excluded from voting at the Election of Members of Parliament can be represented in that Assembly, or how those who are elected do not sit in the House as Representatives of their Constituents. These Assertions appear to me not only paradoxical, but contrary to the fundamental Principles of the English Constitution.

To illustrate this important Disquisition, I conceive we must recur to the civil Constitution of England, and from thence deduce and ascertain the Rights and Privileges of the People at the first Establishment of the Government, and discover the Alterations that have been made in them from Time to Time; and it is from the Laws of the Kingdom, founded upon the Principles of the Law of Nature, that we are to show the Obligation every Member of the State is under to pay Obedience to its Institutions. From these Principles I shall endeavor to prove that the Inhabitants of Britain, who have no Vote in the Election of Members of Parliament, are not represented in that Assembly, and yet that they owe Obedience to the Laws of Parliament; which, as to them, are constitutional, and not arbitrary. As to the Colonies, I shall consider them afterwards.

Now it is a Fact, as certain as History can make it, that the present civil Constitution of England derives its Original from those Saxons who, coming over to the Assistance of the Britons in the Time of their King Vortiger made themselves Masters of the Kingdom, and es-
established a Form of Government in it similar to that they had been accustomed to live under in their native Country as similar, at least, as the Difference of their Situation and Circumstances would permit. This Government, like that from whence they came, was founded upon Principles of the most perfect Liberty: The conquered Lands were divided among the Individuals in Proportion to the Rank they held in the Nation, and every Freeman, that is, every Freeholder, was a member of their Wittinagemot, or Parliament. The other Part of the Nation, or the Non-Proprietors of Land, were of little Estimation. They, as in Germany, were either Slaves, mere Hewers of Wood and Drawers of Water, or Freedmen; who, being of foreign Extraction, had been manumitted by their Masters, and were excluded from the high Privilege of having a Share in the Administration of the Commonwealth, unless they became Proprietors of Land (which they might obtain by Purchase or Donation) and in that Case they has a Right to sit with the Freemen, in the Parliament or sovereign Legislature of the State.

How long this Right of being personally present in the Parliament continued, or when the Custom of sending Representatives to this great Council of the Nation, was first introduced, cannot be determined with Precision; but let the Custom of Representation be introduced when it will, it is certain that every Freeman, or, which was the same Thing in the Eye of the Constitution, every Freeholder, had a right to vote at the Election of Members of Parliament, and therefore might be said, with great Propriety, to be present in that Assembly, either in his own Person or by Representation. This Right of Election in the Freeholders is evident from the Statute 1st Hen. 5. Ch. 1st, which limits the Right of Election to those Freeholders only who are resident in the Counties the Day of the Date of the Writ of Election; but yet every resident Freeholder indiscriminately, let his Freehold be ever so small, had a Right to vote at the Election of Knights for his County so that they were actually represented. And this Right of Election continued until it was taken away by the Statute 8th Hen. 6 Ch. 7. Shillings by the year at the least.

Now this statute was deprivative of the Right of those Freeholders who came within the Description of it; but of what did it deprive them, if they were represented notwithstanding their Right of Election was taken from them? The mere Act of voting was nothing, of no
Value, if they were represented as constitutionally without it as with it: But when by the fundamental Principles of the Constitution they were to be considered as Members of the Legislature, and as such had a right to be present in Person, or to send their Procurators or Attornies, and by them to give their Suffrage in the supreme Council of the Nation, this Statute deprived them of an essential Right; a Right without which by the ancient Constitution of the State, all other Liberties were but a Species of Bondage.

As these Freeholders then were deprived of their Rights to substitute Delegates to Parliament, they could not be represented, but were placed in the same Condition with the Non-Proprietors of Land, who were excluded by the original Constitution from having any Share in the Legislature, but who, notwithstanding such Exclusion, are bound to pay Obedience to the Laws of Parliament, even if they should consist of nine Tenths of the People of Britain; but then the Obligation of these Laws does not arise from their being virtually represented in Parliament, but from a quite different Reason….

From hence it is evident that the Obligation of the Laws of Parliament upon the People of Britain who have no Right to be Electors does not arise from their being virtually represented, but from a quite different Principle; a Principle of the Law of Nature, true, certain, and universal, applicable to every Sort of Government, and not contrary to the common Understandings of Mankind.

If what you say is real Fact, that the nine Tenths of the People of Britain are deprived of the high Privilege of being Electors, it shows a great Defect in the present Constitution, which has departed so much from its original Purity; but never can prove that those People are even virtually represented in Parliament. And here give me Leave to observe that it would be a Work worthy of the best patriotick Spirits in the Nation to effectuate an Alteration in this putrid Part of the Constitution; and, by restoring it to its pristine Perfection, prevent any “Order or Rank of the Subjects from imposing upon or binding the rest without their Consent.” But, I fear, the Gangrene has taken too deep Hold to be eradicated in these Days of Venality.
But if those People of Britain who are excluded from being Electors are not represented in Parliament, the Conclusion is much stronger against the People of the Colonies being represented; who are considered by the British Government itself, in every Instance of Parliamentary Legislation, as a distinct People.…

As then we can receive no Light from the Laws of the Kingdom, or from ancient History, to direct us in out Inquiry, we must have Recourse to the Law of Nature, and those Rights of Mankind which flow from it.

I have observed before that when Subjects are deprived of their civil Rights, or are dissatisfied with the Place they hold in the Community, they have a natural Right to quit the Society of which they are Members, and to retire into another Country. Now when Men exercise this Right, and withdraw themselves from their Country, they recover their natural Freedom and Independence: The Jurisdiction and Sovereignty of the State they have quitted ceases; and if they unite, and by common Consent take Possession of a New Country, and form themselves into a political Society, they become a sovereign State, independent of the State from which they have separated. If then the Subjects of England have a natural Right to relinquish their Country, and by retiring from it, and associating together, to form a new political Society and independent State, they must have a Right, by Compact with Sovereign of the Nation, to remove into a new Country, and to form a civil Establishment upon the Terms of the Compact. In such a Case, the Terms of the Compact must be obligatory and binding upon the Parties; they must be the Magna Charta, the fundamental Principles of Government, to this new Society; and every Infringement of them must be wrong, and may be opposed. It will be necessary then to examine whether any such Compact was entered into between the Sovereign and those English Subjects who established themselves in America.
BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

To Lord Kaims

LETTER

February 25, 1767

London, Great Britain

BACKGROUND

While in Great Britain, the famous American colonist Benjamin Franklin addressed this letter to his friend, Lord Kaims.

ANNOTATIONS

I Received your Favour of Jan. 19. You have kindly reliev’d me from the Pain I had long been under. You are Goodness itself.

I ought long since to have answered yours of Decr. 25. 1765. I never receiv’d a Letter that contain’d Sentiments more suitable to my own. It found me under much Agitation of Mind on the very important Subject it treated. It fortified me greatly in the Judgment I was inclined to form (tho’ contrary to the general Vogue) on the then delicate and critical Situation of Affairs between Britain and her Colonies; and on that weighty Point their Union: You guess’d aright in supposing I could not be a Mute in that Play. I was extremely busy, attending Members of both Houses, informing, explaining, consulting, disputing, in a continual Hurry from Morning to Night till the Affair was happily ended. During the Course of it, being called before the House of Commons, I spoke my Mind pretty plainly. Inclos’d I send you the imperfect Account that was taken of that Examination; you will there see how intirely we agree, except in a Point of Fact of which you could not but be mis-inform’d, the Papers at that time being full of mistaken Assertions, that the Colonies had been the Cause of the War, and had ungratefully refus’d to bear any part of the Expence of it. I send

it you now, because I apprehend some late Incidents are likely to revive the Contest between the two Countries. I fear it will be a mischievous one. It becomes a Matter of great Importance that clear Ideas should be formed on solid Principles, both in Britain and America, of the true political Relation between them, and the mutual Duties belonging to that Relation. Till this is done, they will be often jarring. I know none whose Knowledge, Sagacity and Impartiality, qualify them so thoroughly for such a Service, as yours do you. I wish therefore you would consider it. You may thereby be the happy Instrument of great Good to the Nation, and of preventing much Mischief and Bloodshed. I am fully persuaded with you, that a consolidating Union, by a fair and equal Representation of all the Parts of this Empire in Parliament, is the only firm Basis on which its political Grandeur and Stability can be founded. Ireland once wish’d it, but now rejects it. The Time has been when the Colonies might have been pleas’d with it; they are now indifferent about it; and, if ’tis much longer delay’d, they too will refuse it. But the Pride of this People cannot bear the Thoughts of it. Every Man in England seems to consider himself as a Piece of a Sovereign over America; seems to jostle himself into the Throne with the King, and talks of OUR Subjects in the Colonies. The Parliament cannot well and wisely make Laws suited to the Colonies, without being properly and truly informed of their Circumstances, Abilities, Temper, &c. This it cannot be without Representatives from thence. And yet it is fond of this Power, and averse to the only Means of duly acquiring the necessary Knowledge for exercising it, which is desiring to be omnipotent without being omniscient.

I have mentioned that the Contest is like to be revived. It is on this Occasion. In the same Session with the Stamp Act, an Act was pass’d to regulate the Quartering of Soldiers in America. When the Bill was first brought in, it contain’d a Clause impowering the Officers to quarter their Soldiers in private Houses; this we warmly oppos’d, and got it omitted. The Bill pass’d however, with a Clause that empty Houses, Barns, &c. should be hired for them; and that the respective Provinces where they were, should pay the Expence, and furnish Firing, Bedding, Drink, and some other Articles, to the Soldiers, gratis. There is no way for
any Province to do this, but by the Assembly’s making a Law to raise the Money. Pensilvania Assembly has made such a Law. New York Assembly has refus’d to do it. And now all the Talk here is to send a Force to compel them.

The Reasons given by the Assembly to the Governor for their Refusal, are, That they understand the Act to mean the furnishing such things to Soldiers only while on their March thro’ the Country, and not to great Bodies of Soldiers, to be fixt as at present in the Province, the Burthen in the latter Case being greater than the Inhabitants can bear: That it would put it in the Power of the Captain General to oppress the Province at pleasure, &c. But there is suppos’d to be another Reason at bottom, which they intimate, tho’ they do not plainly express it; to wit, that it is of the nature of an internal Tax laid on them by Parliament, which has no Right so to do. Their Refusal is here called Rebellion, and Punishment is thought of.

Now waiving that Point of Right, and supposing the Legislatures in America subordinate to the Legislature of Great Britain, one might conceive, I think, a Power in the superior Legislature to forbid the inferior Legislature’s making particular Laws; but to enjoin it to make a particular Law, contrary to its own Judgment, seems improper, an Assembly or Parliament not being an executive Officer of Government, whose Duty it is, in Law-making, to obey Orders; but a deliberative Body, who are to consider what comes before them, its Propriety, Practicability, or Possibility, and to determine accordingly. The very Nature of a Parliament seems to be destroy’d, by supposing it may be bound and compell’d by a Law of a superior Parliament to make a Law contrary to its own Judgment.

Indeed the Act of Parliament in question has not, as in other Acts, when a Duty is injoined, directed a Penalty on Neglect or Refusal, and a Mode of Recovering that Penalty. It seems therefore to the People in America as a mere Requisition, which they are at Liberty to comply with or not as it may suit or not suit the different Circumstances of different Colonies. Pensilvania has therefore voluntarily comply’d. New York, as I said before, has refus’d. The Ministry that made the Act, and all their Adherents, call out for Vengeance. The present Ministry are perplexed, and the Measures they will finally take on the Occasion are unknown.
But sure I am, that, if Force is us’d, great Mischief will ensue, the Affections of the People of America to this Country will be alienated, your Commerce will be diminished, and a total Separation of Interests be the final Consequence.

It is a common but mistaken Notion here, that the Colonies were planted at the Expence of Parliament, and that therefore the Parliament has a Right to tax them, &c. The Truth is, they were planted at the Expence of private Adventurers, who went over there to settle with Leave of the King given by Charter. On receiving this Leave and these Charters, the Adventurers voluntarily engag’d to remain the King’s Subjects, though in a foreign Country, a Country which had not been conquer’d by either King or Parliament, but was possess’d by a free People. When our Planters arriv’d, they purchas’d the Lands of the Natives without putting King or Parliament to any Expence. Parliament had no hand in their Settlement, was never so much as consulted about their Constitution, and took no kind of Notice of them till many Years after they were established; never attempted to meddle with the Government of them, till that Period when it destroy’d the Constitution of all Parts of the Empire, and usurp’d a Power over Scotland, Ireland, Lords and King. I except only the two modern Colonies, or rather Attempts to make Colonies, (for they succeed but poorly, and as yet hardly deserve the Name of Colonies) I mean Georgia and Nova Scotia, which have been hitherto little better than Parliamentary Jobbs. Thus all the Colonies acknowledge the King as their Sovereign: His Governors there represent his Person. Laws are made by their Assemblies or little Parliaments, with the Governor’s Assent, subject still to the King’s Pleasure to confirm or annul them. Suits arising in the Colonies, and Differences between Colony and Colony, are not brought before your Lords of Parliament, as those within the Realm, but determined by the King in Council. In this View they seem so many separate little States, subject to the same Prince. The Sovereignty of the King is therefore easily understood. But nothing is more common here than to talk of the Sovereignty of Parliament, and the Sovereignty of this Nation over the Colonies; a kind of Sovereignty the Idea of which is not so clear, nor does it clearly appear on what Foundations it is established. On the other hand it seems necessary for the common Good of the Empire, that a Power be
lodg’d somewhere to regulate its general Commerce; this, as Things are at present circum-
stance’d, can be plac’d no where so properly as in the Parliament of Great Britain; and there-
fore tho’ that Power has in some Instances been executed with great Partiality to Britain
and Prejudice to the Colonies, they have nevertheless always submitted to it. Customhouses
are established in all of them by Virtue of Laws made here, and the Duties constantly paid,
except by a few Smugglers, such as are here and in all Countries; but internal Taxes laid on
them by Parliament are and ever will be objected to, for the Reasons that you will see in the
mentioned Examination.

Upon the whole, I have lived so great a Part of my Life in Britain, and have formed so many
Friendships in it, that I love it and wish its Prosperity, and therefore wish to see that Union
on which alone I think it can be secur’d and establish’d. As to America, the Advantages of
such an Union to her are not so apparent. She may suffer at present under the arbitrary
Power of this Country; she may suffer for a while in a Separation from it; but these are
temporary Evils that she will outgrow. Scotland and Ireland are differently circumstanc’d.

Confin’d by the Sea, they can scarcely increase in Numbers, Wealth and Strength so as to
overbalance England. But America, an immense Territory, favour’d by Nature with all Ad-
vantages of Climate, Soil, great navigable Rivers and Lakes, &c. must become a great Coun-
try, populous and mighty; and will in a less time than is generally conceiv’d be able to shake
off any Shackles that may be impos’d on her, and perhaps place them on the Imposers. In
the mean time, every Act of Oppression will sour their Tempers, lessen greatly if not anni-
hilate the Profits of your Commerce with them, and hasten their final Revolt: For the Seeds
of Liberty are universally sown there, and nothing can eradicate them. And yet there re-
 mains among that People so much Respect, Veneration and Affection for Britain, that, if
cultivated prudently, with kind Usage and Tenderness for their Privileges, they might be
easily govern’d still for Ages, without Force or any considerable Expence. But I do not see
here a sufficient Quantity of the Wisdom that is necessary to produce such a Conduct, and
I lament the Want of it.

I borrow’d at Millar’s the new Edition of your Principles of Equity, and have read with great
Pleasure the preliminary Discourse. I have never before met with anything so satisfactory
on the Subject. While Reading it, I made a few Remarks as I went along: They are not of much Importance, but I send you the Paper.

I know the Lady you mention, having, when in England before, met with her once or twice at Lord Bath’s. I remember I then entertain’d the same Opinion of her that you express. On the Strength of your kind Recommendation, I purpose soon to wait on her.

This is unexpectedly grown a long Letter. The Visit to Scotland, and the Art of Virtue, we will talk of hereafter. It is now time to say, that I am, with increasing Esteem and Affection, My dear Friend, Yours ever

B Franklin
VIRGINIA HOUSE OF BURGESSES

Resolves

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION

May 16, 1765

The Capitol | Williamsburg, Virginia

BACKGROUND

The Virginia House of Burgesses passed this resolution in response to the British Parliament’s Stamp Act of 1765.

ANNOTATIONS

Resolved, That it is the Opinion of this Committee, that the sole Right of imposing Taxes on the Inhabitants of this his Majesty’s Colony and Dominion of Virginia, is now, and ever hath been, legally and constitutionally vested in the House of Burgesses, lawfully convened according to the ancient and establish Practice, with the Consent of the Council, and of his Majesty, the King of Great-Britain, or his Governor, for the Time being.

Resolved, That it is the Opinion of this Committee, that it is the undoubted Privilege of the Inhabitants of this Colony, to petition their Sovereign for Redress of Grievances; and that it is lawful and expedient to procure the Concurrence of his Majesty’s other Colonies, in dutiful Addresses, praying the royal Interposition in Favour of the Violated Rights of America.

Resolved, That it is the Opinion of this Committee, that all Trials for Treason, Misprison of Treason, or for any Felony or Crime whatsoever, committed and done in this his Majesty’s said Colony and Dominion, by any Person or Persons, residing in this Colony, suspected of any Crime whatsoever, committed therein, and sending such Person, or Persons,

_____________________
to Places beyond the Sea, to be tried, is highly derogatory of the Rights of British subjects; as thereby the 
inestimable Privilege of being tried by a Jury from the Vicinage, as well as the Liberty of summoning and 
producing Witnesses on such Trial, will be taken away from the Party accused.

Resolved, That it is the Opinion of this Committee, that an humble, dutiful, and loyal Ad-

dress, be presented to his Majesty, to assure him of our inviolable Attachment to his sacred 
Person and Government; and to beseech his royal Interposition, as the Father of all his 
people, however remote from the Seat of his Empire, to quiet the Minds of his loyal Subjects 
of this Colony, and to avert from them, those Dangers and Miseries which will ensue, from 
the seizing and carrying beyond Sea, any Person residing in America, suspected of any 
Crime whatsoever, to be tried in any other Manner, than by the ancient and long estab-
lished Course of Proceeding.
NOVANGLUS (JOHN ADAMS)

A History of the Dispute with America,
From Its Origin in 1754 to the Present Time,
No. VII

ARTICLE EXCERPTS

1774

Boston Gazette | Boston, Massachusetts

BACKGROUND

John Adams wrote this as part of a series of articles in 1774 under the pseudonym Novanglus in response to articles by Daniel Leonard, who himself was writing under the pseudonym Massachusettensis and who was critical of the patriots’ position against Great Britain over the past several years.

ANNOTATIONS

To the Inhabitants of the Colony of Massachusetts-Bay

My Friends,

Our rhetorical magician, in his paper of January the 9th continues to wheedle. “You want nothing but to know the true state of facts, to rectify whatever is amiss.” He becomes an advocate for the poor of Boston! Is for making great allowance for the whigs. “The whigs are too valuable a part of the community to lose. He would not draw down the vengeance of Great Britain. He shall become an advocate for the leading whigs,” &C. It is in vain for us to enquire after the sincerity or consistency of all this. It is agreeable to the precept of Horace:

10  Irritat, mulcet falsis terroribus implet, ut magus.

And that is all he desires.

After a long discourse, which has nothing in it but what has been answered already, he comes to a great subject indeed, the British constitution; and undertakes to prove that “the authority of parliament extends to the colonies.” …

The question is not therefore, whether the authority of parliament extends to the colonies in any case; for it is admitted by the whigs that it does in that of commerce: But whether it extends in all cases….

If the English parliament were to govern us, where did they get the right, without our consent to take the Scottish parliament, into a participation of the government over us? When this was done, was the American share of the democracy of the constitution consulted? If not, were not the Americans deprived of the benefit of the democratical part of the constitution?...

If a new constitution was to be formed for the whole British dominions, and a supreme legislature coextensive with it, upon the general principles of the English constitution, an equal mixture of monarchy, aristocracy and democracy, let us see what would be necessary. England have six millions of people we will say: America has three. England has five hundred members in the house of commons we will say: America must have two hundred and fifty. Is it possible she should maintain them there, or could they at such a distance know the state, the sense or exigences of their constituents? Ireland too must be incorporated, and send another hundred or two of members. The territory in the East-Indies and West India islands must send members. And after all this, every navigation act, every act of trade must be repealed. America and the East and West Indies and Africa too, must have equal liberty to trade with all the world, that the favoured inhabitants of Great-Britain have now. Will the ministry thank Massachusettensis for becoming an advocate for such an union and incorporation of all the dominions of the king of Great-Britain? Yet without such an union, a legislature which shall be sovereign and supreme in all cases whatsoever, and co-extensive with the empire, can never be established upon the general principles of the English constitution, which Massachusettensis lays down, viz. an equal mixture of monarchy,
aristocracy and democracy. Nay further, in order to comply with this principle, this new
government, this mighty Colossus which is to bestride the narrow world, must have an
house of lords consisting of Irish, East and West Indian, African, American, as well as Eng-
lish and Scottish noblemen; for the nobility ought to be scattered about all the dominions,
as well as the representatives of the commons. If in twenty years more America should have
six millions of inhabitants, as there is a boundless territory to fill up, she must have five
hundred representatives. Upon these principles, if in forty years, she should have twelve
millions, a thousand; and if the inhabitants of the three kingdoms remain as they are, being
already full of inhabitants, what will become of your supream legislative? It will be trans-
lated, crown and all, to America. This is a sublime system for America. It will flatter those
ideas of independency, which the tories impute to them, if they have any such, more than
any other plan of independency, that I have ever heard projected….

Is it not astonishing then, that any British minister should ever have considered this subject
so little as to believe it possible for him to new model all our governments, to tax us by an
authority that never taxed us before, and subdue us to an implicit obedience to a legislature,
that millions of us scarcely ever tho’t any thing about.

I have said that the practice of free governments alone can be quoted with propriety, to
shew the sense of nations. But the sense and practice of nations is not enough. Their prac-
tice must be reasonable, just and right, or it will not govern Americans.

Absolute monarchies, whatever their practice may be, are nothing to us. For as Harrington
observes, “Absolute monarchy, as that of the Turks, neither plants its people at home nor
abroad, otherwise than as tenants for life or at will; wherefore its national and provincial
government is all one.”

I deny therefore that the practice of free nations, or the opinions of the best writers upon
the law of nations, will warrant the position of Massachusettensis, that when a nation takes
possession of a distant territory, that becomes a part of the state equally with its ancient
possessions. The practice of free nations, and the opinions of the best writers, are in general
on the contrary.
I agree, that “two supreme and independent authorities cannot exist in the same state,” any more than two supreme beings in one universe. And therefore I contend, that our provincial legislatures are the only supreme authorities in our colonies. Parliament, notwithstanding this, may be allowed an authority supreme and sovereign over the ocean, which may be limited by the banks of the ocean, or the bounds of our charters; our charters give us no authority over the high seas. Parliament has our consent to assume a jurisdiction over them. And here is a line fairly drawn between the rights of Britain and the rights of the colonies, viz. the banks of the ocean, or low water mark. The line of division between common law and civil, or maritime law. If this is not sufficient—if parliament are at a loss for any principle of natural, civil, maritime, moral or common law, on which to ground any authority over the high seas, the Atlantic especially, let the colonies be treated like reasonable creatures, and they will discover great ingenuity and modesty: The acts of trade and navigation might be confirmed by provincial laws, and carried into execution by our own courts and juries, and in this case illicit trade would be cut up by the roots forever. I knew the smuggling tories in New-York and Boston would cry out against this, because it would not only destroy their profitable game of smuggling, but their whole place and pension system. But the whigs, that is a vast majority of the whole continent, would not regard the smuggling tories. In one word, if public principles and motives and arguments, were alone to determine this dispute between the two countries, it might be settled forever, in a few hours; but the everlasting clamours of prejudice, passion and private interest, drown every consideration of that sort, and are precipitating us into a civil war.

“If then we are a part of the British empire, we must be subject to the supreme power of the state, which is vested in the estates in parliament.”

Here again we are to be conjured out of our senses by the magic in the words “British empire,”—and “supreme power of the state.” But however it may sound, I say we are not a part of the British empire. Because the British government is not an empire. The governments of France, Spain, &c. are not empires, but monarchies, supposed to be governed by fixed fundamental laws, tho’ not really. The British government, is still less intitled to the style of an empire: it is a limited monarchy. If Aristotle, Livy, and Harrington, knew what
a republic was, the British constitution is much more like a republic than an empire. They define a republic to be a government of laws, and not of men. If this definition is just, the British constitution is nothing more nor less than a republic, in which the king is first magistrate. This office being hereditary, and being possessed of such ample and splendid prerogatives, is no objection to the government’s being a republic, as long as it is bound by fixed laws, which the people have a voice in making, and a right to defend. An empire is a despotism, and an emperor a despot, bound by no law or limitation, but his own will: it is a stretch of tyranny beyond absolute monarchy. For altho’ the will of an absolute monarch is law, yet his edicts must be registered by parliaments. Even this formality is not necessary in an empire. There the maxim is *quod principi placuit legis, habet vigorem*, even without having that will and pleasure recorded. There are but three empires now in Europe, the German, or Holy Roman, the Russian and the Ottoman.

There is another sense indeed in which the word empire is used, in which it may be applied to the government of Geneva, or any other republic, as well as to monarchy, or despotism. In this sense it is synonymous with government, rule or dominion. In this sense, we are within the dominion, rule or government of the king of Great-Britain.

The question should be, whether we are a part of the kingdom of Great-Britain: this is the only language, known in English laws. We are not then a part of the British kingdom, realm or state; and therefore the supreme power of the kingdom, realm or state, is not upon these principles, the supreme power over us. That “supreme power over America is vested in the estates in parliament,” is an affront to us; for there is not an acre of American land represented there—there are no American estates in parliament.

To say that we “must be” subject, seems to betray a consciousness that we are not by any law or upon any principles, but those of meer power; and an opinion that we ought to be, or that it is necessary that we should be. But if this should be admitted, for argument sake only, what is the consequence? The consequences that may fairly be drawn are these. That Britain has been imprudent enough to let Colonies be planted, untill they are become numerous and important, without ever having wisdom enough to concert a plan for their
government, consistent with her own welfare. That now it is necessary to make them submit to the authority of parliament: and because there is no principle of law or justice, or reason, by which she can effect it: therefore she will resort to war and conquest—to the maxim *delenda est Carthago*. These are the consequences, according to this writer’s ideas.

We think the consequences are, that she has after 150 years, discovered a defect in her government, which ought to be supply’d by some just and reasonable means: that is, by the consent of the Colonies; for metaphysicians and politicians may dispute forever, but they will never find any other moral principle or foundation of rule or obedience, than the consent of governors and governed. She has found out that the great machine will not go any longer without a new wheel. She will make this herself. We think she is making it of such materials and workmanship as will tear the whole machine to pieces. We are willing, if she can convince us of the necessity of such a wheel, to assist with artists and materials, in making it, so that it may answer the end: But she says, we shall have no share in it; and if we will not let her patch it up as she pleases, her Massachusettensis’s and other advocates tell us, she will tear it to pieces herself, by cutting our throats. To this kind of reasoning we can only answer, that we will not stand still to be butchered. We will defend our lives as long as providence shall enable us.

“It is beyond doubt, that it was the sense both of the Parent Country, and our Ancestors, that they were to remain subject to parliament.”

This has been often asserted, and as often contradicted, and fully confuted. The confutation, may not, however, have come to every eye which has read this News-Paper.

The public acts of kings and ministers of state, in that age, when our ancestors emigrated, which were not complained of, remonstrated and protested against by the commons, are look’d upon as sufficient proof of the “sense” of the parent country.

The charter to the treasurer and company of Virginia, 23 March 1609, grants ample powers of government, legislative, executive and judicial, and then contains an express covenant “to and with the said treasurer and company, their successors, factors and assigns, that they, and every of them, shall be free from all taxes and impositions forever, upon any goods or
merchandizes, at any time or times hereafter, either upon importation thither, or exportation from thence, into our realm of England, or into any other of our realms or dominions.”

I agree with this writer that the authority of a supreme legislature, includes the right of taxation. Is not this quotation then an irresistible proof, that it was not the sense of king James or his ministers, or of the ancestors of the Virginians, that they were “to remain subject to parliament as a supreme legislature.”

After this, James issued a proclamation, recalling this patent, but this was never regarded—then Charles issued another proclamation, which produced a remonstrance from Virginia, which was answered by a letter from the lords of the privy council, 22d July 1634, containing the royal assurance that “all their estates, trade, freedom, and privileges should be enjoyed by them, in as extensive a manner, as they enjoyed them before those proclamations.”

Here is another evidence of the sense of the king and his ministers.

Afterwards parliament sent a squadron of ships to Virginia—the colony rose in open resistance, untill the parliamentary commissioners granted them conditions, that they should enjoy the privileges of Englishmen; that their assembly should transact the affairs of the colony; that they should have a free trade to all places and nations, as the people of England; and 4thly, that “Virginia shall be free from all taxes, customs, and impositions whatever, and none shall be imposed on them without consent of their general assembly; and that neither forts nor castles be erected, or garrisons maintained without their consent.”

One would think this was evidence enough of the sense both of the parent country, and our ancestors.

After the acts of navigation were passed, Virginia sent agents to England, and a remonstrance against those acts. Charles, in answer, sent a declaration under the privy seal, 19 April 1676, affirming, “that taxes ought not to be laid upon the inhabitants and proprietors of the colony, but by the common consent of the general assembly; except such impositions as the parliament should lay on the commodities imported into England from the colony.” And he ordered a charter, under the great seal, to secure this right to the Virginians.
What becomes of the “sense” of the parent country, and our ancestors? For the ancestors of the Virginians, are our ancestors, when we speak of ourselves as Americans….

Afterwards in 1677, The General Court passed a law, which shews the sense of our ancestors in a very strong light. It is in these words. “This court being informed, by letters received this day from our messengers, of his Majesty’s expectation that the acts of Trade and Navigation be exactly and punctually observed by this his Majesty’s colony, his pleasure therein not having before now [been] signified unto us, either by express from his Majesty, or any of his ministers of state; It is therefore hereby ordered, and by the authority of this court enacted, that henceforth, all masters of ships, ketches, or other vessels, of greater or lesser burthen, arriving in, or sailing from any of the ports in this jurisdiction, do, without coven, or fraud, yield faithful and constant obedience unto, and observation of, all the said acts of navigation and trade, on penalty of suffering such forfeitures, loss and damage as in the said acts are particularly expressed. And the governor and council, and all officers, commissioned and authorized by them, are hereby ordered and required to see to the strict observation of the said acts.” As soon as they had passed this law, they wrote a letter to their agent, in which they acknowledge they had not conformed to the acts of trade; and they say, they “apprehended them to be an invasion of the rights, liberties and properties of the subjects of his Majesty in the colony, they not being represented in parliament, and according to the usual sayings of the learned in the law, the laws of England were bounded within the four seas, and did not reach America. However, as his Majesty had signified his pleasure, that these acts should be observed in the Massachusetts, they had made provision by a law of the colony, that they should be strictly attended from time to time, although it greatly discouraged trade, and was a great damage to his Majesty’s plantation.”

Thus it appears, that the ancient Massachusettensians and Virginians, had precisely the same sense of the authority of parliament, viz. that it had none at all: and the same sense of the necessity, that by the voluntary act of the colonies, their free cheerful consent, it should be allowed the power of regulating trade: and this is precisely the idea of the late Congress at Philadelphia, expressed in the fourth proposition in their Bill of Rights.
But this was the sense of the parent country too, at that time; for K. Charles II. in a letter to
the Massachusetts, after this law had been laid before him, has these words, “We are in-
formed that you have lately made some good provision for observing the acts of trade and
navigation, which is well pleasing unto us.” Had he, or his ministers an idea that parliament
was the sovereign legislative over the Colony? If he had, would he not have censured this
law as an insult to that legislature?

I sincerely hope, we shall see no more such round affirmations, that it was the sense of the
parent country and our ancestors, that they were to remain subject to parliament.

So far from thinking themselves subject to parliament, that during the Interregnum, it was
their desire and design to have been a free commonwealth, an independent Republic; and
after the restoration, it was with the utmost reluctance, that in the course of 16 or 17 years,
they were bro’t to take the oaths of allegiance: and for some time after this, they insisted
upon taking an oath of fidelity to the Country, before that of allegiance to the King.

That “it is evident from the Charter itself,” that they were to remain subject to parliament,
is very unaccountable, when there is not one word in either Charter concerning parliament.

That the authority of parliament has been exercised almost ever since the settlement of the
country, is a mistake; for there is no instance, untill the first Navigation Act, which was in
1660, more than 40 years after the first settlement. This act was never executed or regarded,
until 17 years afterwards, and then it was not executed as an act of parliament, but as a law
of the colony, to which the king agreed….

We have by our own express consent contracted to observe the navigation act, and by our
implied consent, by long usage and uninterrupted acquiescence, have submitted to the
other acts of trade, however grievous some of them may be. This may be compared to a
treaty of commerce, by which those distinct states are cemented together, in perpetual
league and amity. And if any further ratifications of this pact or treaty are necessary, the
colonies would readily enter into them, provided their other liberties were inviolate…. 
The only proposition, in all this writer’s long string of pretended absurdities, which he says follow from the position, that we are distinct states, is this,—That “as the king must govern each state by its parliament, those several parliaments would pursue the particular interest of its own state and however well disposed the king might be to pursue a line of interest that was common to all, the checks and controul that he would meet with, would render it impossible.” Every argument ought to be allowed its full weight: and therefore candor obliges me to acknowledge, that here lies all the difficulty that there is in this whole controversy. There has been, from first to last, on both sides of the Atlantic, an idea, an apprehension that it was necessary, there should be some superintending power, to draw together all the wills, and unite all the strength of the subjects in all the dominions, in case of war, and in the case of trade. The necessity of this, in case of trade, has been so apparent, that as has often been said, we have consented that parliament should exercise such a power. In case of war, it has by some been thought necessary. But in fact and experience, it has not been found so. What tho’ the proprietary colonies, on account of disputes with the proprietors, did not come in so early to the assistance of the general cause in the last war, as they ought, and perhaps one of them not at all! The inconveniences of this were small, in comparison of the absolute ruin to the liberties of all which must follow the submission to parliament, in all cases, which would be giving up all the popular limitations upon the government. These inconveniences fell chiefly upon New England. She was necessitated to greater exertions. But she had rather suffer these again and again, than others infinitely greater. However this subject has now been so long in contemplation, that it is fully understood now, in all the colonies: so that there is no danger, in case of another war, of any colonies failing of its duty.

But admitting the proposition in its full force, that it is absolutely necessary there should be a supreme power, coextensive with all the dominions, will it follow that parliament as now constituted has a right to assume this supream jurisdiction? By no means.

A union of the colonies might be projected, and an American legislature: or if America has 3,000,000 people, and the whole dominions twelve, she ought to send a quarter part of all
the members to the house of commons, and instead of holding parliaments always at West-
minster, the haughty members for Great-Britain, must humble themselves, one session in
four, to cross the Atlantic, and hold the parliament in America.

There is no avoiding all inconveniences, in human affairs: The greatest possible or conceiv-
able, would arise from ceding to parliament all power over us, without a representation in
it: the next greatest, would accrue from any plan that can be devised for a representation
there. The least of all [would] arise from going on as we begun, and fared well for 150 years,
by letting parliament regulate trade, and our own assemblies all other matters.

As to “the prerogatives not being defined or limited,” it is as much so in the Colonies as in
Great Britain, and as well understood, and as cheerfully submitted to in the former as the
latter….

But perhaps it will be said, that we are to enjoy the British constitution in our supreme
legislature, the Parliament, not in our provincial legislatures.

To this I answer, if parliament is to be our supreme legislature, we shall be under a compleat
oligarchy or aristocracy, not the British Constitution, which this writer himself defines a
mixture of monarchy, aristocracy and democracy. For King, lords and commons, will con-
stitute one great oligarchy, as they will stand related to America, as much as the Decimvirs
did in Rome. With this difference for the worse, that our rulers are to be three thousand
miles off. The definition of an oligarchy, is a government by a number of grandees, over
whom the people have no controul. The states of Holland were once chosen by the people
frequently. Then chosen for life. Now they are not chosen by the people at all. When a
member dies, his place is filled up not by the people he is to represent, but by the states. Is
not this depriving the Hollanders of a free constitution, and subjecting them to an aristoc-
racy, or oligarchy? Will not the government of America be like it? Will not representatives
be chosen for them by others, whom they never saw nor heard of? If our provincial consti-
tutions are in any respect imperfect and want alteration, they have capacity enough to dis-
cern it, and power enough to effect it, without the interposition of parliament. There never
was an American constitution attempted by parliament, before the Quebec Bill and Massachusetts Bill. These are such samples of what they may and probably will be, that few Americans are in love with them. However, America will never allow that parliament has any authority to alter their constitution at all. She is wholly penetrated with a sense of the necessity of resisting it, at all hazards. And she would resist it, if the constitution of the Massachusetts had been altered as much for the better, as it is for the worse. The question we insist on most, is not whether the alteration is for the better or not, but whether parliament has any right to make any alteration at all. And it is the universal sense of America, that it has none.

We are told that “the provincial constitutions have no principle of stability within themselves”. This is so great a mistake, that there is not more order or stability in any government upon the globe, than there ever has been in that of Connecticut. The same may be said of the Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, and indeed of the others, very nearly. “That these constitutions in turbulent times would become wholly monarchial or wholly republican.” They must be such times as would have a similar effect upon the constitution at home. But in order to avoid the danger of this, what is to be done. Not give us an English constitution, it seems, but make sure of us at once, by giving us constitutions wholly monarchical, annihilating our houses of representatives first, by taking from them the support of government, &c. and then making the councils and judges wholly dependent on the crown.

That a representation in parliament is impracticable we all agree: but the consequence is, that we must have a representation in our supreme legislatures here. This was the consequence that was drawn by kings, ministers, our ancestors, and the whole nation, more than a century ago, when the colonies were first settled, and continued to be the general sense untill the last peace, and it must be the general sense again soon, or Great-Britain will lose her colonies.
“This is apparently the meaning of that celebrated passage in governor Hutchinsons letter, that rung through the continent, viz. (There must be an abridgment of what is called English liberties.)” But all the art and subtlety of Massachusettensis will never vindicate or excuse that expression. According to this writer, it should have been “there is an abridgment of English liberties and it can’t be otherwise.” But every candid reader must see that the letter writer had more than that in his view and in his wishes. In the same letter, a little before, he says, “what marks of resentment the parliament will shew, whether they will be upon the province in general or particular persons, is extremely uncertain; but that they will be placed somewhere is most certain, and I add, because I think it ought to be so.” Is it possible to read this without thinking of the port bill, the charter bill, and the resolves for sending persons to England by the statute of H. 8, to be tried! But this is not all. “This is most certainly a crisis,” says he. &c. “If no measure shall have been taken to secure this dependence (i.e. the dependence which a colony ought to have upon the parent state) it is all over with us.” “The friends of government will be utterly disheartned, and the friends of anarchy will be afraid of nothing, be it ever so extravagant.” But this is not all. “I never think of the measures necessary for the peace and good order of the colonies without pain.” “There must be an abridgment of what are called English liberties.” What could he mean? Any thing less than depriving us of trial by jury? Perhaps he wanted an act of parliament to try persons here for treason by a court of admiralty. Perhaps an act that the province should be governed by a governor and a mandamus council, without an house of representatives. But to put it out of all doubt that his meaning was much worse than Massachusettensis endeavours to make it, he explains himself in a subsequent part of the letter. “I wish,” says he, “the good of the colony, when I wish to see some further restraint of liberty.” Here it is rendered certain, that he is pleading for a further restraint of liberty, not explaining the restraint, he apprehended the constitution had already laid us under.

My indignation at this letter, has sometimes been softened by compassion. It carries on the face of it, evident marks of madness. It was written in such a transport of passions, ambition, and revenge chiefly, that his reason was manifestly overpowered. The vessel was tost
in such a hurricane, that she could not feel her helm. Indeed he seems to have had a confused consciousness of this himself. “Pardon me this excursion,” says he, “it really proceeds from the state of mind, into which our perplexed affairs often throws me.”

“It is our highest interest to continue a part of the British empire, and equally our duty to remain subject to the authority of parliament,” says Massachusettensis.

We are a part of the British dominions, that is of the king of Great-Britain, and it is our interest and duty to continue so. It is equally our interest and duty to continue subject to the authority of parliament, in the regulation of our trade, as long as she shall leave us to govern our internal policy, and to give and grant our own money, and no longer.

This letter concludes with an agreeable flight of fancy. The time may not be so far off, however, as this writer imagines, when the colonies may have the balance of numbers and wealth in her favour. But when that shall happen, if we should attempt to rule her by an American parliament, without an adequate representation in it, she will infallibly resist us by her arms.
PATRICK HENRY, DELEGATE TO THE SECOND VIRGINIA CONVENTION

On the Resolution for a State of Defense

SPEECH

March 23, 1775
St. John’s Episcopal Church | Richmond, Virginia

Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death

BACKGROUND

Just weeks before the battles of Lexington and Concord in Massachusetts, Patrick Henry delivered this speech in support of raising a company of cavalry or infantry in every Virginian county.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Why does Patrick Henry think reconciliation with Great Britain is impossible?

2. What are the only alternatives to war with Great Britain?

Mr. President:

No man thinks more highly than I do of the patriotism, as well as abilities, of the very worthy gentlemen who have just addressed the House. But different men often see the same subject in different lights; and, therefore, I hope it will not be thought disrespectful to those gentlemen if, entertaining as I do opinions of a character very opposite to theirs, I shall speak forth my sentiments freely and without reserve. This is no time for ceremony.

The question before the House is one of awful moment to this country. For my own part, I consider it as nothing less than a question of freedom or slavery; and in proportion to the magnitude of the subject ought to be the freedom of the debate. It is only in this way that we can hope to arrive at truth, and fulfill the great responsibility which we hold to God and our country. Should I keep back my opinions at such a time, through fear of giving offense, I should consider myself as guilty of treason towards my country, and of an act of disloyalty toward the Majesty of Heaven, which I revere above all earthly kings.

Mr. President, it is natural to man to indulge in the illusions of hope. We are apt to shut our eyes against a painful truth, and listen to the song of that siren till she transforms us into beasts. Is this the part of wise men, engaged in a great and arduous struggle for liberty? Are we disposed to be of the number of those who, having eyes, see not, and, having ears, hear not, the things which so nearly concern their temporal salvation? For my part, whatever anguish of spirit it may cost, I am willing to know the whole truth; to know the worst, and to provide for it.

I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience. I know of no way of judging of the future but by the past. And judging by the past, I wish to know what there has been in the conduct of the British ministry for the last ten years to justify those hopes with which gentlemen have been pleased to solace themselves and the House.

Is it that insidious smile with which our petition has been lately received? Trust it not, sir; it will prove a snare to your feet. Suffer not yourselves to be betrayed with a kiss.
Ask yourselves how this gracious reception of our petition comports with those warlike preparations which cover our waters and darken our land. Are fleets and armies necessary to a work of love and reconciliation? Have we shown ourselves so unwilling to be reconciled that force must be called in to win back our love? Let us not deceive ourselves, sir. These are the implements of war and subjugation; the last arguments to which kings resort.

I ask gentlemen, sir, what means this martial array, if its purpose be not to force us to submission? Can gentlemen assign any other possible motive for it? Has Great Britain any enemy, in this quarter of the world, to call for all this accumulation of navies and armies? No, sir, she has none. They are meant for us: they can be meant for no other. They are sent over to bind and rivet upon us those chains which the British ministry have been so long forging.

And what have we to oppose to them? Shall we try argument? Sir, we have been trying that for the last ten years. Have we anything new to offer upon the subject? Nothing. We have held the subject up in every light of which it is capable; but it has been all in vain. Shall we resort to entreaty and humble supplication? What terms shall we find which have not been already exhausted? Let us not, I beseech you, sir, deceive ourselves longer.

Sir, we have done everything that could be done to avert the storm which is now coming on. We have petitioned; we have remonstrated; we have supplicated; we have prostrated ourselves before the throne, and have implored its interposition to arrest the tyrannical hands of the ministry and Parliament. Our petitions have been slighted; our remonstrances have produced additional violence and insult; our supplications have been disregarded; and we have been spurned, with contempt, from the foot of the throne!

In vain, after these things, may we indulge the fond hope of peace and reconciliation. There is no longer any room for hope. If we wish to be free—if we mean to preserve inviolate those inestimable privileges for which we have been so long contending—if we mean not basely to abandon the noble struggle in which we have been so long engaged, and which we have pledged ourselves never to abandon until the glorious object of our contest shall
be obtained—we must fight! I repeat it, sir, we must fight! An appeal to arms and to the God of hosts is all that is left us!

They tell us, sir, that we are weak; unable to cope with so formidable an adversary. But when shall we be stronger? Will it be the next week, or the next year? Will it be when we are totally disarmed, and when a British guard shall be stationed in every house? Shall we gather strength by irresolution and inaction? Shall we acquire the means of effectual resistance by lying supinely on our backs and hugging the delusive phantom of hope, until our enemies shall have bound us hand and foot?

Sir, we are not weak if we make a proper use of those means which the God of nature hath placed in our power. Three millions of people, armed in the holy cause of liberty, and in such a country as that which we possess, are invincible by any force which our enemy can send against us.

Besides, sir, we shall not fight our battles alone. There is a just God who presides over the destinies of nations, and who will raise up friends to fight our battles for us. The battle, sir, is not to the strong alone; it is to the vigilant, the active, the brave. Besides, sir, we have no election. If we were base enough to desire it, it is now too late to retire from the contest. There is no retreat but in submission and slavery! Our chains are forged! Their clanking may be heard on the plains of Boston! The war is inevitable—and let it come! I repeat it, sir, let it come.

It is in vain, sir, to extenuate the matter. Gentlemen may cry, peace, peace—but there is no peace. The war is actually begun! The next gale that sweeps from the north will bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms! Our brethren are already in the field! Why stand we here idle? What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?

Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!
EDMUND BURKE, MEMBER OF THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT FOR BRISTOL
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BACKGROUND

Edmund Burke offered these insights and policies to his fellow members of Parliament to attempt reconciliation with the colonists before open hostilities commenced.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What is the predominate feature of the Americans' character?

2. What form of government did the colonies enjoy?

3. What does Burke identify as the causes of American “disobedience”?

4. What course of action does Burke recommend Parliament take?

In this character of the Americans, a love of freedom is the predominating feature which marks and distinguishes the whole: and as an ardent is always a jealous affection, your colonies become suspicious, restive, and untractable, whenever they see the least attempt to wrest from them by force, or shuffle from them by chicane, what they think the only advantage worth living for. This fierce spirit of liberty is stronger in the English colonies probably than in any other people of the earth; and this from a great variety of powerful causes; which, to understand the true temper of their minds, and the direction which this spirit takes, it will not be amiss to lay open somewhat more largely.

First, the people of the colonies are descendants of Englishmen. England, Sir, is a nation, which still I hope respects, and formerly adored, her freedom. The colonists emigrated from you when this part of your character was most predominant; and they took this bias and direction the moment they parted from your hands. They are therefore not only devoted to liberty, but to liberty according to English ideas, and on English principles. Abstract liberty, like other mere abstractions, is not to be found. Liberty inheres in some sensible object; and every nation has formed to itself some favourite point, which by way of eminence becomes the criterion of their happiness. It happened, you know, Sir, that the great contests for freedom in this country were from the earliest times chiefly upon the question of taxing. Most of the contests in the ancient commonwealths turned primarily on the right of election of magistrates; or on the balance among the several orders of the state. The question of money was not with them so immediate. But in England it was otherwise. On this point of taxes the ablest pens, and most eloquent tongues, have been exercised; the greatest spirits have acted and suffered. In order to give the fullest satisfaction concerning the importance of this point, it was not only necessary for those who in argument defended the excellence of the English constitution, to insist on this privilege of granting money as a dry point of fact, and to prove, that the right had been acknowledged in ancient parchments, and blind usages, to reside in a certain body called a House of Commons. They went much farther; they attempted to prove, and they succeeded, that in theory it ought to be so, from the particular nature of a House of Commons, as an immediate representative of the people; whether the old records had delivered this oracle or not. They
took infinite pains to inculcate, as a fundamental principle, that in all monarchies the people must in effect themselves, mediately or immediately, possess the power of granting their own money, or no shadow of liberty could subsist. The colonies draw from you, as with their life-blood, these ideas and principles. Their love of liberty, as with you, fixed and attached on this specific point of taxing. Liberty might be safe, or might be endangered, in twenty other particulars, without their being much pleased or alarmed. Here they felt its pulse; and as they found that beat, they thought themselves sick or sound. I do not say whether they were right or wrong in applying your general arguments to their own case. It is not easy indeed to make a monopoly of theorems and corollaries. The fact is, that they did thus apply those general arguments; and your mode of governing them, whether through lenity or indolence, through wisdom or mistake, confirmed them in the imagination, that they, as well as you, had an interest in these common principles.

They were further confirmed in this pleasing error by the form of their provincial legislative assemblies. Their governments are popular in a high degree; some are merely popular; in all, the popular representative is the most weighty; and this share of the people in their ordinary government never fails to inspire them with lofty sentiments, and with a strong aversion from whatever tends to deprive them of their chief importance.

If anything were wanting to this necessary operation of the form of government, religion would have given it a complete effect. Religion, always a principle of energy, in this new people is no way worn out or impaired; and their mode of professing it is also one main cause of this free spirit. The people are Protestants; and of that kind which is the most adverse to all implicit submission of mind and opinion. This is a persuasion not only favourable to liberty, but built upon it. I do not think, Sir, that the reason of this averseness in the dissenting churches, from all that looks like absolute government, is so much to be sought in their religious tenets, as in their history. Every one knows that the Roman Catholic religion is at least coeval with most of the governments where it prevails; that it has generally gone hand in hand with them, and received great favour and every kind of support from authority. The Church of England too was formed from her cradle under the nursing care of regular government. But the dissenting interests have sprung up in direct
opposition to all the ordinary powers of the world; and could justify that opposition only
on a strong claim to natural liberty. Their very existence depended on the powerful and
unremitted assertion of that claim. All Protestantism, even the most cold and passive, is a
sort of dissent. But the religion most prevalent in our northern colonies is a refinement on
the principle of resistance; it is the dissidence of dissent, and the Protestantism of the
Protestant religion. This religion, under a variety of denominations agreeing in nothing but
in the communion of the spirit of liberty, is predominant in most of the northern provinces;
where the Church of England, notwithstanding its legal rights, is in reality no more than a
sort of private sect, not composing most probably the tenth of the people. The colonists left
England when this spirit was high, and in the emigrants was the highest of all; and even
that stream of foreigners, which has been constantly flowing into these colonies, has, for
the greatest part, been composed of dissenters from the establishments of their several
countries, and have brought with them a temper and character far from alien to that of the
people with whom they mixed.

Sir, I can perceive by their manner, that some gentlemen object to the latitude of this de-
scription; because in the southern colonies the Church of England forms a large body, and
has a regular establishment. It is certainly true. There is, however, a circumstance attending
these colonies, which, in my opinion, fully counterbalances this difference, and makes the
spirit of liberty still more high and haughty than in those to the northward. It is, that in
Virginia and the Carolinas they have a vast multitude of slaves. Where this is the case in
any part of the world, those who are free, are by far the most proud and jealous of their
freedom. Freedom is to them not only an enjoyment, but a kind of rank and privilege. Not
seeing there, that freedom, as in countries where it is a common blessing, and as broad and
general as the air, may be united with much abject toil, with great misery, with all the exte-
rior of servitude, liberty looks, amongst them, like something that is more noble and liberal.
I do not mean, Sir, to commend the superior morality of this sentiment, which has at least
as much pride as virtue in it; but I cannot alter the nature of man. The fact is so; and these
people of the southern colonies are much more strongly, and with a higher and more stub-
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born spirit, attached to liberty, than those to the northward. Such were all the ancient com-
monwealths; such were our Gothic ancestors; such in our days were the Poles; and such
will be all masters of slaves, who are not slaves themselves. In such a people, the haughtiness
of domination combines with the spirit of freedom, fortifies it, and renders it invincible.

Permit me, Sir, to add another circumstance in our colonies, which contributes no mean
part towards the growth and effect of this untractable spirit. I mean their education. In no
country perhaps in the world is the law so general a study. The profession itself is numerous
and powerful; and in most provinces it takes the lead. The greater number of the deputies
sent to the congress were lawyers. But all who read, and most do read, endeavour to obtain
some smattering in that science. I have been told by an eminent bookseller, that in no
branch of his business, after tracts of popular devotion, were so many books as those on
the law exported to the plantations. The colonists have now fallen into the way of printing
them for their own use. I hear that they have sold nearly as many of Blackstone's Commen-
taries in America as in England. General Gage marks out this disposition very particularly
in a letter on your table. He states, that all the people in his government are lawyers, or
smatterers in law; and that in Boston they have been enabled, by successful chicane, wholly
to evade many parts of one of your capital penal constitutions. The smartness of debate will
say, that this knowledge ought to teach them more clearly the rights of legislature, their
obligations to obedience, and the penalties of rebellion. All this is mighty well. But my hon-
ourable and learned friend on the floor, who condescends to mark what I say for animad-25
version, will disdain that ground. He has heard, as well as I, that when great honours and
great emoluments do not win over this knowledge to the service of the state, it is a formi-
dable adversary to government. If the spirit be not tamed and broken by these happy meth-
ods, it is stubborn and litigious. Abeunt studia in mores. This study renders men acute,
inquisitive, dexterous, prompt in attack, ready in defence, full of resources. In other coun-
tries, the people, more simple, and of a less mercurial cast, judge of an ill principle in gov-
ernment only by an actual grievance; here they anticipate the evil, and judge of the pressure
of the grievance by the badness of the principle. They augur misgovernment at a distance;
and snuff the approach of tyranny in every tainted breeze.
The last cause of this disobedient spirit in the colonies is hardly less powerful than the rest, as it is not merely moral, but laid deep in the natural constitution of things. Three thousand miles of ocean lie between you and them. No contrivance can prevent the effect of this distance in weakening government. Seas roll, and months pass, between the order and the execution; and the want of a speedy explanation of a single point is enough to defeat a whole system. You have, indeed, winged ministers of vengeance, who carry your bolts in their pounces to the remotest verge of the sea. But there a power steps in, that limits the arrogance of raging passions and furious elements, and says, "So far shalt thou go, and no farther." Who are you, that should fret and rage, and bite the chains of nature?--Nothing worse happens to you than does to all nations who have extensive empire; and it happens in all the forms into which empire can be thrown. In large bodies, the circulation of power must be less vigorous at the extremities. Nature has said it. The Turk cannot govern Egypt, and Arabia, and Curdistan, as he governs Thrace; nor has he the same dominion in Crimea and Algiers, which he has at Brusa and Smyrna. Despotism itself is obliged to truck and huckster. The Sultan gets such obedience as he can. He governs with a loose rein, that he may govern at all; and the whole of the force and vigour of his authority in his centre is derived from a prudent relaxation in all his borders. Spain, in her provinces, is, perhaps, not so well obeyed as you are in yours. She complies too; she submits; she watches times. This is the immutable condition, the eternal law, of extensive and detached empire.

Then, Sir, from these six capital sources; of descent; of form of government; of religion in the northern provinces; of manners in the southern; of education; of the remoteness of situation from the first mover of government; from all these causes a fierce spirit of liberty has grown up. It has grown with the growth of the people in your colonies, and increased with the increase of their wealth; a spirit, that unhappily meeting with an exercise of power in England, which, however lawful, is not reconcilable to any ideas of liberty, much less with theirs, has kindled this flame that is ready to consume us.

I do not mean to commend either the spirit in this excess, or the moral causes which produce it. Perhaps a more smooth and accommodating spirit of freedom in them would be more acceptable to us. Perhaps ideas of liberty might be desired, more reconcilable with an
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arbitrary and boundless authority. Perhaps we might wish the colonists to be persuaded, that their liberty is more secure when held in trust for them by us (as their guardians during a perpetual minority) than with any part of it in their own hands. The question is, not whether their spirit deserves praise or blame, but—what, in the name of God, shall we do with it? You have before you the object, such as it is, with all its glories, with all its imperfections on its head. You see the magnitude; the importance; the temper; the habits; the disorders. By all these considerations we are strongly urged to determine something concerning it. We are called upon to fix some rule and line for our future conduct, which may give a little stability to our politics, and prevent the return of such unhappy deliberations as the present. Every such return will bring the matter before us in a still more untractable form. For, what astonishing and incredible things have we not seen already! What monsters have not been generated from this unnatural contention! Whilst every principle of authority and resistance has been pushed, upon both sides, as far as it would go, there is nothing so solid and certain, either in reasoning or in practice, that has not been shaken. Until very lately, all authority in America seemed to be nothing but an emanation from yours. Even the popular part of the colony constitution derived all its activity, and its first vital movement, from the pleasure of the crown. We thought, Sir, that the utmost which the discontented colonists could do, was to disturb authority; we never dreamt they could of themselves supply it; knowing in general what an operose business it is to establish a government absolutely new. But having, for our purposes in this contention, resolved, that none but an obedient assembly should sit; the humours of the people there, finding all passage through the legal channel stopped, with great violence broke out another way. Some provinces have tried their experiment, as we have tried ours; and theirs has succeeded. They have formed a government sufficient for its purposes, without the bustle of a revolution, or the troublesome formality of an election. Evident necessity, and tacit consent, have done the business in an instant. So well they have done it, that Lord Dunmore (the account is among the fragments on your table) tells you, that the new institution is infinitely better obeyed than the ancient government ever was in its most fortunate periods. Obedience is what makes government, and not the names by which it is called; not the name of governor, as formerly, or committee, as at present. This new government has originated directly from the people;
and was not transmitted through any of the ordinary artificial media of a positive constitution. It was not a manufacture ready formed, and transmitted to them in that condition from England. The evil arising from hence is this; that the colonists having once found the possibility of enjoying the advantages of order in the midst of a struggle for liberty, such struggles will not henceforward seem so terrible to the settled and sober part of mankind as they had appeared before the trial.

Pursuing the same plan of punishing by the denial of the exercise of government to still greater lengths, we wholly abrogated the ancient government of Massachusetts. We were confident that the first feeling, if not the very prospect of anarchy, would instantly enforce a complete submission. The experiment was tried. A new, strange, unexpected face of things appeared. Anarchy is found tolerable. A vast province has now subsisted, and subsisted in a considerable degree of health and vigour, for near a twelvemonth, without governor, without public council, without judges, without executive magistrates. How long it will continue in this state, or what may arise out of this unheard-of situation, how can the wisest of us conjecture? Our late experience has taught us that many of those fundamental principles, formerly believed infallible, are either not of the importance they were imagined to be; or that we have not at all adverted to some other far more important and far more powerful principles, which entirely overrule those we had considered as omnipotent. I am much against any further experiments, which tend to put to the proof any more of these allowed opinions, which contribute so much to the public tranquillity. In effect, we suffer as much at home by this loosening of all ties, and this concussion of all established opinions, as we do abroad. For, in order to prove that the Americans have no right to their liberties, we are every day endeavouring to subvert the maxims which preserve the whole spirit of our own. To prove that the Americans ought not to be free, we are obliged to depreciate the value of freedom itself; and we never seem to gain a paltry advantage over them in debate, without attacking some of those principles, or deriding some of those feelings, for which our ancestors have shed their blood.
THOMAS PAINE
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BACKGROUND

After outright conflict the previous year at Lexington and Concord and Bunker Hill, and with Boston occupied by the British army and navy, Thomas Paine wrote this pamphlet on the relationship between the British and the American colonists.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Why does Paine criticize the protection that Great Britain provided the American colonies?

2. How does the colonies’ connection to Great Britain negatively impact the colonists economically?

3. What practical difficulties with the governance of Great Britain does Paine point to in advocating for independent government?

4. How does Paine believe the Americans should organize themselves?

Introduction

PERHAPS the sentiments contained in the following pages are not yet sufficiently fashionable to procure them general favor. A long habit of not thinking a thing wrong gives it a superficial appearance of being right, and raises at first a formidable outcry in defense of custom. But tumult soon subsides. Time makes more converts than reason.

As a long and violent abuse of power is generally the means of calling the right of it in question (and in matters too which might never have been thought of, had not the sufferers been aggravated into the inquiry), and as the King of England hath undertaken in his own Right to support the Parliament in what he calls Theirs, and as the good people of this country are grievously oppressed by the combination, they have an undoubted privilege to inquire into the pretensions of both, and equally to reject the usurpation of either. . . .

The cause of America is in a great measure the cause of all mankind. Many circumstances hath and will arise which are not local, but universal, and through which the principles of all Lovers of Mankind are affected, and in the event of which their Affections are interested.

The laying a Country desolate with Fire and Sword, declaring War against the natural rights of all Mankind, and extirpating the Defenders thereof from the Face of the Earth, is the Concern of every Man to whom Nature hath given the Power of feeling; of which Class, regardless of Party Censure, is the AUTHOR.

Thoughts on the Present State of American Affairs.

In the following pages I offer nothing more than simple facts, plain arguments, and common sense: and have no other preliminaries to settle with the reader, than that he will divest himself of prejudice and prepossession, and suffer his reason and his feelings to determine for themselves: that he will put on, or rather that he will not put off, the true character of a man, and generously enlarge his views beyond the present day.

...Now is the seed-time of Continental union, faith and honour. The least fracture now will be like a name engraved with the point of a pin on the tender rind of a young oak; the wound would enlarge with the tree, and posterity read it in full grown characters.
By referring the matter from argument to arms, a new æra for politics is struck—a new method of thinking hath arisen. All plans, proposals, &c. prior to the nineteenth of April, *i.e.* to the commencement of hostilities, are like the almanacks of the last year; which tho’ proper then, are superceded and useless now…

I have heard it asserted by some, that as America has flourished under her former connection with Great-Britain, the same connection is necessary towards her future happiness, and will always have the same effect. Nothing can be more fallacious than this kind of argument. We may as well assert that because a child has thrived upon milk, that it is never to have meat, or that the first twenty years of our lives is to become a precedent for the next twenty. But even this is admitting more than is true; for I answer roundly, that America would have flourished as much, and probably much more, had no European power taken any notice of her. The commerce by which she hath enriched herself are the necessaries of life, and will always have a market while eating is the custom of Europe.

But she has protected us, say some. That she hath engrossed us is true, and defended the Continent at our expense as well as her own, is admitted; and she would have defended Turkey from the same motive, *viz.* for the sake of trade and dominion.

Alas! we have been long led away by ancient prejudices and made large sacrifices to superstition. We have boasted the protection of Great Britain, without considering, that her motive was *interest* not *attachment*; and that she did not protect us from *our enemies* on *our account*; but from *her enemies on her own account*, from those who had no quarrel with us on any *other account*, and who will always be our enemies on the *same account*. Let Britain waive her pretensions to the Continent, or the Continent throw off the dependance, and we should be at peace with France and Spain, were they at war with Britain. The miseries of Hanover last war ought to warn us against connections.

But Britain is the parent country, say some. Then the more shame upon her conduct. Even brutes do not devour their young, nor savages make war upon their families…This new World hath been the asylum for the persecuted lovers of civil and religious liberty from *every part* of Europe. Hither have they fled, not from the tender embraces of the
mother, but from the cruelty of the monster; and it is so far true of England, that the same
tyrranny which drove the first emigrants from home, pursues their descendants still.

But, admitting that we were all of English descent, what does it amount to? Nothing. Brit-
ain, being now an open enemy, extinguishes every other name and title: and to say that
reconciliation is our duty, is truly farcical…

I challenge the warmest advocate for reconciliation to show a single advantage that this
continent can reap by being connected with Great Britain. I repeat the challenge; not a
single advantage is derived. Our corn will fetch its price in any market in Europe, and our
imported goods must be paid for buy them where we will…

Europe is too thickly planted with Kingdoms to be long at peace, and whenever a war
breaks out between England and any foreign power, the trade of America goes to ruin, be-
cause of her connection with Britain. The next war may not turn out like the last, and should
it not, the advocates for reconciliation now will be wishing for separation then, because
neutrality in that case would be a safer convoy than a man of war. Every thing that is right
or reasonable pleads for separation. The blood of the slain, the weeping voice of nature
cries, 'TIS TIME TO PART. Even the distance at which the Almighty hath placed England
and America is a strong and natural proof that the authority of the one over the other, was
never the design of Heaven…

It is the good fortune of many to live distant from the scene of present sorrow; the evil is
not sufficiently brought to their doors to make them feel the precariousness with which all
American property is possessed. But let our imaginations transport us a few moments to
Boston; that seat of wretchedness will teach us wisdom, and instruct us for ever to renounce
a power in whom we can have no trust. The inhabitants of that unfortunate city who but a
few months ago were in ease and affluence, have now no other alternative than to stay and
starve, or turn out to beg. Endangered by the fire of their friends if they continue within
the city, and plundered by the soldiery if they leave it, in their present situation they are
prisoners without the hope of redemption, and in a general attack for their relief they would
be exposed to the fury of both armies…
"Tis repugnant to reason, to the universal order of things, to all examples from former ages, to suppose that this Continent can long remain subject to any external power. The most sanguine in Britain doth not think so. The utmost stretch of human wisdom cannot, at this time, compass a plan, short of separation, which can promise the continent even a year’s security. Reconciliation is now a fallacious dream. Nature hath deserted the connection, and art cannot supply her place. For, as Milton wisely expresses, “never can true reconcilement grow where wounds of deadly hate have pierced so deep.”

Every quiet method for peace hath been ineffectual. Our prayers have been rejected with disdain; and hath tended to convince us that nothing flatters vanity or confirms obstinacy in Kings more than repeated petitioning—and nothing hath contributed more than that very measure to make the Kings of Europe absolute. Witness Denmark and Sweden. Wherefore, since nothing but blows will do, for God’s sake let us come to a final separation, and not leave the next generation to be cutting throats under the violated unmeaning names of parent and child.

As to government matters, ’tis not in the power of Britain to do this continent justice: the business of it will soon be too weighty and intricate to be managed with any tolerable degree of convenience, by a power so distant from us, and so very ignorant of us; for if they cannot conquer us, they cannot govern us. To be always running three or four thousand miles with a tale or a petition, waiting four or five months for an answer, which, when obtained, requires five or six more to explain it in, will in a few years be looked upon as folly and childishness. There was a time when it was proper, and there is a proper time for it to cease.

Small islands not capable of protecting themselves are the proper objects for government to take under their care; but there is something absurd, in supposing a Continent to be perpetually governed by an island. In no instance hath nature made the satellite larger than its primary planet; and as England and America, with respect to each other, reverse the common order of nature, it is evident that they belong to different systems. England to Europe: America to itself.
I am not induced by motives of pride, party, or resentment to espouse the doctrine of separation and independence; I am clearly, positively, and conscientiously persuaded that it is the true interest of this Continent to be so; that every thing short of that is mere patchwork, that it can afford no lasting felicity,—that it is leaving the sword to our children, and shrinking back at a time when a little more, a little further, would have rendered this Continent the glory of the earth…

…No man was a warmer wisher for a reconciliation than myself, before the fatal nineteenth of April, 1775, but the moment the event of that day was made known, I rejected the hardened, sullen-tempered Pharaoh of England for ever; and disdain the wretch, that with the pretended title of FATHER OF HIS PEOPLE can unfeelingly hear of their slaughter, and composedly sleep with their blood upon his soul.

But admitting that matters were now made up, what would be the event? I answer, the ruin of the Continent. And that for several reasons.

First. The powers of governing still remaining in the hands of the King, he will have a negative over the whole legislation of this Continent. And as he hath shown himself such an inveterate enemy to liberty, and discovered such a thirst for arbitrary power, is he, or is he not, a proper person to say to these colonies, You shall make no laws but what I please!? And is there any inhabitant of America so ignorant as not to know, that according to what is called the present constitution, this Continent can make no laws but what the king gives leave to; and is there any man so unwise as not to see, that (considering what has happened) he will suffer no law to be made here but such as suits his purpose? We may be as effectually enslaved by the want of laws in America, as by submitting to laws made for us in England…

Secondly. That as even the best terms which we can expect to obtain can amount to no more than a temporary expedient, or a kind of government by guardianship, which can last no longer than till the Colonies come of age, so the general face and state of things in the interim will be unsettled and unpromising. Emigrants of property will not choose to come to a country whose form of government hangs but by a thread, and who is every day tottering
on the brink of commotion and disturbance; and numbers of the present inhabitants would lay hold of the interval to dispose of their effects, and quit the Continent.

But the most powerful of all arguments is, that nothing but independance, *i.e.* a Continental form of government, can keep the peace of the Continent and preserve it inviolate from civil wars. I dread the event of a reconciliation with Britain now, as it is more than probable that it will be followed by a revolt some where or other, the consequences of which may be far more fatal than all the malice of Britain.

...Besides, the general temper of the Colonies, towards a British government will be like that of a youth who is nearly out of his time; they will care very little about her: And a government which cannot preserve the peace is no government at all, and in that case we pay our money for nothing; and pray what is it that Britain can do, whose power will be wholly on paper, should a civil tumult break out the very day after reconciliation?...

If there is any true cause of fear respecting independance, it is because no plan is yet laid down. Men do not see their way out. Wherefore, as an opening into that business I offer the following hints; at the same time modestly affirming, that I have no other opinion of them myself, than that they may be the means of giving rise to something better. Could the straggling thoughts of individuals be collected, they would frequently form materials for wise and able men to improve into useful matter.

Let the assemblies be annual, with a president only. The representation more equal, their business wholly domestic, and subject to the authority of a Continental Congress.

Let each Colony be divided into six, eight, or ten, convenient districts, each district to send a proper number of Delegates to Congress, so that each Colony send at least thirty. The whole number in Congress will be at least 390. Each congress to sit and to choose a President by the following method. When the Delegates are met, let a Colony be taken from the whole thirteen Colonies by lot, after which let the Congress choose (by ballot) a president from out of the Delegates of that Province. In the next Congress, let a Colony be taken by
lot from twelve only, omitting that Colony from which the president was taken in the for-
mer Congress, and so proceeding on till the whole thirteen shall have had their proper ro-
tation. And in order that nothing may pass into a law but what is satisfactorily just, not less
than three fifths of the Congress to be called a majority. He that will promote discord, under
a government so equally formed as this, would have joined Lucifer in his revolt.

But as there is a peculiar delicacy from whom, or in what manner, this business must first
arise, and as it seems most agreeable and consistent that it should come from some inter-
mediate body between the governed and the governors, that is, between the Congress and
the People, let a Continental Conference be held in the following manner, and for the fol-
lowing purpose,

A Committee of twenty six members of congress, viz. Two for each Colony. Two Members
from each House of Assembly, or Provincial Convention; and five Representatives of the
people at large, to be chosen in the capital city or town of each Province, for, and in behalf
of the whole Province, by as many qualified voters as shall think proper to attend from all
parts of the Province for that purpose; or, if more convenient, the Representatives may be
chosen in two or three of the most populous parts thereof. In this conference, thus assem-
bled, will be united the two grand principles of business, knowledge and power. The Mem-
bers of Congress, Assemblies, or Conventions, by having had experience in national con-
cerns, will be able and useful counsellors, and the whole, being impowered by the people,
will have a truly legal authority.

The conferring members being met, let their business be to frame a Continental Charter,
or Charter of the United Colonies; (answering to what is called the Magna Charta of Eng-
land) fixing the number and manner of choosing Members of Congress, Members of As-
sembly, with their date of sitting; and drawing the line of business and jurisdiction between
them: Always remembering, that our strength is Continental, not Provincial. Securing free-
dom and property to all men, and above all things, the free exercise of religion, according
to the dictates of conscience; with such other matter as it is necessary for a charter to con-
tain. Immediately after which, the said conference to dissolve, and the bodies which shall
be chosen conformable to the said charter, to be the Legislators and Governors of this Con-
tinent for the time being: Whose peace and happiness, may GOD preserve. AMEN…

A government of our own is our natural right: and when a man seriously reflects on the
precariousness of human affairs, he will become convinced, that it is infinitely wiser and
safer, to form a constitution of our own in a cool deliberate manner, while we have it in our
power, than to trust such an interesting event to time and chance …

O! ye that love mankind! Ye that dare oppose not only the tyranny but the tyrant, stand
forth! Every spot of the old world is overrun with oppression. Freedom hath been hunted
round the Globe. Asia and Africa have long expelled her. Europe regards her like a stranger,
and England hath given her warning to depart. O! receive the fugitive, and prepare in time
an asylum for mankind.
SECOND CONTINENTAL CONGRESS

Petition to George III, King of Britain

LETTER

July 8, 1775

Pennsylvania State House | Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Olive Branch Petition

BACKGROUND

Following the battles of Lexington and Concord in the spring and just after the Battle of Bunker Hill, the Second Continental Congress sent this petition to George III to redress colonial grievances without any further bloodshed.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What are the colonists’ complaints?

2. From whom do the colonies seek redress?

To the King's Most Excellent Majesty.

Most Gracious Sovereign: We, your Majesty's faithful subjects of the Colonies of New-Hampshire, Massachusetts-Bay, Rhode-Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New-York, New-Jersey, Pennsylvania, the Counties of Newcastle, Kent, and Sussex, on Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, in behalf of ourselves and the inhabitants of these Colonies, who have deputed us to represent them in General Congress, entreat your Majesty's gracious attention to this our humble petition.

The union between our Mother Country and these Colonies, and the energy of mild and just Government, produced benefits so remarkably important, and afforded such an assurance of their permanency and increase, that the wonder and envy of other nations were excited, while they beheld Great Britain rising to a power the most extraordinary the world had ever known.

Her rivals, observing that there was no probability of this happy connexion being broken by civil dissensions, and apprehending its future effects if left any longer undisturbed, resolved to prevent her receiving such continual and formidable accessions of wealth and strength, by checking the growth of those settlements from which they were to be derived.

In the prosecution of this attempt, events so unfavourable to the design took place, that every friend to the interest of Great Britain and these Colonies, entertained pleasing and reasonable expectations of seeing an additional force and exertion immediately given to the operations of the union hitherto experienced, by an enlargement of the dominions of the Crown, and the removal of ancient and warlike enemies to a greater distance.

At the conclusion, therefore, of the late war, the most glorious and advantageous that ever had been carried on by British arms, your loyal Colonists having contributed to its success by such repeated and strenuous exertions as frequently procured them the distinguished approbation of your Majesty, of the late King, and of Parliament, doubted not but that they should be permitted, with the rest of the Empire, to share in the blessings of peace, and the emoluments of victory and conquest.
While these recent and honourable acknowledgments of their merits remained on record in the Journals and acts of that august Legislature, the Parliament, undefaced by the imputation or even the suspicion of any offence, they were alarmed by a new system of statutes and regulations adopted for the administration of the Colonies, that filled their minds with the most painful fears and jealousies; and, to their inexpressible astonishment, perceived the danger of a foreign quarrel quickly succeeded by domestick danger, in their judgment of a more dreadful kind.

Nor were these anxieties alleviated by any tendency in this system to promote the welfare of their Mother Country. For though its effects were more immediately felt by them, yet its influence appeared to be injurious to the commerce and prosperity of Great Britain.

We shall decline the ungrateful task of describing the irksome variety of artifices practised by many of your Majesty's Ministers, the delusive pretences, fruitless terrours, and unavailing severities, that have, from time to time, been dealt out by them, in their attempts to execute this impolitick plan, or of tracing through a series of years past the progress of the unhappy differences between Great Britain and these Colonies, that have flowed from this fatal source.

Your Majesty's Ministers, persevering in their measures, and proceeding to open hostilities for enforcing them, have compelled us to arm in our own defence, and have engaged us in a controversy so peculiarly abhorrent to the affections of your still faithful Colonists, that when we consider whom we must oppose in this contest, and if it continues, what may be the consequences, our own particular misfortunes are accounted by us only as parts of our distress. Knowing to what violent resentments and incurable animosities civil discords are apt to exasperate and inflame the contending parties, we think ourselves required by indispensable obligations to Almighty God, to your Majesty, to our fellow-subjects, and to ourselves, immediately to use all the means in our power, not incompatible with our safety, for stopping the further effusion of blood, and for averting the impending calamities that threaten the British Empire.
Thus called upon to address your Majesty on affairs of such moment to America, and probably to all your Dominions, we are earnestly desirous of performing this office with the utmost deference for your Majesty; and we therefore pray, that your Majesty's royal magnanimity and benevolence may make the most favourable constructions of our expressions on so uncommon an occasion. Could we represent in their full force the sentiments that agitate the minds of us your dutiful subjects, we are persuaded your Majesty would ascribe any seeming deviation from reverence in our language, and even in our conduct, not to any reprehensible intention, but to the impossibility of reconciling the usual appearances of respect with a just attention to our own preservation against those artful and cruel enemies who abuse your royal confidence and authority, for the purpose of effecting our destruction.

Attached to your Majesty's person, family, and Government, with all devotion that principle and affection can inspire; connected with Great Britain by the strongest ties that can unite societies, and deploring every event that tends in any degree to weaken them, we solemnly assure your Majesty, that we not only most ardently desire the former harmony between her and these Colonies may be restored, but that a concord may be established between them upon so firm a basis as to perpetuate its blessings, uninterrupted by any future dissensions, to succeeding generations in both countries, and to transmit your Majesty's name to posterity, adorned with that signal and lasting glory that has attended the memory of those illustrious personages, whose virtues and abilities have extricated states from dangerous convulsions, and, by securing happiness to others, have erected the most noble and durable monuments to their own fame.

We beg leave further to assure your Majesty, that notwithstanding the sufferings of your loyal Colonists during the course of this present controversy, our breasts retain too tender a regard for the kingdom from which we derive our origin, to request such a reconciliation as might, in any manner, be inconsistent with her dignity or her welfare. These, related as we are to her, honour and duty, as well as inclination, induce us to support and advance; and the apprehensions that now oppress our hearts with unspeakable grief, being once removed, your Majesty will find your faithful subjects on this Continent ready and willing at
all times, as they have ever been, with their lives and fortunes, to assert and maintain the
rights and interests of your Majesty, and of our Mother Country.

We therefore beseech your Majesty, that your royal authority and influence may be gra-
ciously interposed to procure us relief from our afflicting fears and jealousies, occasioned
by the system before-mentioned, and to settle peace through every part of our Dominions,
with all humility submitting to your Majesty's wise consideration, whether it may not be
expedient, for facilitating those important purposes, that your Majesty be pleased to direct
some mode, by which the united applications of your faithful Colonists to the Throne, in
pursuance of their common counsels, may be improved into a happy and permanent rec-
10 onciliation; and that, in the mean time, measures may be taken for preventing the further
destruction of the lives of your Majesty's subjects; and that such statutes as more immedi-
ately distress any of your Majesty's Colonies, may be repealed.

For such arrangements as your Majesty's wisdom can form for collecting the united sense
of your American people, we are convinced your Majesty would receive such satisfactory
proofs of the disposition of the Colonists towards their Sovereign and Parent State, that the
wished for opportunity would soon be restored to them, of evincing the sincerity of their
professions, by every testimony of devotion becoming the most dutiful subjects, and the
most affectionate Colonists.

That your Majesty may enjoy a long and prosperous reign, and that your descendants may
govern your Dominions with honour to themselves and happiness to their subjects, is our
sincere prayer.
Delegate Thomas Jefferson (VA) of the Second Continental Congress

A Declaration

Draft Statement

June 1776

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Draft of the Declaration of Independence

Background

Thomas Jefferson drafted and the Committee of Five edited this initial version of what would become the Declaration of Independence. This draft includes the edits that the Second Continental Congress made.

Annotations

Notes & Questions

Key:

word = language deleted by Congress from Jefferson’s draft

«word» = language added by Congress to Jefferson’s draft

A DECLARATION By the REPRESENTATIVES of the UNITED STATES of AMERICA, in «GENERAL» CONGRESS ASSEMBLED

When in the Course of human Events it becomes necessary for one People to dissolve the Political Bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the Powers of the Earth the separate & equal Station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God entitle them, a decent Respect to the Opinions of Mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the Separation.

We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with inherent and unalienable Rights, that among these are Life,
Liberty, & the Pursuit of Happiness: —That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the Consent of the governed; that whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these Ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or abolish it, & to institute new Government, laying it’s Foundation on such Principles, & organizing it’s Powers in such Form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety & Happiness. Prudence indeed will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light & transient Causes; and accordingly all Experience hath shown that Mankind are more disposed to suffer, while Evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the Forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long Train of Abuses & Usurpations began at a distinguished period and pursuing invariably the same Object, evinces a Design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their Right, it is their Duty to throw off such Government, & to provide new Guards for their future Security. Such has been the patient Sufferance of these Colonies; & such is now the Necessity which constrains them to expunge «alter» their former Systems of Government. The History of the present King of Great-Britain is a History of unremitting «repeated» Injuries & Usurpations, among which appears no solitary fact to contradict the uniform tenor of the rest; but all have «all having» in direct Object the Establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid World for the truth of which we pledge a faith yet unsullied by falsehood.

He has refused his Assent to Laws, the most wholesome & necessary for the public Good.

He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly, & continually for opposing with manly Firmness his Invasions on the Rights of the People.

He has refused for a long Time, after such Dissolutions, to cause others to be elected, whereby the Legislative Powers, incapable of Annihilation, have returned to the People at large for their exercise; the State remaining in the meantime exposed to all the Dangers of Invasion from without, & Convulsions within.
He has endeavored to prevent the Population of these states; for that Purpose obstructing the laws for Naturalization of Foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their Migrations hither, & raising the Conditions of new Appropriations of Lands.

He has made our Judges dependent on his Will alone, for the Tenure of their Offices, & the Amount & payment of their Salaries.

He has erected a Multitude of new Offices by a self assumed power and sent hither Swarms of new Officers to harass our People and eat out their Substance.

He has kept among us in Times of Peace, Standing Armies, and ships of war without the consent of our Legislatures.

He has affected to render the Military independent of, & superior to the Civil power.

He has combined with others to subject us to a Jurisdiction foreign to our Constitution, & unacknowledged by our Laws; giving his Assent to their Acts of pretended Legislation:
For quartering large Bodies of Armed Troops among us:
For protecting them, by a mock-Trial, from Punishment for any Murders which they should commit on the Inhabitants of these States:
For cutting off our Trade with all Parts of the World:
For imposing Taxes on us without our consent:
For depriving us «, in many Cases,» of the Benefits of Trial by Jury:
For transporting us beyond Seas to be tried for pretended Offences:
For abolishing the free System of English Laws in a neighboring Province, establishing therein an arbitrary Government, and enlarging it's Boundaries, so as to render it at once an Example and fit Instrument for introducing the same absolute Rule into these states «Colonies»:
For taking away our Charters, abolishing our most valuable Laws, and altering fundamentally the Forms of our Governments:
For suspending our own Legislatures, & declaring themselves invested with Power to legislate for us in all Cases whatsoever.
He has abdicated Government here by withdrawing his governors, and declaring us out of his allegiance & protection «declaring us out of his Protection, and Waging war against us.» He has plundered our Seas, ravaged our Coasts, burnt our towns, & destroyed the Lives of our People.

He is, at this time Transporting large Armies of foreign Mercenaries to complete the works of Death, Desolation & Tyranny, already begun with circumstances of Cruelty and Perfidy «scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous Ages, & totally» unworthy the Head of a civilized Nation. He has constrained our fellow Citizens taken Captive on the high Seas to bear Arms against their Country, to become the Executioners of their Friends & Brethren, or to fall themselves by their Hands. He has «excited domestic Insurrections amongst us, & has» endeavored to bring on the Inhabitants of our Frontiers, the merciless Indian Savages, whose known Rule of Warfare, is an undistinguished Destruction, of all Ages, Sexes, & Conditions of existence. He has incited treasonable insurrections of our fellow citizens, with the allurements of forfeiture & confiscation of our property. He has waged cruel war against human nature itself, violating it's most sacred rights of life and liberty in the persons of a distant people who never offended him, captivating & carrying them into slavery in another hemisphere, or to incur miserable death in their transportation thither. This piratical warfare, the opprobrium of INFIDEL powers, is the warfare of the CHRISTIAN king of Great Britain. Determined to keep open a market where MEN should be bought & sold, he has prostituted his negative for suppressing every legislative attempt to prohibit or to restrain this execrable commerce. And that this assemblage of horrors might want no fact of distinguished die, he is now exciting those very people to rise in arms among us, and to purchase that liberty of which he has deprived them, by murdering the people on whom he also obtruded them: thus paying off former crimes committed against the LIBERTIES of one people, with crimes which he urges them to commit against the LIVES of another. In every stage of these Oppressions we have Petitioned for Redress in the most humble Terms: Our repeated Petitions have been answered only by repeated Injury. A Prince whose Character is thus marked by every act which may define a Tyrant, is unfit to be the Ruler of a «free» People who mean to be free. Future ages will scarcely believe that the hardness of
one man adventured, within the short compass of twelve years only, to lay a foundation so broad & so undisguised for tyranny over a people fostered & fixed in principles of freedom.

Nor have we been wanting in attentions to our British Brethren. We have warned them from time to time of attempts by their legislature to extend a «unwarrantable» jurisdiction over these our states «us». We have reminded them of the circumstances of our Emigration & Settlement here, no one of which could warrant so strange a pretension: that these were effected at the expense of our own blood & treasure, unassisted by the wealth or the strength of Great Britain: that in constituting indeed our several forms of government, we had adopted one common king, thereby laying a foundation for perpetual league & amity with them: but that submission to their parliament was no part of our constitution, nor ever in idea, if history may be credited, and. We have appealed to their native Justice and Magnanimity as well as to «, and we have conjured them by» the ties of our common Kindred to disavow these usurpations, which were likely to«, would inevitably» interrupt our connection and correspondence. They too have been deaf to the voice of justice & of consanguinity, and when occasions have been given them, by the regular course of their laws, of removing from their councils the disturbers of our harmony, they have, by their free election, re-established them in power. At this very time too they are permitting their chief magistrate to send over not only soldiers of our common blood, but Scotch & foreign mercenaries to invade & destroy us. These facts have given the last stab to agonizing affection, and manly spirit bids us to renounce forever these unfeeling brethren. We must endeavor to forget our former love for them, and hold them as we hold the rest of mankind, enemies in war, in peace friends. We might have been a free and a great people together; but a communication of grandeur & of freedom it seems is below their dignity. Be it so, since they will have it. The road to happiness & to glory is open to us too. We will tread it apart from them, and «. We must therefore» acquiesce in the necessity which denounces our eternal Separation «, and hold them, as we hold the rest of Mankind, Enemies in War, in Peace, Friends!»

We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America in General Congress assembled,«appealing to the Supreme Judge of the World for the Rectitude of our Intentions,» do, in the name, & by the authority of the good People of these states.
Draft of the Declaration of Independence

reject and renounce all allegiance and subjection to the kings of Great Britain and all others who may hearafter claim by, through or under them; we utterly dissolve all political connection which may heretofore have subsided between us and the people or parliament of Great Britain; and finally we do assert and declare these colonies to be free and independent states; "Colonies, solemnly Publish and Declare, That these United Colonies are, and are of Right to be, Free and Independent States; that they are absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political Connection between them and the State of Great-Britain is and ought to be totally dissolved;" & that as Free & Independent States, they have full Power to levy War, conclude Peace, contract Alliances, establish Commerce & to do all other Acts & Things which Independent States may of right do. And for the support of this declaration, "with a firm Reliance on the Protection of divine Providence," we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our Fortunes, & our sacred Honor.
THE THIRTEEN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Unanimous Declaration

A DECLARATION

July 4, 1776

Pennsylvania State House | Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Background

The delegates from each colony at the Second Continental Congress announced their votes to form a new country separate from Great Britain in this statement to mankind that expounds both the principles on which this new country would be founded and the reasons they judged themselves justified to separate.

Guiding Questions

1. Why do the United States believe they need to release a statement about their decision to form a country separate from Great Britain?

2. What do they consider about the truths they posit?

3. How are all men equal?

4. From where comes their rights?

5. What is the reason why people create governments?

6. From where comes a government’s powers?

7. What may a people do if a government does not fulfill its ends?

8. Although governments should not be changed for small reasons, when should the people change them?

9. Against which person does the Declaration of Independence level its charges?

10. What actions involving the military has this person carried out against the colonists?

11. What legal practices has this person violated?

12. What efforts have the colonists made to seek redress and reconciliation with Great Britain?

13. To whom do the representatives appeal for the justness of their intentions?

14. By whose authority do the representatives declare independence?

15. What do each of the representatives pledge to one another?
When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.—That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,—That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security.—Such has been the patient sufferance of these Colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former Systems of Government. The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. To prove this, let Facts be submitted to a candid world.

He has refused his Assent to Laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.
He has forbidden his Governors to pass Laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his Assent should be obtained; and when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.

He has refused to pass other Laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of Representation in the Legislature, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only.

He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their public Records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures.

He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly, for opposing with manly firmness his invasions on the rights of the people.

He has refused for a long time, after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected; whereby the Legislative powers, incapable of Annihilation, have returned to the People at large for their exercise; the State remaining in the mean time exposed to all the dangers of invasion from without, and convulsions within.

He has endeavored to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the Laws for Naturalization of Foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migrations hither, and raising the conditions of new Appropriations of Lands.

He has obstructed the Administration of Justice, by refusing his Assent to Laws for establishing Judiciary powers.

He has made Judges dependent on his Will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.
He has erected a multitude of New Offices, and sent hither swarms of Officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance.

He has kept among us, in times of peace, Standing Armies without the Consent of our legislatures.

He has affected to render the Military independent of and superior to the Civil power.

He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his Assent to their Acts of pretended Legislation:

For Quartering large bodies of armed troops among us:

For protecting them, by a mock Trial, from punishment for any Murders which they should commit on the Inhabitants of these States:

For cutting off our Trade with all parts of the world:

For imposing Taxes on us without our Consent:

For depriving us in many cases, of the benefits of Trial by Jury:

For transporting us beyond Seas to be tried for pretended offenses:

For abolishing the free System of English Laws in a neighboring Province, establishing therein an Arbitrary government, and enlarging its Boundaries so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these Colonies:

For taking away our Charters, abolishing our most valuable Laws, and altering fundamentally the Forms of our Governments:
For suspending our own Legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

He has abdicated Government here, by declaring us out of his Protection and waging War against us.

He has plundered our seas, ravaged our Coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people.

He is at this time transporting large Armies of foreign Mercenaries to complete the works of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of Cruelty and perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the Head of a civilized nation.

He has constrained our fellow Citizens taken Captive on the high Seas to bear Arms against their Country, to become the executioners of their friends and Brethren, or to fall themselves by their Hands.

He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavored to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian Savages, whose known rule of warfare, is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes and conditions.

In every stage of these Oppressions We have Petitioned for Redress in the most humble terms: Our repeated Petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A Prince whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a Tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.

Nor have We been wanting in attentions to our British brethren. We have warned them from time to time of attempts by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement here. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured
them by the ties of our common kindred to disavow these usurpations, which, would inev-
itably interrupt our connections and correspondence. They too have been deaf to the voice of justice and of consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity, which de-
nounces our Separation, and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind, Enemies in War, in Peace Friends.

We, therefore, the Representatives of the united States of America, in General Congress, Assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the Name, and by Authority of the good People of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, That these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be Free and Independent States; that they are Absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as Free and Independent States, they have full Power to levy War, conclude Peace, contract Alliances, establish Commerce, and to do all other Acts and Things which Inde-
pendent States may of right do. And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor.

Georgia

Button Gwinnett, Lyman Hall, George Walton

North Carolina

William Hooper, Joseph Hewes, John Penn

South Carolina

Edward Rutledge, Thomas Heyward, Jr., Thomas Lynch, Jr., Arthur Middleton

Maryland

Samuel Chase, William Paca, Thomas Stone, Charles Carroll of Carrollton
Virginia
George Wythe, Richard Henry Lee, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Harrison, Thomas Nelson, Jr., Francis Lightfoot Lee, Carter Braxton

Pennsylvania
Robert Morris, Benjamin Rush, Benjamin Franklin, John Morton, George Clymer, James Smith, George Taylor, James Wilson, George Ross

Delaware
Caesar Rodney, George Read, Thomas McKean

New York
William Floyd, Philip Livingston, Francis Lewis, Lewis Morris

New Jersey
Richard Stockton, John Witherspoon, Francis Hopkinson, John Hart, Abraham Clark

New Hampshire
Josiah Bartlett, William Whipple, Matthew Thornton

Massachusetts
John Hancock, Samuel Adams, John Adams, Robert Treat Paine, Elbridge Gerry

Rhode Island
Stephen Hopkins, William Ellery

Connecticut
Roger Sherman, Samuel Huntington, William Williams, Oliver Wolcot
GENERAL GEORGE WASHINGTON, COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF OF THE CONTINENTAL ARMY

General Orders

MILITARY DISPATCH

July 2, 1776

Head Quarters | New York

BACKGROUND

George Washington issued these daily orders to his forces from New York.

ANNOTATIONS

Parole Armstrong. Countersign Lee.

Genl Mifflin is to repair to the post near Kingsbridge and use his utmost endeavours to forward the works there—General Scott in the mean time to perform the duty required of General Mifflin in the orders of the 29th of June.

No Sentries are to stop or molest the Country people coming to Market or going from it but to be very vigilant in preventing Soldiers leaving the army.

Col. Cortlandt of the New-Jersey Brigade is to send over five-hundred of the Militia under his command to reinforce General Greene’s Brigade; these troops are to be distinguished from the old Militia in future by being called New-Levies—The Quarter Master General to furnish them with Tents: The detachment from General Spencers Brigade to return when these get over. The Militia not under the immediate Command of General Heard are to be under that of Genl Mercer until the arrival of their own General Officer.

The time is now near at hand which must probably determine, whether Americans are to

be, Freemen, or Slaves; whether they are to have any property they can call their own; whether their Houses, and Farms, are to be pillaged and destroyed, and they consigned to a State of Wretchedness from which no human efforts will probably deliver them. The fate of unborn Millions will now depend, under God, on the Courage and Conduct of this army—Our cruel and unrelenting Enemy leaves us no choice but a brave resistance, or the most abject submission; this is all we can expect—We have therefore to resolve to conquer or die: Our own Country’s Honor, all call upon us for a vigorous and manly exertion, and if we now shamefully fail, we shall become infamous to the whole world—Let us therefore rely upon the goodness of the Cause, and the aid of the supreme Being, in whose hands Victory is, to animate and encourage us to great and noble Actions—The Eyes of all our Countrymen are now upon us, and we shall have their blessings, and praises, if happily we are the instruments of saving them from the Tyranny meditated against them. Let us therefore animate and encourage each other, and shew the whole world, that a Freeman contending for Liberty on his own ground is superior to any slavish mercenary on earth.

The General recommends to the officers great coolness in time of action, and to the soldiers a strict attention and obedience, with a becoming firmness and spirit.

Any officer, or soldier, or any particular Corps, distinguishing themselves by any acts of bravery, and courage, will assuredly meet with notice and rewards; and on the other hand, those who behave ill, will as certainly be exposed and punished—The General being resolved, as well for the Honor and Safety of the Country, as Army, to shew no favour to such as refuse, or neglect their duty at so important a crisis.

The General expressly orders that no officer, or soldier, on any pretence whatever, without leave in writing, from the commanding officer of the regiment, do leave the parade, so as to be out of drum-call, in case of an alarm, which may be hourly expected—The Regiments are immediately to be under Arms on their respective parades, and should any be absent they will be severely punished—The whole Army to be at their Alarm posts completely equipped to morrow, a little before day.
Ensign Charles Miller, Capt. Wrisst’s Company, and Colonel Wyllys’s Regiment, charged with “absenting himself from his Guard” tried by a General Court Martial and acquitted—The General approves the sentence, and orders him to be dismissed from his arrest.

As there is a probability of Rain, the General strongly recommends to the officers, to pay particular attention, to their men’s arms and ammunition, that neither may be damaged.

Lieut. Col. Clark who was ordered to sit on General Court Martial in the orders of yesterday being absent on command, Lieut. Col. Tyler is to sit in Court.

Evening Orders. "Tis the General’s desire that the men lay upon their Arms in their tents and quarters, ready to turn out at a moments warning, as their is the greatest likelihood of it.
GENERAL GEORGE WASHINGTON, COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF OF THE CONTINENTAL ARMY

Address to Congress

SPEECH

December 23, 1783
Old Senate Chamber of the Maryland State House | Annapolis, Maryland

BACKGROUND

George Washington delivered this message to Congress to resign his commission as Commander-in-Chief of the Continental Army.

ANNOTATIONS

The great events on which my resignation depended having at length taken place; I have now the honor of offering my sincere Congratulations to Congress and of presenting myself before them to surrender into their hands the trust committed to me, and to claim the indulgence of retiring from the Service of my Country.

Happy in the confirmation of our Independence and Sovereignty, and pleased with the opportunity afforded the United States of becoming a respectable Nation, I resign with satisfaction the Appointment I accepted with diffidence. A diffidence in my abilities to accomplish so arduous a task, which however was superseded by a confidence in the rectitude of our Cause, the support of the Supreme Power of the Union, and the patronage of Heaven.

The Successful termination of the War has verified the most sanguine expectations, and my gratitude for the interposition of Providence, and the assistance I have received from my Countrymen, encreases with every review of the momentous Contest.

While I repeat my obligations to the Army in general, I should do injustice to my own feelings not to acknowledge in this place the peculiar Services and distinguished merits of

the Gentlemen who have been attached to my person during the War. It was impossible
the choice of confidential Officers to compose my family should have been more fortunate.
Permit me Sir, to recommend in particular those, who have continued in Service to the
present moment, as worthy of the favorable notice and patronage of Congress.

I consider it an indispensable duty to close this last solemn act of my Official life, by com-
mending the Interests of our dearest Country to the protection of Almighty God, and those
who have the superintendence of them, to his holy keeping.

Having now finished the work assigned me, I retire from the great theatre of Action; and
bidding an Affectionate farewell to this August body under whose orders I have so long
acted, I here offer my Commission, and take my leave of all the employments of public life.
PHYLLIS WHEATLEY

“Liberty and Peace”

POEM

1784

Boston, Massachusetts

BACKGROUND

Phyllis Wheatley composed this poem after the signing of the Treaty of Paris officially ending the War of Independence.

ANNOTATIONS

LO! Freedom comes. Th’ prescient Muse foretold,

All Eyes th’ accomplish’d Prophecy behold:

Her Port describ’d, "She moves divinely fair,

"Olive and Laurel bind her golden Hair."

She, the bright Progeny of Heaven, descends,

And every Grace her sovereign Step attends;

For now kind Heaven, indulgent to our Prayer,

In smiling Peace resolves the Din of War.

Fix’d in Columbia her illustrious Line,

And bids in thee her future Councils shine.

To every Realm her Portals open’d wide,

Receives from each the full commercial Tide.

Each Art and Science now with rising Charms

Th’ expanding Heart with Emulation warms.

E’en great Britannia sees with dread Surprize,

And from the dazzling Splendor turns her Eyes!

Britain, whose Navies swept th’ Atlantic o’er,

And Thunder sent to every distant Shore;
E'en thou, in Manners cruel as thou art,
The Sword resign'd, resume the friendly Part!
For Galia's Power espous'd Columbia's Cause,
And new-born Rome shall give Britannia Law,
Nor unremember'd in the grateful Strain,
Shall princely Louis' friendly Deeds remain;
The generous Prince th' impending Vengeance eye's,
Sees the fierce Wrong, and to the rescue flies.

Perish that Thirst of boundless Power, that drew
On Albion's Head the Curse to Tyrants due.
But thou appeas'd submit to Heaven's decree,
That bids this Realm of Freedom rival thee!
Now sheathe the Sword that bade the Brave attone
With guiltless Blood for Madness not their own.
Sent from th' Enjoyment of their native Shore
Ill-fated – never to behold her more!
From every Kingdom on Europa's Coast
Throng'd various Troops, their Glory, Strength and Boast.

With heart-felt pity fair Hibernia saw
Columbia menac'd by the Tyrant's Law:
On hostile Fields fraternal Arms engage,
And mutual Deaths, all dealt with mutual Rage:
The Muse's Ear hears mother Earth deplore
Her ample Surface smoak with kindred Gore:
The hostile Field destroys the social Ties,
And every-lasting Slumber seals their Eyes.
Columbia mourns, the haughty Foes deride,
Her Treasures plunder'd, and her Towns destroy'd:
Witness how Charlestown's curling Smoaks arise,
In sable Columns to the clouded Skies!
The ample Dome, high-wrought with curious Toil,
In one sad Hour the savage Troops despoil.
Descending Peace and Power of War confounds;
From every Tongue celestial Peace resounds:
As for the East th’ illustrious King of Day,
With rising Radiance drives the Shades away,
So Freedom comes array’d with Charms divine,
And in her Train Commerce and Plenty shine.

Britannia owns her Independent Reign,
Hibernia, Scotia, and the Realms of Spain;
And great Germania’s ample Coast admires
The generous Spirit that Columbia fires.
Auspicious Heaven shall fill with fav’ring Gales,

Where e’er Columbia spreads her swelling Sails:
To every Realm shall Peace her Charms display,
And Heavenly Freedom spread her golden Ray.

THE END
The U.S. Congress of the Confederation

An Ordinance for the Government of the Territory of the United States Northwest of the River Ohio

BACKGROUND

Congress passed the Northwest Ordinance to provide the governing structure for all of the territories of the young United States, lands that would later become the states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin.

ANNOTATIONS

Article III

Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged. The utmost good faith shall always be observed towards the Indians; their lands and property shall never be taken from them without their consent; and in their property, rights, and liberty they never shall be invaded or disturbed unless in just and lawful wars authorized by Congress; but laws founded in justice and humanity shall, from time to time, be made, for preventing wrongs being done to them, and for preserving peace and friendship with them….
THE DELEGATES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN CONGRESS

Articles of Confederation

LAW

March 1, 1781
United States of America

BACKGROUND

After forming their own country with the Declaration of Independence, the Congress created the Articles of Confederation during the Revolutionary War as the first national government for the United States.

ANNOTATIONS

To all to whom these Presents shall come, we the undersigned Delegates of the States affixed to our Names, send greeting:

Whereas the Delegates of the United States of America in Congress assembled did on the fifteenth day of November in the Year of our Lord One Thousand Seven Hundred and Seventy-Seven, and in the Second Year of the Independence of America agree to certain articles of Confederation and perpetual Union between the States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia in the words following, viz.

Articles of Confederation and perpetual Union between the states of New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia.

Article I

The stile of this confederacy shall be "The United States of America."

Article II

Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom and independence, and every power, jurisdiction and right, which is not by this confederation expressly delegated to the United States, in Congress assembled.

Article III

The said States hereby severally enter into a firm league of friendship with each other, for their common defense, the security of their liberties, and their mutual and general welfare, binding themselves to assist each other, against all force offered to, or attacks made upon them, or any of them, on account of religion, sovereignty, trade, or any other pretense whatever.

Article IV

The better to secure and perpetuate mutual friendship and intercourse among the people of the different States in this Union, the free inhabitants of each of these States, paupers, vagabonds and fugitives from justice excepted, shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of free citizens in the several States; and the people of each State shall have free ingress and regress to and from any other State and shall enjoy therein all the privileges of trade and commerce, subject to the same duties, impositions and restrictions as the inhabitants thereof respectively, provided that such restriction shall not extend so far as to prevent the removal of property imported into any State, to any other State of which the owner is an inhabitant; provided also that no imposition, duties or restriction shall be laid by any State, on the property of the United States, or either of them.
If any person guilty of, or charged with treason, felony, or other high misdemeanor in any State, shall flee from justice, and be found in any of the United States, he shall, upon demand of the Governor or Executive power, of the State from which he fled, be delivered up and removed to the State having jurisdiction of his offense.

Full faith and credit shall be given in each of these States to the records, acts and judicial proceedings of the courts and magistrates of every other State.

Article V

For the more convenient management of the general interests of the United States, delegates shall be annually appointed in such manner as the legislature of each State shall direct, to meet in Congress on the first Monday in November, in every year, with a power reserved to each State to recall its delegates, or any of them, at any time within the year, and to send others in their stead, for the remainder of the year.

No State shall be represented in Congress by less than two, nor by more than seven members; and no person shall be capable of being a delegate for more than three years in any term of six years; nor shall any person, being a delegate, be capable of holding any office under the United States, for which he, or another for his benefit receives any salary, fees or emolument of any kind.

Each State shall maintain its own delegates in a meeting of the States, and while they act as members of the committee of the States.

In determining questions in the United States, in Congress assembled, each State shall have one vote.

Freedom of speech and debate in Congress shall not be impeached or questioned in any court, or place out of Congress, and the members of Congress shall be protected in their persons from arrests and imprisonments, during the time of their going to and from, and attendance on Congress, except for treason, felony, or breach of the peace.
Article VI

No State without the consent of the United States in Congress assembled, shall send any embassy to, or receive any embassy from, or enter into any conference, agreement, alliance or treaty with any king, prince or state; nor shall any person holding any office of profit or trust under the United States, or any of them, accept of any present, emolument, office or title of any kind whatever from any king, prince or foreign state; nor shall the United States in Congress assembled, or any of them, grant any title of nobility.

No two or more States shall enter into any treaty, confederation or alliance whatever between them, without the consent of the United States in Congress assembled, specifying accurately the purposes for which the same is to be entered into, and how long it shall continue.

No State shall lay any imposts or duties, which may interfere with any stipulations in treaties, entered into by the United States in Congress assembled, with any king, prince or state, in pursuance of any treaties already proposed by Congress, to the courts of France and Spain.

No vessels of war shall be kept up in time of peace by any State, except such number only, as shall be deemed necessary by the United States in Congress assembled, for the defense of such State, or its trade; nor shall any body of forces be kept up by any State, in time of peace, except such number only, as in the judgment of the United States, in Congress assembled, shall be deemed requisite to garrison the forts necessary for the defense of such State; but every State shall always keep up a well regulated and disciplined militia, sufficiently armed and accoutred, and shall provide and constantly have ready for use, in public stores, a due number of field pieces and tents, and a proper quantity of arms, ammunition and camp equipage.

No State shall engage in any war without the consent of the United States in Congress assembled, unless such State be actually invaded by enemies, or shall have received certain advice of a resolution being formed by some nation of Indians to invade such State, and the
danger is so imminent as not to admit of a delay, till the United States in Congress assembled can be consulted: nor shall any State grant commissions to any ships or vessels of war, nor letters of marque or reprisal, except it be after a declaration of war by the United States in Congress assembled, and then only against the kingdom or state and the subjects thereof, against which war has been so declared, and under such regulations as shall be established by the United States in Congress assembled, unless such State be infested by pirates, in which case vessels of war may be fitted out for that occasion, and kept so long as the danger shall continue or until the United States in Congress assembled shall determine otherwise.

Article VII

When land-forces are raised by any State for the common defense, all officers of or under the rank of colonel, shall be appointed by the Legislature of each State respectively, by whom such forces shall be raised, or in such manner as such State shall direct, and all vacancies shall be filled up by the State which first made the appointment.

Article VIII

All charges of war, and all other expenses that shall be incurred for the common defense or general welfare, and allowed by the United States in Congress assembled, shall be defrayed out of a common treasury, which shall be supplied by the several States, in proportion to the value of all land within each State, granted to or surveyed for any person, as such land and the buildings and improvements thereon shall be estimated according to such mode as the United States in Congress assembled, shall from time to time direct and appoint.

The taxes for paying that proportion shall be laid and levied by the authority and direction of the Legislatures of the several States within the time agreed upon by the United States in Congress assembled.

Article IX

The United States in Congress assembled, shall have the sole and exclusive right and power of determining on peace and war, except in the cases mentioned in the sixth article—of sending and receiving ambassadors—entering into treaties and alliances, provided that no
treaty of commerce shall be made whereby the legislative power of the respective States shall be restrained from imposing such imposts and duties on foreigners, as their own people are subjected to, or from prohibiting the exportation or importation of any species of goods or commodities, whatsoever—of establishing rules for deciding in all cases, what captures on land or water shall be legal, and in what manner prizes taken by land or naval forces in the service of the United States shall be divided or appropriated—of granting letters of marque and reprisal in times of peace—appointing courts for the trial of piracies and felonies committed on the high seas and establishing courts for receiving and determining finally appeals in all cases of captures, provided that no member of Congress shall be appointed a judge of any of the said courts.

The United States in Congress assembled shall also be the last resort on appeal in all disputes and differences now subsisting or that hereafter may arise between two or more States concerning boundary, jurisdiction or any other cause whatever; which authority shall always be exercised in the manner following. Whenever the legislative or executive authority or lawful agent of any State in controversy with another shall present a petition to Congress, stating the matter in question and praying for a hearing, notice thereof shall be given by order of Congress to the legislative or executive authority of the other State in controversy, and a day assigned for the appearance of the parties by their lawful agents, who shall then be directed to appoint by joint consent, commissioners or judges to constitute a court for hearing and determining the matter in question: but if they cannot agree, Congress shall name three persons out of each of the United States, and from the list of such persons each party shall alternately strike out one, the petitioners beginning, until the number shall be reduced to thirteen; and from that number not less than seven, nor more than nine names as Congress shall direct, shall in the presence of Congress be drawn out by lot, and the persons whose names shall be so drawn or any five of them, shall be commissioners or judges, to hear and finally determine the controversy, so always as a major part of the judges who shall hear the cause shall agree in the determination: and if either party shall neglect to attend at the day appointed, without showing reasons, which Congress shall judge sufficient, or being present shall refuse to strike, the Congress shall proceed to nominate three persons out of each State, and the Secretary of Congress shall strike in behalf of such party.
absent or refusing; and the judgment and sentence of the court to be appointed, in the
manner before prescribed, shall be final and conclusive; and if any of the parties shall refuse
to submit to the authority of such court, or to appear or defend their claim or cause, the
court shall nevertheless proceed to pronounce sentence, or judgment, which shall in like
manner be final and decisive, the judgment or sentence and other proceedings being in
either case transmitted to Congress, and lodged among the acts of Congress for the security
of the parties concerned: provided that every commissioner, before he sits in judgment,
shall take an oath to be administered by one of the judges of the supreme or superior court
of the State where the cause shall be tried, "well and truly to hear and determine the matter
in question, according to the best of his judgment, without favor, affection or hope of re-
ward:" provided also that no State shall be deprived of territory for the benefit of the United
States.

All controversies concerning the private right of soil claimed under different grants of two
or more States, whose jurisdictions as they may respect such lands, and the States which
passed such grants are adjusted, the said grants or either of them being at the same time
claimed to have originated antecedent to such settlement of jurisdiction, shall on the peti-
tion of either party to the Congress of the United States, be finally determined as near as
may be in the same manner as is before prescribed for deciding disputes respecting territo-
rial jurisdiction between different States.

The United States in Congress assembled shall also have the sole and exclusive right and
power of regulating the alloy and value of coin struck by their own authority, or by that of
the respective States.—fixing the standard of weights and measures throughout the United
States.—regulating the trade and managing all affairs with the Indians, not members of any
of the States, provided that the legislative right of any State within its own limits be not
infringed or violated—establishing and regulating post-offices from one State to another,
throughout all the United States, and exacting such postage on the papers passing thro’ the
same as may be requisite to defray the expenses of the said office—appointing all officers
of the land forces, in the service of the United States, excepting regimental officers—ap-
pointing all the officers of the naval forces, and commissioning all officers whatever in the
service of the United States—making rules for the government and regulation of the said land and naval forces, and directing their operations.

The United States in Congress assembled shall have authority to appoint a committee, to sit in the recess of Congress, to be denominated "a Committee of the States", and to consist of one delegate from each State; and to appoint such other committees and civil officers as may be necessary for managing the general affairs of the United States under their direction—to appoint one of their number to preside, provided that no person be allowed to serve in the office of president more than one year in any term of three years; to ascertain the necessary sums of money to be raised for the service of the United States, and to appropriate and apply the same for defraying the public expenses—to borrow money, or emit bills on the credit of the United States, transmitting every half year to the respective States an account of the sums of money so borrowed or emitted,—to build and equip a navy—to agree upon the number of land forces, and to make requisitions from each State for its quota, in proportion to the number of white inhabitants in such State; which requisition shall be binding, and thereupon the Legislature of each State shall appoint the regimental officers, raise the men and clothe, arm and equip them in a soldier-like manner, at the expense of the United States; and the officers and men so clothed, armed and equipped shall march to the place appointed, and within the time agreed on by the United States in Congress assembled: but if the United States in Congress assembled shall, on consideration of circumstances judge proper that any State should not raise men, or should raise a smaller number than its quota, and that any other State should raise a greater number of men than the quota thereof, such extra number shall be raised, officered, clothed, armed and equipped in the same manner as the quota of such State, unless the legislature of such State shall judge that such extra number cannot be safely spared out of the same, in which case they shall raise, officer, cloth, arm and equip as many of such extra number as they judge can be safely spared. And the officers and men so clothed, armed and equipped, shall march to the place appointed, and within the time agreed on by the United States in Congress assembled.
The United States in Congress assembled shall never engage in a war, nor grant letters of marque and reprisal in time of peace, nor enter into any treaties or alliances, nor coin money, nor regulate the value thereof, nor ascertain the sums and expenses necessary for the defense and welfare of the United States, or any of them, nor emit bills, nor borrow money on the credit of the United States, nor appropriate money, nor agree upon the number of vessels of war, to be built or purchased, or the number of land or sea forces to be raised, nor appoint a commander in chief of the army or navy, unless nine States assent to the same; nor shall a question on any other point, except for adjourning from day to day be determined, unless by the votes of a majority of the United States in Congress assembled.

The Congress of the United States shall have power to adjourn to any time within the year, and to any place within the United States, so that no period of adjournment be for a longer duration than the space of six months, and shall publish the journal of their proceedings monthly, except such parts thereof relating to treaties, alliances or military operations, as in their judgment require secrecy; and the yeas and nays of the delegates of each State on any question shall be entered on the journal, when it is desired by any delegate; and the delegates of a State, or any of them, at his or their request shall be furnished with a transcript of the said journal, except such parts as are above excepted, to lay before the legislatures of the several States.

Article X

The committee of the States, or any nine of them, shall be authorized to execute, in the recess of Congress, such of the powers of Congress as the United States in Congress assembled, by the consent of nine States, shall from time to time think expedient to vest them with; provided that no power be delegated to the said committee, for the exercise of which, by the articles of confederation, the voice of nine states in the Congress of the United States assembled is requisite.
Article XI

Canada acceding to this confederation, and joining in the measures of the United States, shall be admitted into, and entitled to all the advantages of this Union: but no other colony shall be admitted into the same, unless such admission be agreed to by nine States.

Article XII

All bills of credit emitted, monies borrowed and debts contracted by, or under the authority of Congress, before the assembling of the United States, in pursuance of the present confederation, shall be deemed and considered as a charge against the United States, for payment and satisfaction whereof the said United States, and the public faith are hereby solemnly pledged.

Article XIII

Every State shall abide by the determinations of the United States in Congress assembled, on all questions which by this confederation, are submitted to them. And the articles of this confederation shall be inviolably observed by every State, and the Union shall be perpetual; nor shall any alteration at any time hereafter be made in any of them; unless such alteration be agreed to in a Congress of the United States, and be afterwards confirmed by the Legislatures of every State.

And whereas it hath pleased the Great Governor of the world to incline the hearts of the Legislatures we respectively represent in Congress, to approve of, and to authorize us to ratify the said articles of confederation and perpetual Union. Know Ye that we, the undersigned delegates, by virtue of the power and authority to us given for that purpose, do by these presents, in the name and in behalf of our respective constituents, fully and entirely ratify and confirm each and every of the said articles of confederation and perpetual Union, and all and singular the matters and things therein contained: and we do further solemnly plight and engage the faith of our respective constituents, that they shall abide by the determinations of the United States in Congress assembled, on all questions, which by the
said confederation are submitted to them. And that the Articles thereof shall be inviolably observed by the States we respectively represent, and that the Union shall be perpetual.

In witness whereof we have hereunto set our hands in Congress. Done at Philadelphia in the State of Pennsylvania the ninth day of July, in the year of our Lord, one thousand seven hundred and seventy-eight, and in the third year of the independence of America.

On the part and behalf of the State of New Hampshire:

Josiah Bartlett, John Wentworth, Jr.

On the part and behalf of the State of Massachusetts Bay:

John Hancock, Samuel Adams, Elbridge Gerry, Francis Dana, James Lovell, Samuel Holten

On the part and behalf of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations:

William Ellery, Henry Marchant, John Collins

On the part and behalf of the State of Connecticut:

Roger Sherman, Samuel Huntington, Oliver Wolcott, Titus Hosmer, Andrew Adams

On the part and behalf of the State of New York:

James Duane, Francis Lewis, William Duer, Gouverneur Morris
On the part and behalf of the State of New Jersey:

John Witherspoon, Nathaniel Scudder

On the part and behalf of the State of Pennsylvania:

Robert Morris, Daniel Roberdeau, Jonathan Bayard Smith, William Clingan, Joseph Reed

On the part and behalf of the State of Delaware:

Thomas McKean, John Dickinson, Nicholas Van Dyke

On the part and behalf of the State of Maryland:

John Hanson, Daniel Carroll

On the part and behalf of the State of Virginia:

Richard Henry Lee, John Banister, Thomas Adams, John Harvie, Francis Lightfoot Lee

On the part and behalf of the State of North Carolina:

John Penn, Cornelius Harnett, John Williams
On the part and behalf of the State of South Carolina:


On the part and behalf of the State of Georgia:

John Walton, Edward Telfair, Edward Langworthy
THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Constitution

LAW

March 4, 1789

United States of America

BACKGROUND

Delegates to the Constitutional Convention drafted and the states ratified this Constitution, forming the second national government for the United States of America.

ANNOTATIONS

Preamble

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

Article I

Section 1. All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Section 2. The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States, and the Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature.

No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the Age of twenty five Years, and been seven Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected,

be an Inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons, including those bound to Service for a Term of Years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three fifths of all other Persons. The actual Enumeration shall be made within three Years after the first Meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent Term of ten Years, in such Manner as they shall by Law direct. The Number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every thirty Thousand, but each State shall have at Least one Representative; and until such enumeration shall be made, the State of New Hampshire shall be entitled to choose three, Massachusetts eight, Rhode-Island and Providence Plantations one, Connecticut five, New-York six, New Jersey four, Pennsylvania eight, Delaware one, Maryland six, Virginia ten, North Carolina five, South Carolina five, and Georgia three.

When vacancies happen in the Representation from any State, the Executive Authority thereof shall issue Writs of Election to fill such Vacancies.

The House of Representatives shall choose their Speaker and other Officers; and shall have the sole Power of Impeachment.

Section 3. The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the Legislature thereof, for six Years; and each Senator shall have one Vote.

Immediately after they shall be assembled in Consequence of the first Election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three Classes. The Seats of the Senators of the first Class shall be vacated at the Expiration of the second Year, of the second Class at the Expiration of the fourth Year, and of the third Class at the Expiration of the sixth Year, so that one third may be chosen every second Year; and if Vacancies happen by Resignation, or otherwise, during the Recess of the Legislature of any State, the Executive thereof may make temporary Appointments until the next Meeting of the Legislature, which shall then fill such Vacancies.
No Person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty Years, and been nine Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen.

The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no Vote, unless they be equally divided.

The Senate shall choose their other Officers, and also a President pro tempore, in the Absence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the Office of President of the United States.

The Senate shall have the sole Power to try all Impeachments. When sitting for that Purpose, they shall be on Oath or Affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside: And no Person shall be convicted without the Concurrence of two thirds of the Members present.

Judgment in Cases of Impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from Office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any Office of honor, Trust or Profit under the United States: but the Party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to Indictment, Trial, Judgment and Punishment, according to Law.

Section 4. The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators andRepresentatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of choosing Senators.

The Congress shall assemble at least once in every Year, and such Meeting shall be on the first Monday in December, unless they shall by Law appoint a different Day.

Section 5. Each House shall be the Judge of the Elections, Returns and Qualifications of its own Members, and a Majority of each shall constitute a Quorum to do Business; but a smaller Number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the Attendance of absent Members, in such Manner, and under such Penalties as each House may provide.
Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behavior, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.

Each House shall keep a Journal of its Proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such Parts as may in their Judgment require Secrecy; and the Yeas and Nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the Desire of one fifth of those Present, be entered on the Journal.

Neither House, during the Session of Congress, shall, without the Consent of the other, adjourn for more than three days, nor to any other Place than that in which the two Houses shall be sitting.

Section 6. The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States. They shall in all Cases, except Treason, Felony and Breach of the Peace, be privileged from Arrest during their Attendance at the Session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any Speech or Debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other Place.

No Senator or Representative shall, during the Time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil Office under the Authority of the United States, which shall have been created, or the Emoluments whereof shall have been encreased during such time; and no Person holding any Office under the United States, shall be a Member of either House during his Continuance in Office.

Section 7. All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills.

Every Bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a Law, be presented to the President of the United States; If he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his Objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the Objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If after such Reconsideration two thirds of that House shall agree to pass the Bill, it shall be sent, together with the Objections, to the other House, by which it shall
likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two thirds of that House, it shall become a Law. But in all such Cases the Votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and Nays, and the Names of the Persons voting for and against the Bill shall be entered on the Journal of each House respectively. If any Bill shall not be returned by the President within ten days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the Same shall be a Law, in like Manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress by their Adjournment prevent its Return in which Case it shall not be a Law.

Every Order, Resolution, or Vote to which the Concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of Adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the Same shall take Effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the Rules and Limitations prescribed in the Case of a Bill.

Section 8. The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow Money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and post Roads;
To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;—And

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.
Section 9. The Migration or Importation of such Persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the Year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a Tax or duty may be imposed on such Importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each Person.

The Privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it.

No Bill of Attainder or ex post facto Law shall be passed.

No Capitation, or other direct, Tax shall be laid, unless in Proportion to the Census or Enumeration herein before directed to be taken.

No Tax or Duty shall be laid on Articles exported from any State.

No Preference shall be given by any Regulation of Commerce or Revenue to the Ports of one State over those of another: nor shall Vessels bound to, or from, one State, be obliged to enter, clear, or pay Duties in another.

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.

Section 10. No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts; pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, or Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts, or grant any Title of Nobility.

No State shall, without the Consent of the Congress, lay any Imposts or Duties on Imports or Exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection Laws: and
the net Produce of all Duties and Imposts, laid by any State on Imports or Exports, shall be for the Use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such Laws shall be subject to the Revision and Control of the Congress.

No State shall, without the Consent of Congress, lay any duty of Tonnage, keep Troops, or Ships of War in time of Peace, enter into any Agreement or Compact with another State, or with a foreign Power, or engage in War, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent Danger as will not admit of delay.

Article II

Section 1. The executive Power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his Office during the Term of four Years, and, together with the Vice-President chosen for the same Term, be elected as follows:

Each State shall appoint, in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors, equal to the whole Number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress: but no Senator or Representative, or Person holding an Office of Trust or Profit under the United States, shall be appointed an Elector. 15

The Electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by Ballot for two Persons, of whom one at least shall not be an Inhabitant of the same State with themselves. And they shall make a List of all the Persons voted for, and of the Number of Votes for each; which List they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the Seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall, in the Presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the Certificates, and the Votes shall then be counted. The Person having the greatest Number of Votes shall be the President, if such Number be a Majority of the whole Number of Electors appointed; and if there be more than one who have such Majority, and have an equal Number of Votes, then the House of Representatives shall immediately choose by Ballot one of them for President; and if no Person have a Majority, then from the five highest on the List the said House shall in like Manner choose the President. But in choosing the President, the Votes shall be taken by States, the Representation from each State having one Vote; a quorum for
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this Purpose shall consist of a Member or Members from two thirds of the States, and a
Majority of all the States shall be necessary to a Choice. In every Case, after the Choice of
the President, the Person having the greatest Number of Votes of the Electors shall be the
Vice President. But if there should remain two or more who have equal Votes, the Senate
shall choose from them by Ballot the Vice President.

The Congress may determine the Time of choosing the Electors, and the Day on which
they shall give their Votes; which Day shall be the same throughout the United States.

No Person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of
the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President; neither shall
any Person be eligible to that Office who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty-five
Years, and been fourteen Years a Resident within the United States.

In Case of the Removal of the President from Office, or of his Death, Resignation, or Ina-
Bility to discharge the Powers and Duties of the said Office, the Same shall devolve on the
Vice President, and the Congress may by Law provide for the Case of Removal, Death,
Resignation or Inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what Officer
shall then act as President, and such Officer shall act accordingly, until the Disability be
removed, or a President shall be elected.

The President shall, at stated Times, receive for his Services, a Compensation, which shall
neither be increased nor diminished during the Period for which he shall have been elected,
and he shall not receive within that Period any other Emolument from the United States,
or any of them.

Before he enter on the Execution of his Office, he shall take the following Oath or Affirma-
tion:—"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President
of the United States, and will to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and defend the
Constitution of the United States."

Section 2. The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United
States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the
United States; he may require the Opinion, in writing, of the principal Officer in each of
the executive Departments, upon any subject relating to the Duties of their respective Offices, and he shall have Power to grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offenses against the United States, except in Cases of Impeachment.

He shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law: but the Congress may by Law vest the Appointment of such inferior Officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the Courts of Law, or in the Heads of Departments.

The President shall have Power to fill up all Vacancies that may happen during the Recess of the Senate, by granting Commissions which shall expire at the End of their next Session.

Section 3. He shall from time to time give to the Congress Information of the State of the Union, and recommend to their Consideration such Measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient; he may, on extraordinary Occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them, and in Case of Disagreement between them, with Respect to the Time of Adjournment, he may adjourn them to such Time as he shall think proper; he shall receive Ambassadors and other public Ministers; he shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed, and shall Commission all the Officers of the United States.

Section 4. The President, Vice President and all civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.

Article III

Section 1. The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good
Behavior, and shall, at stated Times, receive for their Services a Compensation, which shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office.

Section 2. The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority;—to all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls;—to all Cases of admiralty and maritime Jurisdiction; — to Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party;—to Controversies between two or more States;—between a State and Citizens of another State;—between Citizens of different States;—between Citizens of the same State claiming Lands under Grants of different States, and between a State, or the Citizens thereof, and foreign States, Citizens or Subjects.

In all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, and those in which a State shall be Party, the supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction. In all the other Cases before mentioned, the supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make.

The Trial of all Crimes, except in Cases of Impeachment, shall be by Jury; and such Trial shall be held in the State where the said Crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State, the Trial shall be at such Place or Places as the Congress may by Law have directed.

Section 3. Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying War against them, or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort. No Person shall be convicted of Treason unless on the Testimony of two Witnesses to the same overt Act, or on Confession in open Court.

The Congress shall have Power to declare the Punishment of Treason, but no Attainder of Treason shall work Corruption of Blood, or Forfeiture except during the Life of the Person attainted.
Article IV

Section 1. Full Faith and Credit shall be given in each State to the public Acts, Records, and judicial Proceedings of every other State. And the Congress may by general Laws prescribe the Manner in which such Acts, Records and Proceedings shall be proved, and the Effect thereof.

Section 2. The Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of Citizens in the several States.

A Person charged in any State with Treason, Felony, or other Crime, who shall flee from Justice, and be found in another State, shall on Demand of the executive Authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having Jurisdiction of the Crime.

No Person held to Service or Labor in one State, under the Laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in Consequence of any Law or Regulation therein, be discharged from such Service or Labor, but shall be delivered up on Claim of the Party to whom such Service or Labor may be due.

Section 3. New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the Junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the Consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

Section 4. The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic Violence.
Article V

The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

Article VI

All Debts contracted and Engagements entered into, before the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation.

This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States.
Article VII

The Ratification of the Conventions of nine States, shall be sufficient for the Establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the Same.

Done in Convention by the Unanimous Consent of the States present the Seventeenth Day of September in the Year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and Eighty seven and of the Independence of the United States of America the Twelfth In witness whereof We have hereunto subscribed our Names.

George Washington—
President and deputy from Virginia

Delaware

George Read, Gunning Bedford, Jr., John Dickinson, Richard Bassett, Jacob Broom

Maryland

James McHenry, Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer, Daniel Carroll

Virginia

John Blair, James Madison, Jr.

North Carolina

William Blount, Richard Dobbs Spaight, Hugh Williamson

South Carolina

John Rutledge, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, Charles Pinckney, Pierce Butler
Georgia
William Few, Abraham Baldwin

New Hampshire
John Langdon, Nicholas Gilman

Massachusetts
Nathaniel Gorham, Rufus King

Connecticut
William Samuel Johnson, Roger Sherman

New York
Alexander Hamilton

New Jersey
William Livingston, David Brearley, William Paterson, Jonathan Dayton

Pennsylvania
Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Mifflin, Robert Morris, George Clymer, Thomas FitzSimmons, Jared Ingersoll, James Wilson, Gouverneur Morris

Attest William Jackson Secretary
Amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America

Amendment I

Ratified December 15, 1791

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Amendment II

Ratified December 15, 1791

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

Amendment III

Ratified December 15, 1791

No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

Amendment IV

Ratified December 15, 1791

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.
Amendment V

Ratified December 15, 1791

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Amendment VI

Ratified December 15, 1791

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defense.

Amendment VII

Ratified December 15, 1791

In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.
Amendment VIII

Ratified December 15, 1791

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

Amendment IX

Ratified December 15, 1791

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Amendment X

Ratified December 15, 1791

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Amendment XI

Ratified February 7, 1795

The Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State.

Amendment XII

Ratified June 15, 1804

The Electors shall meet in their respective states and vote by ballot for President and Vice-President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same state with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice-President, and they shall make distinct lists of all per-
sons voted for as President, and of all persons voted for as Vice-President, and of the num-
ber of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat
of the government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate;—the Pres-
ident of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open
all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted;—The person having the greatest
number of votes for President, shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the
whole number of Electors appointed; and if no person have such majority, then from the
persons having the highest numbers not exceeding three on the list of those voted for as
President, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President.
But in choosing the President, the votes shall be taken by states, the representation from
each state having one vote; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or mem-
bers from two-thirds of the states, and a majority of all the states shall be necessary to a
choice. And if the House of Representatives shall not choose a President whenever the right
of choice shall devolve upon them, before the fourth day of March next following, then the
Vice-President shall act as President, as in the case of the death or other constitutional dis-
ability of the President.—The person having the greatest number of votes as Vice-Presi-
dent, shall be the Vice-President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of
Electors appointed, and if no person have a majority, then from the two highest numbers
on the list, the Senate shall choose the Vice-President; a quorum for the purpose shall con-
sist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number
shall be necessary to a choice. But no person constitutionally ineligible to the office of Pres-
ident shall be eligible to that of Vice-President of the United States.

Amendment XIII

Ratified December 6, 1865

Section 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime
whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or
any place subject to their jurisdiction.

Section 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.
Amendment XIV

Ratified July 9, 1868

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

Section 3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice-President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.
Section 4. The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.

Section 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

Amendment XV

Ratified February 3, 1870

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment XVI

Ratified February 3, 1913

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

Amendment XVII

Ratified April 8, 1913

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.
When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive au-
authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: Provided, That the 
legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appoint-
ments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.

This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator 
chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.

Amendment XVIII

Ratified January 16, 1919

Section 1. After one year from the ratification of this article the manufacture, sale, or trans-
portation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation 
thereof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof for bev-
erage purposes is hereby prohibited.

Section 2. The Congress and the several States shall have concurrent power to enforce this 
article by appropriate legislation.

Section 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amend-
ment to the Constitution by the legislatures of the several States, as provided in the Consti-
tution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Con-
gress.

Amendment XIX

Ratified August 18, 1920

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the 
United States or by any State on account of sex.

Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.
Amendment XX

Ratified January 23, 1933

Section 1. The terms of the President and the Vice President shall end at noon on the 20th day of January, and the terms of Senators and Representatives at noon on the 3rd day of January, of the years in which such terms would have ended if this article had not been ratified; and the terms of their successors shall then begin.

Section 2. The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall begin at noon on the 3rd day of January, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.

Section 3. If, at the time fixed for the beginning of the term of the President, the President elect shall have died, the Vice President elect shall become President. If a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or if the President elect shall have failed to qualify, then the Vice President elect shall act as President until a President shall have qualified; and the Congress may by law provide for the case wherein neither a President elect nor a Vice President shall have qualified, declaring who shall then act as President, or the manner in which one who is to act shall be selected, and such person shall act accordingly until a President or Vice President shall have qualified.

Section 4. The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.

Section 5. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect on the 15th day of October following the ratification of this article.

Section 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission.
Amendment XXI

Ratified December 5, 1933

Section 1. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

Section 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited.

Section 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress.

Amendment XXII

Ratified February 27, 1951

Section 1. No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than two years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of President more than once. But this Article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President when this Article was proposed by the Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this Article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term.

Section 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.
Amendment XXIII

Ratified March 29, 1961

Section 1. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct:

A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the twelfth article of amendment.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment XXIV

Ratified January 23, 1964

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment XXV

Ratified February 10, 1967

Section 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

Section 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.
Section 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

Section 4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session.

If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office.
Amendment XXVI

Ratified July 1, 1971

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States, who are eighteen years of age or older, to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment XXVII

Ratified May 7, 1992

No law varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives shall take effect, until an election of Representatives shall have intervened.
PUBLIUS (ALEXANDER HAMILTON)

Federalist No. 9

ESSAY

November 21, 1787

The Independent Journal | New York City, New York

BACKGROUND

Publius (Alexander Hamilton) argues for the proposed Constitution by explaining the new understandings in political philosophy that informed its creation.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What was the problem with disunited republics of the past?

2. What are the five key elements of the advanced understanding of politics?

3. How does Publius respond to Anti-Federalist arguments claiming that Montesquieu rejected large republics?

4. According to Publius, does Montesquieu support a federal government intervening in the affairs of the states?

The Union as a Safeguard Against Domestic Faction and Insurrection

A firm Union will be of the utmost moment to the peace and liberty of the States, as a barrier against domestic faction and insurrection. It is impossible to read the history of the petty republics of Greece and Italy without feeling sensations of horror and disgust at the distractions with which they were continually agitated, and at the rapid succession of revolutions by which they were kept in a state of perpetual vibration between the extremes of tyranny and anarchy. If they exhibit occasional calms, these only serve as short-lived contrast to the furious storms that are to succeed. If now and then intervals of felicity open to view, we behold them with a mixture of regret, arising from the reflection that the pleasing scenes before us are soon to be overwhelmed by the tempestuous waves of sedition and party rage. If momentary rays of glory break forth from the gloom, while they dazzle us with a transient and fleeting brilliancy, they at the same time admonish us to lament that the vices of government should pervert the direction and tarnish the lustre of those bright talents and exalted endowments for which the favored soils that produced them have been so justly celebrated.

From the disorders that disfigure the annals of those republics the advocates of despotism have drawn arguments, not only against the forms of republican government, but against the very principles of civil liberty. They have decried all free government as inconsistent with the order of society, and have indulged themselves in malicious exultation over its friends and partisans. Happily for mankind, stupendous fabrics reared on the basis of liberty, which have flourished for ages, have, in a few glorious instances, refuted their gloomy sophisms. And, I trust, America will be the broad and solid foundation of other edifices, not less magnificent, which will be equally permanent monuments of their errors.

But it is not to be denied that the portraits they have sketched of republican government were too just copies of the originals from which they were taken. If it had been found impracticable to have devised models of a more perfect structure, the enlightened friends to liberty would have been obliged to abandon the cause of that species of government as
indefensible. The science of politics, however, like most other sciences, has received great improvement. The efficacy of various principles is now well understood, which were either not known at all, or imperfectly known to the ancients. The regular distribution of power into distinct departments; the introduction of legislative balances and checks; the institution of courts composed of judges holding their offices during good behavior; the representation of the people in the legislature by deputies of their own election: these are wholly new discoveries, or have made their principal progress towards perfection in modern times. They are means, and powerful means, by which the excellences of republican government may be retained and its imperfections lessened or avoided. To this catalogue of circumstances that tend to the amelioration of popular systems of civil government, I shall venture, however novel it may appear to some, to add one more, on a principle which has been made the foundation of an objection to the new Constitution; I mean the ENLARGEMENT of the ORBIT within which such systems are to revolve, either in respect to the dimensions of a single State or to the consolidation of several smaller States into one great Confederacy. The latter is that which immediately concerns the object under consideration. It will, however, be of use to examine the principle in its application to a single State, which shall be attended to in another place.

The utility of a Confederacy, as well to suppress faction and to guard the internal tranquility of States, as to increase their external force and security, is in reality not a new idea. It has been practiced upon in different countries and ages, and has received the sanction of the most approved writers on the subject of politics. The opponents of the PLAN proposed have, with great assiduity, cited and circulated the observations of Montesquieu on the necessity of a contracted territory for a republican government. But they seem not to have been apprised of the sentiments of that great man expressed in another part of his work, nor to have adverted to the consequences of the principle to which they subscribe with such ready acquiescence.
When Montesquieu recommends a small extent for republics, the standards he had in view were of dimensions far short of the limits of almost every one of these States. Neither Virginia, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New York, North Carolina, nor Georgia can by any means be compared with the models from which he reasoned and to which the terms of his description apply. If we therefore take his ideas on this point as the criterion of truth, we shall be driven to the alternative either of taking refuge at once in the arms of monarchy, or of splitting ourselves into an infinity of little, jealous, clashing, tumultuous commonwealths, the wretched nurseries of unceasing discord, and the miserable objects of universal pity or contempt. Some of the writers who have come forward on the other side of the question seem to have been aware of the dilemma; and have even been bold enough to hint at the division of the larger States as a desirable thing. Such an infatuated policy, such a desperate expedient, might, by the multiplication of petty offices, answer the views of men who possess not qualifications to extend their influence beyond the narrow circles of personal intrigue, but it could never promote the greatness or happiness of the people of America.

Referring the examination of the principle itself to another place, as has been already mentioned, it will be sufficient to remark here that, in the sense of the author who has been most emphatically quoted upon the occasion, it would only dictate a reduction of the size of the more considerable members of the Union, but would not militate against their being all comprehended in one confederate government. And this is the true question, in the discussion of which we are at present interested.

So far are the suggestions of Montesquieu from standing in opposition to a general union of the States, that he explicitly treats of a confederate republic as the expedient for extending the sphere of popular government, and reconciling the advantages of monarchy with those of republicanism.

"It is very probable," (says he) "that mankind would have been obliged at length to live constantly under the government of a single person, had they not contrived a kind of
constitution that has all the internal advantages of a republican, together with the external force of a monarchical government. I mean a CONFEDERATE REPUBLIC.

"This form of government is a convention by which several smaller states agree to become members of a larger one, which they intend to form. It is a kind of assemblage of societies that constitute a new one, capable of increasing, by means of new associations, till they arrive to such a degree of power as to be able to provide for the security of the united body.

"A republic of this kind, able to withstand an external force, may support itself without any internal corruptions. The form of this society prevents all manner of inconveniences.

"If a single member should attempt to usurp the supreme authority, he could not be supposed to have an equal authority and credit in all the confederate states. Were he to have too great influence over one, this would alarm the rest. Were he to subdue a part, that which would still remain free might oppose him with forces independent of those which he had usurped and overpower him before he could be settled in his usurpation.

"Should a popular insurrection happen in one of the confederate states the others are able to quell it. Should abuses creep into one part, they are reformed by those that remain sound. The state may be destroyed on one side, and not on the other; the confederacy may be dissolved, and the confederates preserve their sovereignty.

"As this government is composed of small republics, it enjoys the internal happiness of each; and with respect to its external situation, it is possessed, by means of the association, of all the advantages of large monarchies."

I have thought it proper to quote at length these interesting passages, because they contain a luminous abridgment of the principal arguments in favor of the Union, and must effectually remove the false impressions which a misapplication of other parts of the work was calculated to make. They have, at the same time, an intimate connection with the more
immediate design of this paper; which is, to illustrate the tendency of the Union to repress domestic faction and insurrection.

A distinction, more subtle than accurate, has been raised between a *confederacy* and a *consolidation* of the States. The essential characteristic of the first is said to be, the restriction of its authority to the members in their collective capacities, without reaching to the individuals of whom they are composed. It is contended that the national council ought to have no concern with any object of internal administration. An exact equality of suffrage between the members has also been insisted upon as a leading feature of a confederate government. These positions are, in the main, arbitrary; they are supported neither by principle nor precedent. It has indeed happened, that governments of this kind have generally operated in the manner which the distinction taken notice of, supposes to be inherent in their nature; but there have been in most of them extensive exceptions to the practice, which serve to prove, as far as example will go, that there is no absolute rule on the subject. And it will be clearly shown in the course of this investigation that as far as the principle contended for has prevailed, it has been the cause of incurable disorder and imbecility in the government.

The definition of a *confederate republic* seems simply to be "an assemblage of societies," or an association of two or more states into one state. The extent, modifications, and objects of the federal authority are mere matters of discretion. So long as the separate organization of the members be not abolished; so long as it exists, by a constitutional necessity, for local purposes; though it should be in perfect subordination to the general authority of the union, it would still be, in fact and in theory, an association of states, or a confederacy. The proposed Constitution, so far from implying an abolition of the State governments, makes them constituent parts of the national sovereignty, by allowing them a direct representation in the Senate, and leaves in their possession certain exclusive and very important portions of sovereign power. This fully corresponds, in every rational import of the terms, with the idea of a federal government.
In the Lycian confederacy, which consisted of twenty-three CITIES or republics, the largest were entitled to *three* votes in the COMMON COUNCIL, those of the middle class to *two*, and the smallest to *one*. The COMMON COUNCIL had the appointment of all the judges and magistrates of the respective CITIES. This was certainly the most, delicate species of interference in their internal administration; for if there be any thing that seems exclusively appropriated to the local jurisdictions, it is the appointment of their own officers. Yet Montesquieu, speaking of this association, says: "Were I to give a model of an excellent Confederate Republic, it would be that of Lycia." Thus we perceive that the distinctions insisted upon were not within the contemplation of this enlightened civilian; and we shall be led to conclude, that they are the novel refinements of an erroneous theory.
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BACKGROUND

Publius (James Madison) argues for the proposed Constitution by explaining the risks of factions and majority tyranny and how the Constitution addresses them.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. How does Madison define faction?
2. How is faction part of human nature?
3. Can the problem of faction be solved by removing the causes of faction?
4. Is it practicable to make all people of one mind? How are opinions and passions related to the problem of faction?
5. What is the first task of government?
6. Since the causes of faction cannot be removed, what must be controlled?
7. How is minority faction solved?
8. What is the solution for majority faction?
9. What is the role of elected representatives in solving the problem of faction?
10. How does a large republic address the problem of majority faction?
11. What are the concerns of a republic being too large or too small?

Among the numerous advantages promised by a well-constructed Union, none deserves to be more accurately developed than its tendency to break and control the violence of faction. The friend of popular governments never finds himself so much alarmed for their character and fate as when he contemplates their propensity to this dangerous vice. He will not fail, therefore, to set a due value on any plan which, without violating the principles to which he is attached, provides a proper cure for it. The instability, injustice, and confusion introduced into the public councils have, in truth, been the mortal diseases under which popular governments have everywhere perished, as they continue to be the favorite and fruitful topics from which the adversaries to liberty derive their most specious declamations. The valuable improvements made by the American constitutions on the popular models, both ancient and modern, cannot certainly be too much admired; but it would be an unwarrantable partiality to contend that they have as effectually obviated the danger on this side, as was wished and expected. Complaints are everywhere heard from our most considerate and virtuous citizens, equally the friends of public and private faith and of public and personal liberty, that our governments are too unstable, that the public good is disregarded in the conflicts of rival parties, and that measures are too often decided, not according to the rules of justice and the rights of the minor party, but by the superior force of an interested and overbearing majority. However anxiously we may wish that these complaints had no foundation, the evidence of known facts will not permit us to deny that they are in some degree true. It will be found, indeed, on a candid review of our situation, that some of the distresses under which we labor have been erroneously charged on the operation of our governments; but it will be found, at the same time, that other causes will not alone account for many of our heaviest misfortunes; and, particularly, for that prevailing and increasing distrust of public engagements and alarm for private rights which are echoed from one end of the continent to the other. These must be chiefly, if not wholly, effects of the unsteadiness and injustice with which a factious spirit has tainted our public administration.
By a faction I understand a number of citizens, whether amounting to a majority or minority of the whole, who are united and actuated by some common impulse of passion, or of interest, adverse to the rights of other citizens, or to the permanent and aggregate interests of the community.

There are two methods of curing the mischiefs of faction: the one, by removing its causes; the other, by controlling its effects.

There are again two methods of removing the causes of faction: the one, by destroying the liberty which is essential to its existence; the other, by giving to every citizen the same opinions, the same passions, and the same interests.

It could never be more truly said than of the first remedy that it was worse than the disease. Liberty is to faction what air is to fire, an aliment without which it instantly expires. But it could not be a less folly to abolish liberty, which is essential to political life, because it nourishes faction than it would be to wish the annihilation of air, which is essential to animal life, because it imparts to fire its destructive agency.

The second expedient is as impracticable as the first would be unwise. As long as the reason of man continues fallible, and he is at liberty to exercise it, different opinions will be formed. As long as the connection subsists between his reason and his self-love, his opinions and his passions will have a reciprocal influence on each other; and the former will be objects to which the latter will attach themselves. The diversity in the faculties of men, from which the rights of property originate, is not less an insuperable obstacle to a uniformity of interests. The protection of these faculties is the first object of government. From the protection of different and unequal faculties of acquiring property, the possession of different degrees and kinds of property immediately results; and from the influence of these on the sentiments and views of the respective proprietors ensues a division of the society into different interests and parties.
The latent causes of faction are thus sown in the nature of man; and we see them everywhere brought into different degrees of activity, according to the different circumstances of civil society. A zeal for different opinions concerning religion, concerning government, and many other points, as well as speculation as of practice; an attachment to different leaders ambitiously contending for preeminence and power; or to persons of other descriptions whose fortunes have been interesting to the human passions, have, in turn, divided mankind into parties, inflamed them with mutual animosity, and rendered them much more disposed to vex and oppress each other than to cooperate for their common good. So strong is this propensity of mankind to fall into mutual animosities that where no substantial occasion presents itself the most frivolous and fanciful distinctions have been sufficient to kindle their unfriendly passions and excite their most violent conflicts. But the most common and durable source of factions has been the various and unequal distribution of property. Those who hold and those who are without property have ever formed distinct interests in society. Those who are creditors, and those who are debtors, fall under a like discrimination. A landed interest, a manufacturing interest, a mercantile interest, a moneyed interest, with many lesser interests, grow up of necessity in civilized nations, and divide them into different classes, actuated by different sentiments and views. The regulation of these various and interfering interests forms the principal task of modern legislation and involves the spirit of party and faction in the necessary and ordinary operations of government.

No man is allowed to be a judge in his own cause because his interest would certainly bias his judgment, and, not improbably, corrupt his integrity. With equal, nay with greater reason, a body of men are unfit to be both judges and parties at the same time; yet what are many of the most important acts of legislation but so many judicial determinations, not indeed concerning the rights of single persons, but concerning the rights of large bodies of citizens? And what are the different classes of legislators but advocates and parties to the causes which they determine? Is a law proposed concerning private debts? It is a question to which the creditors are parties on one side and the debtors on the other. Justice ought to hold the balance between them. Yet the parties are, and must be, themselves the judges;
and the most numerous party, or in other words, the most powerful faction must be expected to prevail. Shall domestic manufactures be encouraged, and in what degree, by restrictions on foreign manufactures? are questions which would be differently decided by the landed and the manufacturing classes, and probably by neither with a sole regard to justice and the public good. The apportionment of taxes on the various descriptions of property is an act which seems to require the most exact impartiality; yet there is, perhaps, no legislative act in which greater opportunity and temptation are given to a predominant party to trample on the rules of justice. Every shilling with which they overburden the inferior number is a shilling saved to their own pockets.

It is in vain to say that enlightened statesmen will be able to adjust these clashing interests and render them all subservient to the public good. Enlightened statesmen will not always be at the helm. Nor, in many cases, can such an adjustment be made at all without taking into view indirect and remote considerations, which will rarely prevail over the immediate interest which one party may find in disregarding the rights of another or the good of the whole.

The inference to which we are brought is that the causes of faction cannot be removed and that relief is only to be sought in the means of controlling its effects.

If a faction consists of less than a majority, relief is supplied by the republican principle, which enables the majority to defeat its sinister views by regular vote. It may clog the administration, it may convulse the society; but it will be unable to execute and mask its violence under the forms of the Constitution. When a majority is included in a faction, the form of popular government, on the other hand, enables it to sacrifice to its ruling passion or interest both the public good and the rights of other citizens. To secure the public good and private rights against the danger of such a faction, and at the same time to preserve the spirit and the form of popular government, is then the great object to which our inquiries
are directed. Let me add that it is the great desideratum by which alone this form of govern-
ment can be rescued from the opprobrium under which it has so long labored and be recommended to the esteem and adoption of mankind.

By what means is this object attainable? Evidently by one of two only. Either the existence of the same passion or interest in a majority at the same time must be prevented, or the majority, having such coexistent passion or interest, must be rendered, by their number and local situation, unable to concert and carry into effect schemes of oppression. If the impulse and the opportunity be suffered to coincide, we well know that neither moral nor religious motives can be relied on as an adequate control. They are not found to be such on the injustice and violence of individuals, and lose their efficacy in proportion to the number combined together, that is, in proportion as their efficacy becomes needful.

From this view of the subject it may be concluded that a pure democracy, by which I mean a society consisting of a small number of citizens, who assemble and administer the government in person, can admit of no cure for the mischiefs of faction. A common passion or interest will, in almost every case, be felt by a majority of the whole; a communication and concert result from the form of government itself; and there is nothing to check the inducements to sacrifice the weaker party or an obnoxious individual. Hence it is that such democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention; have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property; and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths. Theoretic politicians, who have patronized this species of government, have erroneously supposed that by reducing mankind to a perfect equality in their political rights, they would at the same time be perfectly equalized and assimilated in their possessions, their opinions, and their passions.

A republic, by which I mean a government in which the scheme of representation takes place, opens a different prospect and promises the cure for which we are seeking. Let us examine the points in which it varies from pure democracy, and we shall comprehend both the nature of the cure and the efficacy which it must derive from the Union.
The two great points of difference between a democracy and a republic are: first, the delegation of the government, in the latter, to a small number of citizens elected by the rest; secondly, the greater number of citizens and greater sphere of country over which the latter may be extended.

The effect of the first difference is, on the one hand, to refine and enlarge the public views by passing them through the medium of a chosen body of citizens, whose wisdom may best discern the true interest of their country and whose patriotism and love of justice will be least likely to sacrifice it to temporary or partial considerations. Under such a regulation it may well happen that the public voice, pronounced by the representatives of the people, will be more consonant to the public good than if pronounced by the people themselves, convened for the purpose. On the other hand, the effect may be inverted. Men of factious tempers, of local prejudices, or of sinister designs, may, by intrigue, by corruption, or by other means, first obtain the suffrages, and then betray the interests of the people. The question resulting is, whether small or extensive republics are most favorable to the election of proper guardians of the public weal; and it is clearly decided in favor of the latter by two obvious considerations.

In the first place it is to be remarked that however small the republic may be the representatives must be raised to a certain number in order to guard against the cabals of a few; and that however large it may be they must be limited to a certain number in order to guard against the confusion of a multitude. Hence, the number of representatives in the two cases not being in proportion to that of the two constituents, and being proportionally greatest in the small republic, it follows that if the proportion of fit characters be not less in the large than in the small republic, the former will present a greater option, and consequently a greater probability of a fit choice.

In the next place, as each representative will be chosen by a greater number of citizens in the large than in the small republic, it will be more difficult for unworthy candidates to
practise with success the vicious arts by which elections are too often carried; and the suf-
frages of the people being more free, will be more likely to center on men who possess the
most attractive merit and the most diffusive and established characters.

It must be confessed that in this, as in most other cases, there is a mean, on both sides of
which inconveniences will be found to lie. By enlarging too much the number of electors,
you render the representative too little acquainted with all their local circumstances and
lesser interests; as by reducing it too much, you render him unduly attached to these, and
too little fit to comprehend and pursue great and national objects. The federal Constitution
forms a happy combination in this respect; the great and aggregate interests being referred
to the national, the local and particular to the State legislatures.

The other point of difference is the greater number of citizens and extent of territory which
may be brought within the compass of republican than of democratic government; and it
is this circumstance principally which renders factious combinations less to be dreaded in
the former than in the latter. The smaller the society, the fewer probably will be the distinct
parties and interests composing it; the fewer the distinct parties and interests, the more
frequently will a majority be found of the same party; and the smaller the number of indi-
viduals composing a majority, and the smaller the compass within which they are placed,
the more easily will they concert and execute their plans of oppression. Extend the sphere
and you take in a greater variety of parties and interests; you make it less probable that a
majority of the whole will have a common motive to invade the rights of other citizens; or
if such a common motive exists, it will be more difficult for all who feel it to discover their
own strength and to act in unison with each other. Besides other impediments, it may be
remarked that, where there is a consciousness of unjust or dishonorable purposes, commu-
nication is always checked by distrust in proportion to the number whose concurrence is
necessary.

Hence, it clearly appears that the same advantage which a republic has over a democracy
in controlling the effects of faction is enjoyed by a large over a small republic—is enjoyed
by the Union over the States composing it. Does this advantage consist in the substitution of representatives whose enlightened views and virtuous sentiments render them superior to local prejudices and to schemes of injustice? It will not be denied that the representation of the Union will be most likely to possess these requisite endowments. Does it consist in the greater security afforded by a greater variety of parties, against the event of any one party being able to outnumber and oppress the rest? In an equal degree, does the increased variety of parties comprised within the Union increase this security? Does it, in fine, consist in the greater obstacles opposed to the concert and accomplishment of the secret wishes of an unjust and interested majority? Here again the extent of the Union gives it the most palpable advantage.

The influence of factious leaders may kindle a flame within their particular States but will be unable to spread a general conflagration through the other States. A religious sect may degenerate into a political faction in a part of the Confederacy; but the variety of sects dispersed over the entire face of it must secure the national councils against any danger from that source. A rage for paper money, for an abolition of debts, for an equal division of property, or for any other improper or wicked project, will be less apt to pervade the whole body of the Union than a particular member of it, in the same proportion as such a malady is more likely to taint a particular county or district than an entire State.

In the extent and proper structure of the Union, therefore, we behold a republican remedy for the diseases most incident to republican government. And according to the degree of pleasure and pride we feel in being republicans ought to be our zeal in cherishing the spirit and supporting the character of federalists.
**Publius (James Madison)**

**Federalist No. 51**
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**BACKGROUND**

Publius (James Madison) argues for the proposed Constitution by explaining the risks of a concentration of power and how the Constitution addresses them.

**GUIDING QUESTIONS**

1. What does it mean for each branch of government to have a will of its own?

2. Is the separation of powers absolute, or should the powers overlap? Why or why not?

3. What additional methods help the government to control itself?

4. How is the executive branch strengthened?

5. How is the power surrendered by the people divided to protect from government encroachment?

6. How does the argument against majority tyranny here relate to the argument made in Federalist 10?

7. What is the end of government and civil society according to Publius in Federalist 51?

The Structure of the Government Must Furnish the Proper Checks and Balances Between the Different Departments

To what expedient, then, shall we finally resort, for maintaining in practice the necessary partition of power among the several departments, as laid down in the Constitution? The only answer that can be given is, that as all these exterior provisions are found to be inadequate, the defect must be supplied, by so contriving the interior structure of the government as that its several constituent parts may, by their mutual relations, be the means of keeping each other in their proper places. Without presuming to undertake a full development of this important idea, I will hazard a few general observations, which may perhaps place it in a clearer light, and enable us to form a more correct judgment of the principles and structure of the government planned by the convention.

In order to lay a due foundation for that separate and distinct exercise of the different powers of government, which to a certain extent is admitted on all hands to be essential to the preservation of liberty, it is evident that each department should have a will of its own; and consequently should be so constituted that the members of each should have as little agency as possible in the appointment of the members of the others. Were this principle rigorously adhered to, it would require that all the appointments for the supreme executive, legislative, and judiciary magistracies should be drawn from the same fountain of authority, the people, through channels having no communication whatever with one another. Perhaps such a plan of constructing the several departments would be less difficult in practice than it may in contemplation appear. Some difficulties, however, and some additional expense would attend the execution of it. Some deviations, therefore, from the principle must be admitted.

In the constitution of the judiciary department in particular, it might be inexpedient to insist rigorously on the principle: first, because peculiar qualifications being essential in the members, the primary consideration ought to be to select that mode of choice which best secures these qualifications; secondly, because the permanent tenure by which the appointments are held in that department, must soon destroy all sense of dependence on the authority conferring them.
It is equally evident, that the members of each department should be as little dependent as possible on those of the others, for the emoluments annexed to their offices. Were the executive magistrate, or the judges, not independent of the legislature in this particular, their independence in every other would be merely nominal.

But the great security against a gradual concentration of the several powers in the same department, consists in giving to those who administer each department the necessary constitutional means and personal motives to resist encroachments of the others. The provision for defense must in this, as in all other cases, be made commensurate to the danger of attack. Ambition must be made to counteract ambition. The interest of the man must be connected with the constitutional rights of the place. It may be a reflection on human nature, that such devices should be necessary to control the abuses of government. But what is government itself, but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary. In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself. A dependence on the people is, no doubt, the primary control on the government; but experience has taught mankind the necessity of auxiliary precautions.

This policy of supplying, by opposite and rival interests, the defect of better motives, might be traced through the whole system of human affairs, private as well as public. We see it particularly displayed in all the subordinate distributions of power, where the constant aim is to divide and arrange the several offices in such a manner as that each may be a check on the other that the private interest of every individual may be a sentinel over the public rights. These inventions of prudence cannot be less requisite in the distribution of the supreme powers of the State.

But it is not possible to give to each department an equal power of self-defense. In republican government, the legislative authority necessarily predominates. The remedy for this
inconveniency is to divide the legislature into different branches; and to render them, by
different modes of election and different principles of action, as little connected with each
other as the nature of their common functions and their common dependence on the soci-
ety will admit. It may even be necessary to guard against dangerous encroachments by still
further precautions. As the weight of the legislative authority requires that it should be thus
divided, the weakness of the executive may require, on the other hand, that it should be
fortified. An absolute negative on the legislature appears, at first view, to be the natural
defense with which the executive magistrate should be armed. But perhaps it would be nei-
ther altogether safe nor alone sufficient. On ordinary occasions it might not be exerted with
the requisite firmness, and on extraordinary occasions it might be perfidiously abused. May
not this defect of an absolute negative be supplied by some qualified connection between
this weaker department and the weaker branch of the stronger department, by which the
latter may be led to support the constitutional rights of the former, without being too much
detached from the rights of its own department?

If the principles on which these observations are founded be just, as I persuade myself they
are, and they be applied as a criterion to the several State constitutions, and to the federal
Constitution it will be found that if the latter does not perfectly correspond with them, the
former are infinitely less able to bear such a test.

There are, moreover, two considerations particularly applicable to the federal system of
America, which place that system in a very interesting point of view.

First. In a single republic, all the power surrendered by the people is submitted to the ad-
ministration of a single government; and the usurpations are guarded against by a division
of the government into distinct and separate departments. In the compound republic of
America, the power surrendered by the people is first divided between two distinct govern-
ments, and then the portion allotted to each subdivided among distinct and separate de-
partments. Hence a double security arises to the rights of the people. The different govern-
ments will control each other, at the same time that each will be controlled by itself.
Second. It is of great importance in a republic not only to guard the society against the oppression of its rulers, but to guard one part of the society against the injustice of the other part. Different interests necessarily exist in different classes of citizens. If a majority be united by a common interest, the rights of the minority will be insecure. There are but two methods of providing against this evil: the one by creating a will in the community independent of the majority that is, of the society itself; the other, by comprehending in the society so many separate descriptions of citizens as will render an unjust combination of a majority of the whole very improbable, if not impracticable. The first method prevails in all governments possessing an hereditary or self-appointed authority. This, at best, is but a precarious security; because a power independent of the society may as well espouse the unjust views of the major, as the rightful interests of the minor party, and may possibly be turned against both parties. The second method will be exemplified in the federal republic of the United States. Whilst all authority in it will be derived from and dependent on the society, the society itself will be broken into so many parts, interests, and classes of citizens, that the rights of individuals, or of the minority, will be in little danger from interested combinations of the majority. In a free government the security for civil rights must be the same as that for religious rights. It consists in the one case in the multiplicity of interests, and in the other in the multiplicity of sects. The degree of security in both cases will depend on the number of interests and sects; and this may be presumed to depend on the extent of country and number of people comprehended under the same government. This view of the subject must particularly recommend a proper federal system to all the sincere and considerate friends of republican government, since it shows that in exact proportion as the territory of the Union may be formed into more circumscribed Confederacies, or States oppressive combinations of a majority will be facilitated: the best security, under the republican forms, for the rights of every class of citizens, will be diminished: and consequently the stability and independence of some member of the government, the only other security, must be proportionately increased. Justice is the end of government. It is the end of civil society. It ever has been and ever will be pursued until it be obtained, or until liberty be lost in the pursuit. In a society under the forms of which the stronger faction can readily unite and oppress the weaker, anarchy may as truly be said to reign as in a state of nature,
where the weaker individual is not secured against the violence of the stronger; and as, in the latter state, even the stronger individuals are prompted, by the uncertainty of their condition, to submit to a government which may protect the weak as well as themselves; so, in the former state, will the more powerful factions or parties be gradually induced, by a like motive, to wish for a government which will protect all parties, the weaker as well as the more powerful. It can be little doubted that if the State of Rhode Island was separated from the Confederacy and left to itself, the insecurity of rights under the popular form of government within such narrow limits would be displayed by such reiterated oppressions of factious majorities that some power altogether independent of the people would soon be called for by the voice of the very factions whose misrule had proved the necessity of it. In the extended republic of the United States, and among the great variety of interests, parties, and sects which it embraces, a coalition of a majority of the whole society could seldom take place on any other principles than those of justice and the general good; whilst there being thus less danger to a minor from the will of a major party, there must be less pretext, also, to provide for the security of the former, by introducing into the government a will not dependent on the latter, or, in other words, a will independent of the society itself. It is no less certain than it is important, notwithstanding the contrary opinions which have been entertained, that the larger the society, provided it lie within a practical sphere, the more duly capable it will be of self-government. And happily for the republican cause, the practicable sphere may be carried to a very great extent, by a judicious modification and mixture of the federal principle.
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BACKGROUND

As part of a compromise to secure the ratification of the Constitution, Federalists introduced in the first Congress a Bill of Rights as twelve amendments to the new Constitution. Below are the ten amendments that were ultimately ratified.

ANNOTATIONS

Amendment I

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Amendment II

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms shall not be infringed.

Amendment III

No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

Amendment IV

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Amendment V

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Amendment VI

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.

Amendment VII

In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.
Amendment VIII

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

Amendment IX

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Amendment X

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.
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Why Teach the Early Republic

The United States of America is an “experiment in self-government.” None other than the Father of the Country, George Washington, said as much at his inauguration. The experiment had seemed to be on the verge of failure by 1787, but the Constitution gave it a second chance. This is the story of the beginning decades of that “second chance.” What is so remarkable about these decades is that the ideas and structures of the Constitution were put into action with real people, real challenges, and real opportunities. America’s first elected and appointed statesmen would set the precedents by which American representative democracy would operate. Indeed, much of American self-government still reflects the precedents established in those first decades. These acts were not performed in a vacuum, however. America’s leaders
had to face very real struggles, and the American people had to learn to trust the Constitution and one another. All the while, America also found before her opportunities rarely afforded to any nation. In navigating the challenges and seizing the opportunities, America matured into an increasingly, though still imperfect, democratic society. Living within the remnants of that “second chance” in the American experiment, students will learn much about the America of today by studying this first era of free self-government.

Enduring Ideas from This Unit

1. The presidency of George Washington was indispensable in establishing precedents conducive to free self-government and in keeping America free of what would have been a disastrous war.
2. The opportunities afforded to the United States were exceedingly rare in the history of nations.
3. Amidst the great strides in the practice of self-government and in taking advantage of opportunities, America’s treatment of Native Americans and the entrenching of slavery in the Southern states reveal the imperfections of the American regime and the injustices that were permitted.
4. American democracy expressed itself in a variety of unique ways and had a deep effect on the habits, thoughts, and character of Americans.
5. The idea of America’s “manifest destiny” to expand from coast to coast and spread its democratic ideas was a mixture of noble and material motivations which led to the Mexican-American War and a renewed debate over the expansion of slavery.

What Teachers Should Consider

The American founding was one of the most momentous—and dramatic—three decades in world history. How many times in history does a group of extraordinary individuals construct a novel government while winning a war against the world’s foremost power? The challenge in teaching the history of the early republic, therefore, is in trying to match the interest and excitement of the founding unit.

We are aided in this challenge by our having already met the cast of characters. The first four presidents were all founding fathers, and many cabinet members, diplomats, and justices were either present in Philadelphia in 1776 and 1787, fought in the War of Independence, or both. It proved consequential to the early national stability of America that these figures should have been the first to govern under the Constitution, George Washington above all others. Students should come to understand how much of the way American government functions and how many traditions of the American political order are owed to President Washington.

At the same time, students should understand the precarious situations into which the young country was drawn and learn how America’s first leaders managed these challenges. From maintaining a fragile unity to enduring buffets from Great Britain and Revolutionary France, these first four presidents had more than enough to handle, including a national existential crisis in the War of 1812.
And yet, America also had an abundance of opportunities during the first half of the 1800s. These began with the Louisiana Purchase and proceeded to include the acquisition of Florida, the Monroe Doctrine’s assertion of American authority in the Western Hemisphere, the annexation of Texas, and the Mexican Cession following the Mexican-American War. Alexander Hamilton’s financial efforts helped to calm and focus the American economy over the long term, while subsequent investments and inventions combined with the security of the rule of law to unleash a vibrant economy.

American representative democracy was thus put into action, and the experiment in self-government seemed to be succeeding. But how did democratic society affect its citizens? Considering this question with students gives them the opportunity to study life in a democratic republic, from its forms of religion to the kind of interests and leaders that it produces. Students should also study the ways in which America’s founding principles were not upheld, with respect to slavery and the treatment of Native Americans. They should understand the way that the institution of slavery changed during these initial decades and varied by region.

Students can access these pictures of American democratic life through the study of Alexis de Tocqueville’s observations in Democracy in America and the presidency of Andrew Jackson. As the former attempted to articulate the nature of democratic government, the latter operated within a representative democracy for what he considered to be the sake of the common man.

The study of America’s “manifest destiny” is an opportunity for students to enter the minds of Americans at the time and attempt to understand the spirit of the democratic age. Based on the circumstances, it seemed almost inevitable that America would spread many of its unique ideas and accomplishments throughout all of North America. Yet this sentiment was sometimes in tension with America’s founding principles. The culmination of this spirit in the Mexican-American War would gain for America an astonishing amount of new land, resources, and opportunity, but also bring closer the prospect of civil war.

How Teachers Can Learn More

**TEXTS**

Empire of Liberty, Gordon Wood  
What Hath God Wrought, Daniel Walker Howe  
The Rise of American Democracy, Sean Wilentz  
An Empire of Wealth, John Steele Gordon  
Land of Promise, Michael Lind  
American Heritage: A Reader, ed. Hillsdale College History Faculty

**ONLINE COURSES** | Online.Hillsdale.edu

The Great American Story  
American Heritage
Lesson Planning Resources

TEACHER RESOURCES

A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope, Wilfred McClay and John McBride
A Student Workbook for Land of Hope, Wilfred McClay and John McBride

STUDENT RESOURCES

Land of Hope, Wilfred McClay

PRIMARY SOURCES

Thanksgiving Proclamation, George Washington
Letter to the Hebrew Congregation, George Washington
Fragment on the French Revolution, Alexander Hamilton
Farewell Address, George Washington
First inaugural address, Thomas Jefferson
On the Amendment to the Missouri Statehood Bill, James Tallmadge
Fourth of July address, John Quincy Adams
Monroe Doctrine, James Monroe
Democracy in America, Volume I, Alexis de Tocqueville
Webster-Hayne debate, Daniel Webster and Robert Hayne
Speech on the Indian Removal Bill, Theodore Frelinghuysen
Address to the People of the United States, John Ross
Annual message to Congress, 1830, Andrew Jackson
Veto message on the Bank of the United States, Andrew Jackson
Speech on the Reception of Abolition Petitions, John C. Calhoun
“The Great Nation of Futurity,” John Louis O’Sullivan
LESSON PLANS,
ASSIGNMENTS,
AND QUIZZES
Lesson 1 — The New Government

Lesson Objective

Students learn about the first decades of American self-government under the Constitution, including the major events and developments during the presidencies of George Washington and John Adams.

Teacher Preparation

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
- *Land of Hope* Pages 78–90
- Primary Sources See below.

Teacher Texts
- *A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope* Pages 85–92, 121–123
- *A Student Workbook for Land of Hope* Pages 47–51

Online.Hillsdale.edu
- *The Great American Story* Lectures 5 and 6
- *American Heritage* Lecture 5

Student Preparation

Assignment 1: Students read *Land of Hope*, pages 78–90, and either complete the reading questions handout in *A Student Workbook for Land of Hope* (pages 47–51) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 2: Students read and annotate George Washington’s Farewell Address and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).

Core Content in this Lesson

Geography and Places
- New York City
- Federal Hall
- Mount Vernon
- Philadelphia
- Vermont
- Kentucky
- New Orleans
- Washington City in the Federal District of Columbia
- Executive Mansion
- Northwest Territory
- Tennessee
Persons

George Washington    Pierre L’Enfant
John Adams          Eli Whitney
Thomas Jefferson    Marquis de Lafayette
Alexander Hamilton  Citizen Genêt
Henry Knox          Anthony Wayne
Edmund Randolph     John Jay
James Madison       Thomas Pinckney

Terms and Topics

Bill of Rights civil suit
11th Amendment criminal suit
Father of Our Country attorney general
cabinet Department of Justice
department original jurisdiction
bureaucracy appellate jurisdiction
treasury Jay’s Treaty
silver dollar Fugitive Slave Law
war debt cotton gin
credit census
tariff First Party System
national bank Federalist Party
Whiskey Rebellion Democratic-Republican Party
French Revolution XYZ Affair
Proclamation of Neutrality Alien and Sedition Acts
Judiciary Act of 1789 Kentucky and Virginia
district courts Resolutions
circuit courts nullification

Primary Sources

Thanksgiving Proclamation, George Washington
Letter to the Hebrew Congregation, George Washington
Fragment on the French Revolution, Alexander Hamilton
Farewell Address, George Washington

To Know by Heart

“In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened.” —George Washington, Farewell Address

“Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious People. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other.” —John Adams, To the Officers of the Militia of Massachusetts
Timeline

1787  Constitutional Convention
1788  Constitution ratified
1789  Elections held; First Congress convened;
      George Washington inaugurated; French Revolution begins
1796  John Adams elected
1800  Thomas Jefferson elected

Images

Historical figures and events
Depictions of Federal Hall and Washington’s inauguration
Diagram of a cotton gin
Early maps and designs for Washington, DC, and the Executive Mansion
Electoral maps

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Biographies and the roles of George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, and John Adams
- George Washington’s travels to New York City for his inauguration
- Thomas Jefferson’s presence in Paris during the opening months of the French Revolution
- George Washington’s presidency, including the “coach and six” and Senator William Maclay’s
  criticisms of his policies and “monarchical” comportment
- The travels of Citizen Genêt in the United States
- The ebb and flow of the friendship between John Adams and Thomas Jefferson
- Stories of the building of Washington, DC
- Thomas Jefferson walking to his inauguration and riding bareback around Washington, DC
- The death of George Washington

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- Why would George Washington’s presidency prove to be so important for America’s future?
- What challenges did George Washington face at the start of and during his presidency?
- As best we can tell, what were George Washington’s goals for his time as president?
- What was America’s debt problem, and how did Alexander Hamilton plan to solve it?
- What were the competing visions for America’s future based on the views of Alexander Hamilton
  and Thomas Jefferson?
- What were Alexander Hamilton’s greatest contributions to the young nation?
- What were the stances of George Washington, John Adams, and Thomas Jefferson regarding the
  conflict between Great Britain and the French revolutionaries?
- How were the American and French Revolutions similar and different? What factors accounted
  for the very different outcomes?
- How did George Washington navigate foreign policy concerning the French Revolution and
  Great Britain?
- How did Eli Whitney’s cotton gin change the course of slavery in America from what many
  during the founding generation had expected?
How did the country expand during the 1790s? How did that expansion take place, and what did it look like?

How does the American federal judiciary system operate, based on the Judiciary Act?

What were the three main points of Washington’s Farewell Address? Explain each.

In what sense may it be said that George Washington was America’s “indispensable man”?

What were the respective positions of the Federalists and the Democratic-Republicans on the issues facing the country by the late 1790s?

How might John Adams’s presidency be characterized?

How did John Adams navigate foreign policy concerning the French Revolution and Great Britain?

What risks emerged as the result of the Alien and Sedition Acts and the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions?

What was so consequential about the election of 1800 and the subsequent change in administrations?

Questions from the US Civics Test:
- Question 37: The president of the United States can serve only two terms. Why?
- Question 47: What does the president’s cabinet do?
- Question 48: What are two cabinet-level positions?
- Question 50: What is one part of the judicial branch?
- Question 51: What does the judicial branch do?
- Question 52: What is the highest court in the United States?
- Question 53: How many seats are on the Supreme Court?
- Question 86: George Washington is famous for many things. Name one.
- Question 89: Alexander Hamilton is famous for many things. Name one.
- Question 119: What is the capital of the United States?

**Keys to the Lesson**

With the Constitution ratified following robust debate, America embarked on the next phase of its experiment with self-government. Success was far from assured. The first statesmen to govern within this new system would play a decisive role in determining not only the immediate success of the fledgling republic but also its long-term well-being. Nearly every action would set a precedent, and there were very real threats to the country, both from without and from within. The statesmanship of George Washington and John Adams was indispensable for setting these precedents while steering the young nation through many trials, including deepening domestic division. When this division was ameliorated through a peaceful national election in 1800, followed by a transfer of power in 1801, the United States could mark a successful passage through its first dozen years of self-government under the Constitution, setting the stage for the next two hundred years of American government and history.

Teachers might best plan and teach The New Government with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Start the lesson by noting the different trajectories taken in two attempts at self-government, both begun in 1789. In the United States, the first government under the Constitution convened in April in New York. Just a few weeks later, in May, across the Atlantic, the French Estates General was convened at Versailles. By July, revolutionaries were storming the Bastille, marking the beginning of years of bloodshed and tyranny. Help students to compare these parallel efforts at
self-government, both ostensibly based on similar principles. Once students have been able to study each revolution within their overall course of high school study, teachers may wish to have a discussion on the differences between the two revolutions that led to such disparate results. These lessons should inform students’ understanding and appreciation of their country’s achievements in free self-government.

- Review with students the challenges facing the new nation. There was America’s disappointing first attempt at government under the Articles of Confederation, at the time still present in the minds of most Americans. Then there were the various problems that remained, such as sizeable war debts among the states, different currencies, tensions between borrowers and creditors, and the continued presence of British soldiers in American territory. And on top of these struggles was the undefined and untested work of actually governing through the structure of the new Constitution.

- Spend time teaching about the importance of George Washington in these first years under the Constitution, including his character and his example. Of special note is Washington’s setting of precedents for the presidency, his unifying example, his balancing of competing interests and views, and his efforts to prevent the young country from being dragged into a foreign war. To gain a sense of Washington’s teachings and the way in which his words and comportment established beneficial precedents, read with students some of his letters and addresses.

- Provide an overview of George Washington’s first cabinet, and outline the emerging debates over the kind of economy, workforce, and society the nation should have—debates represented by the disagreements between Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton.

- Review George Washington’s emphasis on learning, religious practice, and religious freedom as essential to America as a self-governing republic. Read with students in class parts of Washington’s Thanksgiving Proclamation and Letter to the Hebrew Congregation at Newport that manifest Washington’s arguments.

- Introduce Alexander Hamilton’s biography and the important and bold plans he developed for the nation, especially those related to the economy and finance. Explore with students Hamilton’s plans for the nation’s debt, protective tariffs, a national bank, and the effects of these programs.

- In foreign policy, the dominant issue facing America was navigating the conflict engulfing Europe during the French Revolution. More pointedly, the danger with respect to the French Revolution itself involved the conflicting sympathies that various Americans had toward Great Britain or France. This issue also forced Americans to think about their own revolution and its similarities to and differences from the French Revolution. George Washington was again vital in charting a course of neutrality, which kept the fragile nation out of a conflict that might have ruined it and its experiment forever. Read with students Alexander Hamilton’s Fragment on the French Revolution to see the position that Washington and even Jefferson would eventually share.

- Mark 1793 as the year in which Eli Whitney developed his cotton gin. Explain the ideal cotton-growing climate in the Southern states and yet the laborious and slow work of separating cotton seeds from the cotton. Then show how Whitney’s gin worked and how it revolutionized the cotton industry. Cotton plantations quickly began to expand and revitalized the demand for slave labor that had been in general decline through many of the founding years.

- Talk with students about the Fugitive Slave Law, which Congress passed to allow for the enforcement of Article IV, Section 2, of the Constitution, and about the laws many Northern legislatures passed in response, including those that allowed alleged fugitive slaves to defend themselves in court and sought to prevent the kidnapping of free African Americans.
Consider with students how different territorial acts between 1798 and 1822 permitted or prohibited slavery in territories, ultimately resulting in seven new slaveholding states and five new free states. Discuss also how the western land cession grants of the original slaveholding states, such as Georgia and North Carolina, to the federal government allowed slavery to spread west in the Southern region of the country, while the Northwest Ordinance prohibited the spread of slavery in the Northwest Territory.

Explain how the plan for surveying and settling the Northwest Territory went into effect through the Northwest Ordinance. Highlight how the distribution of public lands through the township system along with an allotment for a public school were both unique in world history.

Discuss Jay’s Treaty and Pinckney’s Treaty and how these two agreements better established the extent of the United States’ territory while also normalizing some trade expectations with European powers, such as the effects of the “right of deposit” in New Orleans.

Teach about the various acts of the first congresses, including their passing the Judiciary Act that set the Supreme Court at six justices; the Senate confirming John Jay as the first Chief Justice; passing twelve amendments to the Constitution, ten of which the states ratified as the Bill of Rights; moving the capital to Philadelphia; and founding Washington, DC.

Outline with students the contours of the federal judiciary as established by the Judiciary Act. Students should be familiar with the various courts at the time and the kinds of cases that may be brought before each, including distinctions between civil and criminal cases.

Emphasize for students the great growth in population and industry during this decade, including further settlement westward and new conflicts between Native Americans and settlers, such as the Northwest Indian War. Explore how disease, treaties, conflict, population density, and competing ideas of land and property factored into westward settlement and the reduction in the number and locations of Native Americans. Conflict, especially on the frontier, was still common—a combination of misunderstanding, outright dishonesty, and revenge. Where treaties were employed, their slightest violation usually gave the opposing side an excuse to act with force, thus undermining any kind of agreement. The distant and unsettled frontier left most nationally decreed restrictions on settlement unenforced.

Consider how voting privileges expanded with the removal of property requirements, what was then a monumental development in self-government unique to America.

Conclude the treatment of George Washington’s presidency with a close reading of his Farewell Address. Especially significant points to read and discuss with students include his warnings about party and the importance of union; his advocacy for remaining independent of other nations with respect to war and alliances; and his emphasis on religion, education, and upright moral conduct as essential to the success of the United States. Implied throughout is the necessity of reverence for the rule of law.

Discuss John Adams’s presidency, beginning with a review of his contributions during the Revolution. Note with students how Adams had a hard act to follow and little of the respect, admiration, or mystique that Washington had possessed. Help students to understand Adams’s major accomplishments, including building a navy and navigating a neutral position with respect to the French wars of revolution, not to mention following the precedents set by Washington, thus lending them greater permanence.

Based on previous conversation about the competing views for the country (as put forward by Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton), trace the development of political parties during the Washington and Adams administrations, culminating in the election of 1800, during which the American people were deeply divided. The threat of civil unrest was high, and Jefferson’s defeat of
Adams posed a risk that such unrest would overflow during the first attempt to transfer power. That the transfer of power was, however, entirely peaceful after twelve years of rule by one regime seemed to confirm the sturdiness of the Constitution and the prudence of those who governed for that first decade. Students should appreciate how extraordinarily rare such transfers of power are in history and what allowed the Americans to avoid bloodshed—the all-too-common outcome in the history of nations.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Explain how George Washington navigated the various challenges facing the young nation in the 1790s and the importance that his example set for the future of American government (2–3 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Explain the differences between Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson on the kind of country they believed America should become (1–2 paragraphs).

**Assignment 3:** Explain the similarities and differences between the American Revolution and the French Revolution, including what accounted for their different outcomes (2–3 paragraphs; only for students who have already studied the French Revolution).
Reading Quiz 3.1

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. How long did George Washington expect the Constitution to last?

2. Who was America’s “indispensable man,” according to the text?

3. The Washington Administration was divided between the differing policy views and visions for the country expressed by which two figures?

4. What was George Washington’s policy with respect to the wars between Great Britain and France?

5. To what did the Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions respond?
Lesson 2 — Prospects, Uncertainties, and War

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about events during the presidencies of Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, including Americans’ conflict with the British in the War of 1812.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
- Land of Hope
- Primary Sources

Teacher Texts
- A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope
- A Student Workbook for Land of Hope

Online.Hillsdale.edu
- The Great American Story
- American Heritage

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students read Land of Hope, pages 90–104, and either complete the reading questions handout in A Student Workbook for Land of Hope (pages 51, 63–65) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 2: Students read and annotate Thomas Jefferson’s first inaugural address and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography and Places
- Virginia
- Monticello
- Barbary Coast
- Tripoli
- Louisiana Territory
- France
- St. Louis
- Ohio
- Missouri River
- Great Britain
- New England
- Canada
- Lake Ontario
- Lake Erie
- Lake Champlain
- Washington, DC
Executive Mansion        Fort Mackinac
Louisiana               Mississippi Territory
Fort Detroit            Indiana

Persons
Thomas Jefferson        Davy Crockett
Alexander Hamilton      James Madison
Aaron Burr              Dolley Madison
John Marshall           Tecumseh
Napoleon Bonaparte      William Henry Harrison
Meriwether Lewis        Oliver Perry
William Clark           Francis Scott Key
Sacagawea               Andrew Jackson
Stephen Decatur

Terms and Topics
Federalists             Embargo Act of 1807
Democratic-Republicans  American Indian raids
Judiciary Act of 1801    Battle of Tippecanoe
Marbury v. Madison       war hawks
judicial review          War of 1812
“unconstitutional”       First Invasion of Canada
12th Amendment           Thames Campaign
Louisiana Purchase       USS Constitution
Napoleonic Wars          Battle of Lake Erie
Corps of Discovery       Burning of Washington
Barbary Pirates          Hartford Convention
US Marine Corps          Battle of Horseshoe Bend
impressment             Battle of New Orleans
Treaty of Ghent

Primary Sources
First inaugural address, Thomas Jefferson

To Know by Heart
“Indeed I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that his justice cannot sleep forever.” —Thomas Jefferson on slavery in America

“The Marines’ Hymn”
Timeline

1800  Thomas Jefferson elected
1801–05  First Barbary War
1803  US purchases the Louisiana Territory from Napoleonic France
1808  James Madison elected
1812–15  War of 1812
1815  Battle of New Orleans

Images

- Historical figures and events
- Landscape pictures of geographic places featured in this lesson
- Executive Mansion
- Washington, DC, depictions
- Statue of Thomas Jefferson (Hillsdale College campus)
- Jefferson Memorial
- Images and uniforms of British and American officers and soldiers
- Depictions of figures at various scenes and moments in battle
- Maps: overall strategies; specific battles
- Relevant forts
- USS *Constitution* in Boston Harbor
- Medical equipment
- Reenactment photos
- Depictions of the Executive Mansion on fire
- Depictions of the defense of Fort McHenry
- Scenes from the Battle of New Orleans
- Statue of James Madison (Hillsdale College campus)

Stories for the American Heart

- Biographies and the roles of Thomas Jefferson, John Marshall, James Madison, and Dolley Madison
- John Adams’s last-minute judicial appointments through the Judiciary Act of 1801
- Thomas Jefferson’s walk to and from his inauguration
- Margaret Bayard Smith’s account of Thomas Jefferson at the Executive Mansion
- James Monroe and Robert Livingston’s negotiations with France for New Orleans, and then Louisiana
- Lucien Bonaparte’s account of Napoleon’s sale of Louisiana to the United States
- Entries from the diaries of Meriwether Lewis and William Clark
- Meriwether Lewis and William Clark’s encounter with a grizzly bear
- John Marshall’s clever reasoning to “lose the battle but win the war” for a strong Supreme Court in *Marbury v. Madison*
- Aaron Burr killing Alexander Hamilton in a duel
- William Henry Harrison’s account of Tecumseh
- News of the US declaration of war and the British decision to stop interfering with American shipping as they passed each other on the Atlantic
- Dolley Madison fleeing the British with the portrait of George Washington
- The burning of Washington, DC, including the Executive Mansion
- George Gleig’s account of British soldiers in the Executive Mansion
- The defense of Fort McHenry and the writing of “The Star-Spangled Banner”
- Andrew Jackson’s various duels and adventures
- The Battle of New Orleans and how it occurred after a peace treaty had been signed—unbeknownst to the battle participants

**Questions for the American Mind**

- What were the major actions and characteristics of Thomas Jefferson’s presidency?
- What were the three major foreign policy issues that Thomas Jefferson addressed?
- What was the impact of the Louisiana Purchase on America’s future?
- In what ways did Thomas Jefferson depart from his Democratic-Republican views as president?
- What did Congress and Thomas Jefferson outlaw in 1808?
- What were Thomas Jefferson’s views and actions, both personal and public, regarding slavery?
- What did the Supreme Court establish in Marbury v. Madison? How did John Marshall arrive at this determination?
- What role did John Marshall and the other Federalist-appointed judges play in the early decades of the republic?
- What were the main characteristics of James Madison’s presidency?
- What were the causes of the War of 1812? How was war actually declared?
- What were the major moments during the War of 1812? How can we characterize America’s degree of success during this war?
- Why was the Battle of New Orleans important for America’s future, even though it was unwittingly fought after a peace treaty had been signed?
- What were the terms of the Treaty of Ghent?
- Questions from the US Civics Test:
  - Question 87: Thomas Jefferson is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 88: James Madison is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 90: What territory did the United States buy from France in 1803?
  - Question 91: Name one war fought by the United States in the 1800s.
  - Question 117: Name one American Indian tribe in the United States.
  - Question 123: What is the name of the national anthem?

**Keys to the Lesson**

Changes in power have historically been among the most tumultuous moments in a nation’s history. America’s first transition from Federalist to Democratic-Republican control not only avoided much tumult but was perfectly peaceful. But how would the nation cope with new policies? And perhaps even more importantly, how would those making those changes behave? It turned out that Thomas Jefferson the president ended up being far less revolutionary than Thomas Jefferson the thinker and party leader. His policies were relatively conservative and even tended in the direction of Federalist positions. Jefferson was also checked by a federal judiciary under the leadership of Chief Justice John Marshall and a host of Federalist judges, securing the coequality of the branch. Yet challenges remained, particularly during the years of the Napoleonic Wars, culminating with the War of 1812 under James Madison. But even when the young nation made serious mistakes, somehow America seemed to emerge the better for it.
Teachers might best plan and teach Prospects, Uncertainties, and War with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Begin the lesson with a review of Thomas Jefferson’s childhood and biography. Like so many of his contemporary American Founders and statesmen, Jefferson had an exceptional mind with many interests and plenty of practical political skill. Of particular note is his storied career as a political thinker and statesman, his devotion to education, and the contradiction between his private efforts and statements against slavery and his continued ownership of slaves at Monticello.

- Treat Thomas Jefferson’s presidency chronologically, including events that do not directly relate to him. Within his presidency, be sure to include instruction on the many ways that Jefferson preserved the Federalist economic policies and the ways that he exerted national authority more forcefully than would have been anticipated. The almost unilateral (and of questionable constitutionality) Louisiana Purchase and the military expedition against the Barbary pirates in the Mediterranean are two examples of Jefferson’s use of presidential power. Begin Jefferson’s administration by reading and discussing parts of his first inaugural address.

- Teach students about *Marbury v. Madison*. Although the topic of judicial review may be somewhat dull in and of itself, explaining how the precedent was arrived at through John Marshall’s reasoning is quite enjoyable for students. They will appreciate Marshall’s skill and respect the power that he and his subsequent decisions secured for the status of the judiciary and the Supreme Court in America. The assertion of its coequality with the other branches in *Marbury* ensured that power was equally distributed and equally accountable to the people.

- Note for students the kind of federal government the Federalist courts and John Marshall himself molded through their cases. In brief, the national government was strengthened, ties of union were deepened, the interpretation of what was “necessary and proper” was expanded, and the federal government’s primacy over the states in regulation of commerce was defended.

- Tell students the stories of the Corps of Discovery Expedition through the Louisiana Territory. Be sure to show plenty of drawings and maps from Meriwether Lewis and William Clark’s sketchbooks. Use this opportunity to review geography material as the Corps traveled westward.

- Discuss the continued menace of the Napoleonic Wars and Americans’ attempts to trade with both the French and the British. Illustrate clearly for students why impressment of American sailors was such an affront, why the British considered it just, and how British and American conceptions of citizenship were at the heart of the issue. Touch also upon the role of the British in sponsoring conflict between Native Americans and settlers on the frontier in order to secure more economic influence from Canada over what was then the American Northwest (present-day Midwest). Outline Thomas Jefferson’s struggles (like Washington and Adams before him) with the British, including his Embargo Act that led to talks of secession within New England.

- Conclude the Jefferson administration by noting how Thomas Jefferson cemented the two-term limit tradition for presidents by following Washington’s example. In the last year of his presidency, Jefferson also signed into law in 1808 the abolition of the international slave trade, the earliest moment the Constitution allowed for it to be abolished.

- Introduce James Madison with a review of his biography and his role in the Constitutional Convention and ratification debates. From this background students should not be surprised that he had become president, just as many Americans at the time had likewise been unsurprised. Madison is an interesting case study in history, since he was now governing within a Constitutional system much of which he himself had designed. The entirety of Madison’s presidency, however, would be absorbed with British aggression and an outright war.
Tell the stories of Tecumseh’s attempts to unite Native Americans east of the Mississippi River against American settlers and Tecumseh’s defeat at the Battle of Tippecanoe by forces under William Henry Harrison. The internal divisions over whether to defy a more powerful enemy or to capitulate were present within many Native American tribes in their responses to settlers and the United States government.

When teaching about the start of the War of 1812, characterize it as a sort of “slipping toward war.” That is, neither party necessarily desired the war but the complexities of the Napoleonic Wars, trade, and miscommunication gradually led to conflict.

Ask students to identify and compare the various advantages and disadvantages of each side at the outset of the war and how these shifted over the years. Having students take simple notes as a “T-Chart” can be effective for this part of the lesson.

Introduce students to the contemporary style of warfare by using images, maps, and artifacts. This approach will provide a foundation for their subsequent study of battles, help them to understand what happens in battle, and allow them to appreciate the bravery of soldiers fighting on both sides.

Explain each side’s strategy at various stages of the war and the tactics and battle plans employed in specific battles.

Teach major battles in detail. Students should understand how the battles came to be, the key stories, factors, and moments from the battles themselves, and the significance of their various outcomes on subsequent events. Employ battle maps often. As with any conflict, draw attention to the key contributions of both leaders and common soldiers in the war.

Note the great division between New England and the rest of the country in the War of 1812. In addition to secession talks, some New England states and New York actively supplied the British through trade for much of the war.

Of particular note in the War of 1812 are the frontier nature of fighting around the Great Lakes, the brutality of this warfare, the Americans’ actual attempt to conquer Canada, the American naval victories on inland lakes such as that of Commodore Oliver Perry in the Battle of Lake Erie as well as the Battle of Plattsburgh Bay on Lake Champlain, the half-hearted British fighting in the early years of the war due to their preoccupation with Napoleon, atrocities by both sides on the frontier and during the Thames Campaign, the British invasions of Washington, Baltimore, New York, and New Orleans, and the writing of “The Star-Spangled Banner.”

Introduce Andrew Jackson, the soldier and frontier lawyer-statesman. Consider the warfare of the day and the understandings each side held as to the means and purpose of combat. Explore with students accounts of Jackson as a military commander by both those in his command and his Native American opponents. Jackson will, of course, be covered again in future lessons, but this is an opportunity to introduce and tell some of the early stories that show different sides to Andrew Jackson.

Conclude this lesson with the Battle of New Orleans, which technically occurred after peace had been agreed to. Note the diverse and ragtag army under Andrew Jackson’s command and their utter decimation of the regular British forces, including three generals. The Battle of New Orleans left Americans with a sense of triumph and pride from a war that had largely lacked such decisive victories, and which had included several embarrassing defeats and policy failures. The Treaty of Ghent did little to formally rectify American grievances. In reality, however, the treaty’s failure to address the maritime legal questions that had caused the war meant little in the wake of Napoleon’s final defeat at Waterloo. Similarly, the treaty’s reaffirmation of the prewar geopolitical status quo in North America actually favored Americans, thanks to Harrison’s and Jackson’s
triumphs over native tribes allied with Great Britain. The war would be the last major conflict with a foreign power that America would fight on its own soil.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Explain the major decisions of Thomas Jefferson’s administration and the extent to which they were consistent with his Democratic-Republican views (1–2 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Retell the story of the War of 1812 (2–3 paragraphs).
Reading Quiz 3.2

The Early Republic | Lesson 2
Land of Hope, Pages 90-104

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question.

1. What was the “revolution of 1800”?

2. Which branch of the federal government was firmly in Federalist control, thwarting many of Thomas Jefferson’s policies?

3. How did Thomas Jefferson double the size of the United States?

4. What did the Embargo Act of 1807 do?

5. Who was president during the War of 1812?
Unit 3 — Formative Quiz

Covering Lessons 1-2
10-15 minutes

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. As best we can tell, what were George Washington’s goals for his time as president?

2. What were Alexander Hamilton’s greatest contributions to the young nation?

3. How did Eli Whitney’s cotton gin change the course of slavery in America from what many during the founding generation had expected?

4. What were the three main points of Washington’s Farewell Address? Explain each.

5. What were the three major foreign policy issues that Thomas Jefferson addressed?

6. What did the Supreme Court establish in *Marbury v. Madison*?

7. What were the causes of the War of 1812?
Lesson 3 — The American Way

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the Era of Good Feelings under James Monroe, the rivalry between John Quincy Adams and Andrew Jackson, continued American expansion, and observations on the nature and practice of American democracy.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

**Student Texts**

*Land of Hope*

Primary Sources

Pages 104–112, 117–126, 139–146

**Teacher Texts**

*A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope*


*A Student Workbook for Land of Hope*

Pages 64–66, 74–75, 86–87

**Online.Hillsdale.edu**

*The Great American Story*  
Lectures 7 and 8

*American Heritage*  
Lecture 5

STUDENT PREPARATION

**Assignment 1:** Students read *Land of Hope*, pages 104–112, and either complete the reading questions handout in *A Student Workbook for Land of Hope* (64–66) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

**Assignment 2:** Students read *Land of Hope*, pages 117–126, and either complete the reading questions handout in *A Student Workbook for Land of Hope* (74–75) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

**Assignment 3:** Students read *Land of Hope*, pages 139–146, and either complete the reading questions handout in *A Student Workbook for Land of Hope* (86–87) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).
CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography and Places
- Red River
- Mississippi
- Illinois
- Florida Territory
- New Spain
- Mexico
- Tejas
- Deep South
- Alabama
- Maine
- Missouri

Persons
- James Monroe
- James Fenimore Cooper
- Henry Wadsworth Longfellow
- Henry Clay
- John C. Calhoun
- John Quincy Adams
- Andrew Jackson
- Daniel Webster
- Alexis de Tocqueville
- Stephen F. Austin
- Joseph Smith
- William Lloyd Garrison

Terms and Topics
- The Virginia Dynasty
- "Era of Good Feelings"
- Adams-Onís Treaty
- 49th Parallel
- immigration
- internal improvements
- Erie Canal
- railroad
- steamship
- steel-cast plow
- mechanical reaper
- Unitarianism
- Second Great Awakening
- Burned-Over District
- Evangelism
- Catholics
- Mormonism
- American System
- McCulloch v. Maryland
- Monroe Doctrine
- slave trade
- cotton gin
- King Cotton
- Missouri Compromise
- 36° 30' line
- Corrupt Bargain
- populist
- Democratic Party
- Democracy in America
- individualism

Primary Sources
- On the Amendment to the Missouri Statehood Bill, James Tallmadge
- Fourth of July address, John Quincy Adams
- Monroe Doctrine, James Monroe
- Democracy in America, Volume I, Alexis de Tocqueville
To Know by Heart

“[America] goes not abroad in search of monsters to destroy. She is the well-wisher to the freedom and independence of all. She is the champion and vindicator only of her own… Her glory is not dominion, but liberty.” —John Quincy Adams

“[He] loved his country partly because it was his own country, but mostly because it was a free country; and he burned with zeal for its advancement, prosperity, and glory, because he saw in such, the advancement, prosperity, and glory of human liberty, human right, and human nature.” —Abraham Lincoln, eulogy for Henry Clay

“America is great because America is good, and if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great.” —Alexis de Tocqueville

Timeline

1816  James Monroe elected
1816–19  Era of Good Feelings
1820  Missouri Compromise
1824  John Quincy Adams elected
1828  Andrew Jackson elected

Images

Historical figures and events
Landscape pictures of geographic places featured in this lesson
First versions of inventions from this time period, such as steamboats, rail, telegraph, and multicylinder printing presses
The Erie Canal
Photos of cotton plantations today
Depictions of life as a slave
Depictions of the Second Great Awakening gatherings and revival scenes
Political cartoons, especially surrounding the Adams-Jackson campaigns
“Old Hickory” campaign paraphernalia
Maps of Mexico and Texas

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Biographies and the roles of James Monroe, John Quincy Adams, Henry Clay, and Andrew Jackson
- Andrew Jackson in the South after the War of 1812 and in Spanish Florida, acting largely autonomously from the authority of the United States government
- The deaths of Thomas Jefferson and John Adams on July 4, 1826
- Frances Trollope’s account of life in early Cincinnati
- José María Sánchez’s account of life in early Texas
- Andrew Jackson’s many duels, rivalries, feats, and accomplishments, before he became president
- Andrew Jackson’s decimation of a Native American village, and then taking in a Native American baby whose mother had been killed
The campaign smears between John Quincy Adams and Andrew Jackson
Margaret Bayard Smith’s account of the inauguration of Andrew Jackson

**QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND**

- In what ways may America be said to have “found its footing” following the War of 1812?
- What international agreements allowed America to focus on domestic policy and peace in the years following the War of 1812?
- How was America changing during the 1820s and 1830s, particularly concerning immigration, transportation, and the prospects for both business and the common man?
- What kind of religious and reform movements emerged during the 1820s and 1830s?
- What did the Monroe Doctrine state? To what extent was it realistic at the time? How effective was it and why?
- What was society and life like in the South compared to the North and West?
- What was life like for slaves during the early nineteenth century?
- How did the status of slavery change following the invention of the cotton gin? How was this similar to and different from the status of slavery in the founding generation—before 1789?
- In what ways did the division over slavery manifest itself, and how was this division usually addressed by politicians?
- Why was there disagreement over the admission of Missouri into the Union, especially compared to the admittance of other slave states previously? How did the Missouri Compromise resolve the issue for the time being?
- How did Henry Clay change American politics?
- What was Henry Clay’s “American System”?
- How were parts of Texas first settled by Americans?
- How may the Adams-Jackson campaigns be characterized?
- What was the “Corrupt Bargain,” and how did it affect John Quincy Adams’s presidency?
- What did Andrew Jackson mean by “democracy”?
- Why did Andrew Jackson promote the common man?
- What risks did Andrew Jackson believe were threats to the well-being of the common man?
- What were Alexis de Tocqueville’s major observations about democracy in America?
- What risks to the American experiment in self-government did Alexis de Tocqueville observe in American society?
- **Question from the US Civics Test:**
  - Question 118: Name one example of an American innovation.

**KEYS TO THE LESSON**

The surprisingly equable outcome of the War of 1812 and the settling of lingering issues with world powers allowed America finally to “gain its footing.” The “Era of Good Feelings” that followed—complete with prosperity at home and peace abroad—permitted America to come into its own, to further develop the potential of its distinctly American character. As America underwent this maturation and as Americans grew more established in the free practice of business enterprise and self-reliance, the democratic nature of the nation was made even more clear. Perhaps no individual channeled or seemed to embody this democratic spirit of the time and the stake of the common man more fully than Andrew Jackson. And perhaps no one has articulated the nature of democratic self-government in America as well as the French
observer Alexis de Tocqueville did in his book *Democracy in America*. From statesmen like Jackson to observers like Tocqueville, students can find an excellent window into the nature and practice of representative democracy as it developed in the early years of the United States. Early nineteenth-century America was the setting of a unique phenomenon on the world stage and formed much of what we consider to be the American way of self-government.

Teachers might best plan and teach The American Way with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Teach students about the background and biography of James Monroe, whose accomplishments prior to his becoming president were already storied and remarkable, and the impressive streak of Virginian presidents—sometimes called the “Virginia Dynasty.”
- Review with students the terms of the Treaty of Ghent and the other agreements with nations to secure America’s frontiers, including Florida. Also note the beginning of one of the first great immigration waves of the nineteenth century. With Europe in shambles following the Napoleonic Wars, European immigrants found new security, personal ownership of land, and opportunity in America, with half settling in New York and Philadelphia, while the other half settled in what is now the Midwest.
- Describe for students the great changes in technology and transportation during the 1820s and 1830s, including canals, the railroad, the steamboat, and advances in agriculture.
- Survey the emergence of new religious ideas and groups during the Second Great Awakening and originating from the Burned-Over District of upstate New York.
- Review the effects of the cotton gin on the practice of slavery in slaveholding states, and the economic value of slavery and the domestic slave trade. Greater percentages of slaves were also shifted decisively into manual field work while new justifications for slavery were often created based on religious interpretation and outright prejudice. Note the years in which different states were admitted as free states or outlawed slavery themselves. Nevertheless, even as the free-state/slave-state balance was maintained, the country was gradually losing the argument of many antislavery Founders, in whose view slavery was to be kept on the path to extinction as a temporary evil destined for its own ruin.
- Provide students with insights into Southern culture and society. Give an overview of Southern socioeconomic demography. Be sure to address the planter class—including the variety of estate sizes within the planter class—the free subsistence farmers, enslaved African Americans, etc. Spend some time on the life of slaves and the culture that emerged among slaves; include reading specific slave narratives. *Land of Hope*’s treatment of these themes on pages 139–145 is an excellent aid in these discussions.
- Discuss with students the major factors that have produced the great wealth and prosperity of America, namely the freedom to innovate and invest, property rights, a peaceful daily life governed by the rule of law and consent of the governed, and the ability to patent ideas and inventions. Discuss also the extent to which many Southerners and even Northerners and Englishmen made considerable fortunes off of slavery and cotton textiles during the nineteenth century.
- Present the question over Missouri’s admission as a state as the first major reemergence of the slavery issue after the founding and a mark of the growing divide in America in the post–cotton gin era. It was clear from this fierce debate, which involved talks of secession, that the hopes of many Founders that slavery would resolve itself organically were no longer tenable with the invention of the cotton gin, and that the deepest of America’s divisions could not be ignored.
forever. As the elderly Thomas Jefferson noted at the time, the crisis over Missouri could be the death knell of the Union. Even though conflict would be postponed forty years, the temporary peace acquired by the Missouri Compromise would leave the problem of slavery to haunt America for those four decades. Read and discuss with students the speech of Representative James Tallmadge that resurfaced and exposed the deepening division over slavery in the country.

- Use this opportunity to introduce major statesmen of the period, such as Henry Clay (the Great Compromiser), John Quincy Adams, John C. Calhoun, and Daniel Webster. On Clay in particular, explore his political maneuverings; note that the way he empowered the position of Speaker of the House of Representatives would be legendary and would mark a new chapter in American politics. On a policy matter, explain for students Clay’s “American System,” which paired well with the growth and technological change America was experiencing.

- Discuss the settlement of Texas by Stephen Austin and other Americans during the 1820s, for the emergence of this American outpost within New Spain and then in Mexico would be consequential for events of subsequent decades.

- Note the importance of the Monroe Doctrine and how unrealistically ambitious it was. Nonetheless, it did secure George Washington’s view of foreign policy as America’s default position and, combined with good timing, was efficacious in fulfilling what it said. Read with the class its text as well as its forerunner, John Quincy Adams’s Fourth of July address, who was the principal mind behind the Monroe Doctrine policy. Students should consider these remarks and policies in light of George Washington’s Farewell Address.

- Describe how American political campaigning sank to new lows in the elections of 1824 and 1828, particularly between John Quincy Adams and Andrew Jackson. Adams’s presidency itself was largely impotent, nagged by the perception of its having been stolen through a “corrupt bargain” and by Jackson’s constant resistance.

- Review with students Andrew Jackson’s biography, full of impressive triumphs and controversial actions, particularly with respect to Native American tribes and Jackson’s thwarting of civilian authority over the military.

- In order to encourage student understanding of America as she was coming into her own during the 1820s and 1830s, read with students portions of Alexis de Tocqueville’s Democracy in America, chosen at the teacher’s discretion. For many students, these discussions should reveal how unique America was and is when it comes to self-government and freedom, slavery notwithstanding (as Tocqueville underscores). They should also come to understand the promises and risks involved in a society of and by the people, and how to preserve the promises and mitigate the risks therein. Asking students to consider how the Founders would have reacted to Tocqueville’s observations is also fruitful.

**Strengthening Understanding: Post-Lesson Assignments**

**Assignment 1:** Describe the ways in which America was rapidly changing following the War of 1812 (1–2 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Explain the idea of the democratic era or the age of the common man as promoted by Andrew Jackson and articulated by Alexis de Tocqueville (2–3 paragraphs).
DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. What was one agreement reached between the British and the Americans in the treaty to end the War of 1812?

2. What did the Monroe Doctrine say?

3. Name one “internal improvement” to transportation—besides railroads—mentioned by the text.

4. The pending admittance of which state reignited the question over slavery and its expansion in 1820?

5. The presidential campaigns and rivalries between which two figures proved to be especially personal and nasty?
Reading Quiz 3.4

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question.

1. What was the name of the French political observer who visited America in the 1830s and wrote *Democracy in America*?

2. What was the “Burned-Over District”?

3. Name one religious group from the Second Great Awakening mentioned by the text.

4. Who was Joseph Smith?

5. The Oneida Community was one example of what kind of experimental communities that were attempted in the first half of the nineteenth century?
DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. To what region did most Irish and German immigrants migrate in the 1840s?

2. What was the religious makeup of the South?

3. The Old South had an economy that was focused overwhelmingly on what kind of activity?

4. What divisions existed among Southerners of European descent?

5. What does the text argue was “at the center of slaves’ communal life”?
Lesson 4 — Manifest Destiny

1829–1848

4–5 classes

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the presidency of Andrew Jackson, the Mexican-American War, and expansion to the Pacific Ocean under the banner of “manifest destiny,” along with the issues associated with such expansion.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
Land of Hope
Pages 112–117, 126–127,
129–138, 146–156

Primary Sources
See below.

Teacher Texts
A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope
Pages 114–115, 120–121, 124–125,
132–136, 140, 143–144, 157–161

A Student Workbook for Land of Hope
Pages 67, 75–77, 87–88, 94–95

Online.Hillsdale.edu
The Great American Story
Lectures 7, 8, and 9

American Heritage
Lectures 5, 6, and 7

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students read Land of Hope, pages 112–117, 126–127, 129–138, and either complete the reading questions handout in A Student Workbook for Land of Hope (67, 75–77) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 2: Students read and annotate Theodore Frelinghuysen’s Speech on the Indian Removal Bill and John Ross’s Address to the People of the United States, and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).

Assignment 3: Students read Land of Hope, pages 146–156, and either complete the reading questions handout in A Student Workbook for Land of Hope (87–88, 94–95) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).
Core Content in This Lesson

Geography and Places
- Texas
- The Alamo
- Goliad
- Republic of Texas
- Arkansas
- Oklahoma Territory
- Oregon Country
- Michigan
- Florida
- Rio Grande
- Seneca Falls
- Iowa
- Wisconsin
- California Territory
- San Francisco Bay
- Utah Territory
- New Mexico Territory

Persons
- Henry Clay
- Daniel Webster
- John C. Calhoun
- Sam Houston
- Antonio López de Santa Anna
- Davy Crockett
- Jim Bowie
- Sequoyah
- Martin Van Buren
- William Henry Harrison
- John Tyler
- Brigham Young
- Ralph Waldo Emerson
- Henry David Thoreau
- Nathaniel Hawthorne
- Herman Melville
- Elizabeth Cady Stanton
- Sojourner Truth
- William Lloyd Garrison
- Frederick Douglass
- Levi and Catharine Coffin
- Harriet Tubman
- James Polk
- Zachary Taylor
- Abraham Lincoln
- Winfield Scott
- John Frémont

Terms and Topics
- spoils system
- bureaucracy
- veto
- Nat Turner Rebellion
- gag rule
- “positive good”
- compact theory
- “state sovereignty”
- “We the People”
- Tariff of 1832
- secession
- Nullification Crisis
- Bank of the United States
- National Republicans
- Worcester v. Georgia
- Indian Removal Act
- Cherokee
- Trail of Tears
- The Alamo
- Texas Revolution
- Second Party System
- Panic of 1837
- immigration
- railroad
- temperance
- abolitionism
- Underground Railroad
- personal liberty laws
- Transcendentalism
- manifest destiny
- pioneer
- 49th Parallel
Aroostook War                  Spot Resolutions
Morse code                    Mexican-American War
annexation                    Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo
Wilmot Proviso                Mexican Cession

Primary Sources

Webster-Hayne debate, Daniel Webster and Robert Hayne
Speech on the Indian Removal Bill, Theodore Frelinghuysen
Address to the People of the United States, John Ross
Annual message to Congress, 1830, Andrew Jackson
Veto message on the Bank of the United States, Andrew Jackson
Speech on the Reception of Abolition Petitions, John C. Calhoun
“‘The Great Nation of Futurity,’” John Louis O’Sullivan

To Know by Heart

“I Hear America Singing” —Walt Whitman

Timeline

1836  Texas independence
1845  US annexes Texas
1846–48 Mexican-American War

Images

Historical figures and events
First flags of Texas
Uniforms and munitions of soldiers in the Mexican-American War
Depictions of battles and battlefields, including strategy and tactics
Depictions of figures at various scenes and moments in battle
Maps: overall strategies, specific battles
Relevant forts
Medical equipment
Reenactment photos

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Biographies and the roles of Andrew Jackson, Stephen F. Austin, Sam Houston, Henry Clay, John C. Calhoun, Martin Van Buren, Frederick Douglass, Harriet Tubman, William Henry Harrison, John Tyler, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and James Polk
- John Latrobe’s account of a race between the first train and a horse
- The 1831–32 slavery debate in the Virginia General Assembly
- Frederick Douglass’s account of his experience with a slave breaker
- Toasts between Andrew Jackson and John C. Calhoun regarding nullification at a Democratic Party dinner
- The passage of the Force Act and Henry Clay’s deal-making to resolve the Nullification Crisis
Andrew Jackson’s many quotes and stories as he railed against nullification and the National Bank
William Barret Travis’s letter from the Alamo
Vicente Filisola’s account of the Battle of the Alamo
William Coodey’s account of the start of the Trail of Tears
Francis Parkman’s account of traveling the Oregon Trail
The sudden illness and death of William Henry Harrison
The feud between John Tyler and Henry Clay
Charles Dickens’s accounts of America from his *American Notes*
Explosion on the USS *Princeton*
The US Marines entering the “Halls of Montezuma” during the Mexican-American War
John Quincy Adams suffering a stroke at his desk in the House of Representatives, and subsequent death in the Speaker’s Room

**QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND**

- What were the arguments concerning slavery that delegates debated during the 1831–32 meeting of the Virginia General Assembly?
- How did the South’s stance toward slavery change in response to the Nat Turner Rebellion?
- What was John C. Calhoun’s idea that slavery was a “positive good”? Why did he argue this, and how was this a change from previous arguments about slavery?
- How would Frederick Douglass have replied to John C. Calhoun’s assertions?
- Compared to the North, how would the South’s society and economy suggest John C. Calhoun was wrong about the supposed economic and social benefits of slavery?
- How did the idea of slavery as a “positive good” challenge the Constitution’s stance on slavery and the path on which the founding generation had set slavery?
- How did John C. Calhoun reject the ideas of the Declaration of Independence in arguing for slavery?
- Which of Andrew Jackson’s actions as president demonstrated his democratic ideas?
- How did the “state sovereignty” and “We the people” views of union differ from each other?
- What was at issue during the Nullification Crisis? What roles did Andrew Jackson, John C. Calhoun, and Henry Clay play during the crisis?
- What policies were adopted concerning Native Americans during the 1820s and 1830s? To what extent did these policies represent an attempt to resolve the conflicts between Native Americans and settlers?
- What factors shaped the history of relations between Native Americans and settlers?
- How did the National Bank work? What were the arguments for and against the rechartering of the National Bank?
- How did Andrew Jackson respond to decisions of the Supreme Court with which he disagreed? Why did he believe he was justified to act in these ways?
- How did the Texas Revolution come about?
- Why did Andrew Jackson evade Texas’s request for admission to the Union?
- What was the Whig Party platform?
- What were the main ideas of Transcendentalism?
- What was the idea of “manifest destiny”? Why were many Americans confident in this assumption?
- How did the Mexican-American War begin? What were James Polk’s motivations for the war?
- Why did the Americans win the Mexican-American War?
- Questions from the US Civics Test:
  - Question 4: The US Constitution starts with the words “We the People.” What does “We the People” mean?
  - Question 91: Name one war fought by the United States in the 1800s.
  - Question 117: Name one American Indian tribe in the United States.

**KEYS TO THE LESSON**

With Andrew Jackson’s background and Alexis de Tocqueville’s insights fresh in mind, students can learn about the increasing democratization of America during the Jackson administration. In each of Jackson’s major policy decisions, students should be able to draw out both the ways in which these policies benefited the common man and how they cemented the power of the presidency. At the same time, a spirit of optimistic expansion imbued American politics, eventually termed America’s “manifest destiny” to settle from coast to coast. Confidence in the benefits of American freedom and self-government, coupled with other motivations and seemingly endless opportunities for expansion, fueled this spirit. Expansion, however, often involved displacing Native Americans in ways that lacked honor or justice. At America’s then-southwestern border, Americans who had settled in Texas were fighting their own revolution against Mexico. The resulting Republic of Texas and its potential admission to the Union stalked the next decade of American politics, as the slavery question lurked over all other debates. Since the Nat Turner Rebellion, the Southern position on slavery had ossified, and the stakes in the “balance of power” struggle in the US Senate became even greater. The Texas question came to a head with the Mexican-American War, the consequences of which would re-ignite the slavery debate and drive the nation toward civil strife.

Teachers might best plan and teach Manifest Destiny with emphasis on the following approaches:

- When teaching about Andrew Jackson and his presidency, consider with students the theme of his democratic appeal, namely in favor of the common man. At its heart, this meant a faith in the rightness of the views of the common man and the defense of his station in life against commercial elites and wealthier coastal and urban interests. Note also this democratic view that government was too often corrupted by these elite interests, that the larger the size of government, the greater the likelihood of corruption and tyranny, and that a permanent bureaucracy created a monopoly on information and power that corrupt politicians and self-interested elites curried for their own benefit. Jackson brought nearly all of these positions to bear on a presidency in which he largely reduced the size of the government and rejected expansion, all the while embodying the ethos of the commoner. Consider with students the extent to which Jackson marked a revitalization and fulfillment of self-government as articulated in the founding view of limited government and the sovereignty of the people.

- As the epitome of Andrew Jackson’s political philosophy and policies, teach about his tour de force against the National Bank of the United States. Jackson left no tactic unused and threw his entire personality and popularity against the bank and, in his eyes, in defense of the common man. Read and discuss with students Jackson’s veto message.

- Teach about Nat Turner’s revolt, the debate over slavery in the Virginia General Assembly of 1831–32 that followed, the series of tightening restrictions on slaves, and the hardening of the slaveholding position during the 1830s and 1840s.
Note the continued North-South divide manifesting itself in the Nullification Crisis of 1833, and Andrew Jackson’s somewhat surprising position against the idea of nullification. Some at the time saw the tariff issue as merely a front for slaveholding states to preserve their power to protect slavery. Read and discuss with the class portions of the debate between Daniel Webster and Robert Hayne on the nature of the union to see the fault lines that would dominate the next half-century.

Take the opportunity when discussing the Indian Removal Act to recap the history of relations between American settlers and Native Americans. *Land of Hope*’s treatment of this topic on pages 115–117 is very good. When it comes to a settled policy, few were ever solidified, and those that were formalized were rarely enforced or openly broken, by settlers or governments or sometimes by tribes. Some frontier settlements were lawless places where the presence of greed, dishonesty, and brutality were unmistakable. When teaching the resettlement chapter of American and Native American history in particular, it is important to capture the diversity of thoughts, motivations, and actions by the different parties: bad, good, and mixed. The general treatment of Native Americans is a bitter and sad part of America’s history, and unfortunately one that may have been better if a more deliberate and imaginative policy were devised, and if the view of the human person laid out in the Declaration of Independence had been more consistently referenced in relationships with the indigenous population. Read Theodore Frelinghuysen’s speech on the Indian Removal Bill, John Ross’ Address to the People of the United States, and Andrew Jackson’s defense of the Act to understand this part of American history. Additionally, spend time teaching about efforts to maintain Native American heritage, such as how Sequoyah and the Cherokee sought to preserve their culture.

Explain to students how the growth in population in the North compared to the South would eventually allow Northern states to restrict slavery further and perhaps even abolish it with a constitutional amendment. Use the Missouri Compromise map handout (*A Student Workbook for Land of Hope*, pages 274–275) to show students the situation in 1820 compared to 1850. Slaveholders recognized that they had to expand the number of slave states if they were to prohibit such actions by Northerners. The challenge, however, was that they needed Northern states to acquiesce to such expansion. To do so, they appealed to the argument that slavery was a positive good, as articulated in the writings of John C. Calhoun. Students should read Calhoun’s speech on the Reception of Abolition Petitions in order to examine his arguments and to understand how Calhoun explicitly rejects the American founding principles as captured in the Declaration of Independence. Students should work through and understand the serious faults in Calhoun’s arguments.

Share the stories of the Texas Revolution, including the Alamo, Texas’s subsequent efforts to join the United States, and the effects of the Texas question on American politics.

Discuss the immigration waves from Ireland and Germany during the 1840s, where most of the people settled first in New York and New England. And discuss the growing reform efforts in the areas of temperance, women’s political participation, and abolitionism.

Outline for students the emerging American literary tradition, spending time especially with the romantics and Transcendentalists of New England. Ask students to think about these figures and their ideas in light of the new religious movements and the democratic spirit they learned about in the last lesson.

Introduce and discuss the idea of “manifest destiny” with students. *Land of Hope*’s treatment of this topic on pages 154–155 is especially helpful. In brief, manifest destiny involved many different dimensions, some of which were noble; others less so. Even then, the meaning of this
expression in the minds of different people varied greatly. The common point is that many Americans believed—based on the situation at the time—that America was destined to reach from coast to coast across a comparably sparsely populated wilderness, and to do great things for freedom, human flourishing, and individuals in the process. This was the sentiment that influenced many decisions during the 1830s and 1840s. Read with students the parts of John Louis O'Sullivan’s “The Great Nation of Futurity,” in which he uses the phrase “manifest destiny” and attempts to explain what it means.

- Present the less-than-honorable origins and intentions behind the Mexican-American War within the contexts of the annexation of Texas, manifest destiny, the consequences of expansion for the slave-state/free-state balance of power, and the resistance to the war by figures such as Abraham Lincoln and Henry David Thoreau.
- Ask students to identify and compare the various advantages and disadvantages of each side at the outset of the war and how these shifted over the years. Having students take simple notes as a “T-Chart” can be effective for this part of the lesson.
- Introduce students to the contemporary style of warfare by using images, maps, and artifacts. This approach will provide a foundation for their subsequent study of battles, help them to understand what happens in battle, and allow them to appreciate the bravery of soldiers fighting on both sides.
- Teach the Mexican-American War with a pace that captures the swiftness with which it was fought and concluded. Explain each side’s strategy at various stages of the war, tactics and battle plans, and the battles themselves in more general terms compared to the War of Independence and the War of 1812. Employ battle maps often. As with any conflict, draw attention to the key contributions of both leaders and common soldiers in the war. Of special interest in teaching this war is foreshadowing the many soldiers who would rise to famous generalships during the Civil War a dozen years later.
- Emphasize with students the terms of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo and its effects on American territory and politics.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Explain the major policies of Andrew Jackson’s administration and their effects on American politics and democratic life (1–2 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Explain the ideas behind “manifest destiny” and the ways in which this assumption showed itself during the 1830s and 1840s (1–2 paragraphs).
DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. What was Andrew Jackson’s position in the Nullification Crisis of 1823–33?

2. How did Andrew Jackson respond to the Supreme Court decision *Worcester v. Georgia*?

3. Name one reform movement from the first half of the nineteenth century mentioned in the text.

4. Name one American author from the first half of the nineteenth century mentioned in the text.

5. What was one idea of Transcendentalism?
Reading Quiz 3.7

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. What was one passive or indirect way that slaves resisted their enslavement?

2. How did stances toward slavery change in slave states following Nat Turner’s Rebellion?

3. Who was the prominent American who first led three hundred settlers into Texas?

4. What was Andrew Jackson’s policy toward Texas’s request for annexation?

5. What justification did America make for starting the Mexican-American War?
APPENDIX A

Study Guide

Test

Writing Assignment
Study Guide — The Early Republic Test

Unit 3

Timeline

When given chronological dates, match events from a list to the years or dates that they happened.

1787  Constitutional Convention
1788  Constitution ratified
1789  Elections held; First Congress convened; George Washington inaugurated; French Revolution begins
1800  Thomas Jefferson elected
1803  US purchases the Louisiana Territory from Napoleonic France
1812–15  War of 1812
1815  Battle of New Orleans
1816–19  Era of Good Feelings
1820  Missouri Compromise
1828  Andrew Jackson elected
1836  Texas independence
1845  US annexes Texas
1846–48  Mexican-American War

Geography and Places

Identify each on a map and/or tell where it is and explain its significance.

New Orleans  Lake Erie  Goliad
Washington City in the Federal District of Columbia  Lake Champlain  Republic of Texas
Northwest Territory  Florida Territory  Oklahoma Territory
Barbary Coast  Mexico  Oregon Country
Louisiana Territory  Tejas  Rio Grande
St. Louis  Deep South  California Territory
St. Louis  Missouri  San Francisco Bay

Persons

Identify each, provide biographical details, and explain what he or she thought or did in specific periods or events.

George Washington  James Madison  John Marshall
John Adams  Eli Whitney  Napoleon Bonaparte
Thomas Jefferson  John Jay  Meriwether Lewis
Alexander Hamilton  Aaron Burr  William Clark
Sacagawea
Davy Crockett
Dolley Madison
Tecumseh
Oliver Perry
Francis Scott Key
Andrew Jackson
James Monroe
Henry Clay
John C. Calhoun
John Quincy Adams
Daniel Webster
Alexis de Tocqueville
Stephen F. Austin
Joseph Smith
William Lloyd Garrison
Sam Houston
Antonio López
Sequoyah
Martin Van Buren
William Henry Harrison
John Tyler
Brigham Young
Henry David Thoreau
Nathaniel Hawthorne
Elizabeth Cady Stanton
Frederick Douglass
Levi and Catharine Coffin
Harriet Tubman
James Polk
Zachary Taylor
Abraham Lincoln
Winfield Scott
John Frémont

Terms and Topics

Identify each and explain its significance to the period of history studied.

Bill of Rights
Cabinet
Bureaucracy
War Debt
Whiskey Rebellion
French Revolution
Judiciary Act of 1789
Jay’s Treaty
Fugitive Slave Law
Cotton Gin
First Party System
Alien and Sedition Acts
Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions
Nullification
Marbury v. Madison
Judicial Review
Louisiana Purchase
Napoleonic Wars
Corps of Discovery
Barbary Pirates
US Marine Corps
Act Prohibiting Importation of Slaves of 1807
Impressment
Embargo Act of 1807
Battle of Tippecanoe
Battle of Lake Erie
Burning of Washington
Battle of Horseshoe Bend
Battle of New Orleans
Treaty of Ghent
“Era of Good Feelings”
49th Parallel
Immigration
Internal Improvements
Steel-Cast Plow
Mechanical Reaper
Second Great Awakening
Evangelism
Mormonism
American System
McCulloch v. Maryland
Slave Trade
Missouri Compromise
Monroe Doctrine
Democracy in America
Nat Turner Rebellion
Gag Rule
“Positive Good”
“State Sovereignty”
“We the People”
Secession
Nullification Crisis
Bank of the United States
Worcester v. Georgia
Indian Removal Act
Cherokee
Trail of Tears
The Alamo
Texas Revolution
Second Party System
Railroad
Temperance
Abolitionism
Underground Railroad
Personal Liberty Laws
Transcendentalism
Manifest Destiny
Morse Code
Annexation
Spot Resolutions
Mexican-American War
Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo
Mexican Cession
PRIMARY SOURCES

Based on annotations and notes from seminar conversations, be able to answer questions on each primary source. While you will not necessarily be asked why each primary source was created, what it did or argued, and what its effects were, being able to answer these kinds of questions will make you well-prepared.

Thanksgiving Proclamation, George Washington
Farewell Address, George Washington
Fourth of July address, John Quincy Adams
Address to the People of the United States, John Ross
Veto message on the Bank of the United States, Andrew Jackson
Speech on the Reception of Abolition Petitions, John C. Calhoun
“The Great Nation of Futurity,” John Louis O’Sullivan

TO KNOW BY HEART

Be prepared to fill in missing words and/or identify the speaker and context.

“In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened.” —George Washington, Farewell Address

“Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious People. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other.” —John Adams, To the Officers of the Militia of Massachusetts

“Indeed I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that his justice cannot sleep forever.” —Thomas Jefferson on slavery in America

“[America] goes not abroad in search of monsters to destroy. She is the well-wisher to the freedom and independence of all. She is the champion and vindicator only of her own…. Her glory is not dominion, but liberty.” —John Quincy Adams

“[He] loved his country partly because it was his own country, but mostly because it was a free country; and he burned with zeal for its advancement, prosperity, and glory, because he saw in such, the advancement, prosperity, and glory of human liberty, human right, and human nature.”
—Abraham Lincoln, eulogy for Henry Clay

“America is great because America is good, and if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great.” —Alexis de Tocqueville
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be middle school students.

- The ebb and flow of the friendship between John Adams and Thomas Jefferson
- The death of George Washington
- Lucien Bonaparte’s account of Napoleon’s sale of Louisiana to the United States
- Entries from the diaries of Meriwether Lewis and William Clark
- Aaron Burr killing Alexander Hamilton in a duel
- William Henry Harrison’s account of Tecumseh
- The burning of Washington, DC, including the Executive Mansion
- The defense of Fort McHenry and the writing of “The Star-Spangled Banner”
- The Battle of New Orleans and how it occurred after a peace treaty had been signed—unbeknownst to the battle participants
- The deaths of Thomas Jefferson and John Adams on July 4, 1826
- Andrew Jackson’s many duels, rivalries, feats, and accomplishments, before he became president
- Margaret Bayard Smith’s account of the inauguration of Andrew Jackson
- The 1831–32 slavery debate in the Virginia General Assembly
- Frederick Douglass’s account of his experience with a slave breaker
- Toasts between Andrew Jackson and John C. Calhoun regarding nullification at a Democratic Party dinner
- The passage of the Force Act and Henry Clay’s deal-making to resolve the Nullification Crisis
- Accounts of the Battle of the Alamo
- Accounts of the start of the Trail of Tears
- Accounts of traveling the Oregon Trail
- The US Marines entering the “Halls of Montezuma” during the Mexican-American War

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.

Lesson 1 | The New Government

☐ What challenges did George Washington face at the start of and during his presidency?
☐ What were the competing visions for America’s future based on the views of Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson?
☐ What were Alexander Hamilton’s greatest contributions to the young nation?
☐ What were the stances of George Washington, John Adams, and Thomas Jefferson regarding the conflict between Great Britain and the French revolutionaries?
☐ How were the American and French Revolutions similar and different? What factors accounted for the very different outcomes?
□ How did George Washington navigate foreign policy concerning the French Revolution and Great Britain?
□ How did Eli Whitney’s cotton gin change the course of slavery in America from what many during the founding generation had expected?
□ How does the American federal judiciary system operate, based on the Judiciary Act?
□ What were the three main points of Washington’s Farewell Address? Explain each.
□ In what sense may it be said that George Washington was America’s “indispensable man”?
□ How might John Adams’s presidency be characterized?
□ What risks emerged as the result of the Alien and Sedition Acts and the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions?
□ What was so consequential about the election of 1800 and the subsequent change in administrations?

Lesson 2 | Prospects, Uncertainties, and War

□ What were the major actions and characteristics of Thomas Jefferson’s presidency?
□ What were the three major foreign policy issues that Thomas Jefferson addressed?
□ What was the impact of the Louisiana Purchase on America’s future?
□ What did Congress and Thomas Jefferson outlaw in 1808?
□ What were Thomas Jefferson’s views and actions, both personal and public, regarding slavery?
□ What did the Supreme Court establish in Marbury v. Madison? How did John Marshall arrive at this determination?
□ What role did John Marshall and the other Federalist-appointed judges play in the early decades of the republic?
□ What were the causes of the War of 1812? How was war actually declared?
□ What were the major moments during the War of 1812? How can we characterize America’s degree of success during this war?
□ Why was the Battle of New Orleans important for America’s future, even though it was unwittingly fought after a peace treaty had been signed?
□ What were the terms of the Treaty of Ghent?

Lesson 3 | The American Way

□ How was America changing during the 1820s and 1830s, particularly concerning immigration, transportation, and the prospects for both business and the common man?
□ What kind of religious and reform movements emerged during the 1820s and 1830s?
□ What was life like for slaves during the early nineteenth century?
□ How did the status of slavery change following the invention of the cotton gin? How was this similar to and different from the status of slavery in the founding generation—before 1789?
□ In what ways did the division over slavery manifest itself, and how was this division usually addressed by politicians?
□ Why was there disagreement over the admission of Missouri into the Union, especially compared to the admittance of other slave states previously? How did the Missouri Compromise resolve the issue for the time being?
□ What was Henry Clay’s “American System”?
□ What did the Monroe Doctrine state? To what extent was it realistic at the time? How effective was it and why?
What was the “Corrupt Bargain,” and how did it affect John Quincy Adams’s presidency?

What did Andrew Jackson mean by “democracy”?

Why did Andrew Jackson promote the common man?

What risks did Andrew Jackson believe were threats to the well-being of the common man?

What were Alexis de Tocqueville’s major observations about democracy in America?

What risks to the American experiment in self-government did Alexis de Tocqueville observe in American society?

Lesson 4 | Manifest Destiny

What were the arguments concerning slavery that delegates debated during the 1831–32 meeting of the Virginia General Assembly?

How did the South’s stance toward slavery change in response to the Nat Turner Rebellion?

Which of Andrew Jackson’s actions as president demonstrated his democratic ideas?

How did the “state sovereignty” and “We the people” views of union differ from each other?

What was at issue during the Nullification Crisis? What roles did Andrew Jackson, John C. Calhoun, and Henry Clay play during the crisis?

What policies were adopted concerning Native Americans during the 1820s and 1830s? To what extent did these policies represent an attempt to resolve the conflicts between Native Americans and settlers?

How did the National Bank work? What were the arguments for and against the rechartering of the National Bank?

How did Andrew Jackson respond to decisions of the Supreme Court with which he disagreed? Why did he believe he was justified to act in these ways?

How did the Texas Revolution come about?

What was the Whig Party platform?

What were the main ideas of Transcendentalism?

What was the idea of “manifest destiny”? Why were many Americans confident in this assumption?

How did the Mexican-American War begin? What were James Polk’s motivations for the war?

Why did the Americans win the Mexican-American War?
Test — The Early Republic

**TIMELINE**

Write the letter of each event next to the date or years it took place.

1787  ______  A. Andrew Jackson elected  
1788  ______  B. Battle of New Orleans  
1789  ______  C. Constitution ratified  
1800  ______  D. Constitutional Convention  
1803  ______  E. Elections held; First Congress convened; George Washington inaugurated; French Revolution begins  
1812–15  ______  F. Era of Good Feelings  
1815  ______  G. Mexican-American War  
1820  ______  H. Missouri Compromise  
1828  ______  I. Texas independence  
1836  ______  J. Thomas Jefferson elected  
1845  ______  K. US annexes Texas  
1846–48  ______  L. US purchases the Louisiana Territory from France  
M. War of 1812  

**GEOGRAPHY AND PLACES**

1. Mark the location of each place on the map using dots, circling, and the corresponding letters:

   A. New Orleans  
   B. Washington, DC  
   C. Northwest Territory  
   D. Louisiana Territory  
   E. St. Louis  
   F. Lake Erie  
   G. Mexico  
   H. Deep South  
   I. Missouri  
   J. Republic of Texas  
   K. Oklahoma Territory  
   L. Oregon Country  
   M. Rio Grande  
   N. California Territory  
   O. San Francisco Bay  

Map courtesy of A Student Workbook for Land of Hope.
PERSONS, TERMS, AND TOPICS

Fill in the blank.

2. Although his debt-reduction plan angered several special interest groups, _____________’s financial plans helped restore the credit of the fledgling United States and placed the country on a path to prosperity based on early industrialism. In 1804, without firing a shot himself, he was shot and killed in a duel by his rival, Aaron Burr.

3. Despite Washington’s efforts and warnings, the party spirit began to divide America even during his administration. The two unofficial parties in this first party system were the ________________-___________s, who tended to be more democratic, pro-France, and in favor of both an agrarian society and state governments; and the ________________-___________, who envisioned a stronger national government, an industry-based society, and support for Great Britain.

4. Having served his country as a respected lawyer, revolutionary leader, ambassador, and Vice President—and arguably the most intelligent of the Founding Fathers—_______________’s presidency suffered in part from his stubborn and cantankerous character but also from having to follow the magnanimous George Washington. It was during his tenure that the president first resided in the new capital of Washington, DC, in the Executive Mansion.

5. Domestic divisions over the Napoleonic Wars led to early challenges for the Constitution, including the passage of the Alien and Sedition Acts and the assertions that states could declare a law unconstitutional, as expressed in the ________________-___________ and ________________-___________ Resolutions.

6. In a very un-Jeffersonian move, President Thomas Jefferson dispatched the US Marines to fight the ________________-___________ in Tripoli to end the exaction of tribute and assert the practice of freedom of the seas for American shipping.

7. Chief Justice John Marshall outlined the power of ________________-___________ in the majority decision for Marbury v. Madison, establishing the Supreme Court’s authority to judge laws to be unconstitutional and cementing the authority of both the federal courts and federal government.

8. The Jefferson administration doubled the size of America in the greatest land deal of all time ($15 million for 500 million acres, or 3 cents per acre) when it purchased the ________________-___________ from Napoleonic France, which offered the land in order to raise money to launch its wars of conquest in Europe.

9. Known as the “Father of the Constitution,” ________________-___________’s first term as president consisted of a gradual, avoidable, and poorly handled “slipping-towards-war” with Great Britain, which deeply divided the nation. First Lady Dolley had to flee the Executive Mansion as the British burned Washington, DC.
10. The Indiana Territory governor-general William Henry Harrison fought the commanding Indian leader __________________________ at the Battle of Tippecanoe, forcing the latter to flee to British Canada, where three years later he would be killed in battle during the Thames Campaign in the War of 1812.

11. During the early 1800s, a religious revival known as the __________________________ along the frontier emphasized spiritualism and feeling. The movement increased the size of the distinctly American denominations of Baptists and Methodists and saw the emergence of Mormonism.

12. The rather quiet and gentlemanly __________________________ served his country with distinction ever since the Battle of Trenton, in which he had been severely wounded. As his reputation for statesmanship grew with his career, he not only secured the Louisiana Purchase for Thomas Jefferson but as Secretary of War he also helped the nation regroup after the Burning of Washington during the War of 1812. He ushered in the “Era of Good Feelings” and the most famous act of his presidency was the issuance of his foreign policy doctrine which warned European nations against starting new colonies in the Western Hemisphere.

13. In 1807 Congress passed and President Thomas Jefferson signed into law an Act Prohibiting __________________________ of __________, thus banning the practice at the first opportunity provided by the US Constitution.

14. Known as the “Great Compromiser,” __________________________ was a renowned statesman similarly despised and admired by friend and foe alike. He would help work out three agreements that would preserve the Union, beginning with the Missouri Compromise.

15. Congress and President Andrew Jackson enacted the __________________________ that authorized the federal government to negotiate treaties with Native Americans that would relocate them to territories in the west. When Native American populations refused to move voluntarily under the terms of treaties signed by what they consider imposter leaders, federal troops were used to escort Native Americans to the west by force and without proper care for their health or safety.

16. The most notable action of Jackson’s presidency was his battle against the __________, during which he defied both Congress and the Supreme Court in his belief of its unconstitutionality.

17. Western settlement of North America during the 1830s and ’40s was aided by new farming techniques and inventions, such as the steel-cast plow by John Deere and the mechanical reaper by Cyrus McCormick. Moreover, transportation was made easier by travelling by steamboat on the Mississippi River and by __________________________ over land.
18. Mexican forces under the leadership of their military-dictator ___________ wiped out a force of Tennessee sharpshooters who ignored Samuel Houston’s orders to retreat in the Battle of the Alamo. The event was dubbed an atrocity by the Texians and, together with the memory of the Goliad Massacre, the Texians were able to win their independence from Mexico.

19. Having campaigned with the slogan “Fifty-Four Forty or Fight!,” ___________, in his inaugural address, promised to do four things: lower tariffs, establish an independent treasury system, settle the question about the Oregon Country with Great Britain, and secure the abundant and natural land of Texas from Mexico, in addition to promising only to serve one term. He accomplished each of these goals during his administration.

20. Asserting that the president purposefully provoked Mexican aggression by sending forces under Zachary Taylor beyond the River Nueces and to the banks of the Rio Grande, the first-year Whig Congressman ___________ introduced demands that the president explain on exactly which spot in American territory the attack by Mexicans on American troops took place. Due to these “Spot Resolutions,” this Congressman lost his seat in the House of Representatives in the next election.

**KNOW BY HEART**

*Fill in missing words and identify the source.*

21. “Our ___________ was made only for a ___________ and ___________ People. It is wholly ___________ to the government of any other.”

   Speaker: ______________________

   “Indeed I ___________ for my country when I reflect that God is ___________; that his justice cannot ___________ forever.”

   Speaker: ______________________

   Topic: ______________________
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be middle school students.

22. The Battle of New Orleans

23. The 1831–32 slavery debate in the Virginia General Assembly

24. Accounts of the Trail of Tears

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and good writing should be employed, and responses must fully answer each question.

25. What were the competing visions for America’s future based on the views of Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson?
26. How were the American and French Revolutions similar and different? What factors accounted for the very different outcomes?

27. How did Eli Whitney’s cotton gin change the course of slavery in America from what many during the founding generation had expected?

28. What were the three main points of Washington’s Farewell Address? Explain each.

29. What was the impact of the Louisiana Purchase on America’s future?

30. What were Thomas Jefferson’s views and actions, both personal and public, regarding slavery?

31. What were the causes of the War of 1812? How was war actually declared?

32. Why was the Battle of New Orleans important for America’s future, even though it was unwittingly fought after a peace treaty had been signed?

33. How was America changing during the 1820s and 1830s, particularly concerning immigration, transportation, and the prospects for both business and the common man?
34. What was life like for slaves during the early nineteenth century?

35. In what ways did the division over slavery manifest itself, and how was this division usually addressed by politicians?

36. What risks did Andrew Jackson believe were threats to the well-being of the common man?

37. What risks to the American experiment in self-government did Alexis de Tocqueville observe in American society?

38. What was at issue during the Nullification Crisis? What roles did Andrew Jackson, John C. Calhoun, and Henry Clay play during the crisis?

39. How did the National Bank work? What were the arguments for and against the rechartering of the National Bank?

40. How did Andrew Jackson respond to decisions of the Supreme Court with which he disagreed? Why did he believe he was justified to act in these ways?

41. What was the idea of “manifest destiny”? Why were many Americans confident in this assumption?
Writing Assignment — The Early Republic

DIRECTIONS

Citing events and primary sources in your argument, write a 500–800-word essay answering this question:

In what ways did the first half-century of American history under the US Constitution demonstrate further fulfillments of and departures from the ideas presented in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution?
APPENDIX B

Primary Sources

George Washington
Alexander Hamilton
Thomas Jefferson
James Tallmadge
John Quincy Adams
James Monroe
Alexis de Tocqueville
Daniel Webster
Robert Hayne
Theodore Frelinghuysen
John Ross
Andrew Jackson
John C. Calhoun
John Louis O’Sullivan
PRESIDENT GEORGE WASHINGTON

A Proclamation

PROCLAMATION

October 3, 1789

Federal Hall | New York City, New York

Thanksgiving Proclamation

BACKGROUND

In response to a joint resolution of Congress, President George Washington issued this proclamation.

ANNOTATIONS

By the President of the United States of America, a Proclamation.

Whereas it is the duty of all Nations to acknowledge the providence of Almighty God, to obey his will, to be grateful for his benefits, and humbly to implore his protection and favor—and whereas both Houses of Congress have by their joint Committee requested me “to recommend to the People of the United States a day of public thanksgiving and prayer to be observed by acknowledging with grateful hearts the many signal favors of Almighty God especially by affording them an opportunity peaceably to establish a form of government for their safety and happiness.”

Now therefore I do recommend and assign Thursday the 26th day of November next to be devoted by the People of these States to the service of that great and glorious Being, who is the beneficent Author of all the good that was, that is, or that will be—That we may then all unite in rendering unto him our sincere and humble thanks—for his kind care and protection of the People of this Country previous to their becoming a Nation—for the signal and manifold mercies, and the favorable interpositions of his Providence which we experienced in the course and conclusion of the late war—for the great degree of tranquility,

Thanksgiving Proclamation
George Washington

union, and plenty, which we have since enjoyed—for the peaceable and rational manner, in which we have been enabled to establish constitutions of government for our safety and happiness, and particularly the national One now lately instituted—for the civil and religious liberty with which we are blessed; and the means we have of acquiring and diffusing useful knowledge; and in general for all the great and various favors which he hath been pleased to confer upon us.

And also that we may then unite in most humbly offering our prayers and supplications to the great Lord and Ruler of Nations and beseech him to pardon our national and other transgressions—to enable us all, whether in public or private stations, to perform our several and relative duties properly and punctually—to render our national government a blessing to all the people, by constantly being a Government of wise, just, and constitutional laws, discreetly and faithfully executed and obeyed—to protect and guide all Sovereigns and Nations (especially such as have shewn kindness unto us) and to bless them with good government, peace, and concord—To promote the knowledge and practice of true religion and virtue, and the increase of science among them and us—and generally to grant unto all Mankind such a degree of temporal prosperity as he alone knows to be best.

Given under my hand at the City of New-York the third day of October in the year of our Lord 1789.

George Washington
PRESIDENT GEORGE WASHINGTON

To the Hebrew Congregation in Newport, Rhode Island

LETTER

August 21, 1790

BACKGROUND

During President George Washington’s goodwill visit to Newport following Rhode Island’s ratification of the Constitution, Moses Seixas—a leading official in Newport and a member of the local Jewish synagogue—publicly read a letter to Washington. Washington responded three days later in a letter of his own.

ANNOTATIONS

Gentlemen:

While I receive, with much satisfaction, your Address replete with expressions of esteem; I rejoice in the opportunity of assuring you, that I shall always retain grateful remembrance of the cordial welcome I experienced in my visit to Newport, from all classes of Citizens.

The reflection on the days of difficulty and danger which are past is rendered the more sweet, from a consciousness that they are succeeded by days of uncommon prosperity and security. If we have wisdom to make the best use of the advantages with which we are now favored, we cannot fail, under the just administration of a good Government, to become a great and happy people.

The Citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy: a policy worthy of

imitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that toleration is spoken of, as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people, that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural rights. For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support.

It would be inconsistent with the frankness of my character not to avow that I am pleased with your favorable opinion of my Administration and fervent wishes for my felicity. May the Children of the Stock of Abraham, who dwell in this land, continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other Inhabitants; while every one shall sit in safety under his own vine and fig tree, and there shall be none to make him afraid. May the father of all mercies scatter light and not darkness in our paths, and make us all in our several vocations useful here, and in his own due time and way everlastingly happy.
TREASURY SECRETARY ALEXANDER HAMILTON

On the French Revolution

UNPUBLISHED WRITING FRAGMENT

1794

BACKGROUND

In an unpublished and unfinished piece, Alexander Hamilton expresses serious concerns over the irreligiosity of the French Revolution.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What are the opinions that threaten the foundations of religion, morality, and society?

2. Which two groups are the enemies of religion and government?

3. How is the French Revolution the practical development of these irreligious and anarchic opinions?

Facts, numerous and unequivocal, demonstrate that the present aera is among the most extraordinary, which have occurred in the history of human affairs. Opinions, for a long time, have been gradually gaining ground, which threaten the foundations of Religion, Morality and Society. An attack was first made upon the Christian Revelation; for which natural Religion was offered as the substitute. The Gospel was to be discarded as a gross imposture; but the being and attributes of a God, the obligations of piety, even the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments were to be retained and cherished.

In proportion as success has appeared to attend the plan, a bolder project has been unfolded. The very existence of a Deity has been questioned, and in some instances denied. The duty of piety has been ridiculed, the perishable nature of man asserted and his hopes bounded to the short span of his earthly state. Death has been proclaimed an Eternal Sleep—“the dogma of the immortality of the soul a cheat invented to torment the living for the benefit of the dead.” Irreligion, no longer confined to the closets of concealed sophists, nor to the haunts of wealthy riot, has more or less displayed its hideous front among all classes.

Wise and good men took a lead in delineating the odious character of Despotism; in exhibiting the advantages of a moderate and well-balanced government, in inviting nations to contend for the enjoyment of rational liberty. Fanatics in political science have since exaggerated and perverted their doctrines. Theories of Government unsuited to the nature of man, miscalculating the force of his passions, disregarding the lessons of experimental wisdom, have been projected and recommended. These have every where attracted sectaries and every where the fabric of Government has been in different degrees undermined.

A league has at length been cemented between the apostles and disciples of irreligion and of anarchy. Religion and Government have both been stigmatised as abuses; as unwarrantable restraints upon the freedom of man; as causes of the corruption of his nature, intrinsically good; as sources of an artificial and false morality, which tyrannically robs him of the enjoyments for which his passions fit him; and as cloggs upon his progress to the perfection for which he was destined.
As a corollary from these premisses, it is a favourite tenet of the sect that religious opinion of any sort is unnecessary to Society; that the maxims of a genuine morality and the authority of the Magistracy and the laws are a sufficient and ought to be the only security for civil rights and private happiness.

As another corollary, it is occasionally maintained by the same sect, that but a small portion of power is requisite to Government; that even this portion is only temporarily necessary, in consequence of the bad habits which have been produced by the errors of ancient systems; and that as human nature shall refine and ameliorate by the operation of a more enlightened plan, government itself will become useless, and Society will subsist and flourish free from its shackles.

If all the votaries of this new philosophy do not go the whole length of its frantic creed; they all go far enough to endanger the full extent of the mischiefs which are inherent in so wild and fatal a scheme; every modification of which aims a mortal blow at the vitals of human happiness.

The practical development of this pernicious system has been seen in France. It has served as an engine to subvert all her ancient institutions civil and religious, with all the checks that served to mitigate the rigour of authority; it has hurried her headlong through a rapid succession of dreadful revolutions, which have laid waste property, made havoc among the arts, overthrow cities, desolated provinces, unpeopled regions, crimsonmed her soil with blood and deluged it in crime poverty and wretchedness; and all this as yet for no better purpose than to erect on the ruins of former things a despotism unlimited and uncontrolled; leaving to a deluded, an abused, a plundered, a scourged and an oppressed people not even the shadow of liberty, to console them for a long train of substantial misfortunes, of bitter sufferings.

This horrid system seemed awhile to threaten the subversion of civilized Society and the introduction of general disorder among mankind. And though the frightful evils, which have been its first and only fruits, have given a check to its progress, it is to be feared that the poison has spread too widely and penetrated too deeply, to be as yet eradicated. Its
activity has indeed been suspended, but the elements remain concocting for new eruptions as occasion shall permit. It is greatly to be apprehended, that mankind is not near the end of the misfortunes, which it is calculated to produce, and that it still portends a long train of convulsion, Revolution, carnage, devastation, and misery.

5 Symptoms of the too great prevalence of this system in the United States are alarmingly visible. It was by its influence, that efforts were made to embark this country in a common cause with France in the early period of the present war; to induce our government to sanction and promote her odious principles and views with the blood and treasure of our citizens. It is by its influence, that every succeeding revolution has been approved or excused—all the horrors that have been committed justified or extenuated—that even the last usurpation, which contradicts all the ostensible principles of the Revolution, has been regarded with complacency; and the despotic constitution engendered by it slyly held up as a model not unworthy of our Imitation.

10 In the progress of this system, impiety and infidelity have advanced with gigantic strides. Prodigious crimes heretofore unknown among us are seen. The chief and idol of…[ENDS]
PRESIDENT GEORGE WASHINGTON

To the People of America

LETTER

September 19, 1796

American Daily Advertiser | Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

BACKGROUND

George Washington wrote this letter to the American people announcing his retirement from the Presidency after his second term. At the time, there were no term limits on the presidency.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What is one of the main pillars supporting American independence, according to Washington?
2. How are the various geographical parts of the country connected to one another?
3. What are Washington’s main criticisms of partisanship?
4. Which habits are necessary for political prosperity and popular government?
5. Why is Washington opposed to permanent alliances with other nations?
6. What should be the foreign policy of the United States in relation to other nations?

Friends, and Fellow Citizens:

The period for a new election of a Citizen, to Administer the Executive government of the United States, being not far distant, and the time actually arrived, when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person, who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation, which binds a dutiful citizen to his country, and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest, no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in, the office to which your Suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire.

I constantly hoped, that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives, which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement, from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last Election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our Affairs with foreign Nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice, that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty, or propriety; and am persuaded whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.
The impressions, with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say, that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the Organization and Administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious, in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and every day the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services, they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe, that while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment, which is intended to terminate the career of my public life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that, under circumstances in which the Passions agitated in every direction were liable to mislead, amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging, in situations in which not unfrequently want of Success has countenanced the spirit of criticism, the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that Heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence; that your Union and brotherly affection may be perpetual; that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained; that its Administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and Virtue; that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these States, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete, by so careful a
preservation and so prudent a use of this blessing as will acquire to them the glory of recom-mending it to the applause, the affection, and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments; which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a People. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The Unity of Government which constitutes you one people is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main Pillar in the Edifice of your real independence, the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very Liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee, that from different causes and from different quarters, much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed, it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national Union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immoveable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the Palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned, and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our
Country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to You, in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of Patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same Religion, Manners, Habits and political Principles. You have in a common cause fought and triumphed together. The independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint councils, and joint efforts; of common dangers, sufferings and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they address themselves to your sensibility are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your Interest. Here every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the Union of the whole.

The North, in an unrestrained intercourse with the South, protected by the equal Laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of Maritime and commercial enterprise and precious materials of manufacturing industry. The South in the same Intercourse, benefitting by the Agency of the North, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the North, it finds its particular navigation envigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the National navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a Maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The East, in a like intercourse with the West, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications, by land and water, will more and more find, a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The West derives from the East supplies requisite to its growth and comfort, and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyment of indispensable outlets for its own productions to the weight, influence, and the future Maritime strength of the
Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as one Nation. Any other tenure by which the West can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength, or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign Power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular Interest in Union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts greater strength, greater resource, proportionately greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their Peace by foreign Nations; and, what is of inestimable value! they must derive from Union an exemption from those broils and Wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries, not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalships alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown Military establishments, which under any form of Government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to Republican Liberty: In this sense it is, that your Union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind, and exhibit the continuance of the Union as a primary object of Patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? Let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective Subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. 'Tis well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to Union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason, to distrust the patriotism of those, who in any quarter may endeavor to weaken its bands.
In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by geographical discriminations: Northern and Southern—Atlantic and Western; whence design-5 ing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of Party to acquire influence, within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other Districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations. They tend to render Alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our Western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head. They have seen, in the Negotiation by the Executive; and in the unanimous ratification by the Senate, of the Treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at that event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the General Government and in the Atlantic States unfriendly to their interests [in] regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two Treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them every thing they could desire, in respect to our Foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the Union by which they were procured? Will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such there are, who would sever them from their Brethren and connect them with Aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a Government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances however strict between the parts can be an adequate substitute. They must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all Alliances in all times have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a Constitution of Government, better calculated than your former for an intimate Union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its
own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its Laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true Liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their Constitutions of Government. But the Constitution which at any time exists, 'til changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole People, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the People to establish Government presupposes the duty of every Individual to obey the established Government.

All obstructions to the execution of the Laws, all combinations and Associations, under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberation and action of the Constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle and of fatal tendency. They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force; to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation, the will of a party; often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the Community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the Mirror of the ill-concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils and modified by mutual interests. However combinations or Associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the Power of the People, and to usurp for themselves the reins of Government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your Government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular oppositions to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles however specious the pretexts. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the Constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system, and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of
Governments, as of other human institutions; that experience is the surest standard, by which to test the real tendency of the existing Constitution of a country; that facility in changes upon the credit of mere hypotheses and opinion exposes to perpetual change, from the endless variety of hypotheses and opinion, and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests, in a country so extensive as ours, a Government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of Liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a Government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest Guardian. It is indeed little else than a name, where the Government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the Society within the limits prescribed by the Laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of Parties in the State, with particular reference to the founding of them on Geographical discriminations. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the Spirit of Party, generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human Mind. It exists under different shapes in all Governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but, in those of the popular form, it is seen in its greatest rankness and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissention, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries, which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an Individual; and sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation, on the ruins of Public Liberty.
Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of Party are sufficient to make it the interest and the duty of a wise People to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the Public Councils and enfeeble the Public administration. It agitates the Community with ill-founded jealousies and false alarms, kindles the animosity of one part against another, foments occasionally riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which find a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country, are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the Administration of the government and serve to keep alive the spirit of Liberty. This within certain limits is probably true, and in Governments of a Monarchical cast Patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in Governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched; it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent its bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free Country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective Constitutional spheres; avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power, and proneness to abuse it, which predominates in the human heart is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power; by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the Guardian of the Public Weal against invasions by the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern, some of them in our
country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If in the opinion of the People, the distribution or modification of the Constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, Religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of Patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great Pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of Men and citizens. The mere Politician, equally with the pious man ought to re-

spect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths, which are the instruments of inves-
tigation in Courts of Justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that National morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

'Tis substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free Government. Who that is a sincere friend to it, can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the founda-
tion of the fabric.

Promote then as an object of primary importance, Institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible: avoiding occasions of expense by cultivat-
ing peace, but remembering also that timely disbursements to prepare for danger frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of Peace to discharge the Debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your Representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be Revenue; that to have Revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper objects (which is always a choice of difficulties) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the Conduct of the Government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining Revenue which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all Nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct; and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great Nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a People always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt that in the course of time and things the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it? Can it be, that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human Nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular Nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded; and that in place of them just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The Nation, which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one Nation against
another, disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable, when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The Nation, prompted by ill will and resentment sometimes impels to War the Government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The Government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the Nation subservient to projects of hostility instigated by pride, ambition and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the Liberty, of Nations has been the victim.

So, likewise, a passionate attachment of one Nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and Wars of the latter, without adequate inducement or justification: It leads also to concessions to the favorite Nation of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the Nation making the concession; by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate, in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld: And it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens (who devote themselves to the favorite Nation) facility to betray, or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition[,] corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent Patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public Councils! Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful Nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.
Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens), the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of Republican Government. But that jealousy to be useful must be impartial; else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike of another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real Patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The Great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign Nations is in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connections as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements let them be fulfilled, with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence therefore it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships, or enmities:

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one People, under an efficient government, the period is not far off, when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interest guided by justice shall Counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle
our peace and prosperity in the toils of European Ambition, Rivalship, Interest, Humor or Caprice?

'Tis our true policy to steer clear of permanent Alliances, with any portion of the foreign world. So far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it, for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements (I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than to private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy). I repeat it therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves, by suitable establishments, on a respectably defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, liberal intercourse with all Nations, are recommended by policy, humanity and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand: neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of Commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with Powers so disposed; in order to give to trade a stable course, to define the rights of our Merchants, and to enable the Government to support them; conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied, as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that 'tis folly in one Nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its Independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors and yet, of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from Nation to Nation. 'Tis an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my Countrypeople, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression, I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our Nation from running the course which
has hitherto marked the Destiny of Nations. But if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the Impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare, by which they have been dictated.

How far in the discharge of my Official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public Records and other evidences of my conduct must Witness to You and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have at least believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting War in Europe, my Proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793 is the index to my Plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice and by that of Your Representatives in both Houses of Congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me; uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination with the aid of the best lights I could obtain I was well satisfied that our Country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a Neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it, with moderation, perseverance, and firmness.

The considerations, which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe, that according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the Belligerent powers has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a Neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every Nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of Peace and amity towards other Nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me, a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress without
interruption, to that degree of strength and consistency, which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my Administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my Country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its Service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the Mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several Generations, I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat, in which I promise myself to realize, without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow Citizens, the benign influence of good Laws under a free Government, the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.
**BACKGROUND**

President Thomas Jefferson delivered this address upon his inauguration in 1801.

**GUIDING QUESTIONS**

1. What “sacred principle” does Jefferson invoke?

2. What has America “banished from our land” and what must still be cast out?

3. Has the American Republic been successful?

4. What does Jefferson say about American geography and culture?

5. What are the essential principles of American government?

Friends and Fellow Citizens:

Called upon to undertake the duties of the first executive office of our country, I avail myself of the presence of that portion of my fellow citizens which is here assembled to express my grateful thanks for the favor with which they have been pleased to look toward me, to declare a sincere consciousness that the task is above my talents, and that I approach it with those anxious and awful presentiments which the greatness of the charge and the weakness of my powers so justly inspire. A rising nation, spread over a wide and fruitful land, traversing all the seas with the rich productions of their industry, engaged in commerce with nations who feel power and forget right, advancing rapidly to destinies beyond the reach of mortal eye—when I contemplate these transcendent objects, and see the honor, the happiness, and the hopes of this beloved country committed to the issue, and the auspices of this day, I shrink from the contemplation, and humble myself before the magnitude of the undertaking. Utterly, indeed, should I despair did not the presence of many whom I here see remind me that in the other high authorities provided by our Constitution I shall find resources of wisdom, of virtue, and of zeal on which to rely under all difficulties. To you, then, gentlemen, who are charged with the sovereign functions of legislation, and to those associated with you, I look with encouragement for that guidance and support which may enable us to steer with safety the vessel in which we are all embarked amidst the conflicting elements of a troubled world.

During the contest of opinion through which we have passed the animation of discussions and of exertions has sometimes worn an aspect which might impose on strangers unused to think freely and to speak and to write what they think; but this being now decided by the voice of the nation, announced according to the rules of the Constitution, all will, of course, arrange themselves under the will of the law, and unite in common efforts for the common good. All, too, will bear in mind this sacred principle, that though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will to be rightful must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights, which equal law must protect, and to violate would be oppression. Let us, then, fellow citizens, unite with one heart and
one mind. Let us restore to social intercourse that harmony and affection without which liberty and even life itself are but dreary things. And let us reflect that, having banished from our land that religious intolerance under which mankind so long bled and suffered, we have yet gained little if we countenance a political intolerance as despotic, as wicked, and capable of as bitter and bloody persecutions. During the throes and convulsions of the ancient world, during the agonizing spasms of infuriated man, seeking through blood and slaughter his long-lost liberty, it was not wonderful that the agitation of the billows should reach even this distant and peaceful shore; that this should be more felt and feared by some and less by others, and should divide opinions as to measures of safety. But every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. We are all Republicans, we are all Federalists. If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it. I know, indeed, that some honest men fear that a republican government cannot be strong, that this government is not strong enough; but would the honest patriot, in the full tide of successful experiment, abandon a government which has so far kept us free and firm on the theoretic and visionary fear that this government, the world's best hope, may by possibility want energy to preserve itself? I trust not. I believe this, on the contrary, the strongest government on earth. I believe it the only one where every man, at the call of the law, would fly to the standard of the law, and would meet invasions of the public order as his own personal concern. Sometimes it is said that man can not be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the forms of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question.

Let us, then, with courage and confidence pursue our own federal and republican principles, our attachment to union and representative government. Kindly separated by nature and a wide ocean from the exterminating havoc of one quarter of the globe; too high-minded to endure the degradations of the others; possessing a chosen country, with room enough for our descendants to the thousandth and thousandth generation;
entertaining a due sense of our equal right to the use of our own faculties, to the acquisitions of our own industry, to honor and confidence from our fellow citizens, resulting not from birth, but from our actions and their sense of them; enlightened by a benign religion, professed, indeed, and practiced in various forms, yet all of them inculcating honesty, truth, temperance, gratitude, and the love of man; acknowledging and adoring an overruling Providence, which by all its dispensations proves that it delights in the happiness of man here and his greater happiness hereafter— with all these blessings, what more is necessary to make us a happy and a prosperous people? Still one thing more, fellow citizens—a wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government, and this is necessary to close the circle of our felicities.

About to enter, fellow citizens, on the exercise of duties which comprehend everything dear and valuable to you, it is proper you should understand what I deem the essential principles of our government, and consequently those which ought to shape its administration. I will compress them within the narrowest compass they will bear, stating the general principle, but not all its limitations. Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none; the support of the state governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against antirepublican tendencies; the preservation of the general government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; a jealous care of the right of election by the people—a mild and safe corrective of abuses which are lopped by the sword of revolution where peaceable remedies are unprovided; absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority, the vital principle of republics, from which is no appeal but to force, the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism; a well disciplined militia, our best reliance in peace and for the first moments of war, till regulars may relieve them; the supremacy
of the civil over the military authority; economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened; the honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith; encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce as its handmaid; the diffusion of information and arraignment of all abuses at the bar of the public reason; freedom of religion; freedom of the press, and freedom of person under the protection of the habeas corpus, and trial by juries impartially selected. These principles form the bright constellation which has gone before us and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation. The wisdom of our sages and blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment. They should be the creed of our political faith, the text of civic instruction, the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust; and should we wander from them in moments of error or of alarm, let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety.

I repair, then, fellow citizens, to the post you have assigned me. With experience enough in subordinate offices to have seen the difficulties of this the greatest of all, I have learnt to expect that it will rarely fall to the lot of imperfect man to retire from this station with the reputation and the favor which bring him into it. Without pretensions to that high confidence you reposed in our first and greatest revolutionary character, whose preeminent services had entitled him to the first place in his country’s love and destined for him the fairest page in the volume of faithful history, I ask so much confidence only as may give firmness and effect to the legal administration of your affairs. I shall often go wrong through defect of judgment. When right, I shall often be thought wrong by those whose positions will not command a view of the whole ground. I ask your indulgence for my own errors, which will never be intentional, and your support against the errors of others, who may condemn what they would not if seen in all its parts. The approbation implied by your suffrage is a great consolation to me for the past, and my future solicitude will be to retain the good opinion of those who have bestowed it in advance, to conciliate that of others by doing them all the good in my power, and to be instrumental to the happiness and freedom of all.
Relying, then, on the patronage of your good will, I advance with obedience to the work, ready to retire from it whenever you become sensible how much better choice it is in your power to make. And may that Infinite Power which rules the destinies of the universe lead our councils to what is best, and give them a favorable issue for your peace and prosperity.
REP. JAMES TALLMADGE, JR. (DEMOCRATIC-REPUBLICAN-NY)

On the Amendment to the Missouri Statehood Bill

SPEECH EXCERPTS

February 16, 1819

House of Representatives Chamber, U.S. Capitol | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

New York Representative James Tallmadge, Jr., offered these remarks on his proposed amendment to a bill to make the Missouri Territory a state.

ANNOTATIONS

Sir, has it already come to this; that in the Congress of the United States . . . the subject of slavery has become a subject of so much feeling—of such delicacy, of such danger, that it cannot safely be discussed? . . . Are we to be told of the dissolution of the Union; of civil war, and of seas of blood? And yet, with such awful threatenings before us, do gentlemen, in the same breath, insist upon the encouragement of this evil; upon the extensions of this monstrous scourge of the human race? An evil so fraught with such dire calamities to us as individuals, and to our nation, and threatening, in its progress, to overwhelm the civil and religious institutions of the country, with the liberties of the nation, ought at once to be met, and to be controlled. If its power, its influence, and its impending dangers have already arrived at such a point that it is not safe to discuss it on this floor, and it cannot now pass under consideration as a proper subject for general legislation, what will be the result when it is spread through your widely extended domain? Its present threatening aspect, and the violence of its supporters so far from inducing me to yield to its progress, prompts me to resist its march. Now is the time. It must now be met, and the extension of the evil must now be prevented, or the occasion is irrecoverably lost, and the evil can never be contracted.

Notes & Questions
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...Sir, we have been told, with apparent confidence, that we have no right to annex conditions to a state on its admission into the Union; and it has been urged that the proposed amendment, prohibiting the further introduction of slavery is unconstitutional. This position, asserted with so much confidence, remains unsupported by any argument, or by any authority derived from the Constitution itself. The Constitution strongly indicates an opposite conclusion, and seems to contemplate a difference between the old and the new states. The practice of the government has sanctioned this difference in many respects....

Sir, the bill now before us proves the correctness of my argument. It is filled with conditions and limitations. ... And to all these amendments we have heard no objection; they have passed unanimously. But now, when an amendment prohibiting the further introduction of slavery is proposed, the whole House is put in agitation, and we are confidently told that it is unconstitutional to annex conditions on the admission of a new state into the Union. The result of all this is, that all amendments and conditions are proper, which suit a certain class of gentlemen, but whatever amendment is proposed, which does not comport with their interests or their views, is unconstitutional, and a flagrant violation of this sacred charter of our rights. In order to be consistent, gentlemen must go back and strike out the various amendments to which they have already agreed. The Constitution applies equally to all, or to none.

Sir, we have been told that this is a new principle for which we contend, never before adopted, or thought of. So far from this being correct, it is due to the memory of our ancestors to say, it is an old principle, adopted by them, as the policy of our country. Whenever the United States have had the right and the power, they have heretofore prevented the extension of slavery. The states of Kentucky and Tennessee were taken off from other states, and were admitted into the Union without condition, because their lands were never owned by the United States. The Territory Northwest of the Ohio is all the land which ever belonged to them. Shortly after the cession of those lands to the Union, Congress passed, in 1787, a compact which was declared to be unalterable, the sixth article...
of which provides that “there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said
territory, otherwise than in the punishment for crimes, whereof the party shall have been
duly convicted.” In pursuance of this compact, all the states formed from that territory have
been admitted into the Union upon various considerations, and among which the sixth
article of this compact is included as one. . . .

Sir, in the course of the debate on this subject, we have been told that, from the long habit
of the Southern and Western people, the possession of slaves has become necessary to them,
and an essential requisite in their living. It has been urged, from the nature of the climate
and soil of the Southern countries, that the lands cannot be occupied or cultivated without
slaves. It has been said that the slaves prosper in those places, and that they are much better
off there than in their own native country. We have even been told that, if we succeed, and
prevent slavery across the Mississippi, we shall greatly lessen the value of property there,
and shall retard, for a long series of years, the settlement of that country.

Sir, if the Western country cannot be settled without slaves, gladly would I prevent its
settlement till time shall be no more. If this class of arguments is to prevail, it sets all morals
at defiance, and we are called to legislate on the subject, as a matter of mere personal
interest. If this is to be the case, repeal all your laws prohibiting the slave trade; throw open
this traffic to the commercial states of the East; and, if it better the condition of these
wretched beings, invite the dark population of benighted Africa to be translated to the
shores of Republican America. But, sir, I will not cast upon this or upon that gentleman an
imputation so ungracious as the conclusion to which their arguments would necessarily
tend. I do not believe any gentleman on this floor could here advocate the slave trade, or
maintain, in the abstract, the principles of slavery. I will not outrage the decorum, nor insult
the dignity of this House, by attempting to argue in this place, as an abstract proposition,
the moral right of slavery. How gladly would the “legitimates of Europe chuckle” to find an
American Congress in debate on such a question!

As an evil brought upon us without our own fault, before the formation of our government,
and as one of the sins of that nation from which we have revolted, we must of necessity
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legislate upon this subject. It is our business so to legislate, as never to encourage, but always to control this evil; and, while we strive to eradicate it, we ought to fix its limits, and render it subordinate to the safety of the white population, and the good order of civil society.

Sir, on this subject the eyes of Europe are turned upon you. You boast of the freedom of your Constitution and your laws; you have proclaimed, in the Declaration of Independence, “That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that amongst these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;” and yet you have slaves in your country. The enemies of your government, and the legitimates of Europe, point to your inconsistencies, and blazon your supposed defects. If you allow slavery to pass into territories where you have the lawful power to exclude it, you will justly take upon yourself all the charges of inconsistency; but, confine it to the original slaveholding states, where you found it at the formation of your government, and you stand acquitted of all imputation. . . .

Sir, I shall bow in silence to the will of the majority, on whichever side it shall be expressed; yet I confidently hope that majority will be found on the side of an amendment, so replete with moral consequences, so pregnant with important political results.
SECRETARY OF STATE JOHN QUINCY ADAMS (FEDERALIST)

An Address Delivered at the Request of a Committee of the Citizens of Washington for Celebrating the Anniversary of Independence at the City of Washington on the Fourth of July

SPEECH EXCERPTS

July 4, 1821

U.S. House of Representatives | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

President James Monroe’s Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams, gave this address to the U.S. House of Representatives on the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

ANNOTATIONS

…And now, friends and countrymen, if the wise and learned philosophers of the elder world, the first observers of nutation and aberration, the discoverers of maddening ether and invisible planets, the inventors of Congreve rockets and Shrapnel shells, should find their hearts disposed to enquire what has America done for the benefit of mankind?

Let our answer be this: America, with the same voice which spoke herself into existence as a nation, proclaimed to mankind the inextinguishable rights of human nature, and the only lawful foundations of government. America, in the assembly of nations, since her admission among them, has invariably, though often fruitlessly, held forth to them the hand of honest friendship, of equal freedom, of generous reciprocity.

She has uniformly spoken among them, though often to heedless and often to disdainful ears, the language of equal liberty, of equal justice, and of equal rights.

She has, in the lapse of nearly half a century, without a single exception, respected the independence of other nations while asserting and maintaining her own.

She has abstained from interference in the concerns of others, even when conflict has been for principles to which she clings, as to the last vital drop that visits the heart.

She has seen that probably for centuries to come, all the contests of that Aceldama the European world, will be contests of inveterate power, and emerging right.

Wherever the standard of freedom and Independence has been or shall be unfurled, there will her heart, her benedictions and her prayers be.

But she goes not abroad, in search of monsters to destroy.

She is the well-wisher to the freedom and independence of all.

She is the champion and vindicator only of her own.

She will commend the general cause by the countenance of her voice, and the benignant sympathy of her example.

She well knows that by once enlisting under other banners than her own, were they even the banners of foreign independence, she would involve herself beyond the power of extrication, in all the wars of interest and intrigue, of individual avarice, envy, and ambition, which assume the colors and usurp the standard of freedom.

The fundamental maxims of her policy would insensibly change from liberty to force....

She might become the dictatress of the world. She would be no longer the ruler of her own spirit....
[America’s] glory is not dominion, but liberty. Her march is the march of the mind. She has a spear and a shield: but the motto upon her shield is, Freedom, Independence, Peace. This has been her Declaration: this has been, as far as her necessary intercourse with the rest of mankind would permit, her practice.
President James Monroe (Democratic-Republican)

Annual Message to Congress

Letter Excerpts

December 2, 1823
Washington, D.C.

Monroe Doctrine

Background

President James Monroe sent his seventh Annual Message to Congress in 1823, as required by the Constitution.

Annotations

Fellow-Citizens of the Senate and House of Representatives:...

A precise knowledge of our relations with foreign powers as respects our negotiations and transactions with each is thought to be particularly necessary. Equally necessary is it that we should form a just estimate of our resources, revenue, and progress in every kind of improvement connected with the national prosperity and public defense. It is by rendering justice to other nations that we may expect it from them. It is by our ability to resent injuries and redress wrongs that we may avoid them....

At the proposal of the Russian Imperial Government, made through the minister of the Emperor residing here, a full power and instructions have been transmitted to the minister of the United States at St. Petersbourg to arrange by amicable negotiation the respective rights and interests of the two nations on the North West coast of this continent. A similar proposal had been made by His Imperial Majesty to the Government of Great Britain, which has likewise been acceded to. The Government of the United States has been desirous by this friendly proceeding of manifesting the great value which

they have invariably attached to the friendship of the Emperor and their solicitude to cultivate the best understanding with his Government. In the discussions to which this interest has given rise and in the arrangements by which they may terminate the occasion has been judged proper for asserting, as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers….

A strong hope has been long entertained, founded on the heroic struggle of the Greeks, that they would succeed in their contest and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth. It is believed that the whole civilized world take a deep interest in their welfare. Although no power has declared in their favor, yet none according to our information, has taken part against them. Their cause and their name have protected them from dangers which might ere this have overwhelmed any other people. The ordinary calculations of interest and of acquisition with a view to aggrandizement, which mingle so much in the transactions of nations, seem to have had no effect in regard to them. From the facts which have come to our knowledge there is good cause to believe that their enemy has lost forever all dominion over them; that Greece will become again an independent nation. That she may obtain that rank is the object of our most ardent wishes.

It was stated at the commencement of the last session that a great effort was then making in Spain and Portugal to improve the condition of the people of those countries, and that it appeared to be conducted with extraordinary moderation. It need scarcely be remarked that the result has been so far very different from what was then anticipated. Of events in that quarter of the globe, with which we have so much intercourse and from which we derive our origin, we have always been anxious and interested spectators.

The citizens of the United States cherish sentiments the most friendly in favor of the liberty and happiness of their fellow men on that side of the Atlantic. In the wars of the
European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do.

It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense. With the movements in this hemisphere we are of necessity more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers.

The political system of the allied powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. This difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective Governments; and to the defense of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure, and matured by the wisdom of their most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity, this whole nation is devoted.

We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere, but with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

In the war between those new Governments and Spain we declared our neutrality at the time of their recognition, and to this we have adhered, and shall continue to adhere, provided no change shall occur which, in the judgment of the competent authorities of this Government, shall make a corresponding change on the part of the United States indispensable to their security.
The late events in Spain and Portugal shew that Europe is still unsettled. Of this important fact no stronger proof can be adduced than that the allied powers should have thought it proper, on any principle satisfactory to themselves, to have interposed by force in the internal concerns of Spain. To what extent such interposition may be carried, on the same principle, is a question in which all independent powers whose governments differ from theirs are interested, even those most remote, and surely none more so than the United States.

Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, nevertheless remains the same, which is, not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the government de facto as the legitimate government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it, and to preserve those relations by a frank, firm, and manly policy, meeting in all instances the just claims of every power, submitting to injuries from none.

But in regard to those continents circumstances are eminently and conspicuously different. It is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness; nor can anyone believe that our southern brethren, if left to themselves, would adopt it of their own accord. It is equally impossible, therefore, that we should behold such interposition in any form with indifference. If we look to the comparative strength and resources of Spain and those new Governments, and their distance from each other, it must be obvious that she can never subdue them. It is still the true policy of the United States to leave the parties to themselves, in the hope that other powers will pursue the same course....
BACKGROUND

The French political philosopher Alexis de Tocqueville wrote his book *Democracy in America* based on his observation of America during a nine-month tour of the country in 1831 and into the early part of 1832.

ANNOTATIONS

The Principle of the Sovereignty of the People in America

Whenever the political laws of the United States are to be discussed, it is with the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people that we must begin. The principle of the sovereignty of the people, which is to be found, more or less, at the bottom of almost all human institutions, generally remains concealed from view. It is obeyed without being recognized, or if for a moment it be brought to light, it is hastily cast back into the gloom of the sanctuary. “The will of the nation” is one of those expressions which have been most profusely abused by the wily and the despotic of every age. To the eyes of some it has been represented by the venal suffrages of a few of the satellites of power; to others by the votes of a timid or an interested minority; and some have even discovered it in the silence of a people, on the supposition that the fact of submission established the right of command.

In America the principle of the sovereignty of the people is not either barren or concealed, as it is with some other nations; it is recognized by the customs and

proclaimed by the laws; it spreads freely, and arrives without impediment at its most remote consequences. If there be a country in the world where the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people can be fairly appreciated, where it can be studied in its application to the affairs of society, and where its dangers and its advantages may be foreseen, that country is assuredly America.

I have already observed that, from their origin, the sovereignty of the people was the fundamental principle of the greater number of British colonies in America. It was far, however, from then exercising as much influence on the government of society as it now does. Two obstacles, the one external, the other internal, checked its invasive progress. It could not ostensibly disclose itself in the laws of colonies which were still constrained to obey the mother-country: it was therefore obliged to spread secretly, and to gain ground in the provincial assemblies, and especially in the townships.

American society was not yet prepared to adopt it with all its consequences. The intelligence of New England, and the wealth of the country to the south of the Hudson (as I have shown in the preceding chapter), long exercised a sort of aristocratic influence, which tended to retain the exercise of social authority in the hands of a few. The public functionaries were not universally elected, and the citizens were not all of them electors. The electoral franchise was everywhere placed within certain limits, and made dependent on a certain qualification, which was exceedingly low in the North and more considerable in the South.

The American revolution broke out, and the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people, which had been nurtured in the townships and municipalities, took possession of the State: every class was enlisted in its cause; battles were fought, and victories obtained for it, until it became the law of laws.

A no less rapid change was effected in the interior of society, where the law of descent completed the abolition of local influences.
At the very time when this consequence of the laws and of the revolution was apparent to every eye, victory was irrevocably pronounced in favor of the democratic cause. All power was, in fact, in its hands, and resistance was no longer possible. The higher orders submitted without a murmur and without a struggle to an evil which was thenceforth inevitable. The ordinary fate of falling powers awaited them; each of their several members followed his own interests; and as it was impossible to wring the power from the hands of a people which they did not detest sufficiently to brave, their only aim was to secure its good-will at any price. The most democratic laws were consequently voted by the very men whose interests they impaired; and thus, although the higher classes did not excite the passions of the people against their order, they accelerated the triumph of the new state of things; so that by a singular change the democratic impulse was found to be most irresistible in the very States where the aristocracy had the firmest hold. The State of Maryland, which had been founded by men of rank, was the first to proclaim universal suffrage, and to introduce the most democratic forms into the conduct of its government.

When a nation modifies the elective qualification, it may easily be foreseen that sooner or later that qualification will be entirely abolished. There is no more invariable rule in the history of society: the further electoral rights are extended, the greater is the need of extending them; for after each concession the strength of the democracy increases, and its demands increase with its strength. The ambition of those who are below the appointed rate is irritated in exact proportion to the great number of those who are above it. The exception at last becomes the rule, concession follows concession, and no stop can be made short of universal suffrage.

At the present day the principle of the sovereignty of the people has acquired, in the United States, all the practical development which the imagination can conceive. It is unencumbered by those fictions which have been thrown over it in other countries, and it appears in every possible form according to the exigency of the occasion. Sometimes the laws are made by the people in a body, as at Athens; and sometimes its representatives,
chosen by universal suffrage, transact business in its name, and almost under its immediate control.

In some countries a power exists which, though it is in a degree foreign to the social body, directs it, and forces it to pursue a certain track. In others the ruling force is divided, being partly within and partly without the ranks of the people. But nothing of the kind is to be seen in the United States; there society governs itself for itself. All power centres in its bosom; and scarcely an individual is to be meet with who would venture to conceive, or, still less, to express, the idea of seeking it elsewhere. The nation participates in the making of its laws by the choice of its legislators, and in the execution of them by the choice of the agents of the executive government; it may almost be said to govern itself, so feeble and so restricted is the share left to the administration, so little do the authorities forget their popular origin and the power from which they emanate.

The American System of Townships and Municipal Bodies

...Municipal freedom is not the fruit of human device; it is rarely created; but it is, as it were, secretly and spontaneously engendered in the midst of a semi-barbarous state of society. The constant action of the laws and the national habits, peculiar circumstances, and above all time, may consolidate it; but there is certainly no nation on the continent of Europe which has experienced its advantages. Nevertheless local assemblies of citizens constitute the strength of free nations. Town-meetings are to liberty what primary schools are to science; they bring it within the people's reach, they teach men how to use and how to enjoy it....

In order to explain to the reader the general principles on which the political organization of the counties and townships of the United States rests, I have thought it expedient to choose one of the States of New England as an example, to examine the mechanism of its constitution, and then to cast a general glance over the country. The township and the county are not organized in the same manner in every part of the Union; it is, however,
easy to perceive that the same principles have guided the formation of both of them throughout the Union. I am inclined to believe that these principles have been carried further in New England than elsewhere, and consequently that they offer greater facilities to the observations of a stranger. The institutions of New England form a complete and regular whole; they have received the sanction of time, they have the support of the laws, and the still stronger support of the manners of the community, over which they exercise the most prodigious influence; they consequently deserve our attention on every account.

Limits of the Township

The township of New England is a division which stands between the commune and the canton of France, and which corresponds in general to the English tithing, or town. Its average population is from two to three thousand; so that, on the one hand, the interests of its inhabitants are not likely to conflict, and, on the other, men capable of conducting its affairs are always to be found among its citizens…

Existence of the Township

I have already observed that the principle of the sovereignty of the people governs the whole political system of the Anglo-Americans. Every page of this book will afford new instances of the same doctrine. In the nations by which the sovereignty of the people is recognized every individual possesses an equal share of power, and participates alike in the government of the State. Every individual is, therefore, supposed to be as well informed, as virtuous, and as strong as any of his fellow-citizens. He obeys the government, not because he is inferior to the authorities which conduct it, or that he is less capable than his neighbor of governing himself, but because he acknowledges the utility of an association with his fellow-men, and because he knows that no such association can exist without a regulating force. If he be a subject in all that concerns the mutual relations of citizens, he is free and responsible to God alone for all that concerns himself. Hence arises the maxim that every one is the best and the sole judge of his own private interest, and that society has no right
to control a man’s actions, unless they are prejudicial to the common weal, or unless the common weal demands his co-operation. This doctrine is universally admitted in the United States. I shall hereafter examine the general influence which it exercises on the ordinary actions of life; I am now speaking of the nature of municipal bodies.

5

The township, taken as a whole, and in relation to the government of the country, may be looked upon as an individual to whom the theory I have just alluded to is applied. Municipal independence is therefore a natural consequence of the principle of the sovereignty of the people in the United States: all the American republics recognize it more or less; but circumstances have peculiarly favored its growth in New England.

10

In this part of the Union the impulsion of political activity was given in the townships; and it may almost be said that each of them originally formed an independent nation. When the Kings of England asserted their supremacy, they were contented to assume the central power of the State. The townships of New England remained as they were before; and although they are now subject to the State, they were at first scarcely dependent upon it. It is important to remember that they have not been invested with privileges, but that they have, on the contrary, forfeited a portion of their independence to the State. The townships are only subordinate to the State in those interests which I shall term social, as they are common to all the citizens. They are independent in all that concerns themselves; and amongst the inhabitants of New England I believe that not a man is to be found who would acknowledge that the State has any right to interfere in their local interests. The towns of New England buy and sell, sue or are sued, augment or diminish their rates, without the slightest opposition on the part of the administrative authority of the State….

15

Public Spirit of the Townships of New England

In America, not only do municipal bodies exist, but they are kept alive and supported by public spirit. The township of New England possesses two advantages which infallibly secure the attentive interest of mankind, namely, independence and authority. Its sphere is
indeed small and limited, but within that sphere its action is unrestrained; and its independence gives to it a real importance which its extent and population may not always ensure.

It is to be remembered that the affections of men generally lie on the side of authority. Patriotism is not durable in a conquered nation. The New Engander is attached to his township, not only because he was born in it, but because it constitutes a social body of which he is a member, and whose government claims and deserves the exercise of his sagacity. In Europe the absence of local public spirit is a frequent subject of regret to those who are in power; everyone agrees that there is no surer guarantee of order and tranquility, and yet nothing is more difficult to create. If the municipal bodies were made powerful and independent, the authorities of the nation might be disunited and the peace of the country endangered. Yet, without power and independence, a town may contain good subjects, but it can have no active citizens. Another important fact is that the township of New England is so constituted as to excite the warmest of human affections, without arousing the ambitious passions of the heart of man. The officers of the country are not elected, and their authority is very limited. Even the State is only a second-rate community, whose tranquil and obscure administration offers no inducement sufficient to draw men away from the circle of their interests into the turmoil of public affairs. The federal government confers power and honor on the men who conduct it; but these individuals can never be very numerous. The high station of the Presidency can only be reached at an advanced period of life, and the other federal functionaries are generally men who have been favored by fortune, or distinguished in some other career. Such cannot be the permanent aim of the ambitious. But the township serves as a centre for the desire of public esteem, the want of exciting interests, and the taste for authority and popularity, in the midst of the ordinary relations of life; and the passions which commonly embroil society change their character when they find a vent so near the domestic hearth and the family circle.

In the American States power has been disseminated with admirable skill for the purpose of interesting the greatest possible number of persons in the common weal. Independently
of the electors who are from time to time called into action, the body politic is divided into innumerable functionaries and officers, who all, in their several spheres, represent the same powerful whole in whose name they act. The local administration thus affords an unfailing source of profit and interest to a vast number of individuals.

5

The American system, which divides the local authority among so many citizens, does not scruple to multiply the functions of the town officers. For in the United States it is believed, and with truth, that patriotism is a kind of devotion which is strengthened by ritual observance. In this manner the activity of the township is continually perceptible; it is daily manifested in the fulfilment of a duty or the exercise of a right, and a constant though gentle motion is thus kept up in society which animates without disturbing it.

10

The American attaches himself to his home as the mountaineer clings to his hills, because the characteristic features of his country are there more distinctly marked than elsewhere. The existence of the townships of New England is in general a happy one. Their government is suited to their tastes, and chosen by themselves. In the midst of the profound peace and general comfort which reign in America the commotions of municipal discord are unfrequent. The conduct of local business is easy. The political education of the people has long been complete; say rather that it was complete when the people first set foot upon the soil. In New England no tradition exists of a distinction of ranks; no portion of the community is tempted to oppress the remainder; and the abuses which may injure isolated individuals are forgotten in the general contentment which prevails. If the government is defective (and it would no doubt be easy to point out its deficiencies), the fact that it really emanates from those it governs, and that it acts, either ill or well, casts the protecting spell of a parental pride over its faults. No term of comparison disturbs the satisfaction of the citizen: England formerly governed the mass of the colonies, but the people was always sovereign in the township where its rule is not only an ancient but a primitive state.

15

The native of New England is attached to his township because it is independent and free: his co-operation in its affairs ensures his attachment to its interest; the well-being it affords
him secures his affection; and its welfare is the aim of his ambition and of his future exertions: he takes a part in every occurrence in the place; he practises the art of government in the small sphere within his reach; he accustoms himself to those forms which can alone ensure the steady progress of liberty; he imbibes their spirit; he acquires a taste for order, comprehends the union or the balance of powers, and collects clear practical notions on the nature of his duties and the extent of his rights.

**Political Associations in the United States**

In no country in the world has the principle of association been more successfully used, or more unsparingly applied to a multitude of different objects, than in America. Besides the permanent associations which are established by law under the names of townships, cities, and counties, a vast number of others are formed and maintained by the agency of private individuals.

The citizen of the United States is taught from his earliest infancy to rely upon his own exertions in order to resist the evils and the difficulties of life; he looks upon social authority with an eye of mistrust and anxiety, and he only claims its assistance when he is quite unable to shift without it. This habit may even be traced in the schools of the rising generation, where the children in their games are wont to submit to rules which they have themselves established, and to punish misdemeanors which they have themselves defined. The same spirit pervades every act of social life. If a stoppage occurs in a thoroughfare, and the circulation of the public is hindered, the neighbors immediately constitute a deliberative body; and this extemporaneous assembly gives rise to an executive power which remedies the inconvenience before anybody has thought of recurring to an authority superior to that of the persons immediately concerned. If the public pleasures are concerned, an association is formed to provide for the splendor and the regularity of the entertainment. Societies are formed to resist enemies which are exclusively of a moral nature, and to diminish the vice of intemperance: in the United States associations are established to promote public order, commerce, industry, morality, and religion; for there
is no end which the human will, seconded by the collective exertions of individuals, despairs of attaining.

I shall hereafter have occasion to show the effects of association upon the course of society, and I must confine myself for the present to the political world. When once the right of association is recognized, the citizens may employ it in several different ways.

An association consists simply in the public assent which a number of individuals give to certain doctrines, and in the engagement which they contract to promote the spread of those doctrines by their exertions. The right of association with these views is very analogous to the liberty of unlicensed writing; but societies thus formed possess more authority than the press. When an opinion is represented by a society, it necessarily assumes a more exact and explicit form. It numbers its partisans, and compromises their welfare in its cause: they, on the other hand, become acquainted with each other, and their zeal is increased by their number. An association unites the efforts of minds which have a tendency to diverge in one single channel, and urges them vigorously towards one single end which it points out.

The second degree in the right of association is the power of meeting. When an association is allowed to establish centres of action at certain important points in the country, its activity is increased and its influence extended. Men have the opportunity of seeing each other; means of execution are more readily combined, and opinions are maintained with a degree of warmth and energy which written language cannot approach.

Lastly, in the exercise of the right of political association, there is a third degree: the partisans of an opinion may unite in electoral bodies, and choose delegates to represent them in a central assembly. This is, properly speaking, the application of the representative system to a party.
Thus, in the first instance, a society is formed between individuals professing the same opinion, and the tie which keeps it together is of a purely intellectual nature; in the second case, small assemblies are formed which only represent a fraction of the party. Lastly, in the third case, they constitute a separate nation in the midst of the nation, a government within the Government. Their delegates, like the real delegates of the majority, represent the entire collective force of their party; and they enjoy a certain degree of that national dignity and great influence which belong to the chosen representatives of the people. It is true that they have not the right of making the laws, but they have the power of attacking those which are in being, and of drawing up beforehand those which they may afterwards cause to be adopted....

Tyranny of the Majority

Unlimited power is in itself a bad and dangerous thing; human beings are not competent to exercise it with discretion, and God alone can be omnipotent, because His wisdom and His justice are always equal to His power. But no power upon earth is so worthy of honor for itself, or of reverential obedience to the rights which it represents, that I would consent to admit its uncontrolled and all-predominant authority. When I see that the right and the means of absolute command are conferred on a people or upon a king, upon an aristocracy or a democracy, a monarchy or a republic, I recognize the germ of tyranny, and I journey onward to a land of more hopeful institutions.

In my opinion the main evil of the present democratic institutions of the United States does not arise, as is often asserted in Europe, from their weakness, but from their overpowering strength; and I am not so much alarmed at the excessive liberty which reigns in that country as at the very inadequate securities which exist against tyranny.

When an individual or a party is wronged in the United States, to whom can he apply for redress? If to public opinion, public opinion constitutes the majority; if to the legislature, it represents the majority, and implicitly obeys its injunctions; if to the executive power, it is
appointed by the majority, and remains a passive tool in its hands; the public troops consist of the majority under arms; the jury is the majority invested with the right of hearing judicial cases; and in certain States even the judges are elected by the majority. However iniquitous or absurd the evil of which you complain may be, you must submit to it as well as you can....

If, on the other hand, a legislative power could be so constituted as to represent the majority without necessarily being the slave of its passions; an executive, so as to retain a certain degree of uncontrolled authority; and a judiciary, so as to remain independent of the two other powers; a government would be formed which would still be democratic without incurring any risk of tyrannical abuse.

I do not say that tyrannical abuses frequently occur in America at the present day, but I maintain that no sure barrier is established against them, and that the causes which mitigate the government are to be found in the circumstances and the manners of the country more than in its laws.

**Power Exercised by the Majority in America upon Opinion**

It is in the examination of the display of public opinion in the United States that we clearly perceive how far the power of the majority surpasses all the powers with which we are acquainted in Europe. Intellectual principles exercise an influence which is so invisible, and often so inappreciable, that they baffle the toils of oppression. At the present time the most absolute monarchs in Europe are unable to prevent certain notions, which are opposed to their authority, from circulating in secret throughout their dominions, and even in their courts. Such is not the case in America; as long as the majority is still undecided, discussion is carried on; but as soon as its decision is irrevocably pronounced, a submissive silence is observed, and the friends, as well as the opponents, of the measure unite in assenting to its propriety. The reason of this is perfectly clear: no monarch is so absolute as to combine all
the powers of society in his own hands, and to conquer all opposition with the energy of a
majority which is invested with the right of making and of executing the laws.

The authority of a king is purely physical, and it controls the actions of the subject without
subduing his private will; but the majority possesses a power which is physical and moral
at the same time; it acts upon the will as well as upon the actions of men, and it represses
not only all contest, but all controversy. I know no country in which there is so little true
independence of mind and freedom of discussion as in America. In any constitutional state
in Europe every sort of religious and political theory may be advocated and propagated
abroad; for there is no country in Europe so subdued by any single authority as not to
contain citizens who are ready to protect the man who raises his voice in the cause of truth
from the consequences of his hardihood. If he is unfortunate enough to live under an
absolute government, the people is upon his side; if he inhabits a free country, he may find
a shelter behind the authority of the throne, if he require one. The aristocratic part of
society supports him in some countries, and the democracy in others. But in a nation where
democratic institutions exist, organized like those of the United States, there is but one sole
authority, one single element of strength and of success, with nothing beyond it.

In America the majority raises very formidable barriers to the liberty of opinion: within
these barriers an author may write whatever he pleases, but he will repent it if he ever step
beyond them. Not that he is exposed to the terrors of an auto-da-fe, but he is tormented by
the slights and persecutions of daily obloquy. His political career is closed forever, since he
has offended the only authority which is able to promote his success. Every sort of
compensation, even that of celebrity, is refused to him. Before he published his opinions
he imagined that he held them in common with many others; but no sooner has he declared
them openly than he is loudly censured by his overbearing opponents, whilst those who
think without having the courage to speak, like him, abandon him in silence. He yields at
length, oppressed by the daily efforts he has been making, and he subsides into silence, as
if he was tormented by remorse for having spoken the truth.
Fetters and headsmen were the coarse instruments which tyranny formerly employed; but the civilization of our age has refined the arts of despotism which seemed, however, to have been sufficiently perfected before. The excesses of monarchical power had devised a variety of physical means of oppression: the democratic republics of the present day have rendered it as entirely an affair of the mind as that will which it is intended to coerce. Under the absolute sway of an individual despot the body was attacked in order to subdue the soul, and the soul escaped the blows which were directed against it and rose superior to the attempt; but such is not the course adopted by tyranny in democratic republics; there the body is left free, and the soul is enslaved. The sovereign can no longer say, “You shall think as I do on pain of death;” but he says, “You are free to think differently from me, and to retain your life, your property, and all that you possess; but if such be your determination, you are henceforth an alien among your people. You may retain your civil rights, but they will be useless to you, for you will never be chosen by your fellow-citizens if you solicit their suffrages, and they will affect to scorn you if you solicit their esteem. You will remain among men, but you will be deprived of the rights of mankind. Your fellow-creatures will shun you like an impure being, and those who are most persuaded of your innocence will abandon you too, lest they should be shunned in their turn. Go in peace! I have given you your life, but it is an existence in comparably worse than death.”

Monarchical institutions have thrown an odium upon despotism; let us beware lest democratic republics should restore oppression, and should render it less odious and less degrading in the eyes of the many, by making it still more onerous to the few.

Works have been published in the proudest nations of the Old World expressly intended to censure the vices and deride the follies of the times; Labruyere inhabited the palace of Louis XIV when he composed his chapter upon the Great, and Moliere criticised the courtiers in the very pieces which were acted before the Court. But the ruling power in the United States is not to be made game of; the smallest reproach irritates its sensibility, and the slightest joke which has any foundation in truth renders it indignant; from the style of its language to the more solid virtues of its character, everything must be made the subject
of encomium. No writer, whatever be his eminence, can escape from this tribute of adulation to his fellow-citizens. The majority lives in the perpetual practice of self-applause, and there are certain truths which the Americans can only learn from strangers or from experience.

5

If great writers have not at present existed in America, the reason is very simply given in these facts; there can be no literary genius without freedom of opinion, and freedom of opinion does not exist in America. The Inquisition has never been able to prevent a vast number of anti-religious books from circulating in Spain. The empire of the majority succeeds much better in the United States, since it actually removes the wish of publishing them. Unbelievers are to be met with in America, but, to say the truth, there is no public organ of infidelity. Attempts have been made by some governments to protect the morality of nations by prohibiting licentious books. In the United States no one is punished for this sort of works, but no one is induced to write them; not because all the citizens are immaculate in their manners, but because the majority of the community is decent and orderly.

10

In these cases the advantages derived from the exercise of this power are unquestionable, and I am simply discussing the nature of the power itself. This irresistible authority is a constant fact, and its judicious exercise is an accidental occurrence.

15

Effects of the Tyranny of the Majority upon the National Character of the Americans

20

The tendencies which I have just alluded to are as yet very slightly perceptible in political society, but they already begin to exercise an unfavorable influence upon the national character of the Americans. I am inclined to attribute the singular paucity of distinguished political characters to the ever-increasing activity of the despotism of the majority in the United States. When the American Revolution broke out they arose in great numbers, for
public opinion then served, not to tyrannize over, but to direct the exertions of individuals. Those celebrated men took a full part in the general agitation of mind common at that period, and they attained a high degree of personal fame, which was reflected back upon the nation, but which was by no means borrowed from it.

In absolute governments the great nobles who are nearest to the throne flatter the passions of the sovereign, and voluntarily truckle to his caprices. But the mass of the nation does not degrade itself by servitude: it often submits from weakness, from habit, or from ignorance, and sometimes from loyalty. Some nations have been known to sacrifice their own desires to those of the sovereign with pleasure and with pride, thus exhibiting a sort of independence in the very act of submission. These peoples are miserable, but they are not degraded. There is a great difference between doing what one does not approve and feigning to approve what one does; the one is the necessary case of a weak person, the other befits the temper of a lackey.

In free countries, where everyone is more or less called upon to give his opinion in the affairs of state; in democratic republics, where public life is incessantly commingled with domestic affairs, where the sovereign authority is accessible on every side, and where its attention can almost always be attracted by vociferation, more persons are to be met with who speculate upon its foibles and live at the cost of its passions than in absolute monarchies. Not because men are naturally worse in these States than elsewhere, but the temptation is stronger, and of easier access at the same time. The result is a far more extensive debasement of the characters of citizens.

Democratic republics extend the practice of currying favor with the many, and they introduce it into a greater number of classes at once: this is one of the most serious reproaches that can be addressed to them. In democratic States organized on the principles of the American republics, this is more especially the case, where the authority of the majority is so absolute and so irresistible that a man must give up his rights as a citizen, and almost abjure his quality as a human being, if he intends to stray from the track which it lays down.
In that immense crowd which throngs the avenues to power in the United States I found very few men who displayed any of that manly candor and that masculine independence of opinion which frequently distinguished the Americans in former times, and which constitutes the leading feature in distinguished characters, wheresoever they may be found. It seems, at first sight, as if all the minds of the Americans were formed upon one model, so accurately do they correspond in their manner of judging. A stranger does, indeed, sometimes meet with Americans who dissent from these rigorous formularies; with men who deplore the defects of the laws, the mutability and the ignorance of democracy; who even go so far as to observe the evil tendencies which impair the national character, and to point out such remedies as it might be possible to apply; but no one is there to hear these things besides yourself, and you, to whom these secret reflections are confided, are a stranger and a bird of passage. They are very ready to communicate truths which are useless to you, but they continue to hold a different language in public.

If ever these lines are read in America, I am well assured of two things: in the first place, that all who peruse them will raise their voices to condemn me; and in the second place, that very many of them will acquit me at the bottom of their conscience.

I have heard of patriotism in the United States, and it is a virtue which may be found among the people, but never among the leaders of the people. This may be explained by analogy; despotism debases the oppressed much more than the oppressor: in absolute monarchies the king has often great virtues, but the courtiers are invariably servile. It is true that the American courtiers do not say “Sire,” or “Your Majesty”—a distinction without a difference. They are forever talking of the natural intelligence of the populace they serve; they do not debate the question as to which of the virtues of their master is pre-eminently worthy of admiration, for they assure him that he possesses all the virtues under heaven without having acquired them, or without caring to acquire them; they do not give him their daughters and their wives to be raised at his pleasure to the rank of his concubines, but, by sacrificing their opinions, they prostitute themselves. Moralists and philosophers
in America are not obliged to conceal their opinions under the veil of allegory; but, before they venture upon a harsh truth, they say, “We are aware that the people which we are addressing is too superior to all the weaknesses of human nature to lose the command of its temper for an instant; and we should not hold this language if we were not speaking to men whom their virtues and their intelligence render more worthy of freedom than all the rest of the world.” It would have been impossible for the sycophants of Louis XIV to flatter more dexterously. For my part, I am persuaded that in all governments, whatever their nature may be, servility will cower to force, and adulation will cling to power. The only means of preventing men from degrading themselves is to invest no one with that unlimited authority which is the surest method of debasing them.

The Greatest Dangers of the American Republics Proceed from the Unlimited Power of the Majority

Governments usually fall a sacrifice to impotence or to tyranny. In the former case their power escapes from them; it is wrested from their grasp in the latter. Many observers, who have witnessed the anarchy of democratic States, have imagined that the government of those States was naturally weak and impotent. The truth is, that when once hostilities are begun between parties, the government loses its control over society. But I do not think that a democratic power is naturally without force or without resources: say, rather, that it is almost always by the abuse of its force and the misemployment of its resources that a democratic government fails. Anarchy is almost always produced by its tyranny or its mistakes, but not by its want of strength.

It is important not to confound stability with force, or the greatness of a thing with its duration. In democratic republics, the power which directs society is not stable; for it often changes hands and assumes a new direction. But whichever way it turns, its force is almost irresistible. The Governments of the American republics appear to me to be as much centralized as those of the absolute monarchies of Europe, and more energetic than they are. I do not, therefore, imagine that they will perish from weakness.
If ever the free institutions of America are destroyed, that event may be attributed to the unlimited authority of the majority, which may at some future time urge the minorities to desperation, and oblige them to have recourse to physical force. Anarchy will then be the result, but it will have been brought about by despotism.

Mr. Hamilton expresses the same opinion in the “Federalist,” No. 51. “It is of great importance in a republic not only to guard the society against the oppression of its rulers, but to guard one part of the society against the injustice of the other part. Justice is the end of government. It is the end of civil society. It ever has been, and ever will be, pursued until it be obtained, or until liberty be lost in the pursuit. In a society, under the forms of which the stronger faction can readily unite and oppress the weaker, anarchy may as truly be said to reign as in a state of nature, where the weaker individual is not secured against the violence of the stronger: and as in the latter state even the stronger individuals are prompted by the uncertainty of their condition to submit to a government which may protect the weak as well as themselves, so in the former state will the more powerful factions be gradually induced by a like motive to wish for a government which will protect all parties, the weaker as well as the more powerful. It can be little doubted that, if the State of Rhode Island was separated from the Confederacy and left to itself, the insecurity of right under the popular form of government within such narrow limits would be displayed by such reiterated oppressions of the factious majorities, that some power altogether independent of the people would soon be called for by the voice of the very factions whose misrule had proved the necessity of it.”

Jefferson has also thus expressed himself in a letter to Madison: “The executive power in our Government is not the only, perhaps not even the principal, object of my solicitude. The tyranny of the Legislature is really the danger most to be feared, and will continue to be so for many years to come. The tyranny of the executive power will come in its turn, but at a more distant period.” I am glad to cite the opinion of Jefferson upon this subject rather than that of another, because I consider him to be the most powerful advocate democracy has ever sent forth….
Futures Condition of Three Races—Parts III and IV

The first negroes were imported into Virginia about the year 1621. *f In America, therefore, as well as in the rest of the globe, slavery originated in the South. Thence it spread from one settlement to another; but the number of slaves diminished towards the Northern States, and the negro population was always very limited in New England.

A century had scarcely elapsed since the foundation of the colonies, when the attention of the planters was struck by the extraordinary fact, that the provinces which were comparatively destitute of slaves, increased in population, in wealth, and in prosperity more rapidly than those which contained the greatest number of negroes. In the former, however, the inhabitants were obliged to cultivate the soil themselves, or by hired laborers; in the latter they were furnished with hands for which they paid no wages; yet although labor and expenses were on the one side, and ease with economy on the other, the former were in possession of the most advantageous system. This consequence seemed to be the more difficult to explain, since the settlers, who all belonged to the same European race, had the same habits, the same civilization, the same laws, and their shades of difference were extremely slight.

Time, however, continued to advance, and the Anglo-Americans, spreading beyond the coasts of the Atlantic Ocean, penetrated farther and farther into the solitudes of the West; they met with a new soil and an unwonted climate; the obstacles which opposed them were of the most various character; their races intermingled, the inhabitants of the South went up towards the North, those of the North descended to the South; but in the midst of all these causes, the same result occurred at every step, and in general, the colonies in which there were no slaves became more populous and more rich than those in which slavery flourished. The more progress was made, the more was it shown that slavery, which is so cruel to the slave, is prejudicial to the master.
But this truth was most satisfactorily demonstrated when civilization reached the banks of the Ohio. The stream which the Indians had distinguished by the name of Ohio, or Beautiful River, waters one of the most magnificent valleys that has ever been made the abode of man. Undulating lands extend upon both shores of the Ohio, whose soil affords inexhaustible treasures to the laborer; on either bank the air is wholesome and the climate mild, and each of them forms the extreme frontier of a vast State: That which follows the numerous windings of the Ohio upon the left is called Kentucky, that upon the right bears the name of the river. These two States only differ in a single respect; Kentucky has admitted slavery, but the State of Ohio has prohibited the existence of slaves within its borders.

Thus the traveller who floats down the current of the Ohio to the spot where that river falls into the Mississippi, may be said to sail between liberty and servitude; and a transient inspection of the surrounding objects will convince him as to which of the two is most favorable to mankind. Upon the left bank of the stream the population is rare; from time to time one descries a troop of slaves loitering in the half-desert fields; the primaeval forest recurs at every turn; society seems to be asleep, man to be idle, and nature alone offers a scene of activity and of life. From the right bank, on the contrary, a confused hum is heard which proclaims the presence of industry; the fields are covered with abundant harvests, the elegance of the dwellings announces the taste and activity of the laborer, and man appears to be in the enjoyment of that wealth and contentment which is the reward of labor.

The State of Kentucky was founded in 1775, the State of Ohio only twelve years later; but twelve years are more in America than half a century in Europe, and, at the present day, the population of Ohio exceeds that of Kentucky by two hundred and fifty thousand souls.

* These opposite consequences of slavery and freedom may readily be understood, and they suffice to explain many of the differences which we remark between the civilization of antiquity and that of our own time.

Upon the left bank of the Ohio labor is confounded with the idea of slavery, upon the right bank it is identified with that of prosperity and improvement; on the one side it is degraded,
on the other it is honored; on the former territory no white laborers can be found, for they would be afraid of assimilating themselves to the negroes; on the latter no one is idle, for the white population extends its activity and its intelligence to every kind of employment. Thus the men whose task it is to cultivate the rich soil of Kentucky are ignorant and lukewarm; whilst those who are active and enlightened either do nothing or pass over into the State of Ohio, where they may work without dishonor.

It is true that in Kentucky the planters are not obliged to pay wages to the slaves whom they employ; but they derive small profits from their labor, whilst the wages paid to free workmen would be returned with interest in the value of their services. The free workman is paid, but he does his work quicker than the slave, and rapidity of execution is one of the great elements of economy. The white sells his services, but they are only purchased at the times at which they may be useful; the black can claim no remuneration for his toil, but the expense of his maintenance is perpetual; he must be supported in his old age as well as in the prime of manhood, in his profitless infancy as well as in the productive years of youth. Payment must equally be made in order to obtain the services of either class of men: the free workman receives his wages in money, the slave in education, in food, in care, and in clothing. The money which a master spends in the maintenance of his slaves goes gradually and in detail, so that it is scarcely perceived; the salary of the free workman is paid in a round sum, which appears only to enrich the individual who receives it, but in the end the slave has cost more than the free servant, and his labor is less productive.

The influence of slavery extends still further; it affects the character of the master, and imparts a peculiar tendency to his ideas and his tastes. Upon both banks of the Ohio, the character of the inhabitants is enterprising and energetic; but this vigor is very differently exercised in the two States. The white inhabitant of Ohio, who is obliged to subsist by his own exertions, regards temporal prosperity as the principal aim of his existence; and as the country which he occupies presents inexhaustible resources to his industry and ever-varying lures to his activity, his acquisitive ardor surpasses the ordinary limits of human cupidity: he is tormented by the desire of wealth, and he boldly enters upon every path which fortune opens to him; he becomes a sailor, a pioneer, an artisan, or a laborer with
the same indifference, and he supports, with equal constancy, the fatigues and the dangers incidental to these various professions; the resources of his intelligence are astonishing, and his avidity in the pursuit of gain amounts to a species of heroism.

But the Kentuckian scorns not only labor, but all the undertakings which labor promotes; as he lives in an idle independence, his tastes are those of an idle man; money loses a portion of its value in his eyes; he covets wealth much less than pleasure and excitement; and the energy which his neighbor devotes to gain, turns with him to a passionate love of field sports and military exercises; he delights in violent bodily exertion, he is familiar with the use of arms, and is accustomed from a very early age to expose his life in single combat. Thus slavery not only prevents the whites from becoming opulent, but even from desiring to become so.

As the same causes have been continually producing opposite effects for the last two centuries in the British colonies of North America, they have established a very striking difference between the commercial capacity of the inhabitants of the South and those of the North. At the present day it is only the Northern States which are in possession of shipping, manufactures, railroads, and canals. This difference is perceptible not only in comparing the North with the South, but in comparing the several Southern States. Almost all the individuals who carry on commercial operations, or who endeavor to turn slave labor to account in the most Southern districts of the Union, have emigrated from the North. The natives of the Northern States are constantly spreading over that portion of the American territory where they have less to fear from competition; they discover resources there which escaped the notice of the inhabitants; and, as they comply with a system which they do not approve, they succeed in turning it to better advantage than those who first founded and who still maintain it.

Were I inclined to continue this parallel, I could easily prove that almost all the differences which may be remarked between the characters of the Americans in the Southern and in the Northern States have originated in slavery; but this would divert me from my subject,
and my present intention is not to point out all the consequences of servitude, but those effects which it has produced upon the prosperity of the countries which have admitted it.

The influence of slavery upon the production of wealth must have been very imperfectly known in antiquity, as slavery then obtained throughout the civilized world; and the nations which were unacquainted with it were barbarous. And indeed Christianity only abolished slavery by advocating the claims of the slave; at the present time it may be attacked in the name of the master, and, upon this point, interest is reconciled with morality.

As these truths became apparent in the United States, slavery receded before the progress of experience. Servitude had begun in the South, and had thence spread towards the North; but it now retires again. Freedom, which started from the North, now descends uninterrupted towards the South. Amongst the great States, Pennsylvania now constitutes the extreme limit of slavery to the North: but even within those limits the slave system is shaken: Maryland, which is immediately below Pennsylvania, is preparing for its abolition; and Virginia, which comes next to Maryland, is already discussing its utility and its dangers.

Of Individualism in Democratic Countries

I have shown how it is that in ages of equality every man seeks for his opinions within himself: I am now about to show how it is that, in the same ages, all his feelings are turned towards himself alone. Individualism is a novel expression, to which a novel idea has given birth. Our fathers were only acquainted with egotism. Egotism is a passionate and exaggerated love of self, which leads a man to connect everything with his own person, and to prefer himself to everything in the world. Individualism is a mature and calm feeling,
which disposes each member of the community to sever himself from the mass of his fellow-creatures; and to draw apart with his family and his friends; so that, after he has thus formed a little circle of his own, he willingly leaves society at large to itself. Egotism originates in blind instinct: individualism proceeds from erroneous judgment more than from depraved feelings; it originates as much in the deficiencies of the mind as in the perversity of the heart. Egotism blights the germ of all virtue; individualism, at first, only saps the virtues of public life; but, in the long run, it attacks and destroys all others, and is at length absorbed in downright egotism. Egotism is a vice as old as the world, which does not belong to one form of society more than to another: individualism is of democratic origin, and it threatens to spread in the same ratio as the equality of conditions.

Amongst aristocratic nations, as families remain for centuries in the same condition, often on the same spot, all generations become as it were contemporaneous. A man almost always knows his forefathers, and respects them: he thinks he already sees his remote descendants, and he loves them. He willingly imposes duties on himself towards the former and the latter; and he will frequently sacrifice his personal gratifications to those who went before and to those who will come after him. Aristocratic institutions have, moreover, the effect of closely binding every man to several of his fellow-citizens. As the classes of an aristocratic people are strongly marked and permanent, each of them is regarded by its own members as a sort of lesser country, more tangible and more cherished than the country at large. As in aristocratic communities all the citizens occupy fixed positions, one above the other, the result is that each of them always sees a man above himself whose patronage is necessary to him, and below himself another man whose co-operation he may claim. Men living in aristocratic ages are therefore almost always closely attached to something placed out of their own sphere, and they are often disposed to forget themselves. It is true that in those ages the notion of human fellowship is faint, and that men seldom think of sacrificing themselves for mankind; but they often sacrifice themselves for other men. In democratic ages, on the contrary, when the duties of each individual to the race are much more clear, devoted service to any one man becomes more rare; the bond of human affection is extended, but it is relaxed.
Amongst democratic nations new families are constantly springing up, others are constantly falling away, and all that remain change their condition; the woof of time is every instant broken, and the track of generations effaced. Those who went before are soon forgotten; of those who will come after no one has any idea: the interest of man is confined to those in close propinquity to himself. As each class approximates to other classes, and intermingles with them, its members become indifferent and as strangers to one another. Aristocracy had made a chain of all the members of the community, from the peasant to the king: democracy breaks that chain, and severs every link of it. As social conditions become more equal, the number of persons increases who, although they are neither rich enough nor powerful enough to exercise any great influence over their fellow-creatures, have nevertheless acquired or retained sufficient education and fortune to satisfy their own wants. They owe nothing to any man, they expect nothing from any man; they acquire the habit of always considering themselves as standing alone, and they are apt to imagine that their whole destiny is in their own hands. Thus not only does democracy make every man forget his ancestors, but it hides his descendants, and separates his contemporaries from him; it throws him back forever upon himself alone, and threatens in the end to confine him entirely within the solitude of his own heart.
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BACKGROUND
Senators Daniel Webster of Massachusetts and Robert Hayne of South Carolina exchanged speeches in a debate concerning Senator Samuel Foot of Connecticut's resolution to abolish the office of Surveyor General and temporarily suspend the sale of new public lands.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. How does Hayne understand the relationship between the federal government and state governments?

2. How does Webster understand the relationship between the federal government and state governments?

3. What preserves the Union and when should it be adapted or abolished, according to each senator?

…Thus it will be seen, Mr. President, that the South Carolina doctrine is the republican doctrine of ’98; that it was first promulgated by the Fathers of the Faith—that it was maintained by Virginia and Kentucky, in the worst of times—that it constituted the very pivot on which the political revolution of that day turned—that it embraced the very principles the triumph of which at that time “saved the Constitution at its last gasp;” and which New England Statesmen were not unwilling to adopt, when they believed themselves to be the victims of unconstitutional legislation! Sir, as to the doctrine that the Federal Government is the exclusive judge of the extent as well as the limitations of its powers, it seems to be utterly subversive of the sovereignty and independence of the States. It makes but little difference, in my estimation, whether Congress or the Supreme Court, are invested with this power. If the Federal Government, in all or any of its departments, are to prescribe the limits of its own authority; and the States are bound to submit to the decision, and are not to be allowed to examine and decide for themselves, when the barriers of the Constitution shall be overleaped, this is practically “a Government without limitation of powers;” the States are at once reduced to mere petty corporations, and the people are entirely at your mercy. I have but one word more to add. In all the efforts that have been made by South Carolina to resist the unconstitutional laws which Congress has extended over them, she has kept steadily in view the preservation of the Union, by the only means by which she believes it can be long preserved—a firm, manly, and steady resistance against usurpation. The measures of the Federal Government have, it is true, prostrated her interests, and will soon involve the whole South in irretrievable ruin. But this evil, great as it is, is not the chief ground of our complaints. It is the principle involved in the contest, a principle which, substituting the discretion of Congress for the limitations of the Constitution, brings the States and the people to the feet of the Federal Government, and leaves them nothing they can call their own. Sir, if the measures of the Federal Government were less oppressive, we should still strive against this usurpation. The South is acting on a principle she has always held sound—resistance to unauthorized taxation. These, Sir, are the principles which induced the immortal Hampden to resist the payment of a tax of
twenty shillings—"Would twenty shillings have ruined his fortune? No—but the payment of half twenty shillings, on the principle on which it was demanded, would have made him a slave." Sir, if, in acting on these high motives—if, animated by that ardent love of liberty which has always been the most prominent trait in the Southern character, we should be hurried beyond the bounds of a cold and calculating prudence, who is there with one noble and generous sentiment in his bosom, who would not be disposed in the language of Burke, to exclaim, “you must pardon something to the spirit of liberty.”

**Senator Daniel Webster of Massachusetts**

**January 26 and 27, 1830**

…If any thing be found in the National Constitution, either by original provision, or subsequent interpretation, which ought not to be in it, the People know how to get rid of it. If any construction be established, unacceptable to them, so as to become, practically, a part of the Constitution, they will amend it, at their own sovereign pleasure. But while the people choose to maintain it, as it is; while they are satisfied with it, and refuse to change it; who has given, or who can give, to the State Legislatures a right to alter it, either by interference, construction, or otherwise? Gentlemen do not seem to recollect that the People have any power to do any thing for themselves; they imagine there is no safety for them, any longer than they are under the close guardianship of the State Legislatures. Sir, the People have not trusted their safety, in regard to the general Constitution, to these hands. They have required other security, and taken other bonds. They have chosen to trust themselves, first, to the plain words of the instrument, and to such construction as the Government itself, in doubtful cases, should put on its own powers, under their oaths of office, and subject to their responsibility to them; just as the People of a State trust their own State Governments with a similar power. Secondly, they have reposed their trust in the efficacy of frequent elections, and in their own power to remove their own servants and agents, whenever they see cause. Thirdly, they have reposed trust in the Judicial power, which, in order that it might be trust-worthy, they have made as respectable, as disinterested, and as independent as was practicable. Fourthly, they have seen fit to rely, in
case of necessity, or high expediency, on their known and admitted power, to alter or
amend the Constitution, peaceably and quietly, whenever experience shall point out defects
or imperfections. And, finally, the People of the United States have, at no time, in no way,
directly or indirectly, authorized any State Legislature to construe or interpret their high
instrument of Government; much less to interfere, by their own power, to arrest its course
and operation.

If, sir, the People, in these respects, had done otherwise than they have done, their
Constitution could neither have been preserved, nor would it have been worth preserving.
And, if its plain provisions shall now be disregarded, and these new doctrines interpolated
in it, it will become as feeble and helpless a being as its enemies, whether early or more
recent, could possibly desire. It will exist in every State, but as a poor dependent on State
permission. It must borrow leave to be; and will be, no longer than State pleasure, or State
discretion, sees fit to grant the indulgence, and to prolong its poor existence.

But, sir, although there are fears, there are hopes also. The People have preserved this, their
own chosen Constitution, for forty years, and have seen their happiness, prosperity, and
renown, grow with its growth, and strengthen with its strength. They are now, generally,
strongly attached to it. Overthrown by direct assault, it cannot be; evaded, undermined,
nullified, it will not be, if we, and those who shall succeed us here, as agents and
representatives of the People, shall conscientiously and vigilantly discharge the two great
branches of our public trust—faithfully to preserve, and wisely to administer it.

Mr. President, I have thus stated the reasons of my dissent to the doctrines which have been
advanced and maintained. I am conscious of having detained you and the Senate much too
long. I was drawn into the debate, with no previous deliberation such as is suited to the
discussion of so grave and important a subject. But it is a subject of which my heart is full,
and I have not been willing to suppress the utterance of its spontaneous sentiments. I
cannot, even now, persuade myself to relinquish it, without expressing, once more, my deep
conviction, that, since it respects nothing less than the Union of the States, it is of most vital
and essential importance to the public happiness. I profess, sir, in my career, hitherto, to
have kept steadily in view the prosperity and honor of the whole country, and the
preservation of our Federal Union. It is to that Union we owe our safety at home, and our
consideration and dignity abroad. It is to that Union that we are chiefly indebted for
whatever makes us most proud of our country. That Union we reached only by the
discipline of our virtues in the severe school of adversity. It had its origin in the necessities
of disordered finance, prostrate commerce, and ruined credit. Under its benign influences,
these great interests immediately awoke, as from the dead, and sprang forth with newness
of life. Every year of its duration has teemed with fresh proofs of its utility and its blessings;
and, although our territory has stretched out wider and wider, and our population spread
farther and farther, they have not outrun its protection or its benefits. It has been to us all
a copious fountain of national, social, and personal happiness. I have not allowed myself,
sir, to look beyond the Union, to see what might lie hidden in the dark recess behind. I have
not coolly weighed the chances of preserving liberty, when the bonds that unite us together
shall be broken asunder. I have not accustomed myself to hang over the precipice of
disunion, to see whether, with my short sight, I can fathom the depth of the abyss below;
nor could I regard him as a safe counsellor in the affairs of this Government, whose
thoughts should be mainly bent on considering, not how the Union should be best
preserved, but how tolerable might be the condition of the People when it shall be broken
up and destroyed. While the Union lasts, we have high, exciting, gratifying prospects spread
out before us, for us and our children. Beyond that I seek not to penetrate the veil. God
grant that, in my day, at least, that curtain may not rise. God grant that on my vision never
may be opened what lies behind. When my eyes shall be turned to behold, for the last time,
the sun in Heaven, may I not see him shining on the broken and dishonored fragments of
a once glorious Union; on States dissevered, discordant, belligerent; on a land rent with
civil feuds, or drenched, it may be, in fraternal blood! Let their last feeble and lingering
glance, rather behold the gorgeous Ensign of the Republic, now known and honored
throughout the earth, still full high advanced, its arms and trophies streaming in their
original lustre, not a stripe erased or polluted, nor a single star obscured—bearing for its
motto, no such miserable interrogatory as, What is all this worth? Nor those other words
of delusion and folly, Liberty first, and Union afterwards—but every where, spread all over
in characters of living light, blazing on all its ample folds, as they float over the sea and over the land, and in every wind under the whole Heavens, that other sentiment, dear to every true American heart—Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable!
SENATOR THEODORE FRELINGHUYSEN (NATIONAL-REPUBLICAN – NJ)
On the Bill for an Exchange of Lands with the Indians

SPEECH EXCERPTS

April 6, 1830
U.S. Senate Chamber | U.S. Capitol | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

Senator Frelinghuysen of New Jersey delivered this speech in debate over the Indian Removal Act of 1830, which would have the federal government pursue treaties to move Native American tribes east of the Mississippi River to the west of the river.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What does Frelinghuysen request from the government?

2. If Georgia continues to encroach upon Indian territory, how should the government respond?

3. Who does Frelinghuysen quote to support his argument?

4. Why should the government protect the Indians?

Theodore Frelinghuysen, On the Bill for an Exchange of Lands with the Indians Residing in any of the States or Territories, and for their Removal West of the Mississippi, April 6, 1830. From the Digital Library of Georgia Internet Archives: https://archive.org/details/speechofmrfrelin00freliala/page/28/mode/2up/.
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…Let the General Government come out, as it should, with decided and temperate firmness and officially announce to Georgia, and the other States, that if the Indian tribes choose to remain, they will be protected against all interference and encroachment; and such is my confidence in the sense of justice, in the respect for law, prevailing in the great body of this portion of our fellow citizens, that I believe they would submit to the authority of the nation. I can expect no other issue. But if the General Government be urged to the crisis, never to be anticipated, of appealing to the last resort of her powers; and when reason, argument, and persuasion fail, to raise her strong arm to repress the violations of the supreme law of the land, I ask, is it not in her bond, Sir? Is her guaranty a rope of sand? This effective weapon has often been employed to chastise the poor Indians, sometimes with dreadful vengeance I fear, and shall not their protection avail to draw it from the scabbard? Permit me to refer the Senate to the views of Mr. Jefferson, directly connected with this delicate, yet sacred duty of protection. In 1791, when he was Secretary of State, there were some symptoms of collision on the Indian subject. This induced the letter from him to General Knox, then our Secretary of War, a part of which I will read:

“I am of opinion that Government should firmly maintain this ground: that the Indians have a right to the occupation of their lands, independent of the States within whose chartered limits they happen to be; that until they cede them by treaty, or other transaction equivalent to a treaty, no act of a State can give a right to such lands; that neither under the present constitution, nor the ancient confederation, had any State or persons a right to treat with the Indians, without the consent of the General Government; that that consent has never been given by any treaty for the cession of the lands in question; that the Government is determined to exert all its energy for the patronage and protection of the rights of the Indians, and the preservation of peace between the United States and them; and that if any settlements are made on lands not ceded by them, without the previous consent of the United States, the Government will think itself bound, not only to declare to the Indians that such settlements are without the authority or protection of the United States, but to remove them also by public force.”
Mr. Jefferson seems to have been disturbed by no morbid sensibilities. He speaks out as became a determined statesman. We can trace in this document the same spirit which shed its influence on a more eventful paper—the declaration of our rights, and of our purpose to maintain and defend them. He looked right onward, in the broad path of public duty; and if, in his way, he met the terrors of State collision and conflict, he was in no degree intimidated. The faith of treaties was his guide; and he would not flinch in his purposes, nor surrender the Indians to State encroachments. Let such decided policy go forth in the majesty of our laws now, and, Sir, Georgia will yield. She will never encounter the responsibilities or the horrors of a civil war. But if she should, no stains of blood will be on our skirts—on herself the guilt will abide forever.

Mr. President, if we abandon these aboriginal proprietors of our soil—these early allies and adopted children of our forefathers, how shall we justify it to our country? To all the glory of the past, and the promise of the future? Her good name is worth all else besides that contributes to her greatness. And, as I regard this crisis in her history, the time has come when this unbought treasure shall be plucked from dishonor, or abandoned to reproach.

How shall we justify this trespass to ourselves? Sir, we may deride it, and laugh it to scorn now; but the occasion will meet every man, when he must look inward, and make honest inquisition there. Let us beware how, by oppressive encroachments upon the sacred privileges of our Indian neighbors, we minister to the agonies of future remorse.

I have, in my humble measure, attempted to discharge a public and most solemn duty towards an interesting portion of my fellow men. Should it prove to have been as fruitless as I know it to be below the weight of their claims, yet even then, Sir, it will have its consolations. Defeat in such a cause is far above the triumphs of unrighteous power—and in the language of an eloquent writer—“I had rather receive the blessing of one poor Cherokee, as he casts his last look back upon his country, for having, though in vain, attempted to prevent his banishment, than to sleep beneath the marble of all the Caesars....”
GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHEROKEE NATION

Address to the People of the United States

ADDRESS EXCERPTS

July 1830

BACKGROUND

The General Council of the Cherokee Nation made this appeal to the American people and its representatives, written primarily, it is believed, by Cherokee Chief John Ross.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. When did United States policy towards the Cherokee change, according to Ross?

2. What does Ross believe will be some of the consequences if the Cherokee are forced to move?

3. What is the essence of Ross’s final argument for why the United States should not force the Cherokee to move?

E.C. Tracy, Memoir of the Life of Jeremiah Evarts, Late Corresponding Secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (Boston: Crocker and Brewster, 1845): 444-448.
…[I]n the midst of our sorrows, we do not forget our obligations to our friends and benefactors. It was with sensations of inexpressionable joy that we have learned that the voice of thousands in many parts of the United States has been raised in our behalf, and the numerous memorials offered in our favor, in both houses of Congress. . . . Our special thanks are due however, to those honorable men, who so ably and eloquently asserted our rights, in both branches of the national legislature. . . .

Before we close this address, permit us to state what we conceive to be our relations with the United States. After the peace of 1785, the Cherokees were an independent people; absolutely so, so much as any people on earth. They had been allies to Great Britain, and as a faithful ally, took a part in the colonial war on her side…. [Great Britain] acknowledged the independence of the United States and made peace. The Cherokees therefore stood alone; and in these circumstances continued the war. They were then under no obligations to the United States any more than to Great Britain, France, or Spain. The United States never subjugated the Cherokees; on the contrary, our fathers remained in possession of their country, and with arms in their hands.

The people of the United States sought a peace; and, in 1785, the Treaty of Hopewell was formed, by which the Cherokees came under the protection of the United States and submitted to such limitation of sovereignty as are mentioned in that instrument. None of these limitations however, effected in the slightest degree their rights of self-government and inviolate territory.

... When the federal Constitution was adopted the Treaty of Hopewell was contained, with all other treaties, as the supreme law of the land. In 1791, the Treaty of Holston was made, by which the sovereignty of the Cherokees was qualified as follows: The Cherokees acknowledged themselves to be under the protection of the United States, and of no other sovereign. They engaged that they would not hold any treaty with a foreign power, with any separate state of the Union, or with individuals. They agreed that the United States should have the exclusive right of regulating their trade; that the citizens of the United States have a right of way in one direction through the Cherokee country; and that if an
Indian should do injury to a citizen of the United States, he should be delivered up to be tried and punished. A cession of lands was also made to the United States. On the other hand, the United States paid a sum of money; offered protection; engaged to punish citizens of the United States who should do any injury to the Cherokees; abandoned white settlers on Cherokee lands to the discretion of the Cherokees, stipulated that white men should not hunt on these lands, nor even enter the country without a passport; and gave a solemn guaranty of all Cherokees lands not ceded. This treaty is the basis of all subsequent compacts; and in none of them are the relations of the parties at all changed.

The Cherokees have always fulfilled their engagements. . . .

The people of the United States will have the fairness to reflect that all the treaties between them and the Cherokees were made at the sole invitation and for the benefit of the whites; that valuable considerations were given for every stipulation, on the part of the United States; that it is impossible to reinstate the parties in their former situation; that there are now hundreds of thousands of citizens of the United States residing upon lands ceded by the Cherokees in these very treaties, and that our people have trusted their country to the guaranty of the United States. If this guaranty fails them, in what can they trust, and where can they look for protection?

We are aware that some persons suppose it will be for our advantage to remove beyond the Mississippi. We think otherwise. Our people universally think otherwise. Thinking that it would be fatal to their interests, they have almost to a man sent their memorial to Congress, deprecating the necessity of a removal. . . .It is incredible that Georgia should ever have enacted the oppressive laws, to which reference is here made, unless she had supposed that something extremely terrific in its character was necessary in order to make the Cherokees willing to remove. We are not willing to remove; and if we could be brought to this extremity, it would be not by argument, not because our judgment was satisfied, not because our condition will be improved; but only because we cannot endure to be deprived of our national and individual rights and subjected to a process of intolerable oppression.
Address to the People of the United States
John Ross

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

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

It is under a sense of the most pungent feelings that we make this, perhaps our last appeal
to the good people of the United States. . . . Shall we be compelled by a civilized and
Christian people, with whom we have lived in perfect peace for the last forty years, and for
whom we have willingly bled in war, to bid a final adieu to our homes, our farms, our
streams, and our beautiful forests? No. We are still firm. We intend still to cling with our
wonted affection to the land which gave us birth and which every day of our lives brings to
us new and stronger ties of attachment. . . . On the soil which contains the ashes of our
beloved men we wish to live—on this soil we wish to die.
We entreat those to whom the preceding paragraphs are addressed to remember the great law of love, “Do to others as ye would that others should do to you.” Let them remember that of all nations on the earth, they are under the greatest obligations to obey this law. We pray them to remember that, for the sake of principle, their forefathers were compelled to leave, therefore driven from the old world, and that the winds of persecution wafted them over the great waters and landed them on the shores of the new world, when the Indian was the sole lord and proprietor of these extensive domains. Let them remember in what way they were received by the savage of America, when power was in his hand, and his ferocity could not be restrained by any human arm. We urge them to bear in mind that those who would now ask of them a cup of cold water, and a spot of earth, a portion of their own patrimonial possessions on which to live and die in peace, are the descendants of those, whose origin as inhabitants of North America history and tradition are alike insufficient to reveal. Let them bring to remembrance all these facts, and they cannot, and we are sure they will not, fail to remember and sympathize with us in these our trials and sufferings.
PRESIDENT ANDREW JACKSON (D-TN)

Annual Message to Congress

LETTER EXCERPTS

December 6, 1830
Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

President Andrew Jackson sent his second Annual Message to Congress in 1830, as required by the Constitution.

ANNOTATIONS

…it gives me pleasure to announce to Congress that the benevolent policy of the Government, steadily pursued for nearly thirty years, in relation to the removal of the Indians beyond the white settlements is approaching to a happy consummation. Two important tribes have accepted the provision made for their removal at the last session of Congress, and it is believed that their example will induce the remaining tribes also to seek the same obvious advantages.

The consequences of a speedy removal will be important to the United States, to individual States, and to the Indians themselves. The pecuniary advantages which it promises to the Government are the least of its recommendations. It puts an end to all possible danger of collision between the authorities of the General and State Governments on account of the Indians. It will place a dense and civilized population in large tracts of country now occupied by a few savage hunters. By opening the whole territory between Tennessee on the north and Louisiana on the south to the settlement of the whites it will incalculably strengthen the southwestern frontier and render the adjacent States strong enough to repel future invasions without remote aid. It will relieve the whole State of Mississippi and the

____________________

President Andrew Jackson’s Message to Congress “On Indian Removal”; 12/6/1830; Presidential Messages, 1789 - 1875; Records of the U.S. Senate, Record Group 46; National Archives Building, Washington, DC.
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western part of Alabama of Indian occupancy, and enable those States to advance rapidly in population, wealth, and power. It will separate the Indians from immediate contact with settlements of whites; free them from the power of the States; enable them to pursue happiness in their own way and under their own rude institutions; will retard the progress of decay, which is lessening their numbers, and perhaps cause them gradually, under the protection of the Government and through the influence of good counsels, to cast off their savage habits and become an interesting, civilized, and Christian community.

What good man would prefer a country covered with forests and ranged by a few thousand savages to our extensive Republic, studded with cities, towns, and prosperous farms embellished with all the improvements which art can devise or industry execute, occupied by more than 12,000,000 happy people, and filled with all the blessings of liberty, civilization and religion?

The present policy of the Government is but a continuation of the same progressive change by a milder process. The tribes which occupied the countries now constituting the Eastern States were annihilated or have melted away to make room for the whites. The waves of population and civilization are rolling to the westward, and we now propose to acquire the countries occupied by the red men of the South and West by a fair exchange, and, at the expense of the United States, to send them to land where their existence may be prolonged and perhaps made perpetual. Doubtless it will be painful to leave the graves of their fathers; but what do they more than our ancestors did or than our children are now doing? To better their condition in an unknown land our forefathers left all that was dear in earthly objects. Our children by thousands yearly leave the land of their birth to seek new homes in distant regions. Does Humanity weep at these painful separations from everything, animate and inanimate, with which the young heart has become entwined? Far from it. It is rather a source of joy that our country affords scope where our young population may range unconstrained in body or in mind, developing the power and facilities of man in their highest perfection. These remove hundreds and almost thousands of miles at their own expense, purchase the lands they occupy, and support themselves at their new homes from
the moment of their arrival. Can it be cruel in this Government when, by events which it can not control, the Indian is made discontented in his ancient home to purchase his lands, to give him a new and extensive territory, to pay the expense of his removal, and support him a year in his new abode? How many thousands of our own people would gladly embrace the opportunity of removing to the West on such conditions! If the offers made to the Indians were extended to them, they would be hailed with gratitude and joy.

And is it supposed that the wandering savage has a stronger attachment to his home than the settled, civilized Christian? Is it more afflicting to him to leave the graves of his fathers than it is to our brothers and children? Rightly considered, the policy of the General Government toward the red man is not only liberal, but generous. He is unwilling to submit to the laws of the States and mingle with their population. To save him from this alternative, or perhaps utter annihilation, the General Government kindly offers him a new home, and proposes to pay the whole expense of his removal and settlement....
PRESIDENT ANDREW JACKSON (D-TN)

Veto Message from the President of the United States, returning the Bank Bill, with his objections, &c.

LETTER EXCERPTS

July 10, 1832
Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

President Andrew Jackson sent this message to the Senate accompany his veto of a bill passed to re-charter the Bank of the United States.

ANNOTATIONS

…It is maintained by the advocates of the bank that its constitutionality in all its features ought to be considered as settled by precedent and by the decision of the Supreme Court. To this conclusion I cannot assent. Mere precedent is a dangerous source of authority, and should not be regarded as deciding questions of constitutional power except where the acquiescence of the people and the states can be considered as well settled. So far from this being the case on this subject, an argument against the bank might be based on precedent. One Congress, in 1791, decided in favor of a bank; another, in 1811, decided against it. One Congress, in 1815, decided against a bank; another, in 1816, decided in its favor. Prior to the present Congress, therefore, the precedents drawn from that source were equal. If we resort to the states, the expressions of legislative, judicial, and executive opinions against the bank have been probably to those in its favor as four to one. There is nothing in precedent, therefore, which, if its authority were admitted, ought to weigh in favor of the act before me.

Andrew Jackson, “Veto message from the President of the United States, returning the bank bill, with his objections, &c. To the Senate . . .” Washington, Herald Office, 1832.
If the opinion of the Supreme Court covered the whole ground of this act, it ought not to control the coordinate authorities of this government. The Congress, the Executive, and the Court must each for itself be guided by its own opinion of the Constitution. Each public officer who takes an oath to support the Constitution swears that he will support it as he understands it, and not as it is understood by others. It is as much the duty of the House of Representatives, of the Senate, and of the president to decide upon the constitutionality of any bill or resolution which may be presented to them for passage or approval as it is of the supreme judges when it may be brought before them for judicial decision. The opinion of the judges has no more authority over Congress than the opinion of Congress has over the judges, and on that point the president is independent of both. The authority of the Supreme Court must not, therefore, be permitted to control the Congress or the Executive when acting in their legislative capacities, but to have only such influence as the force of their reasoning may deserve.…

It is to be regretted that the rich and powerful too often bend the acts of government to their selfish purposes. Distinctions in society will always exist under every just government. Equality of talents, of education, or of wealth cannot be produced by human institutions. In the full enjoyment of the gifts of Heaven and the fruits of superior industry, economy, and virtue, every man is equally entitled to protection by law; but when the laws undertake to add to these natural and just advantages artificial distinctions, to grant titles, gratuities, and exclusive privileges, to make the rich richer and the potent more powerful, the humble members of society—the farmers, mechanics, and laborers—who have neither the time nor the means of securing like favors to themselves, have a right to complain of the injustice of their government. There are no necessary evils in government. Its evils exist only in its abuses. If it would confine itself to equal protection, and, as Heaven does its rains, shower its favors alike on the high and the low, the rich and the poor, it would be an unqualified blessing. In the act before me there seems to be a wide and unnecessary departure from these just principles.
Nor is our government to be maintained or our Union preserved by invasions of the rights and powers of the several states. In thus attempting to make our general government strong we make it weak. Its true strength consists in leaving individuals and states as much as possible to themselves—in making itself felt not in its power, but in its beneficence; not in its control, but in its protection; not in binding the states more closely to the center, but leaving each to move unobstructed in its proper orbit.

Experience should teach us wisdom. Most of the difficulties our government now encounters and most of the dangers which impend over our Union have sprung from an abandonment of the legitimate objects of government by our national legislation, and the adoption of such principles as are embodied in this act. Many of our rich men have not been content with equal protection and equal benefits, but have besought us to make them richer by act of Congress. By attempting to gratify their desires we have in the results of our legislation arrayed section against section, interest against interest, and man against man, in a fearful commotion which threatens to shake the foundations of our Union. It is time to pause in our career to review our principles, and if possible revive that devoted patriotism and spirit of compromise which distinguished the sages of the Revolution and the fathers of our Union. If we cannot at once, in justice to interests vested under improvident legislation, make our government what it ought to be, we can at least take a stand against all new grants of monopolies and exclusive privileges, against any prostitution of our government to the advancement of the few at the expense of the many, and in favor of compromise and gradual reform in our code of laws and system of political economy.

I have now done my duty to my country. If sustained by my fellow citizens, I shall be grateful and happy; if not, I shall find in the motives which impel me ample grounds for contentment and peace. In the difficulties which surround us and the dangers which threaten our institutions there is cause for neither dismay nor alarm. For relief and deliverance let us firmly rely on that kind Providence which I am sure watches with peculiar care over the destinies of our Republic, and on the intelligence and wisdom of our
countrymen. Through His abundant goodness and heir patriotic devotion our liberty and Union will be preserved.
**SEN. JOHN C. CALHOUN (D-SC)**

On the Reception of Abolition Petitions

**SPEECH EXCERPT**

February 6, 1837

U.S. Senate Chamber, U.S. Capitol | Washington, D.C.

---

**BACKGROUND**

John C. Calhoun delivered this speech in the U.S. Senate in response to petitions submitted by abolitionists demanding an end to slavery in the District of Columbia and the abolition of the slave trade across state lines.

**GUIDING QUESTIONS**

1. What does Calhoun argue to be the effect of enslavement in America on African Americans? Why?

2. In which ways does Calhoun take exception to northern criticism of the effects of slavery on European Americans?

3. What does Calhoun mean by a “positive good”? What evidence does he claim to support his assertion?

4. How does Calhoun argue that slaves are treated better than laborers in the north?

5. If slavery were to be abolished, what is Calhoun’s fear?

6. What do Calhoun’s tone and words suggest about the changing stance of southerners on the issue of slavery, especially with respect to northern criticism and policies against it?

---

…Abolition and Union cannot co-exist. As the friend of the Union I openly proclaim it, and the sooner it is known the better. The former may now be controlled, but in a short time it will be beyond the power of man to arrest the course of events. We of the South will not, cannot, surrender our institutions. To maintain the existing relations between the two races, inhabiting that section of the Union, is indispensable to the peace and happiness of both. It cannot be subverted without drenching the country in blood, and extirpating one or the other of the races. Be it good or bad, it has grown up with our society and institutions, and is so interwoven with them, that to destroy it would be to destroy us as a people. But let me not be understood as admitting, even by implication, that the existing relations between the two races in slaveholding States is an evil—far otherwise; I hold it to be a good, as it has thus far proved itself to be to both, and will continue to prove so if not disturbed by the fell spirit of abolition. I appeal to facts. Never before has the black race of Central Africa, from the dawn of history to the present day, attained a condition so civilized and so improved, not only physically, but morally and intellectually. It came among us in a low, degraded, and savage condition, and in the course of a few generations it has grown up under the fostering care of our institutions, reviled as they have been to its present comparatively civilized condition. This, with the rapid increase of numbers, is conclusive proof of the general happiness of the race, in spite of all the exaggerated tales to the contrary. In the mean time, the white or European race has not degenerated. It has kept pace with its brethren in other sections of the Union where slavery does not exist. It is odious to make comparison; but I appeal to all sides whether the South is not equal in virtue, intelligence, patriotism, courage, disinterestedness, and all the high qualities which adorn our nature. I ask whether we have not contributed our full share of talents and political wisdom in forming and sustaining this political fabric; and whether we have not constantly inclined most strongly to the side of liberty, and been the first to see and first to resist the encroachments of power. In one thing only are we inferior—the arts of gain; we acknowledge that we are less wealthy than the Northern section of this Union, but I trace this mainly to the fiscal action of this Government, which has extracted much from and spent little among us. Had it been the reverse—if the exaction had been from the other section, and the expenditure with us, this point of superiority would not be against us now, as it was not at the formation
of this Government. But I take higher ground. I hold that in the present state of civilization, where two races of different origin, and distinguished by color, and other physical differences, as well as intellectual, are brought together, the relation now existing in the slave-holding States between the two, is, instead of an evil, a good—a positive good. I feel myself called upon to speak freely upon the subject where the honor and interests of those I represent are involved. I hold then that there never has yet existed a wealthy and civilized society in which one portion of the community did not, in point of fact, live on the labor of the other. Broad and general as is this assertion, it is fully borne out by history. This is not the proper occasion, but if it were, it would not be difficult to trace the various devices by which the wealth of all civilized communities has been so unequally divided, and to show by what means so small a share has been allotted to those by whose labor it was produced, and so large a share given to the non-producing classes. The devices are almost innumerable, from the brute force and gross superstition of ancient times, to the subtle and artful fiscal contrivances of modern. I might well challenge a comparison between them and the more direct, simple, and patriarchal mode by which the labor of the African race is, among us, commanded by the European. I may say with truth, that in few countries so much is left to the share of the laborer, and so little exacted from him, or where there is more kind attention paid to him in sickness or infirmities of age. Compare his condition with the tenants of the poor houses in the more civilized portions of Europe—look at the sick, and the old and infirm slave, on one hand, in the midst of his family and friends, under the kind superintending care of his master and mistress, and compare it with the forlorn and wretched condition of the pauper in the poor house. But I will not dwell on this aspect of the question; I turn to the political; and here I fearlessly assert that the existing relation between the two races in the South, against which these blind fanatics are waging war, forms the most solid and durable foundation on which to rear free and stable political institutions. It is useless to disguise the fact. There is and always has been in an advanced stage of wealth and civilization, a conflict between labor and capital. The condition of society in the South exempts us from the disorders and dangers resulting from this conflict; and which explains why it is that the political condition of the slaveholding States has been so much more stable and quiet than that of the North. The advantages of the former, in this
respect, will become more and more manifest if left undisturbed by interference from without, as the country advances in wealth and numbers. We have, in fact, but just entered that condition of society where the strength and durability of our political institutions are to be tested; and I venture nothing in predicting that the experience of the next generation will fully test how vastly more favorable our condition of society is to that of other sections for free and stable institutions, provided we are not disturbed by the interference of others, or shall have sufficient intelligence and spirit to resist promptly and successfully such interference. It rests with ourselves to meet and repel them. I look not for aid to this Government, or to the other States; not but there are kind feelings towards us on the part of the great body of the nonslaveholding States; but as kind as their feelings may be, we may rest assured that no political party in those States will risk their ascendency for our safety. If we do not defend ourselves none will defend us; if we yield we will be more and more pressed as we recede; and if we submit we will be trampled under foot. Be assured that emancipation itself would not satisfy these fanatics—that gained, the next step would be to raise the negroes to a social and political equality with the whites; and that being effected, we would soon find the present condition of the two races reversed. They and their northern allies would be the masters, and we the slaves; the condition of the white race in the British West India Islands, bad as it is, would be happiness to ours. There the mother country is interested in sustaining the supremacy of the European race. It is true that the authority of the former master is destroyed, but the African will there still be a slave, not to individuals but to the community,—forced to labor, not by the authority of the overseer, but by the bayonet of the soldiery and the rod of the civil magistrate. Surrounded as the slaveholding States are with such imminent perils, I rejoice to think that our means of defence are ample, if we shall prove to have the intelligence and spirit to see and apply them before it is too late. All we want is concert, to lay aside all party differences, and unite with zeal and energy in repelling approaching dangers. Let there be concert of action, and we shall find ample means of security without resorting to secession or disunion. I speak with full knowledge and a thorough examination of the subject, and for one, see my way clearly. One thing alarms me—the eager pursuit of gain which overspreads the land, and which absorbs every faculty of the mind and every feeling of the heart. Of all passions avarice is the most blind and
On the Reception of Abolition Petitions
John C. Calhoun

compromising—the last to see and the first to yield to danger. I dare not hope that any thing I can say will arouse the South to a due sense of danger; I fear it is beyond the power of mortal voice to awaken it in time from the fatal security into which it has fallen.
JOHN LOUIS O’SULLIVAN

“The Great Nation of Futurity”

EDITORIAL EXCERPTS

November 6, 1839

The United States Democratic Review

BACKGROUND

The United States Democratic Review’s founder and editor, John Louis O’Sullivan, published this editorial in 1839.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Where does America derive its origins from, according to O’Sullivan?

2. What are the principles of America?

3. What is America’s destiny?

The American people having derived their origin from many other nations, and the Declaration of National Independence being entirely based on the great principle of human equality, these facts demonstrate at once our disconnected position as regards any other nation; that we have, in reality, but little connection with the past history of any of them, and still less with all antiquity, its glories, or its crimes. On the contrary, our national birth was the beginning of a new history, the formation and progress of an untried political system, which separates us from the past and connects us with the future only; and so far as regards the entire development of the natural rights of man, in moral, political, and national life, we may confidently assume that our country is destined to be the great nation of futurity.

It is so destined, because the principle upon which a nation is organized fixes its destiny, and that of equality is perfect, is universal. It presides in all the operations of the physical world, and it is also the conscious law of the soul—the self-evident dictates of morality, which accurately defines the duty of man to man, and consequently man's rights as man.

Besides, the truthful annals of any nation furnish abundant evidence, that its happiness, its greatness, its duration, were always proportionate to the democratic equality in its system of government. . . .

What friend of human liberty, civilization, and refinement, can cast his view over the past history of the monarchies and aristocracies of antiquity, and not deplore that they ever existed? What philanthropist can contemplate the oppressions, the cruelties, and injustice inflicted by them on the masses of mankind, and not turn with moral horror from the retrospect?

America is destined for better deeds. It is our unparalleled glory that we have no reminiscences of battle fields, but in defence of humanity, of the oppressed of all nations, of the rights of conscience, the rights of personal enfranchisement. Our annals describe no scenes of horrid carnage, where men were led on by hundreds of thousands to slay one another, dupes and victims to emperors, kings, nobles, demons in the human form called heroes. We have had patriots to defend our homes, our liberties, but no aspirants to crowns
or thrones; nor have the American people ever suffered themselves to be led on by wicked ambition to depopulate the land, to spread desolation far and wide, that a human being might be placed on a seat of supremacy.

We have no interest in the scenes of antiquity, only as lessons of avoidance of nearly all their examples. The expansive future is our arena, and for our history. We are entering on its untrodden space, with the truths of God in our minds, beneficent objects in our hearts, and with a clear conscience unsullied by the past. We are the nation of human progress, and who will, what can, set limits to our onward march? Providence is with us, and no earthly power can. We point to the everlasting truth on the first page of our national declaration, and we proclaim to the millions of other lands, that "the gates of hell"—the powers of aristocracy and monarchy—"shall not prevail against it."

The far-reaching, the boundless future will be the era of American greatness. In its magnificent domain of space and time, the nation of many nations is destined to manifest to mankind the excellence of divine principles; to establish on earth the noblest temple ever dedicated to the worship of the Most High—the Sacred and the True. Its floor shall be a hemisphere—its roof the firmament of the star-studded heavens, and its congregation an Union of many Republics, comprising hundreds of happy millions, calling, owning no man master, but governed by God’s natural and moral law of equality, the law of brotherhood—of "peace and good will amongst men." . . .

Yes, we are the nation of progress, of individual freedom, of universal enfranchisement. Equality of rights is the cynosure of our union of States, the grand exemplar of the correlative equality of individuals; and while truth sheds its effulgence, we cannot retrograde, without dissolving the one and subverting the other. We must onward to the fulfilment of our mission—to the entire development of the principle of our organization—freedom of conscience, freedom of person, freedom of trade and business pursuits, universality of freedom and equality. This is our high destiny, and in nature’s eternal, inevitable decree of cause and effect we must accomplish it. All this will be our future history, to establish on earth the moral dignity and salvation of man—the immutable truth
and beneficence of God. For this blessed mission to the nations of the world, which are shut out from the life-giving light of truth, has America been chosen; and her high example shall smite unto death the tyranny of kings, hierarchs, and oligarchs, and carry the glad tidings of peace and good will where myriads now endure an existence scarcely more enviable than that of beasts of the field. Who, then, can doubt that our country is destined to be the great nation of futurity?
UNIT 4

The American Civil War

1848–1877

45-50-minute classes | 14-18 classes

UNIT PREVIEW

Structure

| LESSON 1 | 1848–1854 | The Expansion of Slavery | 3-4 classes | p. 7 |
| LESSON 2 | 1854–1861 | Toward Civil War | 3-4 classes | p. 15 |
| LESSON 3 | 1861–1865 | The Civil War | 4-5 classes | p. 22 |
| LESSON 4 | 1865–1877 | Reconstruction | 2-3 classes | p. 32 |
| APPENDIX A | Study Guide, Test, and Writing Assignment | | | p. 39 |
| APPENDIX B | Primary Sources | | | p. 57 |

Why Teach the American Civil War

"Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent, a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure."

These famous opening lines from President Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg express why the Civil War was fought. Whether America, founded in liberty and equality, could long endure depended on whether the nation’s original contradiction, slavery, could be abolished while still preserving the country’s existence as a union. American students must know how the ideas at the heart of their country were undermined by
slavery; but they must also learn how heroic Americans committed to America’s founding ideas made great sacrifices and sometimes gave their lives, so that these ideas of liberty and equality might prevail over the dehumanizing tyranny of slavery. And students must learn that, like those in Lincoln’s audience, it is up to each American to oppose tyranny and dehumanization to ensure that “government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.”

**Enduring Ideas from This Unit**

1. That slavery was the original contradiction in America, and that slavery is immoral, unjust, dehumanizing, and in violation of the inherent dignity and equal possession of natural rights of each person, as are any ways in which one person or group of people is favored over another due to the color of their skin.

2. That at its heart, the Civil War was fought over the issue of slavery: first, whether slavery would expand in America; next, whether it would be permitted at all; and last, whether the half of the country that opposed slavery would let the country be divided and the injustice to continue elsewhere, instead of fighting to preserve a union that would guarantee liberty and abolish slavery.

3. That President Abraham Lincoln exemplified American statesmanship as he piloted the nation toward fulfillment of its founding ideas, ended the barbarous and tyrannical institution of slavery, and nevertheless abided by the rule of law in doing so.

4. That the period of Reconstruction following the Civil War witnessed a realization of civil rights for freedmen, producing greater degrees of justice and equality that would nevertheless be challenged both during Reconstruction and in following decades.

**What Teachers Should Consider**

The American Civil War is one of the most important events in American history if only for its attempt to prove, with the blood of hundreds of thousands of Americans, that a people may freely govern themselves and organize themselves to preserve the liberty and equal natural rights of all.

Many students may not know that America was founded on these ideas. Fewer, perhaps, know that America even succeeded in proving these ideas true, striving to live up to them for twenty years, before such progress was eclipsed after Reconstruction. Although subsequent decades would manifest different kinds of failures to guarantee the equal protection of natural rights in certain parts of the country, the Civil War demonstrated that some statesmen and a considerable portion of Americans were committed to carrying out America’s founding promise to the point of bloodshed.

Teachers will greatly benefit from studying not only the war itself but also the thoughts, words, and deeds of the statesman who conducted the war for the Union: President Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln’s ideas and speeches, and his political actions, should constitute for students a model of prudence, both in the public arena and in their own lives. His understanding of the issue of slavery, not merely in the abstract but as it existed in America, can teach students much about their country and its history.
This unit should begin, therefore, with an understanding of slavery as it was found in America in 1848. The teacher should especially emphasize the changes in the status and practice of slavery since the founding in 1776. The teacher should also emphasize changes in legal and public opinion toward the institution since the Constitution went into effect in 1789. In brief, both had entrenched slavery instead of keeping it on the gradual path to extinction, where the founding generation had arguably placed it.

Abraham Lincoln saw these legal and public opinion shifts most clearly, and he saw that such changes struck directly at the ideas on which America was founded. In brief, his entire public career as well as the founding of the Republican Party were devoted to checking this change, to returning slavery to the path of extinction, and to fulfilling the founding ideas of constitutional self-government. Lincoln’s arguments to these ends dominate the crescendo leading to war in spring of 1861. At its heart, this is what the Civil War was about.

The teacher will be able to enrich his or her students by cultivating their imaginations with the events, battles, and images of the Civil War, the bloodiest conflict in which Americans have ever been involved. Strategy, battles, and the general history of the war should be taught in detail. The teacher should learn and share accounts and images of the important moments and figures who contributed to Union victory in 1865. Meanwhile, Lincoln’s careful yet effective maneuverings—both to preserve the Union and to seize the constitutional opportunity afforded him to emancipate the slaves—should be followed in detail.

The unit best concludes with a study of the period known as Reconstruction. Perhaps never in history was so much hoped for, achieved, and mismanaged in so short a period of time with respect to liberty and equality under the law. Students should learn to appreciate both the sacrifices of the Civil War and its immediate achievements during Reconstruction. Nevertheless, students should also learn about the emergence of different kinds of injustice, especially for African Americans living in the former rebel states: injustices that would be perpetuated for a century.

How Teachers Can Learn More

**TEXTS**

*No Property in Man*, Sean Wilentz  
*Fateful Lightning*, Allen Guelzo  
*Abraham Lincoln*, Lord Charnwood  
*Lincoln and the American Founding*, Lucas Morel  
*The Essential Douglass: Selected Writings and Speeches*, Frederick Douglass  
*The Columbian Orator*, ed. David Blight  
*Crisis of the House Divided*, Harry Jaffa  
*A New Birth of Freedom*, Harry Jaffa  
*The American Heritage: A Reader*, ed. Hillsdale College History Faculty  
*The U.S. Constitution: A Reader*, ed. Hillsdale College Politics Faculty (ConstitutionReader.com)
Lesson Planning Resources

TEACHER RESOURCES

*Battle Cry of Freedom*, James McPherson
*Reconstruction*, Allen Guelzo
*A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope*, Wilfred McClay and John McBride
*A Student Workbook for Land of Hope*, Wilfred McClay and John McBride
*A Short History of the Civil War*, James Stokesbury

STUDENT RESOURCES

*Land of Hope*, Wilfred McClay

PRIMARY SOURCES

*Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass*, Frederick Douglass
Speech on the Oregon Bill, John C. Calhoun
Peoria speech on the Kansas-Nebraska Act, Abraham Lincoln
*Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, Harriet Beecher Stowe
*Dred Scott v. Sandford*, Roger Taney
Speech on the *Dred Scott* decision, Abraham Lincoln
“House Divided” speech, Abraham Lincoln
The Seventh Lincoln-Douglas Debate, Abraham Lincoln and Stephen Douglas
“The Constitution of the United States: Is It Pro-Slavery or Anti-Slavery?,” Frederick Douglass
Fragment on the Constitution and Union, Abraham Lincoln
First inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln
Emancipation Proclamation, Abraham Lincoln
Gettysburg Address, Abraham Lincoln
Second inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln
Civil Rights Act of 1866
13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments
Black Code from Opelousas, Louisiana
LESSON PLANS, ASSIGNMENTS, AND FORMATIVE QUIZ
Lesson 1 — The Expansion of Slavery

1848–1854

3–4 classes

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn how the defenders of slavery began to assert that slavery was a “positive good” that ought to be expanded throughout the country instead of an existing evil that should be contained and kept on the path to extinction.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
- *Land of Hope* Pages 128–129, 156–162

Primary Sources
- See below.

Teacher Texts
- *Battle Cry of Freedom* Pages 6–144
- *A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope* Pages 157–162
- *A Student Workbook for Land of Hope* Pages 94–98
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- *The Great American Story* Lecture 9
- *Civil Rights in American History* Lecture 3
- *Constitution 101* Lecture 6

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students read *Land of Hope*, pages 128–129, 156–162, and either complete the reading questions handout in the *Student Workbook for Land of Hope* (pages 94–98) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 2: Students read and annotate Lincoln’s speech on the Kansas-Nebraska Act and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places
- Mason-Dixon Line
- Minnesota
- Mexico
- Oregon
- California
- Kansas-Nebraska Territory

Persons
Henry Clay  Frederick Douglass
John C. Calhoun  Sojourner Truth
Daniel Webster  Harriet Beecher Stowe
James K. Polk  Harriet Tubman
Abraham Lincoln  William Lloyd Garrison
Zachary Taylor  Franklin Pierce
Millard Fillmore  Stephen Douglas

Terms and Topics
The Great Triumvirate  Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass
Wilmot Proviso  Uncle Tom’s Cabin
“positive good”  Underground Railroad
King Cotton  Hillsdale College
antebellum  Know-Nothing Party
Gold Rush  Kansas-Nebraska Act
secession  popular sovereignty
Compromise of 1850
Fugitive Slave Law
abolitionism

Primary Sources
Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, Frederick Douglass
Speech on the Oregon Bill, John C. Calhoun
Uncle Tom’s Cabin, Harriet Beecher Stowe
Peoria speech on the Kansas-Nebraska Act, Abraham Lincoln

To Know by Heart
“The African Chief”—William Cullen Bryant
“The Hunters of Men”—John Greenleaf Whittier
“Knowledge makes a man unfit to be a slave.”—Frederick Douglass
“I have observed this in my experience of slavery—that whenever my condition was improved, instead of its increasing my contentment, it only increased my desire to be free, and set me to thinking of plans to gain my freedom. I have found that, to make a contented slave, it is necessary to make a thoughtless one. It is necessary to darken his moral and mental vision, and, as far as possible, to annihilate the power of reason.”—Frederick Douglass, Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass

Timeline
1846–48  Mexican-American War
1849  California Gold Rush
1850  Compromise of 1850
1852  Uncle Tom’s Cabin published
1854 Indiana Territory

Images

Historical figures and events
Photographs and depictions of the life of slaves and the horrors of slavery
Maps of the free-versus-slave-state breakdown when changes occur; Electoral College outcomes
Pictures of first-edition copies of Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass and Uncle Tom’s Cabin
Statue of Frederick Douglass (on the Hillsdale College campus)
Copy of newspaper in which Lincoln’s Peoria speech was first printed

Stories for the American Heart

- Biographies and the roles of Frederick Douglass, Harriet Tubman, and Abraham Lincoln prior to the Civil War
- Childhood biography of Abraham Lincoln
- Scenes from Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass and Uncle Tom’s Cabin
- Frederick Douglass’s letter to his former master, Thomas Auld, 1848
- Actions of Harriet Tubman and the Underground Railroad
- Levi Coffin’s accounts from the Underground Railroad
- Frederick Douglass’s letter to Harriet Tubman, 1868
- James Marshall’s account of striking gold at Sutter’s Mill

Questions for the American Mind

- What general prediction about the future of slavery did the Framers of the Constitution make?
- What technology invented in 1793, four years after the Constitution went into effect, revolutionized the cotton industry, resulting in a revived demand for slave labor and undermining the Founders’ predictions regarding slavery?
- What was life like for slaves in the South? What was a slave auction like?
- Why, politically, did the question of the expansion of slavery become so important for the slaveholding interest, especially following the growth of the United States between 1846 and 1848?
- What were the terms of the Compromise of 1850? Was it really a “compromise”? Why or why not?
- What were the two most controversial parts of the Compromise of 1850? What were their effects? What did the compromise settle, and what did it not settle?
- What were the various kinds of abolitionist activities engaged in by Northern abolitionists?
- What roles did Frederick Douglass, William Lloyd Garrison, Harriet Tubman, and Harriet Beecher Stowe play in the abolitionist movement?
- How did the Underground Railroad work?
- What did the Kansas-Nebraska Act do?
- What was the idea of “popular sovereignty”? Where did the idea come from and why?
- Question from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 75: What group of people was taken and sold as slaves?
KEYS TO THE LESSON

The status of slavery in 1848 was markedly different than it was when the Founders crafted the Constitution in 1787. The gradual decline in the profitability of slavery, evident during the founding, was forecast to continue—but this trend reversed direction upon the invention of the cotton gin in 1793. From then on, the demand for slave labor in the Southern states rapidly compounded. But the free population in the South was vastly outstripped by the burgeoning population of the North. If nothing changed, demographics and geography would eventually give Americans living in the North the power to limit slavery through law and perhaps even abolish it entirely through a constitutional amendment. Slaveholders in the South needed to change this trajectory by expanding slavery westward into the territories. Students need to understand that to justify such expansion, slavery advocates in the South had to change the opinion of Northerners: either to believe slavery to be morally beneficial or, at the very least, to view slavery as merely another option to be decided by the majority, what Stephen Douglas called “popular sovereignty.” Moral relativism, the idea that “might makes right,” and a belief in unfettered democracy through the vote of the majority were the slaveholders’ pillars in arguing to preserve slavery. Students should understand that Abraham Lincoln favored government “of the people, by the people, and for the people” but also saw how popular sovereignty’s neutrality concerning slavery violated both equality and consent, as well as liberty itself. Lincoln went about waging an oratorical war in defense of objective standards of truth and justice, of good and evil. They should also learn how abolitionists, of both African and European descent, continued to publicize the horrors of slavery for Americans in Northern states far removed from witnessing slavery firsthand. Abolitionists also shepherded escaped slaves to freedom in the Northern states and Canada.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Expansion of Slavery with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Have students consider the status of slavery over the initial decades of the country’s history. At the founding, slavery was generally either openly condemned by those in the North or defended by those in the South. Its toleration by northern delegates and others who were opposed to slavery at the time of the founding was for the sake of a unity that even many abolitionists believed was the only eventual path toward abolition. The Declaration of Independence established the country on principles of equality that could and would be cited to demand the end of slavery, the Northwest Ordinance had prohibited the expansion of slavery, the Constitution refused to give legal standing to the institution, and many states had restricted or abolished slavery outright. Lastly, many leading Founders, including those who held slaves, believed that the profitability of slavery was gradually but decisively waning and that slavery would die out on its own in a relatively short period of time. However, the invention of the cotton gin by Eli Whitney four years after the adoption of the Constitution greatly increased the profitability of slavery in the cotton-growing states of the South and thereby create a significant (and regional) interest in perpetuating the institution of slavery. The new economics of slavery that would grow out of the cotton gin and the vast cotton industry questioned the assumption and changed the projection of the founding generation concerning the viability and eventual demise of slavery.

- Help students to imagine and understand the dehumanizing and brutal tyranny of slavery. Although students should understand that the ways in which various slaveholders treated their slaves varied, from the downright barbaric to more familial—in order to see how many slavery apologists tried to justify slavery—they must nevertheless understand that the sheer fact that some people owned other human beings is and always will be morally reprehensible. Moreover, as
Frederick Douglass argued, slavery actually dehumanized the master as well as the slave. William Cullen Bryant’s “The African Chief” may be helpful here.

- Teach students that despite this attempted defense of slavery, the institution almost certainly weakened the South as a whole while supporting the lifestyle of the elite few. For all other Southerners, slavery depreciated the value and wages of labor by non-slaves, limited innovation, and thwarted economic development in the South. The Civil War would reveal the weakness of the position in which Southerners’ insistence on slavery had placed them. Students might benefit from hearing read aloud and imagining Alexis de Tocqueville’s antebellum float down the Ohio River: “[T]he traveller who floats down the current of the Ohio...may be said to sail between liberty and servitude; and a transient inspection of the surrounding objects will convince him which of the two is most favourable to mankind. Upon the left bank of the stream the population is rare; from time to time one [discovers] a troop of slaves loitering in the half-desert fields; the primeval forest recurs at every turn; society seems to be asleep, man to be idle, and nature alone offers a scene of activity and of life. From the right bank, on the contrary, a confused hum is heard, which proclaims the presence of industry; the fields are covered with abundant harvests; the elegance of the dwellings announces the taste and activity of the laborer; and man appears to be in the enjoyment of that wealth and contentment which are the reward of labor” (trans. Henry Reeve, 1848).

- Likewise, consider with students the contributions to America’s tremendous wealth and prosperity throughout its history. There were the Southern plantation owners and many businesses and individuals in the North who profited handsomely from slavery, even as the degree of prosperity generated by slavery was dwarfed by other factors. These factors included Americans’ unprecedented freedom to innovate and invest, the ability to patent ideas and inventions, the protection of private property rights, and above all the productive work of citizens within a free marketplace governed by the rule of law and consent of the governed. The great achievements of individual families through the Homestead Act of 1862 demonstrates the point, both for immigrants to America and for the freedmen who would also take advantage of such freedom and opportunity after the Civil War. In brief, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution are the catalysts for allowing human beings to unleash the most prosperous and technologically advanced economy in history. A simple comparison of the Northern to the Southern economy, infrastructure, and society before and during the Civil War illustrates the case, as Tocqueville shows above.

- Teach students how the slavery issue nearly resulted in civil war over the question of expanding slavery into the territories acquired from Mexico after the Mexican-American War, brought to a head when California, after a population surge during the California Gold Rush, applied to become a state without slavery. California’s lone admission as a free state would have increased Northern power in Congress and the Electoral College against Southern states on the issue of slavery.

- Spend some time discussing the Compromise of 1850, which was not really a “compromise” in the real sense of the word. A “compromise” would involve all parties sacrificing something of their position to achieve a common outcome. The Compromise of 1850, however, was not one bill but five separate bills that had five separate lines of voting. Students should understand what each of these acts did, especially the Fugitive Slave Law. Using the Missouri Compromise map handout (A Student Workbook for Land of Hope, pages 274–275), help students track the changed situation under the Compromise of 1850. This orchestration begun by Henry Clay but completed...
by Stephen Douglas may have avoided war in the short term, but it only deepened and delayed the divisions tearing at the country over the next ten years.

- Ask students about the effects of the Fugitive Slave Law, which compelled Northerners to assist in capturing escaped slaves and encouraged the practice of abducting free African Americans living in the North and forcing them into slavery. Perhaps use John Greenleaf Whittier’s poem, “The Hunters of Men.”

- Teach students about the various parts of the abolitionist movement and its major figures. Students should learn that there was great diversity among abolitionists, especially in their underlying views about America’s governing principles and the best way to abolish slavery. For instance, William Lloyd Garrison actually agreed with the slaveholder reading of the Constitution while Frederick Douglass moved from this view to that of Abraham Lincoln that the Constitution was pro-freedom. One might read aloud with students some portions of Douglass’s *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass* and Harriet Beecher Stowe’s *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, important works in making Northerners, most of whom had never seen slavery in practice, aware of its moral evil. Other abolitionists, such as Harriet Tubman and those running the Underground Railroad, heroically worked to lead escaped slaves to freedom. In general, most abolitionists appealed to the principles of equality stated in the Declaration of Independence in justifying their cause.

- Tell students the childhood and political biography of Abraham Lincoln, to show how he rose from poverty and obscurity to become arguably America’s greatest president.

- Consider having students learn what the Kansas-Nebraska Act did. Focus specifically on the idea of popular sovereignty as used by Stephen Douglas, and the idea that right and wrong amount to the mere will of the majority opinion, which happens to be what many people today believe constitutes truth and the moral rightness of political decisions. Using the Missouri Compromise map handout (*A Student Workbook for Land of Hope*, pages 274–275), help students track the changed situation under the Kansas-Nebraska Act.

- Have students read and answer guiding questions on parts of Lincoln’s speech on the Kansas-Nebraska Act in response to the act of the same name. Students should understand that Lincoln saw slavery to be, above all, a moral question, and one that every American ought to take seriously as such. Lincoln also believed that moral relativism over the question of slavery, as conveyed in the idea of popular sovereignty, was antithetical to the ideas of the Declaration of Independence, and that slavery was simply a form of majority tyranny, the very danger latent in democracy that the Founders had warned against. Finally, Lincoln condemned the Kansas-Nebraska Act as achieving a complete reversal of the stance the Constitution, the Northwest Ordinance, and the founding generation had toward slavery: that it should be contained until it was abolished and by no means allowed to spread.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Explain how subsequent events undermined the Founders’ projections regarding the future of slavery and how and why slavery became an increasingly divisive political issue, especially between 1848 and 1854 (1–2 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Retell the biography of one of the following: Frederick Douglass, Harriet Tubman, or Abraham Lincoln (3–4 paragraphs).
Reading Quiz

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. The acquisition of western lands following the war with ____________ and the discovery of gold in ____________ brought the issue of slavery’s expansion to a head in the late 1840s.

2. What was the name of the compromise bill regarding the expansion of slavery that Congress passed in 1850?

3. What was the name of the part of this compromise that Northerners hated most and worked to circumvent?

4. What infrastructure project motivated Illinois Democratic Senator Stephen Douglas to propose the creation of the Kansas-Nebraska Territory?

5. What would Stephen Douglas’s proposal of popular sovereignty in the Kansas-Nebraska Territory permit to occur in western territories north of the 36° 30’ parallel for the first time since the Missouri Compromise of 1820?
Lesson 2 — Toward Civil War

1854–1861
3–4 classes

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn how Abraham Lincoln and the new Republican Party’s opposition to the expansion of slavery led slaveholding states to secede from the Union, resulting in civil war.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
Land of Hope
Pages 162–173
Primary Sources
See below.

Teacher Texts
Battle Cry of Freedom
Pages 145–307
A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope
Pages 163–181
A Student Workbook for Land of Hope
Pages 94–98

Online.Hillsdale.edu
The Great American Story
Lecture 9
Civil Rights in American History
Lecture 3
Constitution 101
Lecture 6

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students read Land of Hope, pages 162–173, and either complete the reading questions handout in the Student Workbook for Land of Hope (pages 94–98) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 2: Students read and annotate excerpts from Abraham Lincoln’s speech on the Dred Scott decision and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).

Assignment 3: Students read and annotate Abraham Lincoln’s “House Divided” speech and excerpts from the Seventh Lincoln-Douglas Debate and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).

Assignment 4: Students read and annotate Frederick Douglass’s “The Constitution of the United States: Is It Pro-Slavery or Anti-Slavery?” and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).
CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Place
Kansas-Nebraska Territory          Harpers Ferry
Kansas                              Fort Sumter

Persons
Abraham Lincoln                     James Buchanan
Frederick Douglass                  Dred Scott
Franklin Pierce                     Walt Whitman
Stephen Douglas                     Roger Taney
Preston Brooks                      John Brown
Charles Sumner

Terms and Topics
Kansas-Nebraska Act                 Lincoln-Douglas Debates
Bleeding Kansas                     objective truth
a house divided                      “don’t care,” “I care not”
popular sovereignty                  moral relativism
Democratic Party                    majority tyranny
Republican Party                    “apple and frame” metaphor
Dred Scott v. Sandford              Wilberforce University

Primary Sources
Dred Scott v. Sandford, Roger Taney
Speech on the Dred Scott Decision, Abraham Lincoln
“House Divided” speech, Abraham Lincoln
The Seventh Lincoln-Douglas Debate, Abraham Lincoln and Stephen Douglas
“The Constitution of the United States: Is It Pro-Slavery or Anti-Slavery?,” Frederick Douglass
Fragment on the Constitution and Union, Abraham Lincoln

To Know by Heart
“A house divided against itself cannot stand.”—Abraham Lincoln, paraphrasing from the words of Jesus of Nazareth in the Bible

Timeline
1854          Kansas-Nebraska Act; Republican Party founded
1857          Dred Scott v. Sandford
1859          John Brown raid on Harpers Ferry
1860          Election of Abraham Lincoln; South Carolina secedes
April 12, 1861 Attack on Fort Sumter

Images
Historical figures and events
Depictions of the Lincoln-Douglas Debates
Campaign materials
Map of the 1860 election results
Fort Sumter

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- The breakdown of civil dialogue resulting in Preston Brooks’s attack on Charles Sumner
- What the Lincoln-Douglas Debates were like in terms of setting, format, length, etc., especially compared to civil dialogue and debate today
- The scenes at the nominating conventions for each party in 1860
- John Daingerfield’s account of John Brown’s raid at Harpers Ferry
- John Brown’s letter to his pastor, 1859, and last words before his execution
- Aaron Stevens’s letter to his brother, 1858
- The young girl who suggested to Abraham Lincoln that he grow a beard
- The first shots fired on Fort Sumter and its surrender

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What was Bleeding Kansas, what was it like, and why did it happen? How did it show the weakness of popular sovereignty?
- When and why did the Republican Party emerge?
- According to Abraham Lincoln, how does Roger Taney’s majority opinion in *Dred Scott v. Sandford* recast the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the founding ideas of equality?
- According to Abraham Lincoln, how does Roger Taney’s majority opinion in *Dred Scott v. Sandford* threaten to make slavery legal anywhere in the union?
- Why did Abraham Lincoln argue that the *Dred Scott* decision should not be considered as having set a legitimate precedent?
- What was Abraham Lincoln’s view of equality?
- Why did Abraham Lincoln argue that Stephen Douglas’s personal stance of how he does not care (“I care not”) how a state or territory votes on slavery is dangerous and indefensible? How was this connected to Lincoln’s predictions regarding the *Dred Scott v. Sandford* decision?
- Why did Abraham Lincoln believe popular sovereignty without an argument on the morality of slavery amounted to majority tyranny?
- What question and answer did Abraham Lincoln consider to be the solution to the issue of the expansion of slavery?
- Why did Abraham Lincoln see the question of the morality of slavery to be at the heart of America’s founding?
- How did Abraham Lincoln end up winning the 1860 election?
- Explain Abraham Lincoln’s arguments about the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution as explained in his “apple of gold, frame of silver” metaphor.
- How did President-Elect Abraham Lincoln navigate the period between his election and the first shots at Fort Sumter? How did the country descend into war during this period?
- How was slavery the true cause of the Civil War?
- In what ways did the Confederacy reject the principle of equality from the Declaration of Independence and insist on the inequality of the races?
The passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act in 1854 sparked the little-known Abraham Lincoln to redouble his efforts to engage in the growing national debate over slavery in America. He saw a tremendous threat in the argument put forward by the bill’s sponsor, Stephen Douglas, that slavery was not a moral question but rather one that should simply be decided by the will of the majority. From 1854 to the outbreak of the Civil War in 1861, Lincoln would combat the idea that the morality of slavery was to be determined merely by majority opinion. Students should come to see this arc to Lincoln’s words and deeds. They should understand how he took up and articulated the heart of the matter regarding the morality of slavery and that slavery struck at America’s founding idea that all men are created equal. Roger Taney’s majority opinion in *Dred Scott v. Sandford* interpreted the Constitution to legitimize slavery, and Lincoln argued against both popular sovereignty and Taney’s position throughout his debates with Douglas. The moral question regarding slavery, manifesting itself in the practical questions of the expansion of slavery, is what a civil war would be fought over. After all, the formal move to secession—a constitutionally debatable claim also at issue in the approach to war—and the war itself were triggered in response to Lincoln being elected president on the position that slavery was wrong and should not be expanded.

Teachers might best plan and teach Toward Civil War with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Perhaps consider John Quincy Adam’s words on civil debate and its enemies: “[W]here prejudice has not acquired an uncontrolled ascendency, and faction is yet confined within the barriers of peace; the voice of eloquence will not be heard in vain” (Inaugural Oration as Boylston professor of rhetoric and oratory in Harvard College, 1806). Emphasize the breakdown in civil dialogue in the several violent episodes related to slavery preceding the Civil War: Bleeding Kansas, Preston Brooks’s attack on Charles Sumner, and John Brown’s raid on the federal armory at Harpers Ferry. Go into some detail to bring these events alive for students. For example, it was Colonel Robert E. Lee who led federal troops to put down Brown’s uprising.

- Clarify the party alignment that was emerging in 1854. The Democratic Party was dividing between those who favored the principle of “popular sovereignty,” in which a state or territory could vote to allow slavery or not, and those who explicitly favored slavery. Meanwhile, the Republican Party was founded in 1854 in opposition to laws encouraging the spread of slavery. The split of the Democratic Party and the consolidation of the Republican Party in 1860 assured the election of Lincoln and significantly contributed to the coming of the Civil War.

- Consider Abraham Lincoln’s arguments against Roger Taney’s majority opinion in *Dred Scott v. Sandford* that asserted that slaves are not humans but only property, and that the Constitution protects their enslavement just as it does any other property. To do so, have students read Lincoln’s critique at home and then read aloud in class parts of Taney’s decision. Lincoln points out that Taney’s ruling rejected the Founders’ view on slavery and would lead, in tandem with Stephen Douglas’s popular sovereignty, to the spread of slavery throughout the country. By extension, this reasoning would also allow for other forms of majority tyranny. Questions on pages 175–178 of *A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope* may be helpful.

- Help students think through Lincoln’s understanding of the morality of slavery and its relationship to the founding ideas of America: that all men are created equal, have unalienable
rights, and that legitimate government is based on the consent of the governed. Students should see that the practical question regarding the expansion of slavery ultimately turned on the moral status of slavery.

- Have students read portions of the Seventh Lincoln-Douglas Debate at home and discuss it alongside Lincoln’s “House Divided” speech in class. Consider the apparently benign stance that Stephen Douglas takes in his position of popular sovereignty, that he does not care about what a group of people does regarding slavery, so long as the majority opinion decides it. Students should be asked why this is problematic.

- Present the settings and atmosphere of the Lincoln-Douglas Debates as imaginatively as possible.

- Help students to understand the various pressures that were mounting on the Southern states during the 1850s, from increasedabolitionist activities to the sheer industrial might of the Northern states to a burgeoning plantation debt as other countries produced more cotton and the price of cotton fell as a result.

- Tell students the stories of Lincoln’s speeches and his reception during these years, including the founding of the Republican Party and the various conventions in 1856 and especially 1860. Students should sense the drama of the times.

- Have students read at home Frederick Douglass’s “The Constitution of the United States: Is It Pro-Slavery or Anti-Slavery?” and read aloud in class Abraham Lincoln’s Fragment on the Constitution and Union. Help students understand the arguments in each with respect to the American founding and slavery. Of special note is Douglass’s change in view on the Declaration and Constitution regarding slavery.

- Provide a clear overview of events between Lincoln’s election and South Carolina’s attack on Fort Sumter in Charleston Harbor. Students should learn both Lincoln and the South’s accounts of what happened.

- There were, of course, other factors and dimensions that impelled each side to fight the Civil War. Students should be familiar with these, as well as the view of most Southerners that the war was about defending what they saw as the rights of their states. This view and Lincoln’s counterview and incumbent duty to preserve the Union and Constitution may have been the occasion for the Civil War, but students should understand that the war was, at its heart, fought over whether slavery would be permitted to spread and so remain indefinitely, or be restricted and returned to the path to extinction on which the founding generation had left it. This question was, in turn, based on the morality of slavery, which Abraham Lincoln would later maintain in his Gettysburg Address was a question about the rejection or fulfillment of the ideas on which America was founded.

**Strengthening Understanding: Post-Lesson Assignments**

**Assignment 1:** Explain how Abraham Lincoln argued that the issue of the expansion of slavery was at its heart a moral question and why it was so important that American public opinion should understand it as such (1–2 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Retell the story of how Abraham Lincoln won the 1860 election and review the subsequent events leading up to the opening shots of the Civil War fired on Fort Sumter (2–3 paragraphs).
Reading Quiz

The American Civil War | Lesson 2
Land of Hope, Pages 162–173

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question.

1. What happened in the Kansas Territory following the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act?

2. What did Supreme Court Chief Justice Roger Taney’s opinion in *Dred Scott v. Sandford* rule regarding federal prohibitions on the expansion of slavery?

3. Who debated Stephen Douglas on the moral implications of popular sovereignty in 1858 in the midst of elections that would determine who would be appointed the next Illinois Senator to Congress?

4. What event led South Carolina and six other Southern states to secede and form the Confederate States of America?

5. Significantly, who fired the first shots of the Civil War?
Unit 4 — Formative Quiz

Covering Lessons 1–2
10–15 minutes

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. What technology invented in 1793, four years after the Constitution went into effect, revolutionized the cotton industry, resulting in a revived demand for slave labor and undermining the Founders’ predictions regarding slavery?

2. What was John C. Calhoun’s idea that slavery was a “positive good”? Why did he argue this, and how did this change from previous arguments about slavery?

3. How did the idea of slavery as a “positive good” challenge the Constitution’s stance on slavery and the path on which the founding generation had set slavery?

4. How did John C. Calhoun reject the ideas of the Declaration of Independence in arguing for slavery?

5. What was the idea of “popular sovereignty”? Who advocated it and why?

6. According to Abraham Lincoln, how does Roger Taney’s majority opinion in Dred Scott v. Sandford threaten to make slavery legal everywhere in the union?

7. Why did Abraham Lincoln believe the idea of popular sovereignty determining the morality of slavery amounted to majority tyranny?

8. How was slavery the ultimate cause of the Civil War?
Lesson 3 — The Civil War

**LESSON OBJECTIVE**

Students learn about the major figures, common soldiers, strategy, and specific battles of the American Civil War, including a close study of the statesmanship of President Abraham Lincoln.

**TEACHER PREPARATION**

Create a note outline based on the following:

**Student Texts**

- *Land of Hope* Pages 173–189
- Primary Sources See below.

**Teacher Texts**

- *Battle Cry of Freedom* Pages 308–852
- *A Short History of the Civil War* As helpful
- *A Student Workbook for Land of Hope* Pages 109–112

**Online.Hillsdale.edu**

- *The Great American Story* Lecture 10
- *Constitution 101* Lecture 7

**STUDENT PREPARATION**

**Assignment 1:** Students read and annotate Lincoln’s first inaugural address and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).

**Assignment 2:** Students read *Land of Hope*, pages 173–189, and either complete the reading questions handout in the *A Student Workbook for Land of Hope* (pages 109–112) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

**Assignment 3:** Students read and annotate Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address and second inaugural address and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).

**CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON**

**Geography & Places**

- Fort Sumter
- Union
- Confederacy
- Richmond
- West Virginia
- Border States
Nevada
Appomattox Court House
Ford’s Theatre
Washington, DC
Gettysburg

Persons
Abraham Lincoln
Jefferson Davis
Alexander Stephens
Robert E. Lee
George McClellan
Thomas “Stonewall” Jackson
Ambrose Burnside
P. G. T. Beauregard
Winfield Scott
James Longstreet
Nathan Bedford Forrest
John Bell Hood
Braxton Bragg
Joseph Hooker
Clara Barton
George Meade
Ulysses S. Grant
William Tecumseh Sherman
Martin Delany
Robert Gould Shaw
John Wilkes Booth

Terms and Topics
secession
“states’ rights”
Anaconda Plan
Confederate States of America
railroads
minié ball
Army of the Potomac
Army of Northern Virginia
American Red Cross
Battle of First Manassas/
    Bull Run
ironclads
USS Monitor*
CSS Virginia
trench warfare
Battle of Shiloh
Peninsula Campaign
abolition
Battle of Antietam
Battles of Fredericksburg
    and Chancellorsville
Battle of Fort Wagner
Siege and Battle of Vicksburg
Battle of Gettysburg
Pickett’s Charge
54th Massachusetts Regiment
Battles of Chickamauga
    and Chattanooga
writ of habeas corpus
Battles of the Wilderness
    and Spotsylvania
Peace Democrats
scorched earth warfare
Sherman’s “March to the Sea”
Forty Acres and a Mule
Burning of Atlanta
Andersonville Prison
Siege of Richmond

Primary Sources
First inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln
Emancipation Proclamation, Abraham Lincoln
Gettysburg Address, Abraham Lincoln
Second inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln

* A previous version referred to the USS Merrimack instead of the USS Monitor.
To Know by Heart

Gettysburg Address—Abraham Lincoln
“So Atlanta is ours, and fairly won.” —William Tecumseh Sherman telegram announcing the fall of Atlanta to Abraham Lincoln
“Not for themselves but for their country.” — Epitaph for “Old Simon” the Private Soldier, Monument at Antietam
“The Master”—Edwin Arlington Robinson

Timeline

1860  Abraham Lincoln elected President; South Carolina and six states secede
1861–65  Civil War
March 4, 1861  Lincoln Inaugurated as President of the United States
April 12, 1861  Attack on Fort Sumter; four additional states secede
September 17, 1862  Battle of Antietam
September 22, 1862  Abraham Lincoln announces the Emancipation Proclamation
January 1, 1863  Emancipation Proclamation takes effect
July 1–3, 1863  Battle of Gettysburg
July 4, 1863  Fall of Vicksburg
1864 (Fall)  Fall of Atlanta
1864  Abraham Lincoln reelected
1865  Second inaugural address
April 9, 1865  Robert E. Lee surrenders at Appomattox
April 14–15, 1865  Abraham Lincoln assassinated; Andrew Johnson becomes president

February 12  Lincoln’s Birthday

Images

Historical figures and events
Landscape pictures of geographic places featured in this lesson
Soldier uniforms, weaponry, flags
Depictions and photographs of figures at various scenes and moments and in battle
Maps: overall strategies, specific battles
Relevant forts
Battle scene depictions and photographs
Medical equipment
Reenactment photos
Pictures of the Emancipation Proclamation, Gettysburg Address, etc.
Robert Gould Shaw and the 54th Massachusetts Regiment Memorial
Lincoln Memorial
Statue of Abraham Lincoln (Hillsdale College campus)
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Biographies and roles of Abraham Lincoln, Jefferson Davis, Robert E. Lee, Ulysses S. Grant, and William Tecumseh Sherman in the Civil War
- Robert E. Lee’s letter to his wife, Mary, December 27, 1856
- Robert E. Lee’s denial of Abraham Lincoln’s offer to command the Union forces
- William Howard Russell’s account of the First Battle of Bull Run/Manassas
- Sullivan Ballou’s letter to his wife, Sarah, on the eve of the First Battle of Bull Run/Manassas, 1861
- Alexander Stephens proclaims that slavery is the “cornerstone” of the Confederacy
- Columbus Huddle’s letter to his father after the Battle of Shiloh, 1862
- How Stonewall Jackson got his nickname
- Battle of the ironclads
- The single bloodiest day for the American people remains September 17, 1862, the Battle of Antietam, with 23,000 dead, wounded, or missing; to this day, fallen soldiers’ remains continue to be found
- William Child’s letter to his wife after the Battle of Antietam, 1862
- Samuel Chase’s account of Abraham Lincoln proclaiming emancipation
- Abraham Lincoln’s letter to George McClellan, October 1862
- Abraham Lincoln’s Order for Sabbath Observance, 1862
- Clara Barton’s letter to her cousin, Vira, December 1862
- The killing of Stonewall Jackson by friendly fire
- Samuel Cabble’s letter to his wife
- Louisa Alexander’s letter to her husband, Archer, 1863
- Lewis Douglass’s letter to his fiancée, Amelia Loguen, 1863
- William T. House’s letter from Vicksburg to his fiancée, Linda Bringham, 1863
- Hannah Johnson’s letter to President Lincoln, 1863
- David Hunter’s letter to Jefferson Davis on reprisals for mistreatment of African American soldiers, 1863
- John Burrill’s letter from Gettysburg to his fiancée, Ell, 1863
- Fighting at Little Round Top and Pickett’s Charge
- Alfred Pleasonton’s accounts from Gettysburg
- George Pickett’s letter from Gettysburg to his fiancée, La Salle Corbell, 1863
- The writing and delivery of the Gettysburg Address
- Henrietta Lee’s letter to David Hunter on the burning of her house, 1864
- Martha Liggan’s letter to the mother of a Confederate soldier, 1864
- Thomas Bowen’s letter to his mother, 1864
- William Pegram’s letter to his wife, 1864
- Accounts of the burning of Atlanta
- Joshua Chamberlain’s letter to his sister on the surrender of the Confederate forces, 1865
- William Tecumseh Sherman’s letter to Anna Gilman Bowen, 1864
- Robert E. Lee’s surrender to Ulysses S. Grant at Appomattox Court House
- Robert E. Lee’s Farewell Address to his Army, General Order No. 9, 1865
- Ulysses S. Grant’s letter to his wife, Julia
- Frances Watkins Harper’s letter to William Still
- Abraham Lincoln’s cabinet meeting regarding healing with the South just hours before his assassination
- Assassination of Abraham Lincoln at Ford’s Theatre and subsequent hunt for John Wilkes Booth
- Abraham Lincoln’s funeral train

**QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND**

- What was the Southern states’ argument for the constitutionality of secession?
- What was Abraham Lincoln’s argument that secession was unconstitutional, especially as articulated in his first inaugural address?
- What were Abraham Lincoln’s goals in his first inaugural address? What was his tone?
- How did Southern states decide to secede? Which segment of the Southern population were those who actually decided for secession?
- What were Jefferson Davis’s arguments on the morality and expansion of slavery, the North, and states’ rights and secession?
- What was important about Virginia’s decision to secede? How did it come about?
- What were Abraham Lincoln’s goals with respect to the Union and slavery at the onset of the Civil War? What were his priorities and why?
- Why and how did Abraham Lincoln need to keep the border states in the Union?
- What were the advantages and disadvantages that the Union and the Confederacy each faced at the outset of the war? All else being equal, which side would have won?
- What was the style of warfare in the Civil War, including battlefield strategy, weapons, ammunition, medical care, etc.?
- What were the overall strategies that each side pursued in the course of the war?
- How did each of the following battles begin, what happened in them, and what was their significance: First Bull Run, Peninsula Campaign, Antietam, Vicksburg, Gettysburg, the Battle of the Wilderness, Sherman’s March to the Sea?
- How did the Civil War reshape the currency and banking systems of the United States?
- What was the significance of the Homestead Act of 1862 in the midst of the Civil War? What was so remarkable about this act in terms of the government’s interest in private land ownership?
- How important were military victories to Lincoln politically?
- What were the problems characteristic of most of the Union’s generals from 1861 until the Battle of Gettysburg, in the Virginia and Maryland theater of war?
- What was General Lee’s strategic purpose for taking the war north, into Pennsylvania?
- How did Abraham Lincoln successfully approach his decision to issue the Emancipation Proclamation?
- What happened during the first four days of July 1863?
- In summary, what did Abraham Lincoln argue in the Gettysburg Address?
- Why were reelection prospects for Abraham Lincoln so poor for much of 1864?
- Why did General Sherman come to be hated in the postwar South?
- How was Abraham Lincoln perceived by his contemporaries?
- Based on his second inaugural address, how did Abraham Lincoln see the hand of God in the war and its outcome?
- What were the most significant moments in the Civil War?
- What factors, figures, moments, etc., led the Union to victory?
- What was the death toll of the war? In proportion to population, what would such a war cost today?
- What were Abraham Lincoln’s plans for reconstruction following the Civil War, as outlined in his second inaugural address and from what we know of his private meetings in the war’s final weeks?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 92: Name the U.S. war between the North and the South.
  - Question 93: The Civil War had many important events. Name one.
  - Question 94: Abraham Lincoln is famous for many things. Name one.
  - Question 95: What did the Emancipation Proclamation do?
  - Question 96: What U.S. war ended slavery?

**Keys to the Lesson**

The American Civil War may be the defining event in American history. The outcome of the Civil War determined whether the nation would live according to the principles of liberty, equality under law, and self-government, or reject those truths in favor of slavery, inequality, and tyrannical rule. Students should appreciate this about the bloodiest conflict in their nation’s history. They should also know the stories of the heroic actions both leaders and of ordinary citizens in that war, understand the strategies employed in general and in specific battles, and consider the key moments and factors that led the Union to ultimate victory. Additionally, students have an unmatched opportunity to understand statesmanship through the careful study of Abraham Lincoln’s thoughts, speeches, and actions as he led the nation through the Civil War.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Civil War with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Have students consider the arguments by the South and by Abraham Lincoln regarding the idea of “states’ rights” and the constitutionality of secession, particularly by reading and discussing Abraham Lincoln’s first inaugural address. Students should understand that there is no such thing as a “state right,” since rights belong only to persons. States (as governments) possess powers (not rights), as outlined in their state and in the federal Constitution, which the states are to use to protect the rights and the common good of their citizens (including from encroachment by the federal government by appealing to the Constitution itself). Lincoln’s first inaugural address presents the case for how secession is unconstitutional and how he, having taken an oath in his office as president, can and must preserve the Constitution and Union.
- Help students to see how the decision by Southern states to secede was largely determined by a small elite or even merely by governors. In Virginia, for example, the governor himself made the decision to secede without consulting the legislature. Moreover, insofar as slavery was the chief interest the South wanted to preserve, only a minority of Southerners owned slaves and even a smaller minority owned a large number of slaves on plantations. The majority of Southerners were not slaveholders and while fighting for their states would preserve slavery, many common Southerners fought for the argument of states’ rights rather than to preserve the institution of slavery.
- Emphasize that the governing state known as the Confederacy was founded on the rejection of the principle of equality from the Declaration of Independence, and on an argument of the inequality of races, as asserted in Alexander Stephens’s “Cornerstone Speech.”
Teach students about the delicacy with which Abraham Lincoln had to approach the border states (slave states that remained in the Union) and why this delicacy was needed. Have students work with Lincoln’s first inaugural address, one purpose of which was to keep wavering states in the Union.

Explain that Abraham Lincoln’s first goal in fighting the Civil War was to preserve the Union. It is important that students understand Lincoln’s reasoning. He was against slavery and wanted it abolished, but his constitutional obligation was to preserve the Union. If he acted otherwise, he would violate the Constitution and the rule of law, becoming no better than the seceding states and forfeiting his moral authority as the defender of the rule of law. Students should also know that while Lincoln did not believe he could abolish slavery alone or that abolishing slavery was the purpose for fighting the war, he nonetheless believed, like many of the Founders, that the only way to abolish slavery would be if the Union were preserved.

Have students think through and compare the various advantages and disadvantages each side had at the outset of the war and how these shifted during the war. Having students take simple notes, as a “T-Chart” can be effective for this part of the lesson.

Build students’ familiarity with the style of warfare in the mid-19th century, and show them plenty of images to do so. Students need this foundation for their subsequent study of battles. This helps them to imagine and understand what happens in battle and to appreciate the bravery of soldiers fighting on both sides.

Present to students explanations of each side’s strategy at various stages of the war and the tactics and battle plans employed in specific battles. Have students track strategy changes on the Civil War map handout (A Student Workbook for Land of Hope, pages 278–279). Of special note are the Union’s Anaconda Plan, James Longstreet’s development of trench warfare, the Mississippi theater of war and the siege and battle of Vicksburg, and Robert E. Lee’s strategy preceding Gettysburg, among others.

As with any conflict, dwell on the key contributions of both leaders and common soldiers in the war, especially Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, George McClellan, George Meade, Ulysses S. Grant, and William Tecumseh Sherman.

Share with students the unity found within the Union ranks in the cause of the United States and eventually the abolition of slavery. 1.3 million Union men of European ancestry fought in the Civil War and 180,000 African American men volunteered for the Union forces, making up nearly 10 percent of the Union army. Of all Union soldiers, 600,000 were wounded and approximately 360,000 Union men were killed.

Teach the war, especially the major battles and military campaigns, in some detail. Students should understand how the battles came to be, the key stories, factors, and moments from the battle itself, and the significance of their various outcomes on subsequent events. Employ battle maps often and have students track battles and campaigns on the Civil War map handout (A Student Workbook for Land of Hope, pages 278–279). A Short History of the Civil War is a great aid for teaching these battles; students may enjoy reading select accounts of these battles from this work, too.

Help students to note the major themes running through the early years of the war, namely how Confederate commanders carried the day repeatedly despite the North’s growing advantages, and how they exhibited military leadership and decisiveness. Students should also appreciate how unpopular Abraham Lincoln was in the North during much of the war.

Have students come to know Abraham Lincoln, in his personal life, interior thoughts and troubles, and his great love for his country. Students should also engage frequently with the
reasoning and decision-making that marks Lincoln as being perhaps the greatest statesman in American history.

- Explain to students the proposal that freedmen should migrate to Africa after gaining their freedom, especially that this idea was initially shared by a large swath of Americans, including African American abolitionists and Abraham Lincoln. Their main reason for entertaining this proposal was a belief that any people treated so cruelly under slavery would want revenge on their owners afterward, as well as a doubt that most Southerners would actually treat African Americans equally (a projection that Jim Crow would prove to be accurate). The reason abolitionists, African Americans, and Lincoln entertained this proposal was not because they believed African Americans should not live in the United States; indeed, there were already nearly half a million free African Americans peaceably living among Americans of European descent in the North at the time of the Civil War.

- Based on his writings, words, and deeds, show students how Abraham Lincoln always believed in the equal human dignity of African Americans and grew over the course of his career to see that African Americans were equal socially as well, a growth in understanding that he knew more Americans would need to develop in order for African Americans to be treated truly as equals. As his own experience showed, he believed this would take some time, particularly in slave-holding states.

- Note that Congress (with the support of Lincoln) outlawed slavery in Washington, DC, in 1862, an action made numerically possible with the absence of Southern congressmen.

- Read aloud in class the Emancipation Proclamation and teach students the technicalities Abraham Lincoln navigated in thinking of it, drawing it up, and the timing of its promulgation. He had to retain the border states, abide by the Constitution, achieve victory, and earn the support of public opinion in order for slaves to be effectively freed—and he did it all. Students should understand that Lincoln’s justification for freeing the slaves involved exercising his executive powers as commander-in-chief of the armed forces during an armed rebellion. This is why Lincoln only had the authority to apply the Emancipation Proclamation to those states in actual rebellion, why it could not be applied to slave-holding border states not in rebellion, and why he knew that after the war, an amendment to the Constitution would be necessary to bring emancipation to all the states and make it permanent.

- Have students read and hold a seminar conversation on the Gettysburg Address. It is a magnificent work of oratory, but it also gets at the heart of the American founding and the ideas that maintain the United States. It also shows the importance of defending and advancing those ideas, both in the Civil War and in our own day, as is incumbent on every American citizen. Questions on page 187 of A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope may be helpful.

- Note the importance of Abraham Lincoln’s choice of Ulysses S. Grant as General-in-Chief of the entire Union Army. Grant’s decisiveness combined with William Tecumseh Sherman’s boldness proved essential in prosecuting the war from late 1863 onward.

- Recap the war by considering major statistics, including the number of causalities and deaths on each side. Ask what stance Americans today should have towards those who fought in the Civil War, distinguishing between Northern soldiers and Southern soldiers. When considering Southern soldiers, be sure to note the tragic death of so many Americans, even if they were fighting for a confederate government dedicated to preserving slavery. As noted previously, most of those doing the actual fighting for the South did not own slaves and believed that they were fighting for their country as well.
Read and have a seminar conversation about Abraham Lincoln’s second inaugural address. Lincoln addresses many topics within the speech, both reflecting on the war and outlining a plan for after the war. In some respects, this speech is “part two” of what Lincoln began to assert in the Gettysburg Address. One of the main ideas Lincoln suggests, however, is that the Civil War was a punishment for the whole nation. This punishment was not necessarily for the mere existence of slavery but because, unlike the founding generation, the nation had in the time since the founding not continued to work for the abolition of the evil of slavery. While no country will ever be perfect, a people should work to make sure its laws do not promote the perpetuation of a practice that violates the equal natural rights of its fellow citizens.

To set up the following unit, outline for students Abraham Lincoln’s preliminary plans for reconstruction, and impress upon students the immense historical consequences of Lincoln’s assassination.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** By considering his speeches and the Emancipation Proclamation, explain how Abraham Lincoln understood the purpose(s) of the Civil War, both absolutely and as the war unfolded (2–3 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Recite by heart the Gettysburg Address.

**Assignment 3:** Retell the history of the Civil War (4–5 paragraphs).
DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. What foreign relations goal did the Confederacy place much hope in, especially early in the Civil War, due to international demand for Southern cotton?

2. Who was the first Union general whom Lincoln eventually removed from command for what amounted to a pattern of hesitation in battle, hesitation that may have cost the Union several chances to win the war relatively soon?

3. What was the name of the order given by President Lincoln that freed the slaves in the rebelling states?

4. Name one of the two Union generals who were key in successfully conducting the Union armies from 1864 onward?

5. What happened on April 14, 1865 (Good Friday), at Ford’s Theatre in Washington, DC?
Lesson 4 — Reconstruction

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the remarkable fulfillment of civil rights for freedmen during Reconstruction despite the objections of some and then the reversal of many of those realizations in former confederate states during Reconstruction and after its end in 1877.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts

Land of Hope  Pages 190–204
Primary Sources  See below.

Teacher Texts

Reconstruction  As helpful.
A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope  Pages 188–199
A Student Workbook for Land of Hope  Pages 114–117

Online.Hillsdale.edu

The Great American Story  Lecture 11
Civil Rights in American History  Lectures 4 and 5

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students read Land of Hope, pages 190–204, and either complete the reading questions handout in the A Student Workbook for Land of Hope (pages 114–117) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 2: Students read and annotate the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments and excerpts from the Civil Rights Act of 1866 and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places

Nebraska  Promontory Point, Utah
Colorado  Alaska

Persons

Andrew Johnson  Edwin Stanton
Thaddeus Stevens  Hiram Revels
Ulysses S. Grant
Lewis Howard Latimer
Elijah McCoy
Rutherford B. Hayes

Terms and Topics
Reconstruction
Presidential Reconstruction
Congressional Reconstruction
Radical Republicans
freedmen
13th, 14th, 15th Amendments
incorporation
1864 Reconstruction Act
military districts
Freedmen’s Bureau
impeachment
Civil Rights Act of 1866
sharecropping
black codes

poll tax
literacy test
Reconstruction Act of 1867
scalawags and carpetbaggers
Ku Klux Klan
lynching
Ku Klux Klan Acts
Transcontinental Railroad
Seward’s Folly
Crédit Mobilier Scandal
Panic of 1873
Jim Crow
Compromise of 1877

Primary Sources
Civil Rights Act of 1866
13th Amendment
14th Amendment
15th Amendment
Black Code from Opelousas, Louisiana

To Know by Heart
First lines of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments

Timeline
1865–77 Reconstruction
1865 Abraham Lincoln assassinated; Andrew Johnson becomes president
1868 First African American elected to Congress
1877 Compromise of 1877; Rutherford B. Hayes becomes president

Last Monday in May Memorial Day (originally Decoration Day, 1868)

Images
Historical figures and events
Maps showing the gradual re-admittance of Southern states
Photographs of African Americans in the South, both in freedom and with the heavy restrictions placed on their freedom
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Frederick Douglass reflecting on the Emancipation Proclamation taking effect
- Booker T. Washington’s account of news of the end of the Civil War reaching him as a slave
- Sidney Andrew’s account from Charleston, South Carolina following the Civil War
- The swearing in of Hiram Revels to the U.S. Senate
- Grenville Dodge’s account of the completion of the Transcontinental Railroad at Promontory Point, Utah

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What were the two major issues facing Andrew Johnson and Republicans in the North during the early years of Reconstruction?
- What were the similarities and differences between Abraham Lincoln’s plan for Reconstruction and that of the Radical Republicans, especially concerning means, manner, and ends?
- What were the sources of tension between Andrew Johnson and the Radical Republicans especially?
- How did Andrew Johnson’s Reconstruction actions differ from those of the Radical Republicans?
- What did a Confederate state have to do to be readmitted fully into the Union?
- Regarding the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments, what did each do?
- What kinds of gains did African Americans attain during Reconstruction after slavery was explicitly abolished via the 13th Amendment?
- In what ways did governments of the former Confederacy attempt to curtail the rights of freedmen during Reconstruction? How did they respond to the actions of Republicans in the North?
- What did the Freedmen’s Bureau do?
- How can Ulysses S. Grant’s presidency be characterized?
- What did the Ku Klux Klan Acts do?
- Why did the North lose much of its prewar zeal for reform?
- What happened in the election of 1876 and subsequent compromise of 1877?
- What were the immediate consequences, especially for African Americans living in the former Confederacy, of the end to Reconstruction in 1877?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 63: There are four amendments to the U.S. Constitution about who can vote. Describe one of them.
  - Question 97: What amendment gives citizenship to all persons born in the United States?
  - Question 98: When did all men get the right to vote?
  - Question 126: Name three national U.S. holidays.
  - Question 127: What is Memorial Day?

KEYS TO THE LESSON

Even before the battlefield fighting was over, a new kind of struggle would emerge to determine the status of former slaves now made free. In decisive ways, Abraham Lincoln’s assassination was devastating for the prospects of healing the nation while effectively securing the equal rights of freedmen. Not only was the desire for vengeance that Lincoln attempted to abate unleashed against the South, but the Republicans
controlling Congress themselves fought bitterly with President Andrew Johnson over the purpose and method of Reconstruction. While some remarkable gains were made for African Americans in the South, particularly in fulfilling in law the core ideas enunciated in the American founding and fought for by the Union, objections to such fulfillments remained, new injustices were established, and the management of Reconstruction was in disarray. The Compromise of 1877 ended the period of Reconstruction, leaving the protections African Americans had gained without federal protection, resulting in decades of restrictions on their rights and liberties.

Teachers might best plan and teach Reconstruction with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Have students consider the effect of Abraham Lincoln's assassination on Reconstruction and the future of America, especially as regards civil rights for African Americans. Lincoln's focus was healing the nation while simultaneously providing for the effective and long-term establishment of equal rights for African Americans. Lincoln was succeeded after his assassination by Vice President Andrew Johnson.
- The transformation of a society away from decades of slavery was no small task. Depict Reconstruction as being tragically undermined and strained by the conflicts between congressional Republicans (who strongly opposed slavery), President Andrew Johnson (a pro-Union Democrat with little sympathy for former slaves), and lawmakers in the Southern states (who mostly wished to restrict the rights of the new freedmen), all of whom operated out of distrust following a painful and bloody Civil War.
- Have students read the three amendments to the Constitution and the laws passed during Reconstruction, especially the Civil Rights Act of 1866, related to the abolition of slavery and citizenship of freedmen. It is important to note the major and meaningful efforts Republicans made to guarantee the rights of African Americans. Questions on pages 197–199 of A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope may be helpful.
- Have students track the re-admittance of Confederate states on the Reconstruction map handout (A Student Workbook for Land of Hope, pages 280–281).
- Teach students about both the important gains and protections Republicans won for African Americans during Reconstruction as well as the ways in which these were undermined by actions in the former Confederate states and Johnson himself. Students should gain an appreciation of the remarkable speed and degrees to which former slaves were incorporated into the civil body early in Reconstruction, including the thousands of African Americans who would hold office at the local, state, and even federal level. But they should also understand the ways that Johnson resisted equal treatment of African Americans and in doing so encouraged and allowed certain bad policies (such as “black codes” passed by state legislatures and movements such as what would become the Ku Klux Klan) in the former Confederacy. In fact, many of the reversals of reconstruction began during the presidential reconstruction of Johnson, who was decidedly against secession but by no means opposed to slavery. Congress repeatedly had to override his vetoes and enact Constitutional amendments to prevent his defense of inequalities. Such Congressional action, however, also laid the groundwork for the expansion of federal power into and over state law, especially through the 14th Amendment and military government.
- Have students learn about the ways in which many civil rights achievements were thwarted or undone both during and after Reconstruction. For instance, spend time discussing how as Southerners were refranchised, African American officials were voted out of office and how “black codes” would eventually become Jim Crow laws. Discuss how “black codes” limited
freedmen’s civil rights and imposed economic restrictions, including making being unemployed illegal, prohibiting landownership, requiring long-term labor contracts, prohibiting assemblies of freedmen only, prohibiting teaching freedmen to read or write, segregating public facilities, prohibiting freedmen from serving on juries, and carrying out corporal punishments for violators, among other restrictions and injustices. Read sample black codes aloud in class and discuss, such as the Black Code from Opelousas, Louisiana. Note also the use of poll taxes and literacy tests to prohibit African Americans from voting.

- Explain how sharecropping made it nearly impossible for freedmen to accumulate enough capital to purchase their own land or set-off on a different pursuit. Moreover, students should be aware of the struggle facing freedmen who were still in a society prejudiced against them, without capital, land, or even the ability to read.

- Explain the emergence of groups such as the Ku Klux Klan and the power that their intimidation of African Americans and Republicans had in diminishing the political participation of freedmen.

- Teach students how Republicans passed and President Ulysses S. Grant signed into law the Ku Klux Klan Acts to prohibit intimidation of freedmen exercising their civil rights. Grant also empowered the president to use the armed forces against those who tried to deny freedmen equal protection under the laws. Nonetheless, such measures were usually sloppily enforced.

- At the same time, note the improvements during Reconstruction in building hospitals, creating a public school system, securing civil rights in principle, and fostering community within the freedmen community, especially in marital and family stability and through vibrant churches.

- Explain that Reconstruction effectively ended with the Compromise of 1877 that settled the disputed election of 1876. Congress (now controlled by the Democratic Party) would allow Republican Rutherford B. Hayes to be declared president in exchange for his withdrawing federal troops in former confederate states. Point out that in the backdrop was both continuing Southern resistance and a gradual waning of Northern zeal for (and political interest in) reform within the South.

- Ask students to consider the tragic nature of Reconstruction: a time of so much hoped for and achieved in applying the principle of equal natural rights was repeatedly undermined and mismanaged, then suddenly ended for political expediency, enabling new forms of injustice in certain areas of the country, after a war to end injustice had consumed the lives of hundreds of thousands of Americans.

- Nevertheless, make sure students do not lose sight of the momentous achievements in liberty, equality, and self-government fulfilled because of the Civil War. Students should appreciate the very significant achievements of Lincoln and the Civil War while looking forward to future generations of Americans who would seek to live up to the fundamental principles of America in their own times.
STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS

Assignment 1: From what would have been the perspective of Abraham Lincoln, explain the ways in which Reconstruction was successful and the ways in which it was not successful (1–2 paragraphs).

Assignment 2: Retell the story of how freedmen had their freedom, natural rights, and civil rights guaranteed during Reconstruction and how certain former confederate governments curtailed or removed those freedoms both during and after Reconstruction (2–3 paragraphs).
Reading Quiz

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question.

1. What was one of the questions that the North had to answer when dealing with the South following the Civil War?

2. What event in the days following Lee’s surrender at Appomattox Court House led to a far messier, distrustful, and vengeful form of Reconstruction than may otherwise have been the case?

3. What did the Republicans in Congress do to Andrew Johnson?

4. What military hero was elected president in 1868?

5. In the Compromise of 1877, what did Republicans promise the South if the Democrats on the electoral commission would choose the Republican Rutherford B. Hayes as president?
APPENDIX A

Study Guide

Test

Writing Assignment
Study Guide — The American Civil War Test

**TIMELINE**

When given chronological dates, match events from a list to the years or dates that they happened.

1846–48  Mexican-American War
1849  California Gold Rush
1850  Compromise of 1850
1854  Kansas-Nebraska Act; Republican Party founded
1857  Dred Scott v. Sandford
1860  Election of Abraham Lincoln; South Carolina secedes
1861–65  Civil War
        April 12, 1861  Attack on Fort Sumter
        1863  Emancipation Proclamation takes effect
        July 1–3, 1863  Battle of Gettysburg
        1864  Abraham Lincoln reelected
        April 9, 1865  Robert E. Lee surrenders at Appomattox Court House
        April 14–15, 1865  Abraham Lincoln assassinated; Andrew Johnson becomes president
1865–77  Reconstruction
1877  Compromise of 1877; Rutherford B. Hayes becomes president

**GEOGRAPHY AND PLACES**

Identify each on a map and/or tell where it is and explain its significance.

Mexico  Fort Sumter  West Virginia
California  Union  Border States
Kansas-Nebraska Territory  Confederacy  Appomattox Court House
Harpers Ferry  Richmond  Ford’s Theatre

**PERSONS**

Identify each, provide biographical details, and explain what he or she thought or did in specific periods or events.

Henry Clay  Frederick Douglass  James Buchanan
John C. Calhoun  Sojourner Truth  Roger Taney
Daniel Webster  Harriet Beecher Stowe  John Brown
James K. Polk  Harriet Tubman  Jefferson Davis
Abraham Lincoln  William Lloyd Garrison  Robert E. Lee
Zachary Taylor  Franklin Pierce  George McClellan
Millard Fillmore  Stephen Douglas
### Terms and Topics

*Identify each and explain its significance to the period of history studied.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term or Topic</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Great Triumvirate</td>
<td>Majority tyranny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmot Proviso</td>
<td>“Apple and frame” metaphor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“positive good”</td>
<td>Wilberforce University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antebellum</td>
<td>Secession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gold rush</td>
<td>States’ rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromise of 1850</td>
<td>Confederate States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugitive Slave Law</td>
<td>Railroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abolitionism</td>
<td>Minié ball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass</em></td>
<td>Anaconda Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Uncle Tom’s Cabin</em></td>
<td>Army of the Potomac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground Railroad</td>
<td>Army of Northern Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know-Nothing Party</td>
<td>American Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas-Nebraska Act</td>
<td>Trench warfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“popular sovereignty”</td>
<td>Ironclads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleeding Kansas</td>
<td>USS Monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“a house divided”</td>
<td>CSS Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Party</td>
<td>Abolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Party</td>
<td>Pickett’s Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dred Scott v. Sandford</em></td>
<td>54th Massachusetts Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln-Douglas Debates</td>
<td>Writ of habeas corpus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objective truth</td>
<td>Peace Democrats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“don’t care”</td>
<td>Scorched-earth warfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moral relativism</td>
<td>Burning of Atlanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andersonville Prison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radical Republicans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freedmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1864 Reconstruction Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Military districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freedmen’s Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impeachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civil Rights Act of 1866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharecropping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruction Act of 1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scalawags and carpetbaggers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ku Klux Klan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lynching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ku Klux Klan Acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transcontinental Railroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crédit Mobilier Scandal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panic of 1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Crow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compromise of 1877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Conflicts

*Explain how each battle began, narrate what happened in it and how, and explain the significance of the battle’s outcome.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Battle</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Manassas/Bull Run</td>
<td>Fort Wagner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiloh</td>
<td>Vicksburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula Campaign</td>
<td>Gettysburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antietam</td>
<td>Chickamauga and Chattanooga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville</td>
<td>The Battle of the Wilderness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Battle of Spotsylvania
Sherman’s “March to the Sea”
Siege of Richmond

**PRIMARY SOURCES**

*Based on annotations and notes from seminar conversations, be able to answer questions on each primary source. While you will not necessarily be asked why each primary source was created, what it did or argued, and what its effects were, being able to answer these kinds of questions will make you well prepared.*

*Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass*, Frederick Douglass  
*Speech on the Kansas-Nebraska Act*, Abraham Lincoln  
*Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, Harriet Beecher Stowe  
*Dred Scott v. Sandford*, Roger Taney  
The *Dred Scott Decision and Slavery* Speech, Abraham Lincoln  
“House Divided” speech, Abraham Lincoln  
Lincoln-Douglas Debates, Abraham Lincoln and Stephen Douglas  
“The Constitution of the United States: Is It Pro-Slavery or Anti-Slavery?,” Frederick Douglass  
“Fragment on the Constitution and Union,” Abraham Lincoln  
First inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln  
Emancipation Proclamation, Abraham Lincoln  
Gettysburg Address, Abraham Lincoln  
Second inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln  
Civil Rights Act of 1866  
13th Amendment  
14th Amendment  
15th Amendment  
Black Code from Opelousas, Louisiana

**TO KNOW BY HEART**

*Fill in missing words and/or identify the speaker and context.*

“Knowledge makes a man unfit to be a slave.” —Frederick Douglass  
“So you’re the little woman who wrote the book that started this great war.” —Abraham Lincoln  
“A house divided against itself cannot stand.” —Abraham Lincoln  
“Battle Hymn of the Republic,” first stanza—Julia Ward Howe  
Gettysburg Address—Abraham Lincoln  
“So Atlanta is ours, and fairly won.” —William Tecumseh Sherman  
“Not for themselves but for their country.” — Epitaph for a monument at Antietam  
First lines of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments

**STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART**
In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be middle school students.

- Biographies and the roles of Frederick Douglass, Harriet Tubman, and Abraham Lincoln prior to the Civil War
- Childhood biography of Abraham Lincoln
- Scenes from *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass* and *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*
- Actions of Harriet Tubman and the Underground Railroad
- The first shots fired on Fort Sumter
- Biographies and roles of Abraham Lincoln, Jefferson Davis, Robert E. Lee, Ulysses S. Grant, and William Tecumseh Sherman in the Civil War
- Fighting at Little Round Top and Pickett’s Charge
- Robert E. Lee’s surrender to Ulysses S. Grant at Appomattox Court House
- Assassination of Abraham Lincoln at Ford’s Theatre and subsequent killing of John Wilkes Booth
- Frederick Douglass reflecting on the Emancipation Proclamation taking effect
- The swearing in of Hiram Revels to the U.S. Senate
- Completion of the Transcontinental Railroad at Promontory Point, Utah

**QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND**

Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.

**Lesson 1 | The Expansion of Slavery**

□ What general prediction about the future of slavery did the Framers of the Constitution make?
□ What technology invented in 1793, four years after the Constitution went into effect, revolutionized the cotton industry, resulting in a revived demand for slave labor and undermining the Founders’ predictions regarding slavery?
□ What was life like for slaves in the South? What was a slave auction like?
□ Why, politically, did the question of the expansion of slavery become so important for the slaveholding interest?
□ What were the terms of the Compromise of 1850? Was it really a “compromise”? Why or why not?
□ What were the two most controversial parts of the Compromise of 1850? What were their effects?
□ What were the various kinds of abolitionist activities engaged in by Northern abolitionists?
□ What roles did Frederick Douglass, William Lloyd Garrison, Harriet Tubman, and Harriet Beecher Stowe play in the abolitionist movement?
□ How did the Underground Railroad work?
□ What did the Kansas-Nebraska Act do?
□ What was the idea of “popular sovereignty”? Where did the idea come from and why?

**Lesson 2 | Toward Civil War**

□ What was Bleeding Kansas, what was it like, and why did it happen?
□ According to Abraham Lincoln, how does Roger Taney’s majority opinion in *Dred Scott v. Sandford* recast the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the founding ideas of equality?
According to Abraham Lincoln, how does Roger Taney’s majority opinion in *Dred Scott v. Sandford* threaten to make slavery legal anywhere in the union?

Why did Abraham Lincoln argue that Stephen Douglas’s personal stance of how he does not care (“I care not”) how a state or territory votes on slavery is dangerous and indefensible? How was this connected to Lincoln’s predictions regarding the *Dred Scott v. Sandford* decision?

Why did Abraham Lincoln believe popular sovereignty without an argument on the morality of slavery amounted to majority tyranny?

What question and answer did Abraham Lincoln consider to be the solution to the issue of the expansion of slavery?

Why did Lincoln see the question of the morality of slavery to be at the heart of America’s founding?

How did Abraham Lincoln end up winning the 1860 election?

Explain Abraham Lincoln’s arguments about the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution as explained in his “apple of gold, frame of silver” metaphor.

How did Abraham Lincoln navigate the period between his election and the first shots at Fort Sumter? How did the country descend into war during this period?

How was slavery the true cause of the Civil War?

In what ways did the Confederacy reject the principle of equality from the Declaration of Independence and insist on the *inequality* of the races?

**Lesson 3 | The Civil War**

What was the Southern states’ argument for the constitutionality of secession?

What was Abraham Lincoln’s argument that secession was unconstitutional, especially as articulated in his first inaugural address?

How did Southern states decide to secede? Which segment of the Southern population were those who actually decided for secession?

What were Jefferson Davis’s arguments on the morality and expansion of slavery, the North, and states’ rights and secession?

What was important about Virginia’s decision to secede? How did it come about?

What were Abraham Lincoln’s goals with respect to the Union and slavery at the onset of the Civil War? What were his priorities and why?

Why and how did Abraham Lincoln need to keep the border states in the Union?

What were the advantages and disadvantages that the Union and the Confederacy each faced at the outset of the war?

What was the style of warfare in the Civil War, including battlefield strategy, weapons, ammunition, medical care, etc.?

What were the overall strategies that each side pursued in the course of the war?

How did the Civil War reshape the currency and banking systems of the United States?

What was the significance of the Homestead Act of 1862 in the midst of the Civil War? What was so remarkable about this act in terms of the government’s interest in private land ownership?

What were the problems characteristic of most of the Union’s generals from 1861 until the Battle of Gettysburg, in the Virginia and Maryland theater of war?

How did Abraham Lincoln successfully approach his decision to issue the Emancipation Proclamation?

In summary, what did Abraham Lincoln argue in the Gettysburg Address?

Why were reelection prospects for Abraham Lincoln so poor for much of 1864?
What were the most significant moments in the Civil War?
What factors, figures, moments, etc., led the Union to victory?
What were Abraham Lincoln’s plans for reconstruction following the Civil War, as outlined in his second inaugural address and from what we know of his private meetings in the war’s final weeks?

Lesson 4 | Reconstruction

What were the two major issues facing Andrew Johnson and Republicans in the North during the early years of Reconstruction?
What were the similarities and differences between Abraham Lincoln’s plan for Reconstruction and that of the Radical Republicans, especially concerning means, manner, and ends?
What were the sources of tension between Andrew Johnson and the Radical Republicans especially?
How did Andrew Johnson’s Reconstruction actions differ from those of the Radical Republicans?
What did a Confederate state have to do to be readmitted fully into the Union?
Regarding the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments, what did each do?
What kinds of gains did African Americans attain during Reconstruction after slavery was explicitly abolished via the 13th Amendment?
In what ways did Southern states attempt to curtail the rights of freedmen during Reconstruction? How did they respond to the actions of Republicans in the North?
What did the Freedmen’s Bureau do?
How can Ulysses S. Grant’s presidency be characterized?
What did the Ku Klux Klan Acts do?
What happened in the election of 1876 and the subsequent Compromise of 1877?
What were the immediate consequences, especially for African Americans living in the South, of the end to Reconstruction in 1877?
Test — The American Civil War

**Timeline**

Write the letter of each event next to the date or years it took place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1846–48</td>
<td>A. Abraham Lincoln assassinated; Andrew Johnson becomes president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>B. Abraham Lincoln reelected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>C. Attack on Fort Sumter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>D. Battle of Gettysburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>E. California Gold Rush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>F. Civil War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861–65</td>
<td>G. Compromise of 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 12, 1861</td>
<td>H. Compromise of 1877; Rutherford B. Hayes president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>I. <em>Dred Scott v. Sandford</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1–3, 1863</td>
<td>J. Election of Abraham Lincoln; South Carolina secedes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>K. Emancipation Proclamation takes effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 9, 1865</td>
<td>L. Kansas-Nebraska Act; Republican Party founded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 14–15, 1865</td>
<td>M. Mexican-American War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865–77</td>
<td>N. Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>O. Robert E. Lee surrenders at Appomattox Court House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Geography and Places**

1. Outline and label the Union states, border states, and Confederate states.

2. Label Charleston, Gettysburg, Richmond, Vicksburg, and Washington, DC.

Map courtesy of *A Student Workbook for Land of Hope.*
PERSONS, TERMS, AND TOPICS

Fill in the blank.

3. The balance in power between free and slave states since the Missouri Compromise was upset by the acquisition of Texas, the Mexican-American War, and the lands procured from that conflict. The question of slavery and its expansion nearly resulted in civil war in 1850 when the California _______________ enlarged California’s population suddenly and the territory petitioned for admittance to the Union as a free state.

4. Although the _______________ kept the Union together, it was not really a compromise but a series of separate laws. While it may have postponed conflict, distrust and animosity festered over the next decade, especially in light of the hated Fugitive Slave Law, which attempted to force Northerners to assist in capturing runaway slaves.

5. An escaped slave who taught himself to read and write in the North, _______________ became a leading abolitionist and orator, powerfully employing his sufferings in slavery to move the hearts and minds of Northerners.

6. Most Northerners never came into contact with slavery, especially in the most Northern regions of the country. While most Northerners believed slavery was morally wrong, many lacked a passion for abolition until _______________’s book, Uncle Tom’s Cabin, brought the horrors of slavery to the living rooms and imaginations of Northerners. Abraham Lincoln attributed the Civil War to this “little lady.”

7. Also having escaped from slavery, _______________ was a veteran conductor on the Underground Railroad, working with hundreds of Northern abolitionists to shepherd escaped slaves to the North and into Canada.

8. As abolitionist and pro-slavery advocates flocked west of Missouri to determine whether slavery would exist there, the open conflict between these two groups known as _______________ prefigured the blood that would be shed over the question of slavery in the coming civil war.

9. In 1854, former Whigs, Free Soilers, and abolitionists formed the _______________ in opposition to the Democratic Party. Unlike the Democratic Party, which had come to promote slavery openly in the South and leave the question to majority vote in the North and West, this new party stood explicitly against the moral evil of the expansion of slavery.

10. In 1856, America’s first historically black university, named _______________ after the English abolitionist, was founded in central Ohio.

11. _______________ argued for the alleged benevolence of slavery based on life at his plantation and strongly defended the right of Southern states to secede. He resigned his seat in the United States Senate to become the president of the Confederate States of America.
12. Within the Maryland and Virginia theater of war, the Union forces were called the Army of [_________] and the Confederate forces were called the Army of [_________].

13. Having graduated at the top of his class at West Point and having served the United States faithfully for thirty-two years, [_________]’s care for, as he put it, “my relatives, my children, my home,” (i.e., Virginia) outweighed his doubts about the constitutionality of secession. He would be the most accomplished Confederate general and fight until the very end of the war.

14. Having graduated near the bottom of his class at West Point and having lived a tumultuous life of poverty and drinking, [_________]’s repeated, bold, and well-executed successes in the Mississippi–Tennessee theater garnered him a promotion to General-in-Chief of the Union forces, a position he would use to lead the Union to ultimate victory.

15. The most famous United States Colored Infantry Regiment was the [__________]. Its tragic attack on Fort Wagner in South Carolina showed Northerners that the war’s purpose, which Abraham Lincoln was about to broaden to include the end of slavery, was being fought for by those whom it was attempting to set free.

16. [_________] proved to be one of the Union’s most successful and controversial generals, especially after his “March to the Sea” campaign of scorched-earth warfare. He justified it by saying, “War is hell.” While such tactics may have hastened the South’s willingness to surrender, they also escalated the bitterness between the North and South into the years after the war.

17. Abraham Lincoln’s reelection prospects were dismal for much of 1864 until the capture and burning of [________] a few weeks before the election projected a victory for the Union and bolstered Lincoln to victory at the ballot box that November.

18. On the night of April 14 at Ford’s Theatre in Washington, DC, actor and Southern sympathizer [_________] shot Abraham Lincoln, who died the next morning, just six days after the Civil War ended. The assassin’s motive may have been outrage at public support for Lincoln’s drive to expand voting rights for African Americans.

19. With the Southern states out of the Union for the time being, Congress and the Northern states passed the Reconstruction Amendments: the [_____] Amendment explicitly prohibited slavery, the [_____] Amendment established citizenship regardless of race, and the [_____] Amendment guaranteed voting rights to all citizens regardless of race.

20. The first African Americans were elected to the U.S. Congress in 1868. Over the next decade, hundreds of African Americans were elected as Republicans to state and local offices, fifteen were elected to the U.S. House of Representatives and one, [__________], was elected to the U.S. Senate.
21. Although African Americans were freed following the Civil War, many Southern governments tried to limit their rights through ____________, including making being unemployed illegal, prohibiting assemblies of freedmen only, prohibiting teaching freedmen to read or write, segregating public facilities, prohibiting freedmen from serving on juries, and carrying out corporal punishments for violators, among other restrictions and injustices.

22. Republicans passed and President Grant signed into law the ____________ Acts to prohibit intimidation of freedmen from exercising their civil rights and to empower the president to use the armed forces against those who tried to deny freedmen equal protection under the laws.

23. Rutherford B. Hayes and Republicans on the electoral commission abandoned the protections afforded to freedmen through the federal military districts in the South in exchange for Democrats supporting Hayes for the presidency, in what was known as the ______________. The suddenness of the change in the South resulted in an undoing of some civil rights achievements of Reconstruction and paved the way for other forms of injustice.

MAJOR CONFLICTS

Explain how each battle began, narrate what happened in it and how, and explain the significance of the battle’s outcome.

24. Antietam

25. Gettysburg

26. “March to the Sea”

KNOW BY HEART

Fill in missing words and/or identify the speaker.

27. “______________ makes a man unfit to be a ____________.” —Frederick Douglass

28. “A house divided against itself cannot stand.” —______________

29. “…and that government of the ____________________________________________

____________________________ Gettysburg Address—Abraham Lincoln
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be middle school students.

30. Retell a scene from *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass* or *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*.

31. Tell the story of Pickett’s Charge.
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and writing should be employed, and responses must fully answer each question.

32. What had been the general prediction about the future of slavery by the Framers of the Constitution? Why did this not happen?

33. What was life like for slaves in the South? What was a slave auction like?

34. Why, politically, did the question of the expansion of slavery become so important for the slaveholding interest?

35. According to Abraham Lincoln, how does Roger Taney’s majority opinion in *Dred Scott v. Sandford* threaten to make slavery legal anywhere in the Union?

36. What was the idea of “popular sovereignty”? Why did Abraham Lincoln believe popular sovereignty without an argument on the morality of slavery amounted to majority tyranny?

37. Why did Lincoln see the question of the morality of slavery to be at the heart of that on which America was founded?

38. Explain Abraham Lincoln’s arguments about the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution as explained in his “apple of gold, frame of silver” metaphor.

39. What was Abraham Lincoln’s argument that secession was unconstitutional, especially as articulated in his first inaugural address?
40. What were Abraham Lincoln’s goals with respect to the Union and slavery at the onset of the Civil War? What were his priorities and why?

41. What were the advantages and disadvantages that the Union and the Confederacy each faced at the outset of the war?

42. What were the problems characteristic of most of the Union’s generals from 1861 until Gettysburg in the Virginia and Maryland theater of war?

43. How did Abraham Lincoln successfully approach his decision to issue the Emancipation Proclamation?

44. What were the most significant moments in the Civil War? What factors, figures, moments, etc., led the Union to victory?

45. What were the similarities and differences between Abraham Lincoln’s plan for Reconstruction and that of the Radical Republicans, especially concerning means, manner, and ends?

46. What kinds of gains did African Americans attain during Reconstruction after slavery was explicitly abolished via the 13th Amendment?

47. In what ways did former confederate states attempt to curtail the rights of freedmen during Reconstruction?

48. What were the immediate consequences, especially for African Americans living in the former confederacy, of the end to Reconstruction in 1877?
Writing Assignment — The American Civil War

DIRECTIONS

Citing events and primary sources in your argument, write a 500–800-word essay answering the question…

In what ways did the American Civil War prove true the principles on which America was founded while still giving the nation a “new birth of freedom”?
APPENDIX B

Primary Sources

Frederick Douglass
Abraham Lincoln
Harriet Beecher Stowe
Roger Taney
Stephen Douglas
The United States Congress
The American People
E.D. Estillette
Senator John C. Calhoun (D-SC)

On the Oregon Bill

Speech Excerpt

June 27, 1848

U.S. Senate Chamber, U.S. Capitol | Washington, D.C.

Background

Senator John C. Calhoun gave this speech in response to the Oregon Bill, which sought to organize the new territory along anti-slavery principles.

Guiding Questions

1. How does Calhoun portray the conflict between the North and the South?

2. How does Calhoun use the Constitution to justify his argument?

3. What theoretical proposition is the cause of the Union's destruction, according to Calhoun?

4. According to Calhoun, what is the relationship between the government and individual liberty?

The first question which offers itself for consideration is — Have the Northern States the power which they claim, to prevent the Southern people from emigrating freely, with their property, into territories belonging to the United States, and to monopolize them for their exclusive benefit?...

Now, I put the question solemnly to the Senators from the North: Can you rightly and justly exclude the South from territories of the United States, and monopolize them for yourselves, even if, in your opinion, you should have the power? It is this question I wish to press on your attention with all due solemnity and decorum. The North and the South stand in the relation of partners in a common Union, with equal dignity and equal rights.

We of the South have contributed our full share of funds, and shed our full share of blood for the acquisition of our territories. Can you, then, on any principle of equity and justice, deprive us of our full share in their benefit and advantage? Are you ready to affirm that a majority of the partners in a joint concern have the right to monopolize its benefits to the exclusion of the minority, even in cases where they have contributed their full share to the concern?...

I turn now to my friends of the South, and ask: What are you prepared to do? If neither the barriers of the constitution nor the high sense of right and justice should prove sufficient to protect you, are you prepared to sink down into a state of acknowledged inferiority; to be stripped of your dignity of equals among equals, and be deprived of your equality of rights in this federal partnership of States? If so, you are woefully degenerated from your sires, and will well deserve to change condition with your slaves;—but if not, prepare to meet the issue. The time is at hand, if the question should not be speedily settled, when the South must rise up, and bravely defend herself, or sink down into base and acknowledged inferiority; and it is because I clearly perceive that this period is favorable for settling it, if it is ever to be settled, that I am in favor of pressing the question now to a decision—not because I have any desire whatever to embarrass either party in reference to the Presidential election. At no other period could the two great parties into which the country is divided be made to see and feel so clearly and intensely the embarrassment and danger caused by the question. Indeed, they must be blind not to perceive that there is a power in action that
must burst asunder the ties that bind them together, strong as they are, unless it should be speedily settled. Now is the time, if ever. Cast your eyes to the North, and mark what is going on there; reflect on the tendency of events for the last three years in reference to this the most vital of all questions, and you must see that no time should be lost.

I am thus brought to the question, How can the question be settled? It can, in my opinion, be finally and permanently adjusted but one way,—and that is on the high principles of justice and the constitution. Fear not to leave it to them. The less you do the better. If the North and South cannot stand together on their broad and solid foundation, there is none other on which they can. If the obligations of the constitution and justice be too feeble to command the respect of the North, how can the South expect that she will regard the far more feeble obligations of an act of Congress? Nor should the North fear that, by leaving it where justice and the constitution leave it, she would be excluded from her full share of the territories. In my opinion, if it be left there, climate, soil, and other circumstances would fix the line between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States in about 36º 30’. It may zigzag a little, to accommodate itself to circumstances—sometimes passing to the north, and at others passing to the south of it; but that would matter little, and would be more satisfactory to all, and tend less to alienation between the two great sections, than a rigid, straight, artificial line, prescribed by an act of Congress.

And here, let me say to Senators form the North;—you make a great mistake in supposing that the portion which might fall to the south of whatever line might be drawn, if left to soil, and climate, and circumstances to determine, would be closed to the white labor of the North, because it could not mingle with slave labor without degradation. The fact is not so. There is no part of the world were agricultural, mechanical, and other descriptions of labor are more respected than in the South, with the exception of two descriptions of employment—that of menial and body servants. No Southern man—not the poorest or the lowest—will, under any circumstance, submit to perform either of them. He has too much pride for that, and I rejoice that he has. They are unsuited to the spirit of a freeman. But the man who would spurn them feels not the least degradation to work in the same field with his slave; or to be employed to work with them in the same field or in any mechanical
operation; and, when so employed, they claim the right,—and are admitted, in the country portion of the South—of sitting at the table of their employers. Can as much, on the score of equality, be said of the North? With us the two great divisions of society are not the rich and poor, but white and black; and all the former, the poor as well as the rich, belong to the upper class, and are respected and treated as equals, if honest and industrious; and hence have a position and pride of character of which neither poverty nor misfortune can deprive them.

But I go further, and hold that justice and the constitution are the easiest and safest guard on which the question can be settled, regarded in reference to party. It may be settled on that ground simply by non-action—by leaving the territories free and open to the emigration of all the world, so long as they continue so,—and when they become States, to adopt whatever constitution they please, with the single restriction, to be republican, in order to their admission into the Union. If a party cannot safely take this broad and solid position and successfully maintain it, what other can it take and maintain? If it cannot maintain itself by an appeal to the great principles of justice, the constitution, and self-government, to what other, sufficiently strong to uphold them in public opinion, can they appeal? I greatly mistake the character of the people of this Union, if such an appeal would not prove successful, if either party should have the magnanimity to step forward, and boldly make it. It would, in my opinion, be received with shouts of approbation by the patriotic and intelligent in every quarter. There is a deep feeling pervading the country that the Union and our political institutions are in danger, which such a course would dispel, and spread joy over the land.

Now is the time to take the step, and bring about a result so devoutly to be wished. I have believed, from the beginning, that this was the only question sufficiently potent to dissolve the Union, and subvert our system of government; and that the sooner it was met and settled, the safer and better for all. I have never doubted but that, if permitted to progress beyond a certain point, its settlement would become impossible, and am under deep conviction that it is now rapidly approaching it,—and that if it is ever to be averted, it must be done speedily. In uttering these opinions I look to the whole. If I speak earnestly, it is to
save and protect all. As deep as is the stake of the South in the Union and our political institutions, it is not deeper than that of the North. We shall be as well prepared and as capable of meeting whatever may come, as you.

Now, let me say, Senators, if our Union and system of government are doomed to perish, and we to share the fate of so many great people who have gone before us, the historian, who, in some future day, may record the events ending in so calamitous a result, will devote his first chapter to the ordinance of 1787, lauded as it and its authors have been, as the first of that series which led to it. His next chapter will be devoted to the Missouri compromise, and the next to the present agitation. Whether there will be another beyond, I know not. It will depend on what we may do.

If he should possess a philosophical turn of mind, and be disposed to look to more remote and recondite causes, he will trace it to a proposition which originated in a hypothetical truism, but which, as now expressed and now understood, is the most false and dangerous of all political errors. The proposition to which I allude, has become an axiom in the minds of a vast many on both sides of the Atlantic, and is repeated daily from tongue to tongue, as an established and incontrovertible truth; it is,—that “all men are born free and equal.” I am not afraid to attack error, however deeply it may be intrenched, or however widely extended, whenever it becomes my duty to do so, as I believe it to be on this subject and occasion.

Taking the proposition literally (it is in that sense it is understood), there is not a word of truth in it. It begins with “all men are born,” which is utterly untrue. Men are not born. Infants are born. They grow to be men. And concludes with asserting that they are born “free and equal,” which is not less false. They are not born free. While infants they are incapable of freedom, being destitute alike of the capacity of thinking and acting, without which there can be no freedom. Besides, they are necessarily born subject to their parents, and remain so among all people, savage and civilized, until the development of their intellect and physical capacity enables them to take care of themselves. They grow to all the freedom of which the condition in which they were born permits, by growing to be men.
Nor is it less false that they are born “equal.” They are not so in any sense in which it can be regarded; and thus, as I have asserted, there is not a word of truth in the whole proposition, as expressed and generally understood.

If we trace it back, we shall find the proposition differently expressed in the Declaration of Independence. That asserts that “all men are created equal.” The form of expression, though less dangerous, is not less erroneous. All men are not created. According to the Bible, only two—a man and a woman—ever were—and of these one was pronounced subordinate to the other. All others have come into the world by being born, and in no sense, as I have shown, either free or equal. But this form of expression being less striking and popular, has given way to the present, and under the authority of a document put forth on so great an occasion, and leading to such important consequences, has spread far and wide, and fixed itself deeply in the public mind. It was inserted in our Declaration of Independence without any necessity. It made no necessary part of our justification in separating from the parent country, and declaring ourselves independent. Breach of our chartered privileges, and lawless encroachment on our acknowledged and well-established rights by the parent country, were the real causes,—and of themselves sufficient, without resorting to any other, to justify the step. Nor had it any weight in constructing the governments which were substituted in the place of the colonial. They were formed of the old materials and on practical and well-established principles, borrowed for the most part from our own experience and that of the country from which we sprang.

If the proposition be traced still further back, it will be found to have been adopted from certain writers in government who had attained much celebrity in the early settlement of these States, and with whose writings all the prominent actors in our revolution were familiar. Among these, Locke and Sydney were prominent. But they expressed it very differently. According to their expression, “all men in the state of nature were free and equal.” From this the others were derived; and it was this to which I referred when I called it a hypothetical truism;—to understand why, will require some explanation.
Man, for the purpose of reasoning, may be regarded in three different states: in a state of individuality; that is, living by himself apart from the rest of his species. In the social; that is, living in society, associated with others of his species. And in the political; that is, living under government. We may reason as to what would be his rights and duties in either, without taking into consideration whether he could exist in it or not. It is certain, that in the first, the very supposition that he lived apart and separated from all others would make him free and equal. No one in such a state could have the right to command or control another. Every man would be his own master, and might do just as he pleased. But it is equally clear, that man cannot exist in such a state; that he is by nature social, and that society is necessary, not only to the proper development of all his faculties, moral and intellectual, but to the very existence of his race. Such being the case, the state is a purely hypothetical one; and when we say all men are free and equal in it, we announce a mere hypothetical truism; that is, a truism resting on a mere supposed stake that cannot exist, and of course one of little or no practical value.

But to call it a state of nature was a great misnomer, and has led to dangerous errors; for that cannot justly be called a state of nature which is so opposed to the constitution of man as to be inconsistent with the existence of his race and the development of the high faculties, mental and moral, with which he is endowed by his Creator.

Nor is the social state of itself his natural state; for society can no more exist without government, in one form or another, than man without society. It is the political, then, which includes the social, that is his natural state. It is the one for which his Creator formed him,—into which he is impelled irresistibly,—and in which only his race can exist and all its faculties be fully developed.

Such being the case, it follows that any, the worst form of government, is better than anarchy; and that individual liberty, or freedom, must be subordinate to whatever power may be necessary to protect society against anarchy within or destruction from without; for the safety and well-being of society is as paramount to individual liberty, as the safety and well-being of the race is to that of individuals; and in the same proportion the power necessary
for the safety of society is paramount to individual liberty. On the contrary, government
has no right to control individual liberty beyond what is necessary to the safety and well-
being of society. Such is the boundary which separates the power of government and the
liberty of the citizen or subject in the political state, which, as I have shown, is the natural
state of man—the only one in which his race can exist, and the one in which he is born,
lives, and dies.

It follows from this that all the quantum of power on the part of the government, and of
liberty on that of individuals, instead of being equal in all cases, must necessarily be very
unequal among different people, according to their different conditions. For just in pro-
portion as a people are ignorant, stupid, debased, corrupt, exposed to violence within, and
danger from without, the power necessary for government to possess, in order to preserve
society against anarchy and destruction, becomes greater and greater, and individual lib-
erty less and less, until the lowest condition is reached,—when absolute and despotic power
becomes necessary on the part of the government, and individual liberty extinct. So, on the
contrary, just as a people rise in the scale of intelligence, virtue, and patriotism, and the
more perfectly they become acquainted with the nature of government, the ends for which
it was ordered, and how it ought to be administered, and the less the tendency to violence
and disorder within, and danger from abroad,—the power necessary for government be-
comes less and less, and individual liberty greater and greater. Instead, then, of all men
having the same right to liberty and equality, as is claimed by those who hold that they are
all born free and equal, liberty is the noble and highest reward bestowed on mental and
moral development, combined with favorable circumstances. Instead, then, of liberty and
equality being born with men,—instead of all men and all classes and descriptions being
equally entitled to them, they are high prizes to be won, and are in their most perfect state,
not only the highest reward that can be bestowed on our race, but the most difficult to be
won,—and when won, the most difficult to be preserved.

They have been made vastly more so by the dangerous error I have attempted to expose,—
that all men are born free and equal,—as if those high qualities belonged to man without
effort to acquire them, and to all equally alike, regardless of their intellectual and moral
condition. The attempt to carry into practice this, the most dangerous of all political errors, and to bestow on all,—without regard to their fitness either to acquire or maintain liberty,—that unbounded and individual liberty supposed to belong to man in the hypothetical and misnamed state of nature, has done more to retard the cause of liberty and civilization, and is doing more at present, than all other causes combined. While it is powerful to pull down governments, it is still more powerful to prevent their construction on proper principles. It is the leading cause among those which have placed Europe in its present anarchical condition, and which mainly stands in the way of reconstructing good governments in the place of those which have been overthrown,—threatening thereby the quarter of the globe most advanced in progress and civilization with hopeless anarchy,—to be followed by military despotism. Nor are we exempt from its disorganizing effects. We now begin to experience the danger of admitting so great an error to have a place in the declaration of our independence. For a long time it lay dormant; but in the process of time it began to germinate, and produce its poisonous fruits. It had strong hold on the mind of Mr. Jefferson, the author of that document, which caused him to take an utterly false view of the subordinate relation of the black to the white race in the South; and to hold, in consequence, that the latter, though utterly unqualified to possess liberty, were as fully entitled to both liberty and equality as the former; and that to deprive them of it was unjust and immoral. To this error, his proposition to exclude slavery from the territory northwest of the Ohio may be traced,—and to that of the ordinance of 1787,—and through it the deep and dangerous agitation which now threatens to engulf, and will certainly engulf, if not speedily settled, our political institutions, and involve the country in countless woes.
BACKGROUND

The former slave and abolitionist Frederick Douglass wrote this autobiography on his life as a slave and his eventual escape and life in freedom.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Who was Douglass’ father?
2. What accounts does Douglass give of his childhood and life as a slave?
3. Why does Douglass go to Baltimore the first time?
4. What happens on Douglass's first escape attempt?
5. How does Douglass end up escaping?

Frederick Douglass, Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass: An American Slave (Boston: Anti-Slavery Office, 1845).
I WAS born in Tuckahoe, near Hillsborough, and about twelve miles from Easton, in Talbot county, Maryland. I have no accurate knowledge of my age, never having seen any authentic record containing it. By far the larger part of the slaves know as little of their ages as horses know of theirs, and it is the wish of most masters within my knowledge to keep their slaves thus ignorant. I do not remember to have ever met a slave who could tell of his birthday. They seldom come nearer to it than planting-time, harvest-time, cherry-time, spring-time, or fall-time. A want of information concerning my own was a source of unhappiness to me even during childhood. The white children could tell their ages. I could not tell why I ought to be deprived of the same privilege. I was not allowed to make any inquiries of my master concerning it. He deemed all such inquiries on the part of a slave improper and impertinent, and evidence of a restless spirit. The nearest estimate I can give makes me now between twenty-seven and twenty-eight years of age. I come to this, from hearing my master say, some time during 1835, I was about seventeen years old.

My mother was named Harriet Bailey. She was the daughter of Isaac and Betsey Bailey, both colored, and quite dark. My mother was of a darker complexion than either my grandmother or grandfather.

My father was a white man. He was admitted to be such by all I ever heard speak of my parentage. The opinion was also whispered that my master was my father; but of the correctness of this opinion, I know nothing; the means of knowing was withheld from me. My mother and I were separated when I was but an infant—before I knew her as my mother. It is a common custom, in the part of Maryland from which I ran away, to part children from their mothers at a very early age. Frequently, before the child has reached its twelfth month, its mother is taken from it, and hired out on some farm a considerable distance off, and the child is placed under the care of an old woman, too old for field labor. For what this separation is done, I do not know, unless it be to hinder the development of the child's affection toward its mother, and to blunt and destroy the natural affection of the mother for the child. This is the inevitable result.
I never saw my mother, to know her as such, more than four or five times in my life; and each of these times was very short in duration, and at night. She was hired by a Mr. Stewart, who lived about twelve miles from my home. She made her journeys to see me in the night, travelling the whole distance on foot, after the performance of her day’s work. She was a field hand, and a whipping is the penalty of not being in the field at sunrise, unless a slave has special permission from his or her master to the contrary—a permission which they seldom get, and one that gives to him that gives it the proud name of being a kind master.

I do not recollect of ever seeing my mother by the light of day. She was with me in the night. She would lie down with me, and get me to sleep, but long before I waked she was gone.

Very little communication ever took place between us. Death soon ended what little we could have while she lived, and with it her hardships and suffering.

She died when I was about seven years old, on one of my master’s farms, near Lee’s Mill. I was not allowed to be present during her illness, at her death, or burial. She was gone long before I knew anything about it. Never have enjoyed, to any considerable extent, her soothing presence, her tender and watchful care, I received the tidings of her death with much the same emotions I should have probably felt at the death of a stranger.

Called thus suddenly away, she left me without the slightest intimation of who my father was. The whisper that my master was my father, may or may not be true; and, true or false, it is of but little consequence to my purpose whilst the fact remains, in all its glaring odiousness, that slaveholders have ordained, and by law established, that the children of slave women shall in all cases follow the condition of their mothers; and this is done too obviously to administer to their own lusts, and make a gratification of their wicked desires profitable as well as pleasurable; for by this cunning arrangement, the slaveholder, in cases not a few, sustains to his slaves the double relation of master and father.

I know of such cases, and it is worthy, of remark that such slaves invariably suffer greater hardships, and have more to contend with, than others. They are, in the first place, a constant offence to their mistress. She is ever disposed to find fault with them; they can seldom do anything to please her; she is never better pleased than when she sees them under the
lash, especially when she suspects her husband of showing to his mulatto children favors which he withholds from his black slaves. The master is frequently compelled to sell this class of his slaves, out of deference to the feelings of his white wife; and, cruel as the deed may strike any one to be, for a man to sell his own children to human flesh-mongers, it is often the dictate of humanity for him to do so; for, unless he does this, he must not only whip them himself, but must stand by and see one white son tie up his brother, of but few shades darker complexion than himself, and ply the gory lash to his naked back; and if he lisp one word of disapproval, “it is set down to his parental partiality, and only makes a bad matter worse, both for himself and the slave whom he would protect and defend.

Every year brings with it multitudes of this class of slaves. It was doubtless in consequence of a knowledge of this fact, that one great statesman of the south predicted the downfall of slavery by the inevitable laws of population. Whether this prophecy is ever fulfilled or not, it is nevertheless plain that a very different-looking class of people are springing up at the south, and are now held in slavery, from those originally brought to this country from Africa; and if their increase will do no other good, it will do away the force of the argument, that God cursed Ham, and therefore American slavery is right. If the lineal descendants of Ham are alone to be scripturally enslaved, it is certain that slavery at the south must soon become unscriptural; for thousands are ushered into the world, annually, who, like myself, owe their existence to white fathers, and those fathers most frequently their own masters.

I have had two masters. My first master’s name was Anthony. I do not remember his first name. He was generally called Captain Anthony—a title which, I presume, he acquired by sailing a craft on the Chesapeake Bay. He was not considered a rich slaveholder. He owned two or three farms, and about thirty slaves. His farms and slaves were under the care of an overseer. The overseer’s name was Plummer. Mr. Plummer was a miserable drunkard, a profane swearer, and a savage monster. He always went armed with a cowskin and a heavy cudgel. I have known him to cut and slash the women’s heads so horribly, that even master would be enraged at his cruelty, and would threaten to whip him if he did not mind himself. Master, however, was not a humane slaveholder. It required extraordinary barbarity on the part of an overseer to affect him. He was a cruel man, hardened by a long life of slave-
holding. He would at times seem to take great pleasure in whipping a slave. I have often been awakened at the dawn of day by the most heart-rending shrieks of an own aunt of mine, whom he used to tie up to a joist, and whip upon her naked back till she was literally covered with blood. No words, no tears, no prayers, from his gory victim, seemed to move his iron heart from its bloody purpose. The louder she screamed, the harder he whipped; and where the blood ran fastest, there he whipped longest. He would whip her to make her scream, and whip her to make her hush; and not until overcome by fatigue, would he cease to swing the blood-clotted cowskin. I remember the first time I ever witnessed this horrible exhibition. I was quite a child, but I well remember it. I never shall forget it whilst I remember any thing. It was the first of a long series of such outrages, of which I was doomed to be a witness and a participant. It struck me with awful force. It was the blood-stained gate, the entrance to the hell of slavery, through which I was about to pass. It was a most terrible spectacle. I wish I could commit to paper the feelings with which I beheld it….

It is partly in consequence of such facts, that slaves, when inquired of as to their condition and the character of their masters, almost universally say they are contented, and that their masters are kind. The slaveholders have been known to send in spies among their slaves, to ascertain their views and feelings in regard to their condition. The frequency of this has had the effect to establish among the slaves the maxim, that a still tongue makes a wise head. They suppress the truth rather than take the consequences of telling it, and in so doing prove themselves a part of the human family. If they have any thing to say of their masters, it is generally in their masters' favor, especially when speaking to an untried man. I have been frequently asked, when a slave, if I had a kind master, and do not remember ever to have given a negative answer; nor did I, in pursuing this course, consider myself as uttering what was absolutely false; for I always measured the kindness of my master by the standard of kindness set up among slaveholders around us. Moreover, slaves are like other people, and imbibe prejudices quite common to others. They think their own better than that of others. Many, under the influence of this prejudice, think their own masters are better than the masters of other slaves; and this, too, in some cases, when the very reverse is true. Indeed, it is not uncommon for slaves even to fall out and quarrel among themselves.
about the relative goodness of their masters, each contending for the superior goodness of
his own over that of the others. At the very same time, they mutually execrate their masters
when viewed separately. It was so on our plantation. When Colonel Lloyd’s slaves met the
slaves of Jacob Jepson, they seldom parted without a quarrel about their masters; Colonel
Lloyd’s slaves contending that he was the richest, and Mr. Jepson’s slaves that he was the
smartest, and most of a man. Colonel Lloyd’s slaves would boast his ability to buy and sell
Jacob Jepson. Mr. Jepson’s slaves would boast his ability to whip Colonel Lloyd. These quar-
rels would almost always end in a fight between the parties, and those that whipped were
supposed to have gained the point at issue. They seemed to think that the greatness of their
masters was transferable to themselves. It was considered as being bad enough to be a slave;
but to be a poor man’s slave was deemed a disgrace indeed!….

As to my own treatment while I lived on Colonel Lloyd’s plantation, it was very similar to
that of the other slave children. I was not old enough to work in the field, and there being
little else than field work to do, I had a great deal of leisure time. The most I had to do was
to drive up the cows at evening, keep the fowls out of the garden, keep the front yard clean,
and run of errands for my old master’s daughter, Mrs. Lucretia Auld. The most of my lei-
sure time I spent in helping Master Daniel Lloyd in finding his birds, after he had shot
them. My connection with Master Daniel was of some advantage to me. He became quite
attached to me, and was a sort of protector of me. He would not allow the older boys to
impose upon me, and would divide his cakes with me.

I was seldom whipped by my old master, and suffered little from any thing else than hunger
and cold. I suffered much from hunger, but much more from cold. In hottest summer and
coldest winter, I was kept almost naked—no shoes, no stockings, no jacket, no trousers,
nothing on but a coarse tow linen shirt, reaching only to my knees. I had no bed. I must
have perished with cold, but that, the coldest nights, I used to steal a bag which was used
for carrying corn to the mill. I would crawl into this bag, and there sleep on the cold, damp,
clay floor, with my head in and feet out. My feet have been so cracked with the frost, that
the pen with which I am writing might be laid in the gashes.
We were not regularly allowanced. Our food was coarse corn meal boiled. This was called mush. It was put into a large wooden tray or trough, and set down upon the ground. The children were then called, like so many pigs, and like so many pigs they would come and devour the mush; some with oyster shells, others with pieces of shingle, some with naked hands, and none with spoons. He that ate fastest got most; he that was strongest secured the best place; and few left the trough satisfied. I was probably between seven and eight years old when I left Colonel Lloyd's plantation. I left it with joy. I shall never forget the ecstasy with which I received the intelligence that my old master (Anthony) had determined to let me go to Baltimore, to live with Mr. Hugh Auld, brother to my old master's son-in-law, Captain Thomas Auld. I received this information about three days before my departure. They were three of the happiest days I ever enjoyed. I spent the most part of all these three days in the creek, washing off the plantation scurf, and preparing myself for my departure.

The pride of appearance which this would indicate was not my own. I spent the time in washing, not so much because I wished to, but because Mrs. Lucretia had told me I must get all the dead skin off my feet and knees before I could go to Baltimore; for the people in Baltimore were very cleanly, and would laugh at me if I looked dirty. Besides, she was going to give me a pair of trousers, which I should not put on unless I got all the dirt off me. The thought of owning a pair of trousers was great indeed! It was almost a sufficient motive, not only to make me take off what would be called by pig-drovers the mange, but the skin itself. I went at it in good earnest, working for the first time with the hope of reward.

The ties that ordinarily bind children to their homes were all suspended in my case. I found no severe trial in my departure. My home was charmless; it was not home to me; on parting from it, I could not feel that I was leaving any thing which I could have enjoyed by staying. My mother was dead, my grandmother lived far off, so that I seldom saw her. I had two sisters and one brother, that lived in the same house with me; but the early separation of us from our mother had well nigh blotted the fact of our relationship from our memories. I looked for home elsewhere, and was confident of finding none which I should relish less than the one which I was leaving. If, however, I found in my new home hardship, hunger,
whipping, and nakedness, I had the consolation that I should not have escaped any one of them by staying. Having already had more than a taste of them in the house of my old master, and having endured them there, I very naturally inferred my ability to endure them elsewhere, and especially at Baltimore; for I had something of the feeling about Baltimore that is expressed in the proverb, that “being hanged in England is preferable to dying a natural death in Ireland.” I had the strongest desire to see Baltimore. Cousin Tom, though not fluent in speech, had inspired me with that desire by his eloquent description of the place. I could never point out any thing at the Great House, no matter how beautiful or powerful, but that he had seen something at Baltimore far exceeding, both in beauty and strength, the object which I pointed out to him. Even the Great House itself, with all its pictures, was far inferior to many buildings in Baltimore. So strong was my desire, that I thought a gratification of it would fully compensate for whatever loss of comforts I should sustain by the exchange. I left without a regret, and with the highest hopes of future happiness.

We sailed out of Miles River for Baltimore on a Saturday morning. I remember only the day of the week, for at that time I had no knowledge of the days of the month, nor the months of the year. On setting sail, I walked aft, and gave to Colonel Lloyd’s plantation what I hoped would be the last look. I then placed myself in the bows of the sloop, and there spent the remainder of the day in looking ahead, interesting myself in what was in the distance rather than in things near by or behind.

In the afternoon of that day, we reached Annapolis, the capital of the State. We stopped but a few moments, so that I had no time to go on shore. It was the first large town that I had ever seen, and though it would look small compared with some of our New England factory villages, I thought it a wonderful place for its size – more imposing even than the Great House Farm

We arrived at Baltimore early on Sunday morning, landing at Smith’s Wharf, not far from Bowley’s Wharf. We had on board the sloop a large flock of sheep; and after aiding in driving them to the slaughter house of Mr. Curtis on Louden Slater’s Hill, I was conducted by
Rich, one of the hands belonging on board of the sloop, to my new home in Alliciana Street, near Mr. Gardner’s ship-yard, on Fells Point.

Mr. and Mrs. Auld were both at home, and met me at the door with their little son Thomas, to take care of whom I had been given. And here I saw what I had never seen before; it was a white face beaming with the most kindly emotions; it was the face of my new mistress, Sophia Auld. I wish I could describe the rapture that flashed through my soul as I beheld it. It was a new and strange sight to me, brightening up my pathway with the light of happiness. Little Thomas was told, there was his Freddy, - and I was told to take care of little Thomas; and thus I entered upon the duties of my new home with the most cheering prospect ahead.

I look upon my departure from Colonel Lloyd’s plantation as one of the most interesting events of my life. It is possible, and even quite probable, that but for the mere circumstance of being removed from that plantation to Baltimore, I should have to-day, instead of being here seated by my own table, in the enjoyment of freedom and the happiness of home, writing this Narrative, been confined in the galling chains of slavery. Going to live at Baltimore laid the foundation, and opened the gateway, to all my subsequent prosperity. I have ever regarded it as the first plain manifestation of that kind providence which ever since attended me, and marked my life with so many favors. I regarded the selection of myself as being somewhat remarkable. There were a number of slave children that might have been sent from the plantation to Baltimore. There were those younger, those older, and those of the same age. I was chosen from among them all, and was the first, last, and only choice.

I may be deemed superstitious, and even egotistical, in regarding this event as a special interposition of divine Providence in my favor. But I should be false to the earliest sentiments of my soul, if I suppressed the opinion. I prefer to be true to myself, even at the hazard of incurring the ridicule of others, rather than to be false, and incur my own abhorrence. From my earliest recollection, I date the entertainment of a deep conviction that slavery would not always be able to hold me within its foul embrace; and in the darkest hours of my career in slavery, this living word of faith and spirit of hope departed not from
me, but remained like ministering angels to cheer me through the gloom. This good spirit was from God, and to him I offer thanksgiving and praise.....

I often found myself regretting my own existence, and wishing myself dead; and but for the hope of being free, I have no doubt but that I should have killed myself, or done something for which I should have been killed. While in this state of mind, I was eager to hear any one speak of slavery. I was a ready listener. Every little while, I could hear something about the abolitionists. It was some time before I found what the word meant. It was always used in such connections as to make it an interesting word to me. If a slave ran away and succeeded in getting clear, or if a slave killed his master, set fire to a barn, or did anything very wrong in the mind of a slaveholder, it was spoken of as the fruit of abolition. Hearing the word in this connection very often, I set about learning what it meant. The dictionary afforded me little or no help. I found it was “the act of abolishing;” but then I did not know what was to be abolished. Here I was perplexed. I did not dare to ask any one about its meaning, for I was satisfied that it was something they wanted me to know very little about. After a patient waiting, I got one of our city papers, containing an account of the number of petitions from the north, praying for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and of the slave trade between the States. From this time I understood the words abolition and abolitionist, and always drew near when that word was spoken, expecting to hear something of importance to myself and fellow-slaves. The light broke in upon me by degrees. I went one day down on the wharf of Mr. Waters; and seeing two Irishmen unloading a scow of stone, I went, unasked, and helped them. When we had finished, one of them came to me and asked me if I were a slave. I told him I was. He asked, “Are ye a slave for life ” I told him that I was. The good Irishman seemed to be deeply affected by the statement. He said to the other that it was a pity so fine a little fellow as myself should be a slave for life. He said it was a shame to hold me. They both advised me to run away to the north; that I should find friends there, and that I should be free. I pretended not to be interested in what they said, and treated them as if I did not understand them; for I feared they might be treacherous. White men have been known to encourage slaves to escape, and then, to get the reward, catch them and return them to their masters. I was afraid that these seemingly good
men might use me so; but I nevertheless remembered their advice, and from that time I resolved to run away. I looked forward to a time at which it would be safe for me to escape. I was too young to think of doing so immediately; besides, I wished to learn how to write, as I might have occasion to write my own pass. I consoled myself with the hope that I should one day find a good chance. Meanwhile, I would learn to write.

The idea as to how I might learn to write was suggested to me by being in Durgin and Bailey's ship yard, and frequently seeing the ship carpenters, after hewing, and getting a piece of timber ready for use, write on the timber the name of that part of the ship for which it was intended. When a piece of timber was intended for the larboard side, it would be marked thus—“L.” When a piece was for the starboard side, it would be marked thus—“S.” A piece for the larboard side forward, would be marked thus—“L. F.” When a piece was for starboard side forward, it would be marked thus—“S. F.” For larboard aft, it would be marked thus—“L.A.” For starboard aft, it would be marked thus—“S. A.” I soon learned the names of these letters, and for what they were intended when placed upon a piece of timber in the ship-yard. I immediately commenced copying them, and in a short time was able to make the four letters named. After that, when I met with any boy who I knew could write, I would tell him I could write as well as he. The next word would be, “I don’t believe you. Let me see you try it.” I would then make the letters which I had been so fortunate as to learn, and ask him to beat that. In this way I got a good many lessons in writing, which it is quite possible I should never have gotten in any other way. During this time, my copy-book was the board fence, brick wall, and pavement; my pen and ink was a lump of chalk. With these, I learned mainly how to write. I then commenced and continued copying the Italics in Webster’s Spelling Book, until I could make them all without looking on the book. By the time, my little Master Thomas had gone to school, and learned how to write, and had written over a number of copy-books. These had been brought home, and shown to some of our near neighbors, and then laid aside. My mistress used to go to class meeting at the Wilk Street meeting-house every Monday afternoon, and leave me to take care of the house. When left thus, I used to spend the time in writing in the spaces left in Master Thomas’s copy-book, copying what he had written. I continued to do this until I could
write a hand very similar to that of Master Thomas. Thus after a long tedious effort for years, I finally succeeded in learning to write…..

At the close of the year 1834, Mr. Freeland again hired me of my master, for the year 1835. But, by this time, I began to want to live upon free land as well as with Freeland; and I was no longer content, therefore, to live with him or any other slaveholder. I began, with the commencement of the year, to prepare myself for a final struggle, which should decide my fate one way or the other. My tendency was upward. I was fast approaching manhood, and year after year had passed, and I was still a slave. These thoughts roused me—I must do something. I therefore resolved that 1835 should not pass without witnessing an attempt, on my part, to secure my liberty. But I was not willing to cherish this determination alone. My fellow-slaves were dear to me. I was anxious to have them participate with me in this, my life-giving determination. I therefore, though with great prudence, commenced early to ascertain their views and feelings in regard to their condition, and to imbue their minds with thoughts of freedom. I bent myself to devising ways and means for our escape, and meanwhile strove, on all fitting occasions, to impress them with the gross fraud and inhumanity of slavery. I went first to Henry, next to John, then to the others. I found, in them all, warm hearts and noble spirits. They were ready to hear, and ready to act when a feasible plan should be proposed. This was what I wanted. I talked to them of our want of manhood, if we submitted to our enslavement without at least one noble effort to be free. We met often, and consulted frequently, and told our hopes and fears, recounted the difficulties, real and imagined, which we should be called on to meet. At times we were almost disposed to give up, and try to content ourselves with our wretched lot; at others, we were firm and unbending in our determination to go. Whenever we suggested any plan, there was shrinking—the odds were fearful. Our path was beset with the greatest obstacles; and if we succeeded in gaining the end of it, our right to be free was yet questionable—we were yet liable to be returned to bondage. We could see no spot, this side of the ocean, where we could be free. We knew nothing about Canada. Our knowledge of the north did not extend farther than New York; and to go there, and be forever harassed with the frightful liability of being returned to slavery—with the certainty of being treated tenfold worse than before—the
thought was truly a horrible one, and one which it was not easy to overcome. The case sometimes stood thus: At every gate through which we were to pass, we saw a watchman—at every ferry a guard—on every bridge a sentinel—and in every wood a patrol. We were hemmed in upon every side. Here were the difficulties, real or imagined—the good to be sought, and the evil to be shunned. On the one hand, there stood slavery, a stern reality, glaring frightfully upon us, - its robes already crimsoned with the blood of millions, and even now feasting itself greedily upon our own flesh. On the other hand, away back in the dim distance, under the flickering light of the north star, behind some craggy hill or snow-covered mountain, stood a doubtful freedom—half frozen—beckoning us to come and share its hospitality. This in itself was sometimes enough to stagger us; but when we permitted ourselves to survey the road, we were frequently appalled. Upon either side we saw grim death, assuming the most horrid shapes. Now it was starvation, causing us to eat our own flesh; —now we were contending with the waves, and were drowned; —now we were over taken, and torn to pieces by the fangs of the terrible bloodhound. We were stung by scorpions, chased by wild beasts, bitten by snakes, and finally, after having nearly reached the desired spot, — after swimming rivers, encountering wild beasts, sleeping in the woods, suffering hunger and nakedness, -we were overtaken by our pursuers, and, in our resistance, we were shot dead upon the spot! I say, this picture sometimes appalled us, and made us “rather bear those ills we had, Than fly to others, that we knew not of.” In coming to a fixed determination to run away, we did more than Patrick Henry, when he resolved upon liberty or death. With us it was a doubtful liberty at most, and almost certain death if we failed. For my part, I should prefer death to hopeless bondage.

Sandy, one of our number, gave up the notion, but still encouraged us. Our company then consisted of Henry Harris, John Harris, Henry Bailey, Charles Roberts, and myself. Henry Bailey was my uncle, and belonged to my master. Charles married my aunt: he belonged to my master's father-in-law, Mr. William Hamilton.

The plan we finally concluded upon was, to get a large canoe belonging to Mr. Hamilton, and upon the Saturday night previous to Easter holidays, paddle directly up the Chesapeake Bay. On our arrival at the head of the bay, a distance of seventy or eighty miles from where
we lived, it was our purpose to turn our canoe adrift, and follow the guidance of the north star till we got beyond the limits of Maryland. Our reason for taking the water route was, that we were less liable to be suspected as runaways; we hoped to be regarded as fishermen; whereas, if we should take the land route, we should be subjected to interruptions of almost every kind. Any one having a white face, and being so disposed, could stop us, and subject us to examination.

The week before our intended start, I wrote several protections, one for each of us. As well as I can remember, they were in the following words, to wit: “THIS is to certify that I, the undersigned, have given the bearer, my servant, full liberty to go to Baltimore, and spend the Easter holidays. Written with mine own hand, &c., 1835. - “WILLIAM HAMILTON, Near St. Michael’s, in Talbot county, Maryland.”

We were not going to Baltimore; but, in going up the bay, we went toward Baltimore, and these protections were only intended to protect us while on the bay.

As the time drew near for our departure, our anxiety became more and more intense. It was truly a matter of life and death with us. The strength of our determination was about to be fully tested. At this time, I was very active in explaining every difficulty, removing every doubt, dispelling every fear, and inspiring all with the firmness indispensable to success in our undertaking; assuring them that half was gained the instant we made the move; we had talked long enough; we were now ready to move; if not now, we never should be; and if we did not intend to move now, we had as well fold our arms, sit down, and acknowledge ourselves fit only to be slaves. This, none of us were prepared to acknowledge. Every man stood firm; and at our last meeting, we pledged our selves afresh, in the most solemn manner, that, at the time appointed, we would certainly start in pursuit of freedom. This was in the middle of the week, at the end of which we were to be off. We went, as usual, to our several fields of labor, but with bosoms highly agitated with thoughts of our truly hazardous undertaking. We tried to conceal our feelings as much as possible; and I think we succeeded very well.
After a painful waiting, the Saturday morning, whose night was to witness our departure, came. I hailed it with joy, bring what of sadness it might. Friday night was a sleepless one for me. I probably felt more anxious than the rest, because I was, by common consent, at the head of the whole affair. The responsibility of success or failure lay heavily upon me. The glory of the one, and the confusion of the other, were alike mine. The first two hours of that morning were such as I never experienced before, and hope never to again. Early in the morning, we went, as usual, to the field. We were spreading manure; and all at once, while thus engaged, I was overwhelmed with an indescribable feeling, in the fulness of which I turned to Sandy, who was near by, and said, “We are betrayed!” “Well,” said he, “that thought has this moment struck me.” We said no more. I was never more certain of anything.

The horn was blown as usual, and we went up from the field to the house for breakfast. I went for the form, more than for want of any thing to eat that morning. Just as I got to the house, in looking out at the lane gate, I saw four white men, with two colored men. The white men were on horseback, and the colored ones were walking behind, as if tied. I watched them a few moments till they got up to our lane gate. Here they halted, and tied the colored men to the gate-post. I was not yet certain as to what the matter was. In a few moments, in rode Mr. Hamilton, with a speed betokening great excitement. He came to the door, and inquired if Master William was in. He was told he was at the barn. Mr. Hamilton, without dismounting, rode up to the barn with extraordinary speed. He came to the door, and inquired if Master William was in. He was told he was at the barn. Mr. Hamilton, with out dismounting, rode up to the barn with extraordinary speed. In a few moments, he and Mr. Freeland returned to the house. By this time, the three constables rode up, and in great haste dismounted, tied their horses, and met Master William and Mr. Hamilton returning from the barn; and after talking awhile, they all walked up to the kitchen door. There was no one in the kitchen but myself and John. Henry and Sandy were up at the barn. Mr. Freeland put his head in at the door, and called me by name, saying, there were some gentlemen at the door who wished to see me. I stepped to the door, and inquired what they wanted. They at once seized me, and, without giving me any satisfaction, tied me — lashing my hands closely together. I insisted upon knowing what the matter was. They at length
said, that they had learned I had been in a “scrape,” and that I was to be examined before my master; and if their information proved false, I should not be hurt.

In a few moments, they succeeded in tying John. They then turned to Henry, who had by this time returned, and commanded him to cross his hands. “I won’t!” said Henry, in a firm tone, indicating his readiness to meet the consequences of his refusal. “Won’t you?” said Tom Graham, the constable. “No, I won’t!” said Henry, in a still stronger tone. With this, two of the constables pulled out their shining pistols, and swore, by their Creator, that they would make him cross his hands or kill him. Each cocked his pistol, and, with fingers on the trigger, walked up to Henry, saying, at the same time, if he did not cross his hands, they would blow his damned heart out. “Shoot me, shoot me!” said Henry; “you can’t kill me but once. Shoot, shoot, —and be damned I won’t be tied!” This he said in a tone of loud defiance; and at the same time, with a motion as quick as lightning, he with one single stroke dashed the pistols from the hand of each constable. As he did this, all hands fell upon him, and, after beating him some time, they finally over powered him, and got him tied.

During the scuffle, I managed, I know not how, to get my pass out, and, without being discovered, put it into the fire. We were all now tied; and just as we were to leave for Easton jail, Betsy Freeland, mother of William Freeland, came to the door with her hands full of biscuits, and divided them between Henry and John. She then delivered herself of a speech, to the following effect: —addressing herself to me, she said, “You devil / You yellow devil it was you that put it into the heads of Henry and John to run away. But for you, you long-legged mulatto devil! Henry nor John would never have thought of such a thing.” I made no reply, and was immediately hurried off towards St. Michael’s. Just a moment previous to the scuffle with Henry, Mr. Hamilton suggested the propriety of making a search for the protections which he had understood Frederick had written for himself and the rest. But, just at the moment he was about carrying his proposal into effect, his aid was needed in helping to tie Henry; and the excitement attending the scuffle caused them either to forget, or to deem it unsafe, under the circumstances, to search. So we were not yet convicted of the intention to run away.
When we got about half way to St. Michael’s, while the constables having us in charge were looking ahead, Henry inquired of me what he should do with his pass. I told him to eat it with his biscuit, and own nothing; and we passed the word around, “Own nothing;” and “Own nothing!” said we all. Our confidence in each other was unshaken. We were resolved to succeed or fail together, after the calamity had befallen us as much as before. We were now prepared for anything. We were to be dragged that morning fifteen miles behind horses, and then to be placed in the Easton jail. When we reached St. Michael’s, we underwent a sort of examination. We all denied that we ever intended to run away. We did this more to bring out the evidence against us, than from any hope of getting clear of being sold; for, as I have said, we were ready for that. The fact was, we cared but little where we went, so we went together. Our greatest concern was about separation. We dreaded that more than anything this side of death. We found the evidence against us to be the testimony of one person; our master would not tell who it was; but we came to a unanimous decision among ourselves as to who their informant was. We were sent off to the jail at Easton.

When we got there, we were delivered up to the sheriff, Mr. Joseph Graham, and by him placed in jail. Henry, John, and myself, were placed in one room together—Charles, and Henry Bailey, in another. Their object in separating us was to hinder concert.

We had been in jail scarcely twenty minutes, when a swarm of slave traders, and agents for slave traders, flocked into jail to look at us, and to ascertain if we were for sale. Such a set of beings I never saw before I felt myself surrounded by so many fiends from perdition. A band of pirates never looked more like their father, the devil. They laughed and grinned over us, saying, “Ah, my boys! we have got you, haven’t we?” And after taunting us in various ways, they one by one went into an examination of us, with intent to ascertain our value. They would impudently ask us if we would not like to have them for our masters.

We would make them no answer, and leave them to find out as best they could. Then they would curse and swear at us, telling us that they could take the devil out of us in a very little while, if we were only in their hands…..

I now come to that part of my life during which planned, and finally succeeded in making, my escape from slavery. But before narrating any of the peculiar circumstances, I deem it
proper to make known my intention not to state all the facts connected with the transaction. My reasons for pursuing this course may be understood from the following: First, were I to give a minute statement of all the facts, it is not only possible, but quite probable, that others would thereby be involved in the most embarrassing difficulties. Secondly, such a statement would most undoubtedly induce greater vigilance on the part of slave holders than has existed heretofore among them; which would, of course, be the means of guarding a door whereby some dear brother bondman might escape his galling chains. I deeply regret the necessity that impels me to suppress any thing of importance connected with my experience in slavery. It would afford me great pleasure indeed, as well as materially add to the interest of my narrative, were I at liberty to gratify a curiosity, which I know exists in the minds of many, by an accurate statement of all the facts pertaining to my most fortunate escape. But I must deprive myself of this pleasure, and the curious of the gratification which such a statement would afford. I would allow myself to suffer under the greatest imputations which evil-minded men might suggest, rather than exculpate myself, and thereby run the hazard of closing the slightest avenue by which a brother slave might clear himself of the chains and fetters of slavery.

I have never approved of the very public manner in which some of our western friends have conducted what they call the underground railroad, but which, I think, by their open declarations, has been made most emphatically the upperground railroad. I honor those good men and women for their noble daring, and applaud them for willingly subjecting themselves to bloody persecution, by openly avowing their participation in the escape of slaves. I, however, can see very little good resulting from such a course, either to themselves or the slaves escaping; while, upon the other hand, I see and feel assured that those open declarations are a positive evil to the slaves remaining, who are seeking to escape. They do nothing towards enlightening the slave, whilst they do much towards enlightening the master. They stimulate him to greater watchfulness, and enhance his power to capture his slave. We owe something to the slaves south of the line as well as to those north of it; and in aiding the latter on their way to freedom, we should be careful to do nothing which would be likely to hinder the former from escaping from slavery. I would keep the merciless slaveholder
profoundly ignorant of the means of flight adopted by the slave. I would leave him to ima-
gine himself surrounded by myriads of invisible tor mentors, ever ready to snatch from
his infernal grasp his trembling prey. Let him be left to feel his way in the dark; let darkness
commensurate with his crime hover over him; and let him feel that at every step he takes,
in pursuit of the flying bondman, he is running the frightful risk of having his hot brains
dashed out by an invisible agency. Let us render the tyrant no aid; let us not hold the light
by which he can trace the footprints of our flying brother. But enough of this. I will now
proceed to the statement of those facts, connected with my escape, for which I am alone
responsible, and for which no one can be made to suffer but myself.

In the early part of the year 1838, I became quite restless. I could see no reason why I should,
at the end of each week, pour the reward of my toil into the purse of my master. When I
carried to him my weekly wages, he would, after counting the money, look me in the face
with a robber-like fierceness, and ask, “Is this all " He was satisfied with nothing less than
the last cent. He would, however, when I made him six dollars, sometimes give me six cents,
to encourage me. It had the opposite effect. I regarded it as a sort of admission of my right
to the whole. The fact that he gave me any part of my wages was proof, to my mind, that he
believed me entitled to the whole of them. I always felt worse for having received any thing;
for I feared that the giving me a few cents would ease his conscience, and make him feel
himself to be a pretty honorable sort of robber. My discontent grew upon me. I was ever
on the look-out for means of escape; and, finding no direct means, I determined to try to
hire my time, with a view of getting money with which to make my escape. In the spring of
1838, when Master Thomas came to Baltimore to purchase his spring goods, I got an op-
portunity, and applied to him to allow me to hire my time. He unhesitatingly refused my
request, and told me this was another stratagem by which to escape. He told me I could go
nowhere but that he could get me ; and that, in the event of my running away, he should
spare no pains in his efforts to catch me. He exhorted me to content myself, and be obedi-
ent. He told me, if I would be happy, I must lay out no plans for the future. He said, if I
behaved myself properly, he would take care of me. Indeed, he advised me to complete
thoughtlessness of the future, and taught me to depend solely upon him for happiness. He
seemed to see fully the pressing necessity of setting aside my intellectual nature, in order to contentment in slavery. But in spite of him, and even in spite of myself, I continued to think, and to think about the injustice of my enslavement, and the means of escape.

About two months after this, I applied to Master Hugh for the privilege of hiring my time. He was not acquainted with the fact that I had applied to Master Thomas, and had been refused. He too, at first, seemed disposed to refuse; but, after some reflection, he granted me the privilege, and proposed the following terms: I was to be allowed all my time, make all contracts with those for whom I worked, and find my own employment; and, in return for this liberty, I was to pay him three dollars at the end of each week; find myself in calking tools, and in board and clothing. My board was two dollars and a half per week. This, with the wear and tear of clothing and calking tools, made my regular expenses about six dollars per week. This amount I was compelled to make up, or relinquish the privilege of hiring my time. Rain or shine, work or no work, at the end of each week the money must be forthcoming, or I must give up my privilege. This arrangement, it will be perceived, was decidedly in my master’s favor. It relieved him of all need of looking after me. His money was sure. He received all the benefits of slaveholding without its evils; while I endured all the evils of a slave, and suffered all the care and anxiety of a freeman. I found it a hard bargain. But, hard as it was, I thought it better than the old mode of getting along. It was a step towards freedom to be allowed to bear the responsibilities of a freeman, and I was determined to hold on upon it. I bent myself to the work of making money. I was ready to work at night as well as day, and by the most untiring perseverance and industry, I made enough to meet my expenses, and lay up a little money every week. I went on thus from May till August. Master Hugh then refused to allow me to hire my time longer. The ground for his refusal was a failure on my part, one Saturday night, to pay him for my week’s time. This failure was occasioned by my attending a camp meeting about ten miles from Baltimore. During the week, I had entered into an engagement with a number of young friends to start from Baltimore to the camp ground early Saturday evening; and being detained by my employer, I was unable to get down to Master Hugh’s without disappointing the company. I knew that Master Hugh was in no special need of the money that night, I therefore decided
to go to camp meeting, and upon my return pay him the three dollars. I staid at the camp meeting one day longer than intended when I left. But as soon as I returned, I called upon him to pay him what he considered his due. I found him very angry; he could scarce restrain his wrath. He said he had a great mind to give me a severe whipping. He wished to know how I dared go out of the city without asking his permission. I told him I hired my time, and while I paid him the price which he asked for it, I did not know that I was bound to ask him when and where I should go. This reply troubled him; and, after reflecting a few moments, he turned to me, and said I should hire my time no longer; that the next thing he should know of, I would be running away. Upon the same plea, he told me to bring my tools and clothing home forthwith. I did so: but instead of seeking work, as I had been accustomed to do previously to hiring my time, I spent the whole week without the performance of a single stroke of work. I did this in retaliation. Saturday night, he called upon me as usual for my week’s wages. I told him I had no wages; I had done no work that week. Here we were upon the point of coming to blows. He raved, and swore his determination to get hold of me. I did not allow myself a single word; but was resolved, if he laid the weight of his hand upon me, it should be blow for blow. He did not strike me, but told me that he would find me in constant employment in future. I thought the matter over during the next day, Sunday, and finally resolved upon the third day of September, as the day upon which I would make a second attempt to secure my freedom. I now had three weeks during which to prepare for my journey. Early on Monday morning, before Master Hugh had time to make any engagement for me, I went out and got employment of Mr. Butler, at his shipyard near the drawbridge, upon what is called the City Block, thus making it unnecessary for him to seek employment for me. At the end of the week, I brought him between eight and nine dollars. He seemed very well pleased, and asked me why I did not do the same the week before. He little knew what my plans were. My object in working steadily was to remove any suspicion he might entertain of my intent to run away; and in this I succeeded admirably. I suppose he thought I was never better satisfied with my condition than at the very time during which I was planning my escape. The second week passed, and again I carried him my full wages; and so well pleased was he, that he gave me twenty-five cents,
(quite a large sum for a slaveholder to give a slaves) and bade me to make a good use of it. I told him I would.

Things went on without very smoothly indeed, but within there was trouble. It is impossible for me to describe my feelings as the time of my contemplated start drew near. I had a number of warm-hearted friends in Baltimore, — friends that I loved almost as I did my life, and the thought of being separated from them forever was painful beyond expression. It is my opinion that thousands would escape from slavery, who now remain, but for the strong cords of affection that bind them to their friends. The thought of leaving my friends was decidedly the most painful thought with which I had to contend. The love of them was my tender point, and shook my decision more than all things else. Besides the pain of separation, the dread and apprehension of a failure exceeded what I had experienced at my first attempt. The appalling defeat I then sustained returned to torment me. I felt assured that, if I failed in this attempt, my case would be a hopeless one — it would seal my fate as a slave forever. I could not hope to get off with any thing less than the severest punishment, and being placed beyond the means of escape. It required no very vivid imagination to depict the most frightful scenes through which I should have to pass, in case I failed. The wretchedness of slavery, and the blessedness of freedom, were perpetually before me. It was life and death with me. But I remained firm, and, according to my resolution, on the third day of September, 1838, I left my chains, and succeeded in reaching New York without the slightest interruption of any kind. How I did so, - what means I adopted, -what direction I travelled, and by what mode of conveyance, — I must leave unexplained, for the reasons before mentioned.

I have been frequently asked how I felt when I found myself in a free State. I have never been able to answer the question with any satisfaction to myself. It was a moment of the highest excitement I ever experienced. I suppose I felt as one may imagine the un armed mariner to feel when he is rescued by a friendly man-of-war from the pursuit of a pirate. In writing to a dear friend, immediately after my arrival at New York, I said I felt like one who had escaped a den of hungry lions. This state of mind, however, very soon subsided; and I was again seized with a feeling of great insecurity and loneliness. I was yet liable to be
taken back, and subjected to all the tortures of slavery. This in itself was enough to damp the ardor of my enthusiasm. But the loneliness overcame me. There I was in the midst of thousands, and yet a perfect stranger; without home and without friends, in the midst of thousands of my own brethren –children of a common Father, and yet I dared not to unfold to any one of them my sad condition. I was afraid to speak to any one for fear of speaking to the wrong one, and thereby falling into the hands of money-loving kidnappers, whose business it was to lie in wait for the panting fugitive, as the ferocious beasts of the forest lie in wait for their prey. The motto which I adopted when I started from slavery was this—“Trust no man!” I saw in every white man an enemy, and in almost every colored man cause for distrust. It was a most painful situation; and, to understand it, one must needs experience it, or imagine himself in similar circumstances. Let him be a fugitive slave in a strange land—a land given up to be the hunting-ground for slaveholders – whose inhabitants are legalized kidnappers – where he is every moment subjected to the terrible liability of being seized upon by his fellow men, as the hideous crocodile seizes upon his prey! I say, let him place himself in my situation—without home or friends—without money or credit—wanting shelter, and no one to give it—wanting bread, and no money to buy it, and at the same time let him feel that he is pursued by merciless men-hunters, and in total darkness as to what to do, where to go, or where to stay, -perfectly helpless both as to the means of defence and means of escape, -in the midst of plenty, yet suffering the terrible gnawings of hunger, — in the midst of houses, yet having no home, —among fellow-men, yet feeling as if in the midst of wild beasts, whose greediness to swallow up the trembling and half-famished fugitive is only equalled by that with which the monsters of the deep swallow up the helpless fish upon which they subsist, —I say, let him be placed in this most trying situation, —the situation in which I was placed, -then, and not till then, will he fully appreciate the hardships of, and know how to sympathize with, the toil-worn and whip-scarred fugitive slave.
Abraham Lincoln
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On the Kansas-Nebraska Act

BACKGROUND

Abraham Lincoln responded to the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act and its principal proponent, Stephen A. Douglas, with this address at Peoria.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Is Lincoln in favor or against self-governance?

2. In what way can the right of self-governance be abused according to Lincoln?

3. What principles does Lincoln take to be more essential than the right to self-governance?

4. What are the results of the violation of the Missouri Compromise both in the north and in the south?

5. How does Lincoln think the founders viewed slavery?

...The repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and the propriety of its restoration, constitute the subject of what I am about to say....

I trust I understand, and truly estimate the right of self-government. My faith in the proposition that each man should do precisely as he pleases with all which is exclusively his own, lies at the foundation of the sense of justice there is in me. I extend the principles to communities of men, as well as to individuals. I so extend it, because it is politically wise, as well as naturally just; politically wise, in saving us from broils about matters which do not concern us. Here, or at Washington, I would not trouble myself with the oyster laws of Virginia, or the cranberry laws of Indiana.

The doctrine of self-government is right—absolutely and eternally right—but it has no just application, as here attempted. Or perhaps I should rather say that whether it has such just application depends upon whether a negro is not or is a man. If he is not a man, why in that case, he who is a man may, as a matter of self-government, do just as he pleases with him. But if the negro is a man, is it not to that extent, a total destruction of self-government, to say that he too shall not govern himself? When the white man governs himself that is self-government; but when he governs himself, and also governs another man, that is more than self-government—that is despotism. If the negro is a man, why then my ancient faith teaches me that “all men are created equal;” and that there can be no moral right in connection with one man’s making a slave of another....

What I do say is, that no man is good enough to govern another man, without that other’s consent. I say this is the leading principle—the sheet anchor of American republicanism. Our Declaration of Independence says:

“We hold these truths to be self evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.”
I have quoted so much at this time merely to show that according to our ancient faith, the just powers of governments are derived from the consent of the governed. Now the relation of masters and slaves is, pro tanto, a total violation of this principle. The master not only governs the slave without his consent; but he governs him by a set of rules altogether different from those which he prescribes for himself. Allow all the governed an equal voice in the government, and that, and that only is self-government....

This same generation of men, and mostly the same individuals of the generation, who declared this principle—who declared independence—who fought the war of the revolution through—who afterwards made the constitution under which we still live—these same men passed the ordinance of ’87, declaring that slavery should never go to the north-west territory. I have no doubt Judge Douglas thinks they were very inconsistent in this. It is a question of discrimination between them and him. But there is not an inch of ground left for his claiming that their opinions—their example—their authority—are on his side in this controversy....

I have done with this mighty argument, of self-government. Go, sacred thing! Go in peace....

The Missouri Compromise ought to be restored. For the sake of the Union, it ought to be restored. We ought to elect a House of Representatives which will vote its restoration. If by any means, we omit to do this, what follows? Slavery may or may not be established in Nebraska. But whether it be or not, we shall have repudiated—discarded from the councils of the Nation—the spirit of compromise; for who after this will ever trust in a national compromise? The spirit of mutual concession—that spirit which first gave us the constitution, and which has thrice saved the Union—we shall have strangled and cast from us forever. And what shall we have in lieu of it? The South flushed with triumph and tempted to excesses; the North, betrayed, as they believe, brooding on wrong and burning for revenge. One side will provoke; the other resent. The one will taunt, the other defy; one agrees, the
other retaliates. Already a few in the North, defy all constitutional restraints, resist the execution of the fugitive slave law, and even menace the institution of slavery in the States where it exists.

Already a few in the South, claim the constitutional right to take to and hold slaves in the free states—demand the revival of the slave trade; and demand a treaty with Great Britain by which fugitive slaves may be reclaimed from Canada. As yet they are but few on either side. It is a grave question for the lovers of the Union, whether the final destruction of the Missouri Compromise, and with it the spirit of all compromise will or will not embolden and embitter each of these, and fatally increase the numbers of both....

I particularly object to the new position which the avowed principle of this Nebraska law gives to slavery in the body politic. I object to it because it assumes that there can be moral right in the enslaving of one man by another. I object to it as a dangerous dalliance for a few people—a sad evidence that, feeling prosperity we forget right—that liberty, as a principle, we have ceased to revere. I object to it because the fathers of the republic eschewed, and rejected it. The argument of “Necessity” was the only argument they ever admitted in favor of slavery; and so far, and so far only as it carried them, did they ever go. They found the institution existing among us, which they could not help; and they cast blame upon the British King for having permitted its introduction. Before the constitution, they prohibited its introduction into the north-western Territory—the only country we owned, then free from it. At the framing and adoption of the constitution, they forbore to so much as mention the word “slave” or “slavery” in the whole instrument. In the provision for the recovery of fugitives, the slave is spoken of as a “person held to service or labor.” In that prohibiting the abolition of the African slave trade for twenty years, that trade is spoken of as “The migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing, shall think proper to admit,” etc. These are the only provisions alluding to slavery. Thus, the thing is hid away, in the constitution, just as an afflicted man hides away a wen or a cancer, which he dares not cut out at once, lest he bleed to death; with the promise, nevertheless, that the cutting may begin at the end of a given time. Less than this our fathers could not do; and now they would not do. Necessity drove them so far, and farther, they would not go. But
this is not all. The earliest Congress, under the constitution, took the same view of slavery. They hedged and hemmed it in to the narrowest limits of necessity.

In 1794, they prohibited an out-going slave-trade—that is, the taking of slaves from the United States to sell.

In 1798, they prohibited the bringing of slaves from Africa, into the Mississippi Territory—this territory then comprising what are now the States of Mississippi and Alabama. This was ten years before they had the authority to do the same thing as to the States existing at the adoption of the constitution.

In 1800 they prohibited American citizens from trading in slaves between foreign countries—as, for instance, from Africa to Brazil.

In 1803 they passed a law in aid of one or two State laws, in restraint of the internal slave trade.

In 1807, in apparent hot haste, they passed the law, nearly a year in advance, to take effect the first day of 1808—the very first day the constitution would permit—prohibiting the African slave trade by heavy pecuniary and corporal penalties.

In 1820, finding these provisions ineffectual, they declared the trade piracy, and annexed to it, the extreme penalty of death. While all this was passing in the general government, five or six of the original slave States had adopted systems of gradual emancipation; and by which the institution was rapidly becoming extinct within these limits.

Thus we see, the plain unmistakable spirit of that age, towards slavery, was hostility to the principle, and toleration, only by necessity....

Our republican robe is soiled, and trailed in the dust. Let us repurify it. Let us turn and wash it white, in the spirit, if not the blood, of the Revolution. Let us turn slavery from its claims of “moral right,” back upon its existing legal rights, and its arguments of “necessity.”

Let us return it to the position our fathers gave it; and there let it rest in peace. Let us re-
adopt the Declaration of Independence, and with it, the practices, and policy, which harmonize with it. Let north and south—let all Americans—let all lovers of liberty everywhere—join in the great and good work. If we do this, we shall not only have saved the Union; but we shall have so saved it, as to make, and to keep it, forever worthy of the saving.

We shall have so saved it, that the succeeding millions of free happy people, the world over, shall rise up, and call us blessed, to the latest generations....
BACKGROUND

Abolitionist writer Harriet Beecher Stowe published this novel about slavery in the South serially in 1851 and as a complete book in 1852. The book itself sold hundreds of thousands of copies in the North in the nine years leading up to the Civil War.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. How are the two gentlemen, Mr. Shelby and Mr. Haley, different?
2. On what grounds does Mary object to the new law?
3. Why does Prue tell Tom she won’t go to heaven?
4. Why does Legree decide to kill Tom?
5. How does Tom respond to Legree’s threats? What happens to Sambo and Quimbo?
6. In his letter, what solution does George favor for the problem of slavery? Why?
7. In her concluding remarks, what is Stowe’s assessment of the state of slavery in America?

From the author’s preface:

…The object of these sketches is to awaken sympathy and feeling for the African race, as they exist among us; to show their wrongs and sorrows, under a system so necessarily cruel and unjust as to defeat and do away the good effects of all that can be attempted for them, by their best friends, under it.

In doing this, the author can sincerely disclaim any invidious feeling towards those individuals who, often without any fault of their own, are involved in the trials and embarrassments of the legal relations of slavery.

Experience has shown her that some of the noblest of minds and hearts are often thus involved; and no one knows better than they do, that what may be gathered of the evils of slavery from sketches like these, is not the half that could be told, of the unspeakable whole…

…“He shall not fail not be discouraged
Till He have set judgment in the earth.”

“He shall deliver the needy when he crieth,
The poor, and him that hath no helper.”

“He shall redeem their soul from deceit and violence,
And precious shall their blood be in His sight.”

Chapter 1: In which the reader is introduced to a man of humanity

Late in the afternoon of a chilly day in February, two gentlemen were sitting alone over their wine, in a well-furnished dining parlor, in the town of P—, in Kentucky. There were no servants present, and the gentlemen, with chairs closely approaching, seemed to be discussing some subject with great earnestness.
For convenience sake, we have said, hitherto, two gentlemen. One of the parties, however, when critically examined, did not seem, strictly speaking, to come under the species. He was a short, thick-set man, with coarse, commonplace features, and that swaggering air of pretension which marks a low man who is trying to elbow his way upward in the world...

His companion, Mr. Shelby, had the appearance of a gentleman; and the arrangement of the house, and the general air of the housekeeping, indicated easy, and even opulent circumstances. As we before stated, the two were in the midst of an earnest conversation.

“That is the way I should arrange the matter,” said Mr. Shelby.

“I can’t make trade that way—I positively can’t, Mr. Shelby,” said the other, holding up a glass of wine between his eye and the light.

“Why, the fact is, Haley, Tom is an uncommon fellow; he is certainly worth that sum anywhere,—steady, honest, capable, manages my whole farm like a clock.”

“You mean honest, as n—s go,” said Haley, helping himself to a glass of brandy.

“No; I mean, really, Tom is a good, steady, sensible, pious fellow. He got religion at a camp-meeting, four years ago; and I believe he really did get it. I’ve trusted him, since then, with everything I have,—money, house horses,— and let him come and go round the country; and I always found him true and square in everything.”

“Some folks don’t believe there is pious n—s, Shelby,” said Haley, with a candid flourish of his hand, “but I do. I had a fellow, now, in this yer last lot I took to Orleans— ’twas as good as a meetin’, now, really, to hear that critter pray; and he was quite gentle and quiet like. He fetched me a good sum, too, for I bought him cheap of a man that was ’bliged to sell out; so I realized six hundred on him. Yes, I consider religion a valeyable thing in a n—, when it’s the genuine article, and no mistake.”
“Well, then, Haley, how will you trade?” said Mr. Shelby, after an uneasy interval of silence.

“Well, haven’t you a boy or gal that you could throw in with Tom?”

“Hum!—none that I could well spare; to tell the truth, it’s only hard necessity makes me willing to sell at all. I don’t like parting with any of my hands, that’s a fact.”

Here the door opened, and a small quadroon boy, between four and five years of age, entered the room. There was something in his appearance remarkably beautiful and engaging. His black hair, fine as floss silk, hung in glossy curls about his round, dimpled face, while a pair of large dark eyes, full of fire and softness, looked out from beneath the rich, long lashes, as he peered curiously into the apartment…

“Hulloa, Jim Crow!” said Mr. Shelby, whistling, and sapping a bunch of raisins towards him, “pick that up, now!”

The child scampered, with all his little strength, after the prize, while his master laughed.

“Come here, Jim Crow,” said he. The child came up, and the master patted the curly head, and chucked him under the chin.

“Now Jim, show this gentleman how you can dance and sing.” The boy commenced one of those wild, grotesque songs common among the negroes, in a rich, clear voice, accompanying his singing with many comic evolutions of the hands, feet, and whole body, all in perfect time to the music.

“Bravo!” said Haley, throwing him a quarter of an orange.

“Now, Jim, walk like old Uncle Cudjoe, when he has the rheumatism,” said his master.
Instantly the flexible limbs of the child assumed the appearance of deformity and distortion, as, with his back humped up, and his master’s stick in his hand, he hobbled about the room, his childish face drawn into a doleful picker, and spitting from right to left, in imitation of an old man.

Both gentlemen laughed uproariously…

Chapter 9: In which it appears that a Senator is but a man

The light of the cheerful fire shone on the rug and carpet of a cosey parlor, and glittered on the sides of the tea-cups and well-brightened tea-pot, as Senator Bird was drawing off his boots, preparatory to inserting his feet in a pair of new handsome slippers, which his wife had been working for him while away on his senatorial tour. Mrs. Bird, looking the very picture of delight, was superintending the arrangements of the table, ever and anon mingling admonitory remarks to a number of frolicsome juveniles, who were effervescing in all those modes of untold gambol and mischief that have astonished mothers ever since the flood.

“Tom, let the door-knob alone,—there’s a man! Mary! Mary! don’t pull the cat’s tail,—poor pussy! Jim, you mustn’t climb on that table,—no, no! You don’t know my dear, what a surprise it is to us all, to see you here to-night!” said she, at last, when she found a space to say something to her husband.

“Yes, yes, I thought I’d just make a run down, spend the night, and have a little comfort at home. I’m tired to death, and my head aches!”

Mrs. Bird cast a glance at a camphor-bottle, which stood in the half-open closet, and appeared to meditate an approach to it, but her husband interposed.

“No, no, Mary, no doctoring! a cup of your good hot tea, and some of our good home living, is what I want. It’s a tiresome business, this legislating!”
And the senator smiled, as if he rather liked the idea of considering himself a sac-
ifice to his country.

“Well,” said his wife, after the business of the tea-table was getting rather slack, “and what have they been doing in the Senate?”

Now, it was a very unusual thing for gentle little Mrs. Bird ever to trouble her head with what was going on in the house of the state, very wisely considering that she had enough to do to mind her own. Mr. Bird, therefore, opened his eyes in surprise and said,

“No very much of importance.”

“Well; but is it true that they have been passing a law forbidding people to give meat and drink to those poor colored folks that come along? I heard they were talking of some such law, but I didn't think any Christian legislature would pass it!”

“Why, Mary, you are getting to be a politician, all at once.”

“No, nonsense! I wouldn't give a fip for all your politics, generally, but I think this is something downright cruel and unchristian. I hope, my dear, no such law has been passed.”

“There has been a law passed forbidding people to help off the slaves that come over from Kentucky, my dear; so much of that thing has been done by these reckless Abolitionists, that our brethren in Kentucky are very strongly excited, and it seems necessary, and no more than Christian and kind, that something should be done by our state to quiet the excitement.”

“And what is the law? It don't forbid us to shelter these poor creatures a night, does it, and to give 'em something comfortable to eat, and a few old clothes, and send them quietly about their business?”

“Why, yes, my dear; that would be aiding and abetting, you know.”
Mrs. Bird was a timid, blushing little woman, of about four feet in height, and with mild blue eyes, and a peach-blown complexion, and the gentlest, sweetest voice in the world; —as for courage, a moderate-sized cock-turkey had been known to put her to rout at the very first gobble... There was only one thing that was capable of arousing her, and that provocation came in on the side of her unusually gentle and sympathetic nature;—anything in the shape of cruelty would throw her into a passion, which was more alarming and inexplicable in proportion to the general softness of her nature...

On the present occasion, Mrs. Bird rose quickly, with very red cheeks, which quite improved her general appearance, and walked up to her husband, with quite a resolute air, and said, in a determined tone,

“Now, John, I want to know if you think such a law as that is right and Christian?”

“You won’t shoot me, now, Mary, if I say I do!”

“I never could have thought it of you, John; you didn’t vote for it?”

“Even so, my fair politician.”

“You ought to be ashamed, John! Poor, homeless, houseless creatures! It’s a shameful, wicked, abominable law, and I’ll break it, for one, the first time I get a chance; and I hope I shall have a chance, I do! Things have got to a pretty pass, if a woman can’t give a warm supper and a bed to poor, starving creatures, just because they are slaves, and have been abused and oppressed all their lives, poor things!”

“But, Mary, just listen to me. Your feelings are all quite right, dear, and interesting, and I love you for them; but, then, dear, we mustn’t suffer our feelings to run away with our judgment; you must consider it’s not a matter of private feeling,—there are great public interests involved,—there is such a state of public agitation rising, that we must put aside our private feelings.”
“Now, John, I don’t know anything about politics, but I can read my Bible; and there I see that I must feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and comfort the desolate; and that Bible I mean to follow.”

“But in cases where your doing so would involve a great public evil—”

“Obeying God never brings on public evils. I know it can’t. It’s always safest, all round, to do as He bids us.”

“Now, listen to me, Mary, and I can state to you a very clear argument, to show—”

“O, nonsense, John! you can talk all night, but you wouldn’t do it. I put it to you, John,—would you now turn away a poor, shivering, hungry creature from your door, because he was a runaway? Would you, now?”

Now if the truth must be told, our senator had the misfortune to be a man who had a particularly humane and accessible nature, and turning away anybody that was in trouble never had been his forte; and what was worse for him in this particular pinch of the argument was, that his wife knew it, and, of course, was making an assault on rather an indefensible point…

“Of course, it would be a very painful duty,” began Mr. Bird, in a moderate tone.

“Duty, John! don’t use that word! You know it isn’t a duty—it can’t be a duty! If folks want to keep their slaves from running away, let ’em treat ’em well,—that’s my doctrine. If I had slaves (as I hope I never shall have), I’d risk their wanting to run away from me, or you either, John. I tell you folks don’t run away when they’re happy; and when they do run, poor creatures! they suffer enough with cold and hunger and fear, without everybody’s turning against them; and, law or no law, I never will, so help me God!”

“Mary! Mary! My dear, let me reason with you.”
“I hate reasoning, John,—especially reasoning on such subjects. There’s a way you political folks have of coming round and round a plain right thing; and you don’t believe in it yourselves, when it comes to practice. I know you well enough, John. You don’t believe it’s right any more than I do; and you wouldn’t do it any sooner than I.”

At this critical juncture, old Cudjoe, the black man-of-all-work, put his head in at the door, and wished “Missis would come into the kitchen;” …

A young, slender woman, with garments torn and frozen, with one shoe gone, and the stocking torn away from the cut and bleeding foot, was laid back in a deadly swoon upon two chairs. There was the impress of the despised race on her face, yet none could help feeling its mournful and pathetic beauty, while its stony sharpness, its cold, fixed, deathly aspect, struck a solemn chill over him. …

“O ma’am!” said she, wildly, to Mrs. Bird, “do protect us! don’t let them get him!”

“Nobody shall hurt you here, poor woman,” said Mrs. Bird, encouragingly. “You are safe; don’t be afraid.”

“God bless you!” said the woman, covering her face and sobbing; while the little boy, seeing her crying, tried to get into her lap. …

“Were you a slave?” said Mr. Bird.

“Yes, sir; I belonged to a man in Kentucky.”

“Was he unkind to you?”

“No, sir; he was a good master.”

“And was your mistress unkind to you?”

“No, sir—no! my mistress was always good to me.”
“What could induce you to leave a good home, then, and run away, and go through such dangers?”

The woman looked up at Mrs. Bird, with a keen, scrutinizing glance, and it did not escape her that she was dressed in deep mourning.

“Ma’am,” she said, suddenly, “have you ever lost a child?”

Chapter 18: Miss Ophelia’s experiences and opinions

…Our friend Tom, who had been in the kitchen during the conversation with the old rusk-woman, had followed her out into the street. He saw her go on, giving every once in a while a suppressed groan. At last she set her basket down on a doorstep, and began arranging the old, faded shawl which covered her shoulders.

“I’ll carry your basket a piece,” said Tom, compassionately.

“Why should ye?” said the woman. “I don’t want no help.”

“You seem to be sick, or in trouble, or something,” said Tom.

“I an’t sick,” said the woman, shortly.

“I wish,” said Tom, looking at her earnestly,—“I wish I could persuade you to leave off drinking. Don’t you know it will be the ruin of ye, body and soul?”

“I know’s I’m gwine to torment,” said the woman, sullenly. “Ye don’t need to tell me that ar. I’s ugly,—I’s wicked,—I’d gwine straight to torment. O, Lord! I wish I’s thar!”

Tom shuddered at these frightful words, spoken with a sullen, impassioned earnestness.

“Oh, Lord have mercy on ye! poor critter. Han’t ye never heard of Jesus Christ?”

“Jesus Christ,—who’s he?”
“Why, he’s the Lord,” said Tom.

“I think I’ve heard tell o’ the Lord, and the judgment and torment. I’ve heard o’ that.”

“But didn’t anybody every tell you of the Lord Jesus, that loved us poor sinners, and died for us?”

“Don’t know nothin’ ’bout that,” said the woman; “nobody han’t never loved me, since my old man died.”

“Where was you raised?” said Tom.

“Up in Kentuck. A man kept me to breed chil’en for market, and sold ’em as fast as they got big enough; last of all, he sold me to a speculator, and my Mas’r got me o’ him.”

“What set you into this bad way of drinkin’?”

“To get shet o’ my misery. I had one child after I come here; and I thought then I’d have one to raise, cause Mas’r wasn’t a speculator. It was de peartest little thing! And Missus she seemed to think a heap on’t, at first; it never cried,—it was likely and fat. But Missis tuck sick, and I tended her; and I tuck the fever, and my milk all left me, and the child it pined to skin and bone, and Missis wouldn’t buy milk for it. She wouldn’t hear to me, when I telled her I hadn’t milk. She said she know I could feed it on what other folks eat; and the child kinder pined, and cried, and cried, and cried, day and night, and got all gone to skin and bones, and Missis got sot agin it, and she said ’twant nothin’ but crossness. She wished it was dead, she said; and she wouldn’t let me have it o’ nights, cause, she said, it kept me awake, and made me good for nothing. She made me sleep in her room; and I had to put it away off in a little kind o’ garret, and thar it cried itself to death, one night. It did; and I tuck to drinin;, to keep its crying out of my ears! I did,—and I will drink! I will, if I do go to torment for it! Mas’r says I shall go to torment, and I tell him I’ve got thar now!”
“O, ye poor critter!” said Tom, “han’t nobody ever telled ye how the Lord Jesus loved ye, and died for ye? Han’t they telled ye that he’ll help ye, and ye can go to heaven, and have rest, at last?”

“I looks like gwine to heaven,” said the woman; “an’t thar where white folks is gwine? S’pose they’d have me thar? I’d rather go to torment, and get away from Mas’r and Missis. I had so,” she said, as, with her usual goan, she got her basket on her head, and walked sullenly away.

Tom turned, and walked sorrowfully back to the house.

Chapter 40: The martyr

...We have walked with our humble friend thus far in the valley of slavery; first through flowery fields of ease and indulgence, then through heart-breaking separations from all that man holds dear. Again, we have waited with him in a sunny island, where generous hands concealed his chains with flowers; and, lastly, we have followed him when the last ray of earthly hope went out in night, and seen how, in the blackness of earthly darkness, the firmament of the unseen has blazed with stars of new and significant lustre.

The morning star now stands over the tops of the mountains, and gales and breezes, not of earth, show that the fates of day are unclosing.

The escape of Cassy and Emmeline irritate the before surly temper of Legree to the last degree; and his fury, as was to be expected, fell upon the defenceless head of Tom. When he hurriedly announced the tidings among his hands, there was a sudden light in Tom’s eye, a sudden upraising of his hands, that did not escape him. He saw that he did not join the muster of the pursuers. He thought of forcing him to do it; but, having had, of old, experience of his inflexibility when commanded to take part in any deed of inhumanity, he would not, in his hurry, stop to enter into any conflict with him.

Tom, therefore, remained behind, with a few who had learned of him to pray, and offered up prayers for the escape of the fugitives.
When Legree returned, baffled and disappointed, all the long-working hatred of his soul towards his slave began to gather in a deadly and desperate form. Had not this man braved him,—steadily, powerfully, resistlessly,—ever since he bought him? Was there not a spirit in him which, silent as it was, burned on him like the fires of perdition?

“I hate him!” said Legree, that night, as he sat up in his bed; “I hate him! And isn’t he MINE? Can’t I do what I like with him? Who’s to hinder, I wonder?” And Legree clenched his fist, and shoot it, as if he had something in his hands that he could rend to pieces.

But, then, Tom was a faithful, valuable servant; and, although Legree hated him the more for that, yet the consideration was still somewhat of a restraint to him.

The next morning, he determined to say nothing, as yet; to assemble a part, from some neighboring plantations, with dogs and guns; to surround the swamp, and go about the hunt systematically. If it succeeded, well and good; if not, he would summon Tom before him, and—his teeth clenched and his blood boiled—then he would break that fellow down, or—there was a dire inward whisper, to which his soul assented.

Ye say that the interest of the master is a sufficient safeguard for the slave. In the fury of man’s mad will, he will wittingly, and with open eye, sell his own soul to the devil to gain his ends; and will he be more careful of his neighbor’s body?

...The men are, two of them, overseers of plantations in the vicinity; and others were some of Legree’s associates at the tavern-bar of a neighboring city, who had come for the interest of the sport. A more hard-favored set, perhaps, could not be imagined. Legree was serving brandy, profusely, round among them, as also among the negroes, who had been detailed from the various plantations for this service; for it was an object to make every service of this kind, among the negroes, as much of a holiday as possible.

Cassy placed her ear to the knot-hole; and, as the morning air blew directly towards the house, she could overhear a good deal of the conversation...
Cassy drew back; and, clasping her hands, looked upward, and said, “O, great Almighty God! We are all sinners; but what have we done, more than all the rest of the world, that we should be treated so?”

There was a terrible earnestness in her face and voice, as she spoke.

“If it wasn’t for you, child,” she said, looking at Emmeline, “I’d go out to them; and I’d thank any one of them that would shoot me down; for what use will freedom be to me? Can it give me back my children, or make me what I sued to be?”

…”O, Em!” said Cassy, “I’ve hungered for my children, and thirsted for them, and my eyes fail with longing for them! Here! here!” she said, striking her breast, “it’s all desolate, all empty! If God would give me back my children, then I could pray.”

“You must trust him, Cassy,” said Emmeline; “he is our Father!”

“His wrath is upon us,” said Cassy; “he has turned away in anger.”

“No, Cassy! He will be good to us! Let us hope in Him,” said Emmeline,—“I always have had hope.”

***

The hunt was long, animated, and thorough, but unsuccessful; and, with grave, ironic exultation, Cassy looked down on Legree, as, weary and dispirited, he alighted from his horse.

“Now, Quimbo,” said Legree, as he stretched himself down in the sitting-room.

“you jest go and walk that Tom up here, right away! The old cuss is at the bottom of this yer whole matter; and I’ll have it out of his old black hide, or I’ll know the reason why!”

Sambo and Quimbo, both, though hating each other, were joined in one mind by a no less cordial hatred of Tom. Legree had told them, at first, that he had bought him for a general overseer, in his absence; and this had begun an ill will, on their part, which had
increased, in their debased and servile natures, as they saw hi becoming obnoxious to their master’s displeasure. Quimbo, therefore, departed, with a will, to execute his orders.

Tom heard the message with a forewarning heart; for he knew all the plan of the fugitives’ escape, and the place of their present concealment;—he knew the deadly character of the man he had to deal with, and his despotic power. But he felt strong in God to meet death, rather than betray the helpless.

He sat his basket down by the row, and, looking up, said, “Into thy hands I commend my spirit! Thou hast redeemed me, oh Lord God of truth!” and then quietly yielded himself to the rough, brutal grasp with which Quimbo seized him.

“Ay, ay!” said the giant, as he dragged him along; “ye’ll catch it, now! I’ll boun’ Mas’r’s back’s up high! No sneaking out, now! Tell ye, ye’ll get it, and no mistake! See how ye’ll look, now, helpin’ Mas’r’s n—s to run away! See what ye’ll get!”

The savage words none of them reached that ear!—a higher voice there was saying, “Fear not them that kill the body, and, after that, have no more that they can do.” Nerve and bone of that poor man’s body vibrated to those words, as if touched by the finger of God; and he felt the strength of a thousand souls in one. As he passed along, the trees and bushes, the huts of his servitude, the whole scene of his degradation, seemed to whirl by him as the landscape by the rushing car.

His soul throbbed,—his home was in sight,—and the hour of release seemed at hand.

“Well, Tom!” said Legree, walking up, and seizing him grimly by the collar of his coat, and speaking through his teeth, in a paroxysm of determined rage, “do you know I’ve made up my mind to KILL you?”

“It’s very likely, Mas’r,” said Tom, calmly.
“I have,” said Legree, with grim, terrible calmness, “done—just—that—thing, Tom, unless you’ll tell me what you kno about these yer gals!”

Tom stood silent.

“D’ye hear!” said Legree, stamping, with a roar like that of an incensed lion.

“I han’t got nothing to tell, Mas’r,” said Tom, with a slow, firm, deliberate utterance.

“Do you date to tell me, ye old black Christian, de don’t know?” said Legree.

Tom was silent.

“Speak!” thundered Legree, striking him furiously. “Do you know anything?”

“I know, Mas’r; but I can’t tell anything. I can die!”

Legree drew in a long breath; and, suppressing his rage, took Tom by the arm, and, approaching his face almost to his, said, in a terrible voice, “Hark’e, Tom!—ye think, ’cause I’ve let you off before, I don’t mean what I say; but, this time, I’ve made up my mind, and counted the cost. You’ve always stood it out agin’ me: now, I’ll conquer ye, or kill ye!—one or t’other. I’ll count every drop of blood there is in you, and take ’em, one by one, till ye give up!”

Tom looked up to his master, and answered, “Mas’r, if you was sick, or in trouble, or dying, and I could save ye, I’d give ye my heart’s blood; and if, taking every drop of blood in this poor old body would save your precious soul, I’d give ’em freely, as the Lord gave his for me. O, Mas’r! don’t bring this great sin on your soul! It will hurt you more than ’twill me! Do the worst you can, my troubles’ll be over soon; but, if ye don’t repent, yours won’t never end!”
Like a strange snatch of heavenly music, heard in the lull of a tempest, this burst of feeling made a moment’s blank pause. Legree stood aghast, and looked at Tom; and there was such a silence, that the tick of the old clock could be heard, measuring, with silent touch, the last moments of mercy and probation to that hardened heart.

It was but a moment. There was one hesitating pause,—one irresolute, relenting thrill,—and the spirit of evil came back, with seven-fold vehemence; and Legree, foaming with rage, smote his victim to the ground.

***

Scenes of blood and cruelty are showing to our ear and heart. What man has nerve to do, man has not nerve to hear. What brother-man and brother-Christian must suffer, cannot be told us, even in our secret chamber, it so harrows up the soul! And yet, oh my country; these things are done under the shadow of thy laws! O, Christ! thy church sees them, almost in silence!

But, of old, there was One whose suffering changed an instrument of torture, degradation and shame, into a symbol of glory, honor, and immortal life; and, where His spirit is, neither degrading stripes, nor blood, nor insults, can make the Christian’s last struggle less than glorious.

Was he alone, that long night, whose brave, loving spirit was bearing up, in that old shed, against buffeting and brutal stripes?

Nay! There stood by him ONE,—seen by him alone,—“like unto the Son of God.”

…“Pay away, till he give up! Give it to him!—give it to him!” shouted Legree. “I'll take every drop of blood he has, unless he confesses!”

Tom opened his eyes, and looked upon his master. “Ye poor miserable critter!” he said, “there an’t no more ye can do! I forgive ye, with all my soul!” and he fainted entirely away.
"I b’lieve, my soul, he’s done for, finally," said Legree, stepping forward, to look at him. “Yes, he is! Well, his mouth’s shut up, at last,—that’s one comfort!”

Yes, Legree; but who shall shut up that voice in thy soul? that soul, past repentance, past prayer, past hope, in whom the fire that never shall be quenched is already burning!

Yet Tom was not quite gone. His wondrous words and pious prayers had struck upon the hearts of the imbruted blacks, who had been the instruments of cruelty upon him; and, the instant Legree withdrew, they took him down, and, in their ignorance, sought to call him back to life,—as if that were any favor to him.

“Sartin, we’s been doin’ a drefful wicked thing!” said Sambo; hopes Mas’r ’ll have to ’count for it, and not we.”

They washed his wounds,—they provided a rude bed, of some refuse cotton, for him to lie down on; and one of them, stealing up to the house, begged a drink of brandy of Legree, pretending that he was tired, and wanted it for himself. He brought it back, and poured it down Tom’s throat.

“O, Tom!” said Quimbo, “we’s been awful wicked to ye!”

“I forgive ye, with all my heart!” said Tom, faintly.

“O, Tom! do tell us who is Jesus, anyhow?” said Sambo;—“Jesus, that’s been a standin’ by you so, all this night!—Who is he?”

The word roused the failing, fainting spirit. He poured forth a few energetic sentences of that wondrous One,—his life, his death, his everlasting presence, and power to save.

They wept,—both the two savage men.

“Why didn’t I never hear this before?” said Sambo; “but I do believe!—I can’t help it! Lord Jesus, have mercy on us!”
“Poor critters!” said Tom, “I’d be willing to b’ar all I have, it it’ll only bring ye to Christ! O, Lord! give me these two more souls, I pray!”

That prayer was answered!

Chapter 43: Results

George’s feelings and views, as an educated man, may be best expressed in a letter to one of his friends.

“I feel somewhat at a loss, as to my future course. True, as you have said to me, I might mingle in the circles of the whites, in this country, my shade of color is so slight and that of my wife and family scarcely perceptible. Well, perhaps, on sufferance, I might. But, to tell you the truth, I have no wish to.

“My sympathies are not for my father’s race, but for my mother’s. To him I was no more than a fine dog or horse: to my poor heart-broken mother I was a child; and, though I never saw her, after the cruel sale that separated us, till she died, yet I know she always loved me dearly. I know it by my own heart. When I think of all she suffered, of my own early sufferings, of the distresses and struggles of my heroic wife, or my sister, sold in the New Orleans slave-market,—though I hope to have no unchristian sentiments, yet I may be excused for saying, I have no wish to pass for an American, or to identify myself with them.

“It is with the oppressed, enslaved African race that I cast in my lot; and, if I wished anything, I would wish myself two shades darker, rather than one lighter.

“The desire and yearning of my soul is for African nationality. I want a people that shall have a tangible, separate existence of its own; and where am I to look for it? Not in Hayti; for in Hayti they had nothing to start with. A stream cannot rise above its fountain. The race that formed the character of the Haytiens was a worn-out, effeminate one; and, of course, the subject race will be centuries in rising to anything.
“Where, then, shall I look? On the shores of Africa I see a republic,—a republic formed of picked men, who, by energy and self-educating force, have, in many cases, individually, raised themselves above a condition of slavery. Having gone through a preparatory stage of feebleness, this republic has, at last, become an acknowledged nation on the face of the earth,—acknowledged by both France and England. There it is my wish to go, and find myself a people.

“Our nation shall roll the tide of civilization and Christianity along its shores, and plant there mighty republics, that, growing with the rapidity of tropical vegetation, shall be for all coming ages.

“Do you say that I am deserting my enslaved brethren? I think not. If I forget them one hour, one moment of my life, so may God forget me! But, what can I do for them, here? Can I break their chains? No, not as an individual; but, let me go and form part of a nation, which shall have a voice in the councils of nations, and then we can speak. A nation has a right to argue, remonstrate, implore, and present the cause of its race,—which an individual has not.

“If Europe ever becomes a grand council of free nation,—as I trust in God it will,—if, there, serfdom, and all unjust and oppressive social inequalities, are done away; and if they, as France and England have done, acknowledge out positions,—then, in the great congress of nations, we will make our appeal, and present the cause of our enslaved and suffering race; and it cannot be that free, enlightened America will not then desire to wipe from her escutcheon that bar sinister which disgraces her among nations, and is as truly a curse to her as to the enslaved.

“But, you will tell me, our race have equal rights to mingle in the American republic as the Irishman, the German, and the Swede. Granted, they have. We ought to be free to meet and mingle,—to rise by our individual worth, without any consideration of caste or color; and they who deny us this right are false to their own professed principles of human equality. We ought, in particular, to be allowed here. We have more than the rights of common men;—we have the claim of an injured race for reparation. But, then, I do not want it;
I want a country, a nation, of my own. I think that the African race has peculiarities, yet to be unfolded in the light of civilization and Christianity, which, if not the same with those of the Anglo-Saxon, may prove to be, morally, of even a higher type.” …

Chapter 45: Concluding remarks

The writer has often been inquired of, by correspondents from different parts of the country, whether this narrative is a true one; and to these inquiries she will give one general answer.

The separate incidents that compose the narrative are, to a very great extent, authentic, occurring, many of them, either under her own observation, or that of her personal friends. She or her friends have observed characters the counterpart of almost all that are here introduced; and many of the sayings are word for word as heard herself, or reported to her.

…That the tragical fate or Tom, also, has too many times had its parallel, there are living witnesses, all over our land, to testify…It is said, “Very likely such cases may now and then occur, but they are no sample of general practice.” If the laws of New England were so arranged that a master could now and then torture an apprentice to death, without a possibility of being brought to justice, would it be received with equal composure? Would it be said, “These cases are rare, and no samples of general practice”? This injustice is an inherent one in the slave system,—it cannot exist without it.

…For many years of her life, the author avoided all reading upon or allusion to the subject of slavery, considering it as too painful to be inquired into, and one which advancing light and civilization would certainly live down. But, since the legislative act of 1850, when she heard, with perfect surprise and consternation, Christian and humane people actually recommending the remanding escaped fugitives into slavery, as a duty binding on good citizens…she could only think, These men and Christians cannot know what slavery is; if they did, such a question could never be open for discussion. And from this arose a
desire to exhibit it in a living dramatic reality. She has endeavored to show it fairly, in its best and its worst phases.

...And now, men and women of America, is this a thing to be trifled with, apologized for, and passed over in silence?

5 ...A day of grace is yet held out to us. Both North and South have been guilty before God, and the Christian church has a heavy account to answer. Not by combining together, to protect injustice and cruelty, and making a common capital of sin, is this Union to be saved,—but by repentance, justice and mercy; for not surer is the eternal law by which the millstone sinks in the ocean, than that stronger law, by which injustice and cruelty shall bring on nations the wrath of Almighty God!
BACKGROUND

Dred Scott was a slave who sued for his freedom after being taken by his owner into territory in which slavery was illegal. The Supreme Court rendered this decision on his case while also using the occasion to address other legalities concerning slavery.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. According to Taney’s account, what was the status of African Americans at the time of the founding? Does he think they were included in the term "people of the United States"?

2. Which two clauses of the Constitution does Taney think declare African Americans to be a separate class of persons? What is his argument for his interpretation?

3. For what specific reason does Taney declare the Missouri Compromise unconstitutional?

Mr. Chief Justice Taney delivered the opinion of the court:...

...The question is simply this: can a negro, whose ancestors were imported into this country and sold as slaves, become a member of the political community formed and brought into existence by the Constitution of the United States, and as such become entitled to all the rights, and privileges, and immunities, guaranteed by that instrument to the citizen. One of these rights is the privilege of suing in a court of the United States in the cases specified in the Constitution.

It will be observed, that the plea applies to that class of persons only whose ancestors were negroes of the African race, and imported into this country, and sold and held as slaves.

The only matter in issue before the court, therefore, is, whether the descendants of such slaves, when they shall be emancipated, or who are born of parents who had become free before their birth, are citizens of a state, in the sense in which the word "citizen" is used in the Constitution of the United States. And this being the only matter in dispute on the pleadings, the court must be understood as speaking in this opinion of that class only; that is, of those persons who are the descendants of Africans who were imported into this country and sold as slaves....

We proceed to examine the case as presented by the pleadings.

The words "people of the United States" and "citizens" are synonymous terms, and mean the same thing. They both describe the political body who, according to our republican institutions, form the sovereignty, and who hold the power and conduct the government through their representatives. They are what we familiarly call the "sovereign people," and every citizen is one of this people, and a constituent member of this sovereignty. The question before us is, whether the class of persons described in the plea in abatement compose a portion of this people, and are constituent members of this sovereignty. We think they are not, and that they are not included, and were not intended to be included, under the word "citizens" in the Constitution, and can, therefore, claim none of the rights and privileges which that instrument provides for and secures to citizens of the United States. On the contrary, they were at that time considered as a subordinate and inferior
class of beings, who had been subjugated by the dominant race, and whether emancipated or not, yet remained subject to their authority, and had no rights or privileges but such as those who held the power and the government might choose to grant them.

It is not the province of the court to decide upon the justice or injustice, the policy or impolicy of these laws. The decision of that question belonged to the political or law-making power; to those who formed the sovereignty and framed the Constitution. The duty of the court is to interpret the instrument they have framed, with the best lights we can obtain on the subject, and to administer it as we find it, according to its true intent and meaning when it was adopted.

In discussing this question, we must not confound the rights of citizenship which a state may confer within its own limits, and the rights of citizenship as a member of the Union. It does not by any means follow, because he has all the rights and privileges of a citizen of a State, that he must be a citizen of the United States. He may have all of the rights and privileges of the citizen of a State, and yet not be entitled to the rights and privileges of a citizen in any other State. For, previous to the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, every State had the undoubted right to confer on whomsoever it pleased the character of a citizen, and to endow him with all its rights. But this character, of course, was confined to the boundaries of the State, and gave him no rights or privileges in other States beyond those secured to him by the laws of nations and the comity of States. Nor have the several States surrendered the power of conferring these rights and privileges by adopting the Constitution of the United States. Each State may still confer them upon an alien, or any one it thinks proper, or upon any class or description of persons; yet he would not be a citizen in the sense in which that word is used in the Constitution of the United States, nor entitled to sue as such in one of its courts, nor to the privileges and immunities of a citizen in the other States. The rights which he would acquire would be restricted to the State which gave them. The Constitution has conferred on Congress the right to establish an uniform rule of naturalization, and this right is evidently exclusive, and has always been held by this court to be so. Consequently, no State, since the adoption of the Constitution, can, by naturalizing an alien, invest him with the rights and privileges secured to a citizen.
of a State under the federal government, although, so far as the State alone was concerned, he would undoubtedly be entitled to the rights of a citizen, and clothed with all the rights and immunities which the Constitution and laws of the State attached to that character.

It is very clear, therefore, that no State can, by any Act or law of its own, passed since the adoption of the Constitution, introduce a new member into the political community created by the Constitution of the United States. It cannot make him a member of this community by making him a member of its own. And for the same reason it cannot introduce any person, or description of persons, who were not intended to be embraced in this new political family, which the Constitution brought into existence, but were intended to be excluded from it.

The question then arises, whether the provisions of the Constitution, in relation to the personal rights and privileges to which the citizen of a state should be entitled, embraced the negro African race, at that time in this country, or who might afterwards be imported, who had then or should afterwards be made free in any State; and to put it in the power of a single State to make him a citizen of the United States, and endue him with the full rights of citizenship in every other State without their consent. Does the Constitution of the United States act upon him whenever he shall be made free under the laws of a State, and raised there to the rank of a citizen, and immediately clothe him with all the privileges of a citizen in every other State, and in its own courts?

The court think the affirmative of these propositions cannot be maintained. And if it cannot, the plaintiff in error could not be a citizen of the State of Missouri, within the meaning of the Constitution of the United States, and, consequently, was not entitled to sue in its courts.

It is true, every person, and every class and description of persons, who were at the time of the adoption of the Constitution recognized as citizens in the several States, became also citizens of this new political body; but none other; it was formed by them, and for them and their posterity, but for no one else. And the personal rights and privileges guaranteed to citizens of this new sovereignty were intended to embrace those only who were then
members of the several state communities, or who should afterwards, by birthright or otherwise, become members, according to the provisions of the Constitution and the principles on which it was founded. It was the union of those who were at that time members of distinct and separate political communities into one political family, whose power, for certain specified purposes, was to extend over the whole territory of the United States. And it gave to each citizen rights and privileges outside of his State which he did not before possess, and placed him in every other State upon a perfect equality with its own citizens as to rights of person and rights of property; it made him a citizen of the United States.

It becomes necessary, therefore, to determine who were citizens of the several States when the Constitution was adopted. And in order to do this, we must recur to the governments and institutions of the thirteen Colonies, when they separated from Great Britain and formed new sovereignties, and took their places in the family of independent nations. We must inquire who, at that time, were recognized as the people or citizens of a State, whose rights and liberties had been outraged by the English Government; and who declared their independence, and assumed the powers of government to defend their rights by force of arms.

In the opinion of the court, the legislation and histories of the times, and the language used in the Declaration of Independence, show, that neither the class of persons who had been imported as slaves, nor their descendants, whether they had become free or not, were then acknowledged as a part of the people, nor intended to be included in the general words used in that memorable instrument.

It is difficult at this day to realize the state of public opinion in relation to that unfortunate race, which prevailed in the civilized and enlightened portions of the world at the time of the Declaration of Independence, and when the Constitution of the United States was framed and adopted. But the public history of every European nation displays it, in a manner too plain to be mistaken.
They had for more than a century before been regarded as beings of an inferior order; and altogether unfit to associate with the white race, either in social or political relations; and so far inferior, that they had no rights which the white man was bound to respect; and that the negro might justly and lawfully be reduced to slavery for his benefit. He was bought and sold, and treated as an ordinary article of merchandise and traffic, whenever a profit could be made by it. This opinion was at that time fixed and universal in the civilized portion of the white race. It was regarded as an axiom in morals as well as in politics, which no one thought of disputing, or supposed to be open to dispute; and men in every grade and position in society daily and habitually acted upon it in their private pursuits, as well as in matters of public concern, without doubting for a moment the correctness of this opinion.

And in no nation was this opinion more firmly fixed or more uniformly acted upon than by the English government and English people. They not only seized them on the coast of Africa, and sold them or held them in slavery for their own use; but they took them as ordinary articles of merchandise to every country where they could make a profit on them, and were far more extensively engaged in this commerce than any other nation in the world.

The opinion thus entertained and acted upon in England was naturally impressed upon the colonies they founded on this side of the Atlantic. And, accordingly, a negro of the African race was regarded by them as an article of property, and held, and bought and sold as such, in every one of the thirteen Colonies which united in the Declaration of Independence, and afterwards formed the Constitution of the United States. The slaves were more or less numerous in the different Colonies, as slave labor was found more or less profitable. But no one seems to have doubted the correctness of the prevailing opinion of the time.

The legislation of the different Colonies furnishes positive and indisputable proof of this fact....

The language of the Declaration of Independence is equally conclusive.
It begins by declaring that, "when in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and nature's God entitle them, a decent respect for the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation."

It then proceeds to say: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among them is life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

The general words above quoted would seem to embrace the whole human family, and if they were used in a similar instrument at this day, would be so understood. But it is too clear for dispute, that the enslaved African race were not intended to be included, and formed no part of the people who framed and adopted this Declaration; for if the language, as understood in that day, would embrace them, the conduct of the distinguished men who framed the Declaration of Independence would have been utterly and flagrantly inconsistent with the principles they asserted; and instead of the sympathy of mankind, to which they so confidently appealed, they would have deserved and received universal rebuke and reprobation.

Yet the men who framed this Declaration were great men—high in literary acquirements—high in their sense of honor, and incapable of asserting principles inconsistent with those on which they were acting. They perfectly understood the meaning of the language they used, and how it would be understood by others; and they knew that it would not, in any part of the civilized world, be supposed to embrace the negro race, which, by common consent, had been excluded from civilized governments and the family of nations, and doomed to slavery. They spoke and acted according to the then established doctrines and principles, and in the ordinary language of the day, and no one misunderstood them. The unhappy black race were separated from the white by indelible marks, and laws long before
established, and were never thought of or spoken of except as property, and when the claims of the owner or the profit of the trader were supposed to need protection.

This state of public opinion had undergone no change when the Constitution was adopted, as is equally evident from its provisions and language.

5 The brief preamble sets forth by whom it was formed, for what purposes, and for whose benefit and protection. It declares that it is formed by the people of the United States; that is to say, by those who were members of the different political communities in the several States; and its great object is declared to be to secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity. It speaks in general terms of the people of the United States, and of citizens of the several States, when it is providing for the exercise of the powers granted or the privileges secured to the citizen. It does not define what description of persons are intended to be included under these terms, or who shall be regarded as a citizen and one of the people. It uses them as terms so well understood that no further description or definition was necessary.

10 But there are two clauses in the Constitution which point directly and specifically to the negro race as a separate class of persons, and show clearly that they were not regarded as a portion of the people or citizens of the government then formed.

One of these clauses reserves to each of the thirteen States the right to import slaves until the year 1808, if it thinks proper. And the importation which it thus sanctions was unquestionably of persons of the race of which we are speaking, as the traffic in slaves in the United States had always been confined to them. And by the other provision the States pledge themselves to each other to maintain the right of property of the master, by delivering up to him any slave who may have escaped from his service, and be found within their respective territories. By the first above-mentioned clause, therefore, the right to purchase and hold this property is directly sanctioned and authorized for twenty years by the people who framed the Constitution. And by the second, they pledge themselves to maintain and uphold the right of the master in the manner specified, as long as the government they then formed should endure. And these two provisions show,
conclusively, that neither the description of persons therein referred to, nor their descendants, were embraced in any of the other provisions of the Constitution; for certainly these two clauses were not intended to confer on them or their posterity the blessings of liberty, or any of the personal rights so carefully provided for the citizen....

In considering this part of the controversy, two questions arise: 1st. Was he, together with his family, free in Missouri by reason of the stay in the territory of the United States hereinbefore mentioned? And 2nd. If they were not, is Scott himself free by reason of his removal to Rock Island, in the State of Illinois, as stated in the above admissions?

We proceed to examine the first question.

The Act of Congress, upon which the plaintiff relies, declares that slavery and involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, shall be forever prohibited in all that part of that territory ceded by France, under the name of Louisiana, which lies north of thirty-six degrees thirty minutes north latitude, and not included within the limits of Missouri. And the difficulty which meets us at the threshold of this part of the inquiry is, whether Congress was authorized to pass this law under any of the powers granted to it by the Constitution; for if the authority is not given by that instrument, it is the duty of this court to declare it void and inoperative, and incapable of conferring freedom upon one who is held as a slave under the laws of any one of the States.

The counsel for the plaintiff has laid much stress upon that article in the Constitution which confers on Congress the power "to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States;" but, in the judgment of the court, that provision has no bearing on the present controversy, and the power there given, whatever it may be, is confined, and was intended to be confined, to the territory which at that time belonged to, or was claimed by, the United States, and was within their boundaries as settled by the Treaty with Great Britain, and can have no influence upon a territory afterwards acquired from a foreign government. It was a special provision for a known and particular Territory, and to meet a present emergency, and nothing more....
Whether, therefore, we take the particular clause in question, by itself, or in connection
with the other provisions of the Constitution, we think it clear, that it applies only to the
particular territory of which we have spoken, and cannot, by any just rule of interpretation,
be extended to a territory which the new government might afterwards obtain from a
foreign nation. Consequently, the power which Congress may have lawfully exercised in
this territory, while it remained under a territorial government, and which may have been
sanctioned by judicial decision, can furnish no justification and no argument to support a
similar exercise of power over territory afterwards acquired by the Federal Government.
We put aside, therefore, any argument, drawn from precedents, showing the extent of the
power which the general government exercised over slavery in this territory, as altogether
inapplicable to the case before us....

All we mean to say on this point is, that, as there is no express regulation in the Constitution
defining the power which the general government may exercise over the person or property
of a citizen in a territory thus acquired, the court must necessarily look to the provisions
and principles of the Constitution, and its distribution of powers, for the rules and
principles by which its decision must be governed....

At the time when the Territory in question was obtained by cession from France, it
contained no population fit to be associated together and admitted as a State; and it
therefore was absolutely necessary to hold possession of it as a Territory belonging to the
United States until it was settled and inhabited by a civilized community capable of self-
government, and in a condition to be admitted on equal terms with the other States as a
member of the Union. But, as we have before said, it was acquired by the general
government as the representative and trustee of the people of the United States, and it must,
therefore, be held in that character for their common and equal benefit; for it was the people
of the several States, acting through the agent and representative, the Federal Government,
who in fact acquired the territory in question, and the government holds it for their
common use until it shall be associated with the other States as a member of the Union. …
But the power of Congress over the person or property of a citizen can never be a mere discretionary power under our Constitution and form of government. The powers of the government and the rights and privileges of the citizen are regulated and plainly defined by the Constitution itself. And when the territory becomes a part of the United States, the Federal Government enters into possession in the character impressed upon it by those who created it. It enters upon it with its powers over the citizen strictly defined, and limited by the Constitution, from which it derives its own existence, and by virtue of which alone it continues to exist and act as a government and sovereignty. It has no power of any kind beyond it; and it cannot, when it enters a territory of the United States, put off its character, and assume discretionary or despotic powers which the Constitution has denied to it. It cannot create for itself a new character separated from the citizens of the United States, and the duties it owes them under the provisions of the Constitution. The territory being a part of the United States, the government and the citizen both enter it under the authority of the Constitution, with their respective rights defined and marked out; and the Federal Government can exercise no power over his person or property, beyond what that instrument confers, nor lawfully deny any right which it has reserved. …

It seems, however, to be supposed, that there is a difference between property in a slave and other property, and that different rules may be applied to it in expounding the Constitution of the United States. And the laws and usages of nations, and the writings of eminent jurists upon the relation of master and slave and their mutual rights and duties, and the powers which governments may exercise over it, have been dwelt upon in the argument.

The powers of the government, and the rights of the citizen under it, are positive and practical regulations plainly written down. The people of the United States have delegated to it certain enumerated powers, and forbidden it to exercise others. It has no power over the person or property of a citizen but what the citizens of the United States have granted. And no laws or usages of other nations, or reasoning of statesmen or jurists upon the relations of master and slave, can enlarge the powers of the government, or take from the citizens the rights they have reserved. And if the Constitution recognizes the right of property of the master in a slave, and makes no distinction between that description of
property and other property owned by a citizen, no tribunal, acting under the authority of the United States, whether it be legislative, executive, or judicial, has a right to draw such a distinction, or deny to it the benefit of the provisions and guarantees which have been provided for the protection of private property against the encroachments of the government. …

Upon these considerations, it is the opinion of the court that the Act of Congress which prohibited a citizen from holding and owning property of this kind in the territory of the United States north of the line therein mentioned, is not warranted by the Constitution, and is therefore void; and that neither Dred Scott himself, nor any of his family, were made free by being carried into this territory; even if they had been carried there by the owner, with the intention of becoming a permanent resident.…. 

But there is another point in the case which depends on state power and state law. And it is contended, on the part of the plaintiff, that he is made free by being taken to Rock Island, in the State of Illinois, independently of his residence in the territory of the United States; and being so made free, he was not again reduced to a state of slavery by being brought back to Missouri.

Our notice of this part of the case will be very brief; for the principle on which it depends was decided in this court, upon much consideration, in the case of Strader et al. v. Graham, reported in 10th Howard, 82. In that case, the slaves had been taken from Kentucky to Ohio, with the consent of the owner, and afterwards brought back to Kentucky. And this court held that their status or condition, as free or slave, depended upon the laws of Kentucky, when they were brought back into that State, and not of Ohio; and that this court had no jurisdiction to revise the judgment of a state court upon its own laws. This was the point directly before the court, and the decision that this court had not jurisdiction, turned upon it, as will be seen by the report of the case.

So in this case: as Scott was a slave when taken into the State of Illinois by his owner, and was there held as such, and brought back in that character, his status, as free or slave, depended on the laws of Missouri, and not of Illinois....
Upon the whole, therefore, it is the judgment of this court, that it appears by the record before us that the plaintiff in error is not a citizen of Missouri, in the sense in which that word is used in the Constitution; and that the Circuit Court of the United States, for that reason, had no jurisdiction in the case, and could give no judgment in it.

Its judgment for the defendant must, consequently, be reversed, and a mandate issued directing the suit to be dismissed for want of jurisdiction.
ABRAHAM LINCOLN

On the Dred Scott Decision

BACKGROUND

Abraham Lincoln offered this speech in response to Senator Stephen Douglas’s defense of the Dred Scott decision and his continued promotion of the Kansas-Nebraska Act.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Why does Lincoln argue that African Americans in the United States are worse off in his time than during the time of the founding?

2. How does the Dred Scott ruling undermine the principles of the founding in Lincoln’s opinion?

3. What is Lincoln’s position towards African Americans?

4. What does Lincoln find in common between the Dred Scott ruling and Stephen Douglas’ arguments?

On the *Dred Scott* Decision
Abraham Lincoln

...I have said, in substance, that the *Dred Scott* decision was, in part; based on assumed historical facts which were not really true; and I ought not to leave the subject without giving some reasons for saying this; I therefore give an instance or two, which I think fully sustain me. Chief Justice Taney, in delivering the opinion of the majority of the Court, insists at great length that negroes were no part of the people who made, or for whom was made, the Declaration of Independence, or the Constitution of the United States.

On the contrary, Judge Curtis, in his dissenting opinion, shows that in five of the then thirteen states, to wit, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey and North Carolina, free negroes were voters, and, in proportion to their numbers, had the same part in making the Constitution that the white people had. He shows this with so much particularity as to leave no doubt of its truth; and, as a sort of conclusion on that point, holds the following language:

"The Constitution was ordained and established by the people of the United States, through the action, in each State, of those persons who were qualified by its laws to act thereon in behalf of themselves and all other citizens of the State. In some of the States, as we have seen, colored persons were among those qualified by law to act on the subject. These colored persons were not only included in the body of 'the people of the United States,' by whom the Constitution was ordained and established; but in at least five of the States they had the power to act, and, doubtless, did act, by their suffrages, upon the question of its adoption."

Again, Chief Justice Taney says: "It is difficult, at this day to realize the state of public opinion in relation to that unfortunate race, which prevailed in the civilized and enlightened portions of the world at the time of the Declaration of Independence, and when the Constitution of the United States was framed and adopted." And again, after quoting from the Declaration, he says: "The general words above quoted would seem to include the whole human family, and if they were used in a similar instrument at this day, would be so understood."
In these the Chief Justice does not directly assert, but plainly assumes, as a fact, that the public estimate of the black man is more favorable now than it was in the days of the Revolution. This assumption is a mistake. In some trifling particulars, the condition of that race has been ameliorated; but, as a whole, in this country, the change between then and now is decidedly the other way; and their ultimate destiny has never appeared so hopeless as in the last three or four years. In two of the five States—New Jersey and North Carolina—that then gave the free negro the right of voting, the right has since been taken away; and in a third—New York—it has been greatly abridged; while it has not been extended, so far as I know, to a single additional State, though the number of the States has more than doubled. In those days, as I understand, masters could, at their own pleasure, emancipate their slaves; but since then, such legal restraints have been made upon emancipation, as to amount almost to prohibition. In those days, Legislatures held the unquestioned power to abolish slavery in their respective States; but now it is becoming quite fashionable for State Constitutions to withhold that power from the Legislatures. In those days, by common consent, the spread of the black man's bondage to new countries was prohibited; but now, Congress decides that it will not continue the prohibition, and the Supreme Court decides that it could not if it would. In those days, our Declaration of Independence was held sacred by all, and thought to include all; but now, to aid in making the bondage of the negro universal and eternal, it is assailed, and sneered at, and construed, and hawked at, and torn, till, if its framers could rise from their graves, they could not at all recognize it. All the powers of earth seem rapidly combining against him. Mammon is after him; ambition follows, and philosophy follows, and the Theology of the day is fast joining the cry. They have him in his prison house; they have searched his person, and left no prying instrument with him. One after another they have closed the heavy iron doors upon him, and now they have him, as it were, bolted in with a lock of a hundred keys, which can never be unlocked without the concurrence of every key; the keys in the hands of a hundred different men, and they scattered to a hundred different and distant places; and they stand musing as to what invention, in all the dominions of mind and matter, can be produced to make the impossibility of his escape more complete than it is.
It is grossly incorrect to say or assume, that the public estimate of the negro is more favor-
able now than it was at the origin of the government.

Three years and a half ago, Judge Douglas brought forward his famous Nebraska bill. The
country was at once in a blaze. He scorned all opposition, and carried it through Congress.
Since then he has seen himself superseded in a Presidential nomination, by one indorsing
the general doctrine of his measure, but at the same time standing clear of the odium of its
untimely agitation, and its gross breach of national faith; and he has seen that successful
rival Constitutionally elected, not by the strength of friends, but by the division of adver-
saries, being in a popular minority of nearly four hundred thousand votes. He has seen his
chief aids in his own State, Shields and Richardson, politically speaking, successively tried,
convicted, and executed, for an offense not their own, but his. And now he sees his own
case, standing next on the docket for trial.

There is a natural disgust in the minds of nearly all white people, to the idea of an indis-
criminate amalgamation of the white and black races; and Judge Douglas evidently is bas-
ing his chief hope, upon the chances of being able to appropriate the benefit of this disgust
to himself. If he can, by much drumming and repeating, fasten the odium of that idea upon
his adversaries, he thinks he can struggle through the storm. He therefore clings to this
hope, as a drowning man to the last plank. He makes an occasion for lugging it in from the
opposition to the Dred Scott decision. He finds the Republicans insisting that the Declara-
tion of Independence includes ALL men, black as well as white; and Judge Douglas evidently is bas-
ing his chief hope, upon the chances of being able to appropriate the benefit of this disgust
to himself. If he can, by much drumming and repeating, fasten the odium of that idea upon
his adversaries, he thinks he can struggle through the storm. He therefore clings to this
hope, as a drowning man to the last plank. He makes an occasion for lugging it in from the
opposition to the Dred Scott decision. He finds the Republicans insisting that the Declara-
tion of Independence includes ALL men, black as well as white; and forthwith he boldly
denies that it includes negroes at all, and proceeds to argue gravely that all who contend it
does, do so only because they want to vote, and eat, and sleep, and marry with negroes! He
will have it that they cannot be consistent else. Now I protest against that counterfeit logic
which concludes that, because I do not want a black woman for a slave I must necessarily
want her for a wife. I need not have her for either, I can just leave her alone. In some respects
she certainly is not my equal; but in her natural right to eat the bread she earns with her
own hands without asking leave of any one else, she is my equal, and the equal of all others.
Chief Justice Taney, in his opinion in the *Dred Scott* case, admits that the language of the Declaration is broad enough to include the whole human family, but he and Judge Douglas argue that the authors of that instrument did not intend to include negroes, by the fact that they did not at once, actually place them on an equality with the whites. Now this grave argument comes to just nothing at all, by the other fact, that they did not at once, or ever afterwards, actually place all white people on an equality with one or another. And this is the staple argument of both the Chief Justice and the Senator, for doing this obvious violence to the plain unmistakable language of the Declaration. I think the authors of that notable instrument intended to include *all* men, but they did not intend to declare all men equal in *all respects*. They did not mean to say all were equal in color, size, intellect, moral developments, or social capacity. They defined with tolerable distinctness, in what respects they did consider all men created equal—equal in “certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” This they said, and this meant. They did not mean to assert the obvious untruth, that all were then actually enjoying that equality, nor yet, that they were about to confer it immediately upon them. In fact they had no power to confer such a boon. They meant simply to declare the *right*, so that the *enforcement* of it might follow as fast as circumstances should permit. They meant to set up a standard maxim for free society, which should be familiar to all, and revered by all; constantly looked to, constantly labored for, and even though never perfectly attained, constantly approximated, and thereby constantly spreading and deepening its influence, and augmenting the happiness and value of life to all people of all colors everywhere. The assertion that “all men are created equal” was of no practical use in effecting our separation from Great Britain; and it was placed in the Declaration, not for that, but for future use. Its authors meant it to be, thank God, it is now proving itself, a stumbling block to those who in after times might seek to turn a free people back into the hateful paths of despotism. They knew the prone-ness of prosperity to breed tyrants, and they meant when such should re-appear in this fair land and commence their vocation they should find left for them at least one hard nut to crack.
I have now briefly expressed my view of the meaning and objects of that part of the Declaration of Independence which declares that "all men are created equal."

Now let us hear Judge Douglas' view of the same subject, as I find it in the printed report of his late speech. Here it is:

"No man can vindicate the character, motives and conduct of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, except upon the hypothesis that they referred to the white race alone, and not to the African, when they declared all men to have been created equal—that they were speaking of British subjects on this continent being equal to British subjects born and residing in Great Britain—that they were entitled to the same inalienable rights, and among them were enumerated life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The Declaration was adopted for the purpose of justifying the colonists in the eyes of the civilized world in withdrawing their allegiance from the British crown, and dissolving their connection with the mother country."

My good friends, read that carefully over some leisure hour, and ponder well upon it—see what a mere wreck—mangled ruin—it makes of our once glorious Declaration.

"They were speaking of British subjects on this continent being equal to British subjects born and residing in Great Britain!" Why, according to this, not only negroes but white people outside of Great Britain and America are not spoken of in that instrument. The English, Irish and Scotch, along with white Americans, were included to be sure, but the French, Germans and other white people of the world are all gone to pot along with the Judge's inferior races.

I had thought the Declaration promised something better than the condition of British subjects; but no, it only meant that we should be equal to them in their own oppressed and unequal condition. According to that, it gave no promise that having kicked off the King and Lords of Great Britain, we should not at once be saddled with a King and Lords of our own.
I had thought the Declaration contemplated the progressive improvement in the condition of all men everywhere; but no, it merely "was adopted for the purpose of justifying the colonists in the eyes of the civilized world in withdrawing their allegiance from the British crown, and dissolving their connection with the mother country." Why, that object having been effected some eighty years ago, the Declaration is of no practical use now—mere rubbish—old wadding left to rot on the battle-field after the victory is won.

I understand you are preparing to celebrate the "Fourth," tomorrow week. What for? The doings of that day had no reference to the present; and quite half of you are not even descendants of those who were referred to at that day. But I suppose you will celebrate; and will even go so far as to read the Declaration. Suppose after you read it once in the old fashioned way, you read it once more with Judge Douglas' version. It will then run thus:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident that all British subjects who were on this continent eighty-one years ago, were created equal to all British subjects born and then residing in Great Britain."

And now I appeal to all—to Democrats as well as others,—are you really willing that the Declaration shall be thus frittered away?—thus left no more at most, than an interesting memorial of the dead past? thus shorn of its vitality, and practical value; and left without the germ or even the suggestion of the individual rights of man in it?…
ABRAHAM LINCOLN (R-IL)
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A House Divided

BACKGROUND

Abraham Lincoln delivered this speech upon his nomination by the Illinois Republican Party to be its candidate for U.S. Senate in Illinois.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. To what, in particular, is Lincoln referring when he quotes the Gospel of Matthew, "A house divided against itself cannot stand"?

2. What does Lincoln find problematic about the politics surrounding the Dred Scott v. Sandford case?

3. What was "squatter sovereignty," and what does Lincoln think happened to it?

4. What are the three "working points" of "machinery" resulting from Dred Scott and Stephen Douglas’s policy, and why does Lincoln think they are constitutionally problematic?

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Convention:

If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could then better judge what to do, and how to do it.

We are now far into the fifth year, since a policy was initiated, with the avowed object, and confident promise, of putting an end to slavery agitation.

Under the operation of that policy, that agitation has not only, not ceased, but has constantly augmented.

In my opinion, it will not cease, until a crisis shall have been reached, and passed.

"A house divided against itself cannot stand."

I believe this government cannot endure, permanently half slave and half free.

I do not expect the Union to be dissolved—I do not expect the house to fall— but I do expect it will cease to be divided.

It will become all one thing, or all the other.

Either the opponents of slavery, will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction; or its advocates will push it forward, till it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new—North as well as South.

Have we no tendency to the latter condition?

Let any one who doubts, carefully contemplate that now almost complete legal combination—piece of machinery so to speak—compounded of the Nebraska doctrine, and the Dred Scott decision. Let him consider not only what work the machinery is adapted to do, and how well adapted; but also, let him study the history of its construction, and trace, if he can, or rather fail, if he can, to trace the evidences of design, and concert of action, among its chief bosses, from the beginning.
But, so far, Congress only, had acted; and an endorsement by the people, real or apparent, was indispensable, to save the point already gained, and give chance for more.

The new year of 1854 found slavery excluded from more than half the States by State Constitutions, and from most of the national territory by Congressional prohibition.

Four days later, commenced the struggle, which ended in repealing that Congressional prohibition.

This opened all the national territory to slavery; and was the first point gained.

This necessity had not been overlooked; but had been provided for, as well as might be, in the notable argument of "squatter sovereignty," otherwise called "sacred right of self government," which latter phrase, though expressive of the only rightful basis of any government, was so perverted in this attempted use of it as to amount to just this: That if any one man, choose to enslave another, no third man shall be allowed to object.

That argument was incorporated into the Nebraska Bill itself, in the language which follows: "It being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any Territory or state, not to exclude it therefrom; but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States."

Then opened the roar of loose declamation in favor of "Squatter Sovereignty" and "Sacred right of self government."

"But," said opposition members, "let us be more specific—let us amend the bill so as to expressly declare that the people of the territory may exclude slavery." "Not we," said the friends of the measure; and down they voted the amendment.

While the Nebraska bill was passing through congress, a law case, involving the question of a negro's freedom, by reason of his owner having voluntarily taken him first into a free state and then a territory covered by the congressional prohibition, and held him as a slave,
for a long time in each, was passing through the U. S. Circuit Court for the District of Mis-
souri; and both Nebraska bill and law suit were brought to a decision in the same month of
May, 1854. The negro’s name was "Dred Scott," which name now designates the decision
finally made in the case.

Before the then next Presidential election, the law case came to, and was argued in the Su-
preme Court of the United States; but the decision of it was deferred until after the election.
Still, before the election, Senator Trumbull, on the floor of the Senate, requests the leading
advocate of the Nebraska Bill to state his opinion whether the people of a territory can con-
stitutionally exclude slavery from their limits; and the latter answers, "That is a question for
the Supreme Court."

The election came. Mr. Buchanan was elected, and the endorsement, such as it was, secured.
That was the second point gained. The endorsement, however, fell short of a clear popular
majority by nearly four hundred thousand votes, and so, perhaps, was not overwhelmingly
reliable and satisfactory.

The outgoing President, in his last annual message, as impressively as possible echoed back
upon the people the weight and authority of the endorsement.

The Supreme Court met again; did not announce their decision, but ordered a re-argument.

The Presidential inauguration came, and still no decision of the court; but the incoming
President, in his inaugural address, fervently exhorted the people to abide by the forthcoming
decision, whatever it might be.

Then, in a few days, came the decision.

The reputed author of the Nebraska bill finds an early occasion to make a speech at this
capitol endorsing the Dred Scott Decision, and vehemently denouncing all opposition to
it.
The new President, too, seizes the early occasion of the Silliman letter to endorse and strongly construe that decision, and to express his astonishment that any different view had ever been entertained.

At length a squabble springs up between the President and the author of the Nebraska bill, on the mere question of fact, whether the Lecompton constitution was or was not, in any just sense, made by the people of Kansas; and in that squabble the latter declares that all he wants is a fair vote for the people, and that he cares not whether slavery be voted down or voted up. I do not understand his declaration that he cares not whether slavery be voted down or voted up, to be intended by him other than as an apt definition of the policy he would impress upon the public mind—the principle for which he declares he has suffered much, and is ready to suffer to the end.

And well may he cling to that principle. If he has any parental feeling, well may he cling to it. That principle, is the only shred left of his original Nebraska doctrine. Under the Dred Scott decision, "squatter sovereignty" squatted out of existence, tumbled down like temporary scaffolding—like the mold at the foundry served through one blast and fell back into loose sand—helped to carry an election, and then was kicked to the winds. His late joint struggle with the Republicans, against the Lecompton Constitution, involves nothing of the original Nebraska doctrine. That struggle was made on a point, the right of a people to make their own constitution, upon which he and the Republicans have never differed.

The several points of the Dred Scott decision, in connection with Senator Douglas' "care not" policy, constitute the piece of machinery, in its present state of advancement. This was the third point gained.

The working points of that machinery are:

First, that no negro slave, imported as such from Africa, and no descendant of such slave can ever be a citizen of any State, in the sense of that term as used in the Constitution of the United States.
This point is made in order to deprive the negro, in every possible event, of the benefit of this provision of the United States Constitution, which declares that—

"The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States."

Secondly, that "subject to the Constitution of the United States," neither Congress nor a Territorial Legislature can exclude slavery from any United States territory.

This point is made in order that individual men may fill up the territories with slaves, without danger of losing them as property, and thus to enhance the chances of permanency to the institution through all the future.

Thirdly, that whether the holding a negro in actual slavery in a free State, makes him free, as against the holder, the United States courts will not decide, but will leave to be decided by the courts of any slave State the negro may be forced into by the master.

This point is made, not to be pressed immediately; but, if acquiesced in for a while, and apparently endorsed by the people at an election, then to sustain the logical conclusion that what Dred Scott's master might lawfully do with Dred Scott, in the free State of Illinois, every other master may lawfully do with any other one, or one thousand slaves, in Illinois, or in any other free State.

Auxiliary to all this, and working hand in hand with it, the Nebraska doctrine, or what is left of it, is to educate and mold public opinion, at least Northern public opinion, not to care whether slavery is voted down or voted up.

This shows exactly where we now are; and partially also, whither we are tending.

It will throw additional light on the latter, to go back, and run the mind over the string of historical facts already stated. Several things will now appear less dark and mysterious than they did when they were transpiring. The people were to be left "perfectly free" "subject only to the Constitution." What the Constitution had to do with it, outsiders could not then see.
Plainly enough now, it was an exactly fitted niche, for the Dred Scott decision to afterwards come in, and declare the perfect freedom of the people, to be just no freedom at all.

Why was the amendment, expressly declaring the right of the people to exclude slavery, voted down? Plainly enough now, the adoption of it, would have spoiled the niche for the Dred Scott decision.

Why was the Court decision held up? Why, even a Senator’s individual opinion withheld, till after the Presidential election? Plainly enough now, the speaking out then would have damaged the "perfectly free" argument upon which the election was to be carried.

Why the outgoing President’s felicitation on the endorsement? Why the delay of a reargument? Why the incoming President’s advance exhortation in favor of the decision?

These things look like the cautious patting and petting of a spirited horse, preparatory to mounting him, when it is dreaded that he may give the rider a fall.

And why the hasty after endorsements of the decision by the President and others?

We can not absolutely know that all these exact adaptations are the result of preconcert. But when we see a lot of framed timbers, different portions of which we know have been gotten out at different times and places and by different workmen—Stephen, Franklin, Roger and James, for instance—and when we see these timbers joined together, and see they exactly make the frame of a house or a mill, all the tenons and mortices exactly fitting, and all the lengths and proportions of the different pieces exactly adapted to their respective places, and not a piece too many or too few—not omitting even scaffolding—or, if a single piece be lacking, we can see the place in the frame exactly fitted and prepared to yet bring such piece in—in such a case, we find it impossible to not believe that Stephen and Franklin and Roger and James all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked upon a common plan or draft drawn up before the first lick was struck....
ABRAHAM LINCOLN (R) & SENATOR STEPHEN DOUGLAS (D)

Seventh Debate in the 1858 Election Campaign

DEBATE EXCERPTS

October 15, 1858
Outside Alton City Hall | Alton, Illinois

BACKGROUND

Incumbent senator from Illinois, Democrat Stephen Douglas, debated Abraham Lincoln, the Republican candidate, for the seventh and final time in the 1858 election campaign. The candidates were not directly running for U.S. Senate, as senators were still appointed by the state legislature at the time, but their arguments were meant to bolster votes for their respective parties in the state legislature, which would then appoint one of them as U.S. Senator.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What are the three positions at issue in the debate?
2. What does Douglas think would have been the result had Lincoln delivered a version of his "A House Divided" speech at the Constitutional Convention?
3. How does Douglas interpret the meaning of "equality" in the Declaration of Independence?
4. In what sense does Douglas want each state to "mind its own business"?
5. Why does Lincoln think that history is on his side with respect to the meaning of "equality" in the Declaration of Independence?
6. According to Lincoln, how should one interpret the language of the Constitution with regard to slavery? What is the view of the founders on slavery, according to Lincoln?
7. What is the primary dividing line between Republicans and Democrats at this time, according to Lincoln?
8. In Lincoln's view, why is the existence of the Union threatened?
9. On what grounds does Lincoln base the struggle between him and Douglas as the struggle between right and wrong?

Senator Stephen Douglas's Speech

...The issue thus being made up between Mr. Lincoln and myself on three points, we went before the people of the State. During the following seven weeks, between the Chicago speeches and our first meeting at Ottawa, he and I addressed large assemblages of the people in many of the central counties. In my speeches I confined myself closely to those three positions which he had taken controverting his proposition that this Union could not exist as our fathers made it, divided into free and slave States, controverting his proposition of a crusade against the Supreme Court because of the Dred Scott decision, and controverting his proposition that the Declaration of Independence included and meant the negroes as well as the white men, when it declared all men to be created equal. I supposed at that time that these propositions constituted a distinct issue between us, and that the opposite positions we had taken upon them we would be willing to be held to in every part of the State. I never intended to waver one hair's breadth from that issue either in the north or the south, or wherever I should address the people of Illinois. I hold that when the time arrives that I cannot proclaim my political creed in the same terms not only in the northern but the southern part of Illinois, not only in the northern but the southern States, and wherever the American flag waves over American soil, that then there must be something wrong in that creed. So long as we live under a common constitution, so long as we live in a confederacy of sovereign and equal States, joined together as one for certain purposes, that any political creed is radically wrong which cannot be proclaimed in every State, and every section of that Union alike. I took up Mr. Lincoln's three propositions in my several speeches, analyzed them, and pointed out what I believed to be the radical errors contained in them. First, in regard to his doctrine that this government was in violation of the law of God which says, that a house divided against itself cannot stand, I repudiated it as a slander upon the immortal framers of our constitution. I then said, have often repeated, and now again assert, that in my opinion this government can endure forever, divided into free and slave States as our fathers made it,—each State having the right to prohibit, abolish or sustain slavery just as it pleases. This government was made upon the great basis of the sovereignty of the States, the right of each State to regulate its own domestic institutions to suit itself, and that right was conferred with understanding and expectation that inasmuch as each
locality had separate interests, each locality must have different and distinct local and domestic institutions, corresponding to its wants and interests. Our fathers knew when they made the government, that the laws and institutions which were well adapted to the green mountains of Vermont, were unsuited to the rice plantations of South Carolina. They knew then, as well as we know now, that the laws and institutions which would be well adapted to the beautiful prairies of Illinois would not be suited to the mining regions of California. They knew that in a Republic as broad as this, having such a variety of soil, climate and interest, there must necessarily be a corresponding variety of local laws—the policy and institutions of each State adapted to its condition and wants. For this reason this Union was established on the right of each State to do as it pleased on the question of slavery, and every other question; and the various States were not allowed to complain of, much less interfere, with the policy of their neighbors.

Suppose the doctrine advocated by Mr. Lincoln and the abolitionists of this day had prevailed when the Constitution was made, what would have been the result? Imagine for a moment that Mr. Lincoln had been a member of the convention that framed the Constitution of the United States, and that when its members were about to sign that wonderful document, he had arisen in that convention as he did at Springfield this summer, and addressing himself to the President, had said, "a house divided against itself cannot stand; this government divided into free and slave States cannot endure, they must all be free or all be slave, they must all be one thing or all the other, otherwise, it is a violation of the law of God, and cannot continue to exist;"—suppose Mr. Lincoln had convinced that body of sages, that that doctrine was sound, what would have been the result? Remember that the Union was then composed of thirteen States, twelve of which were slaveholding and one free. Do you think that the one free State would have outvoted the twelve slaveholding States, and thus have secured the abolition of slavery? On the other hand, would not the twelve slaveholding States have outvoted the one free State, and thus have fastened slavery, by a Constitutional provision, on every foot of the American Republic forever? You see that if this abolition doctrine of Mr. Lincoln had prevailed when the government was made, it would have established slavery as a permanent institution, in all the States whether they wanted it or not, and the question for us to determine in Illinois now as one of the free
States is, whether or not we are willing, having become the majority section, to enforce a doctrine on the minority, which we would have resisted with our heart's blood had it been attempted on us when we were in a minority. How has the South lost her power as the majority section in this Union, and how have the free States gained it, except under the operation of that principle which declares the right of the people of each State and each territory to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way. It was under that principle that slavery was abolished in New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania; it was under that principle that one half of the slaveholding States became free; it was under that principle that the number of free States increased until from being one out of twelve States, we have grown to be the majority of States of the whole Union, with the power to control the House of Representatives and Senate, and the power, consequently, to elect a President by Northern votes without the aid of a Southern State. Having obtained this power under the operation of that great principle, are you now prepared to abandon the principle and declare that merely because we have the power you will wage a war against the Southern States and their institutions until you force them to abolish slavery everywhere....

But the Abolition party really think that under the Declaration of Independence the negro is equal to the white man, and that negro equality is an inalienable right conferred by the Almighty, and hence, that all human laws in violation of it are null and void. With such men it is no use for me to argue. I hold that the signers of the Declaration of Independence had no reference to negroes at all when they declared all men to be created equal. They did not mean negro, nor the savage Indians, nor the Fejee Islanders, nor any other barbarous race. They were speaking of white men. They alluded to men of European birth and European descent—to white men, and to none others, when they declared that doctrine. I hold that this Government was established on the white basis. It was established by white men for the benefit of white men and their posterity forever, and should be administered by white men, and none others. But it does not follow, by any means, that merely because the negro is not a citizen, and merely because he is not our equal, that, therefore, he should be a slave. On the contrary, it does follow, that we ought to extend to the negro race, and to all other dependent races all the rights, all the privileges, and all the immunities which they
can exercise consistently with the safety of society. Humanity requires that we should give them all these privileges; Christianity commands that we should extend those privileges to them. The question then arises what are those privileges, and what is the nature and extent of them. My answer is that that is a question which each State must answer for itself. We in Illinois have decided it for ourselves. We tried slavery, kept it up for twelve years, and finding that it was not profitable we abolished it for that reason, and became a free State. We adopted in its stead the policy that a negro in this State shall not be a slave and shall not be a citizen. We have a right to adopt that policy. For my part I think it is a wise and sound policy for us. You in Missouri must judge for yourselves whether it is a wise policy for you.

If you choose to follow our example, very good; if you reject it, still well, it is your business, not ours. So with Kentucky. Let Kentucky adopt a policy to suit herself. If we do not like it we will keep away from it, and if she does not like ours let her stay at home, mind her own business and let us alone. If the people of all the States will act on that great principle, and each State mind its own business, attend to its own affairs, take care of its own negroes and not meddle with its neighbors, then there will be peace between the North and the South, the East and the West, throughout the whole Union. Why can we not thus have peace? Why should we thus allow a sectional party to agitate this country, to array the North against the South, and convert us into enemies instead of friends, merely that a few ambitious men may ride into power on a sectional hobby? How long is it since these ambitious Northern men wished for a sectional organization? Did any one of them dream of a sectional party as long as the North was the weaker section and the South the stronger? Then all were opposed to sectional parties; but the moment the North obtained the majority in the House and Senate by the admission of California, and could elect a President without the aid of Southern votes, that moment ambitious Northern men formed a scheme to excite the North against the South, and make the people be governed in their votes by geographical lines, thinking that the North, being the stronger section, would outvote the South, and consequently they, the leaders, would ride into office on a sectional hobby. I am told that my hour is out. It was very short.
Abraham Lincoln's Reply

...At Galesburg the other day, I said in answer to Judge Douglas, that three years ago there never had been a man, so far as I knew or believed, in the whole world, who had said that the Declaration of Independence did not include negroes in the term "all men." I reassert it today. I assert that Judge Douglas and all his friends may search the whole records of the country, and it will be a matter of great astonishment to me if they shall be able to find that one human being three years ago had ever uttered the astounding sentiment that the term "all men" in the Declaration did not include the negro. Do not let me be misunderstood. I know that more than three years ago there were men who, finding this assertion constantly in the way of their schemes to bring about the ascendancy and perpetuation of slavery, denied the truth of it. I know that Mr. Calhoun and all the politicians of his school denied the truth of the Declaration. I know that it ran along in the mouths of some Southern men for a period of years, ending at last in that shameful though rather forcible declaration of Pettit of Indiana, upon the floor of the United States Senate, that the Declaration of Independence was in that respect "a self-evident lie," rather than a self-evident truth. But I say, with a perfect knowledge of all this hawking at the Declaration without directly attacking it, that three years ago there never had lived a man who had ventured to assail it in the sneaking way of pretending to believe it and then asserting it did not include the negro. I believe the first man who ever said it was Chief Justice Taney in the Dred Scott case, and the next to him was our friend Stephen A. Douglas. And now it has become the catch-word of the entire party. I would like to call upon his friends everywhere to consider how they have come in so short a time to view this matter in a way so entirely different from their former belief? to ask whether they are not being borne along by an irresistible current—whither, they know not?...

And when this new principle—this new proposition that no human being ever thought of three years ago,—is brought forward, I combat it as having an evil tendency, if not an evil design; I combat it as having a tendency to dehumanize the negro—to take away from him
the right of ever striving to be a man. I combat it as being one of the thousand things con-
stantly done in these days to prepare the public mind to make property, and nothing but
property of the negro in all the States of this Union....

Again; the institution of slavery is only mentioned in the Constitution of the United States
two or three times, and in neither of these cases does the word "slavery" or "negro race"
occur; but covert language is used each time, and for a purpose full of significance. What is
the language in regard to the prohibition of the African slave trade? It runs in about this
way: "The migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall
think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year one thou-
sand eight hundred and eight."

The next allusion in the Constitution to the question of slavery and the black race, is on the
subject of the basis of representation, and there the language used is, "Representatives and
direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within
this Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to
the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and
excluding Indians not taxed—three-fifths of all other persons."

It says "persons," not slaves, not negroes; but this "three-fifths" can be applied to no other
class among us than the negroes.

Lastly, in the provision for the reclamation of fugitive slaves it is said: "No person held to
service or labor in one State under the laws thereof escaping into another, shall in conse-
quence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall
be delivered up, on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due." There
again there is no mention of the word "negro" or of slavery. In all three of these places,
being the only allusions to slavery in the instrument, covert language is used. Language is
used not suggesting that slavery existed or that the black race were among us. And I under-
stand the contemporaneous history of those times to be that covert language was used with
a purpose, and that purpose was that in our Constitution, which it was hoped and is still
hoped will endure forever—when it should be read by intelligent and patriotic men, after
the institution of slavery had passed from among us—there should be nothing on the face of the great charter of liberty suggesting that such a thing as negro slavery had ever existed among us. This is part of the evidence that the fathers of the Government expected and intended the institution of slavery to come to an end. They expected and intended that it should be in the course of ultimate extinction. And when I say that I desire to see the further spread of it arrested I only say I desire to see that done which the fathers have first done. When I say I desire to see it placed where the public mind will rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction, I only say I desire to see it placed where they placed it. It is not true that our fathers, as Judge Douglas assumes, made this government part slave and part free. Understand the sense in which he puts it. He assumes that slavery is a rightful thing within itself,—was introduced by the framers of the Constitution. The exact truth is, that they found the institution existing among us, and they left it as they found it. But in making the government they left this institution with many clear marks of disapprobation upon it. They found slavery among them and they left it among them because of the difficulty— the absolute impossibility of its immediate removal. And when Judge Douglas asks me why we cannot let it remain part slave and part free as the fathers of the government made, he asks a question based upon an assumption which is itself a falsehood; and I turn upon him and ask him the question, when the policy that the fathers of the government had adopted in relation to this element among us was the best policy in the world—the only wise policy—the only policy that we can ever safely continue upon—that will ever give us peace unless this dangerous element masters us all and becomes a national institution—I turn upon him and ask him why he could not let it alone? I turn and ask him why he was driven to the necessity of introducing a new policy in regard to it? He has himself said he introduced a new policy. He said so in his speech on the 22nd of March of the present year, 1858. I ask him why he could not let it remain where our fathers placed it? I ask too of Judge Douglas and his friends why we shall not again place this institution upon the basis on which the fathers left it? I ask you when he infers that I am in favor of setting the free and slave States at war, when the institution was placed in that attitude by those who made the constitution, did they make any war? If we had no war out of it when thus placed, wherein is the ground of belief that we shall have war out of it if we return to that policy? Have we
had any peace upon this matter springing from any other basis? I maintain that we have not. I have proposed nothing more than a return to the policy of the fathers....

I have stated upon former occasions, and I may as well state again, what I understand to be the real issue in this controversy between Judge Douglas and myself. On the point of my wanting to make war between the free and the slave States, there has been no issue between us. So, too, when he assumes that I am in favor of introducing a perfect social and political equality between the white and black races. These are false issues, upon which Judge Douglas has tried to force the controversy. There is no foundation in truth for the charge that I maintain either of these propositions. The real issue in this controversy—the one pressing upon every mind—is the sentiment on the part of one class that looks upon the institution of slavery as a wrong, and of another class that does not look upon it as a wrong. The sentiment that contemplates the institution of slavery in this country as a wrong is the sentiment of the Republican party. It is the sentiment around which all their actions—all their arguments circle—from which all their propositions radiate. They look upon it as being a moral, social and political wrong; and while they contemplate it as such, they nevertheless have due regard for its actual existence among us, and the difficulties of getting rid of it in any satisfactory way and to all the constitutional obligations thrown about it. Yet having a due regard for these, they desire a policy in regard to it that looks to its not creating any more danger. They insist that it should as far as may be, be treated as a wrong, and one of the methods of treating it as a wrong is to make provision that it shall grow no larger. They also desire a policy that looks to a peaceful end of slavery at sometime, as being wrong. These are the views they entertain in regard to it as I understand them; and all their sentiments—all their arguments and propositions are brought within this range. I have said and I repeat it here, that if there be a man amongst us who does not think that the institution of slavery is wrong in any one of the aspects of which I have spoken, he is misplaced and ought not to be with us. And if there be a man amongst us who is so impatient of it as a wrong as to disregard its actual presence among us and the difficulty of getting rid of it suddenly in a satisfactory way, and to disregard the constitutional obligations thrown about it, that man is misplaced if he is on our platform. We disclaim sympathy with him in practical action. He is not placed properly with us.
On this subject of treating it as a wrong, and limiting its spread, let me say a word. Has anything ever threatened the existence of this Union save and except this very institution of Slavery? What is it that we hold most dear amongst us? Our own liberty and prosperity. What has ever threatened our liberty and prosperity save and except this institution of Slavery? If this is true, how do you propose to improve the condition of things by enlarging Slavery—by spreading it out and making it bigger? You may have a wen or a cancer upon your person and not be able to cut it out lest you bleed to death; but surely it is no way to cure it, to engraft it and spread it over your whole body. That is no proper way of treating what you regard a wrong. You see this peaceful way of dealing with it as a wrong—restricting the spread of it, and not allowing it to go into new countries where it has not already existed. That is the peaceful way, the old-fashioned way, the way in which the fathers themselves set us the example.

On the other hand, I have said there is a sentiment which treats it as not being wrong. That is the Democratic sentiment of this day. I do not mean to say that every man who stands within that range positively asserts that it is right. That class will include all who positively assert that it is right, and all who like Judge Douglas treat it as indifferent and do not say it is either right or wrong. These two classes of men fall within the general class of those who do not look upon it as a wrong. And if there be among you anybody who supposes that he as a Democrat, can consider himself "as much opposed to slavery as anybody," I would like to reason with him. You never treat it as a wrong. What other thing that you consider as a wrong, do you deal with as you deal with that? Perhaps you say it is wrong, but your leader never does, and you quarrel with anybody who says it is wrong. Although you pretend to say so yourself you can find no fit place to deal with it as a wrong. You must not say anything about it in the free States, because it is not here. You must not say anything about it in the slave States, because it is there. You must not say anything about it in the pulpit, because that is religion and has nothing to do with it. You must not say anything about it in politics, because that will disturb the security of "my place." There is no place to talk about it as being a wrong, although you say yourself it is a wrong. But finally you will screw yourself up to the belief that if the people of the slave States should adopt a system of gradual emancipation on the slavery question, you would be in favor of it. You would be in favor of it. You
say that is getting it in the right place, and you would be glad to see it succeed. But you are deceiving yourself. You all know that Frank Blair and Gratz Brown, down there in St. Louis, undertook to introduce that system in Missouri. They fought as valiantly as they could for the system of gradual emancipation which you pretend you would be glad to see succeed.

Now I will bring you to the test. After a hard fight they were beaten, and when the news came over here you threw up your hats and hurrahed for Democracy. More than that, take all the argument made in favor of the system you have proposed, and it carefully excludes the idea that there is anything wrong in the institution of slavery. The arguments to sustain that policy carefully excluded it. Even here today you heard Judge Douglas quarrel with me because I uttered a wish that it might sometime come to an end. Although Henry Clay could say he wished every slave in the United States was in the country of his ancestors, I am denounced by those pretending to respect Henry Clay for uttering a wish that it might sometime, in some peaceful way, come to an end. The Democratic policy in regard to that institution will not tolerate the merest breath, the slightest hint, of the least degree of wrong about it. Try it by some of Judge Douglas' arguments. He says he "don't care whether it is voted up or voted down" in the Territories. I do not care myself in dealing with that expression, whether it is intended to be expressive of his individual sentiments on the subject, or only of the national policy he desires to have established. It is alike valuable for my purpose. Any man can say that who does not see anything wrong in slavery, but no man can logically say it who does see a wrong in it; because no man can logically say he don't care whether a wrong is voted up or voted down. He may say he don't care whether an indifferent thing is voted up or down, but he must logically have a choice between a right thing and a wrong thing. He contends that whatever community wants slaves has a right to have them. So they have if it is not a wrong. But if it is a wrong, he cannot say people have a right to do wrong.

He says that upon the score of equality, slaves should be allowed to go in a new Territory, like other property. This is strictly logical if there is no difference between it and other property. If it and other property are equal, his argument is entirely logical. But if you insist that one is wrong and the other right, there is no use to institute a comparison between right and wrong. You may turn over everything in the Democratic policy from beginning to end, whether in the shape it takes on the statute book, in the shape it takes in the Dred
Scott decision, in the shape it takes in conversation or the shape it takes in short maxim-like arguments—it everywhere carefully excludes the idea that there is anything wrong in it.

That is the real issue. That is the issue that will continue in this country when these poor tongues of Judge Douglas and myself shall be silent. It is the eternal struggle between these two principles—right and wrong—throughout the world. They are the two principles that have stood face to face from the beginning of time; and will ever continue to struggle. The one is the common right of humanity and the other the divine right of kings. It is the same principle in whatever shape it develops itself. It is the same spirit that says, "You work and toil and earn bread, and I'll eat it." No matter in what shape it comes, whether from the mouth of a king who seeks to bestride the people of his own nation and live by the fruit of their labor, or from one race of men as an apology for enslaveing another race, it is the same tyrannical principle. I was glad to express my gratitude at Quincy, and I re-express it here to Judge Douglas—*that he looks to no end of the institution of slavery*. That will help the people to see where the struggle really is. It will hereafter place with us all men who really do wish the wrong may have an end. And whenever we can get rid of the fog which obscures the real question—when we can get Judge Douglas and his friends to avow a policy looking to its perpetuation—we can get out from among them that class of men and bring them to the side of those who treat it as a wrong. Then there will soon be an end of it, and that end will be its "ultimate extinction." Whenever the issue can be distinctly made, and all extraneous matter thrown out so that men can fairly see the real difference between the parties, this controversy will soon be settled, and it will be done peaceably too. There will be no war, no violence. It will be placed again where the wisest and best men of the world, placed it. Brooks of South Carolina once declared that when this Constitution was framed, its framers did not look to the institution existing until this day. When he said this, I think he stated a fact that is fully borne out by the history of the times. But he also said they were better and wiser men than the men of these days; yet the men of these days had experience which they had not, and by the invention of the cotton gin it became a necessity in this country that slavery should be perpetual. I now say that willingly or unwillingly, purposely or without purpose, Judge Douglas has been the most prominent instrument in changing
the position of the institution of slavery which the fathers of the government expected to come to an end ere this—and putting it upon Brooks' cotton gin basis,—placing it where he openly confesses he has no desire there shall ever be an end of it....

**Senator Stephen Douglas's Reply**

Mr. Lincoln has concluded his remarks by saying that there is not such an Abolitionist as I am in all America. If he could make the Abolitionists of Illinois believe that, he would not have much show for the Senate. Let him make the Abolitionists believe the truth of that statement and his political back is broken.

His first criticism upon me is the expression of his hope that the war of the administration will be prosecuted against me and the Democratic party of his State with vigor. He wants that war prosecuted with vigor; I have no doubt of it. His hopes of success, and the hopes of his party depend solely upon it. They have no chance of destroying the Democracy of this State except by the aid of federal patronage. He has all the federal office-holders here as his allies, running separate tickets against the Democracy to divide the party although the leaders all intend to vote directly the Abolition ticket, and only leave the green-horns to vote this separate ticket who refuse to go into the Abolition camp. There is something really refreshing in the thought that Mr. Lincoln is in favor of prosecuting one war vigorously. It is the first war I ever knew him to be in favor of prosecuting. It is the first war that I ever knew him to believe to be just or constitutional. When the Mexican war [was] being waged, and the American army was surrounded by the enemy in Mexico, he thought that war was unconstitutional, unnecessary and unjust. He thought it was not commenced on the right spot.

When I made an incidental allusion of that kind in the joint discussion over at Charleston some weeks ago, Lincoln, in replying, said that I, Douglas, had charged him with voting against supplies for the Mexican war, and then he reared up, full length, and swore that he never voted against the supplies—that it was a slander—and caught hold of Ficklin, who sat on the stand, and said, "Here, Ficklin, tell the people that it is a lie." Well, Ficklin, who had served in Congress with him, stood up and told them all that he recollected about it. It
was that when George Ashmun, of Massachusetts, brought forward a resolution declaring
the war unconstitutional, unnecessary, and unjust, that Lincoln had voted for it. "Yes," said
Lincoln, "I did." Thus he confessed that he voted that the war was wrong, that our country
was in the wrong, and consequently that the Mexicans were in the right; but charged that I
had slandered him by saying that he voted against the supplies. I never charged him with
voting against the supplies in my life, because I knew that he was not in Congress when
they were voted. The war was commenced on the 13th day of May, 1846, and on that day
we appropriated in Congress ten millions of dollars and fifty thousand men to prosecute it.
During the same session we voted more men and more money, and at the next session we
voted more men and more money, so that by the time Mr. Lincoln entered Congress we
had enough men and enough money to carry on the war, and had no occasion to vote any
more. When he got into the House, being opposed to the war, and not being able to stop
the supplies, because they had all gone forward, all he could do was to follow the lead of
Corwin, and prove that the war was not begun on the right spot, and that it was unconsti-
tutional, unnecessary, and wrong. Remember, too, that this he did after the war had been
begun. It is one thing to be opposed to the declaration of a war, another and very different
thing to take sides with the enemy against your own country after the war has been com-
menced. Our army was in Mexico at the time, many battles had been fought; our citizens,
who were defending the honor of their country's flag, were surrounded by the daggers, the
guns and the poison of the enemy. Then it was that Corwin made his speech in which he
declared that the American soldiers ought to be welcomed by the Mexicans with bloody
hands and hospitable graves; then it was that Ashmun and Lincoln voted in the House of
Representatives that the war was unconstitutional and unjust; and Ashmun's resolution,
Corwin's speech, and Lincoln's vote were sent to Mexico and read at the head of the Mexi-
can army, to prove to them that there was a Mexican party in the Congress of the United
States who were doing all in their power to aid them. That a man who takes sides with the
common enemy against his own country in time of war should rejoice in a war being made
on me now, is very natural. And in my opinion, no other kind of a man would rejoice in
it....
Mr. Lincoln tries to avoid the main issue by attacking the truth of my proposition, that our fathers made this government divided into free and slave States, recognizing the right of each to decide all its local questions for itself. Did they not thus make it? It is true that they did not establish slavery in any of the States, or abolish it in any of them; but finding thirteen States twelve of which were slave and one free, they agreed to form a government uniting them together, as they stood divided into free and slave States, and to guarantee forever to each State the right to do as it pleased on the slavery question. Having thus made the government, and conferred this right upon each State forever, I assert that this government can exist as they made it, divided into free and slave States, if any one State chooses to retain slavery. He says that he looks forward to a time when slavery shall be abolished everywhere. I look forward to a time when each State shall be allowed to do as it pleases. If it chooses to keep slavery forever, it is not my business, but its own; if it chooses to abolish slavery, it is its own business—not mine. I care more for the great principle of self-government, the right of the people to rule, than I do for all the negroes in Christendom. I would not endanger the perpetuity of this Union. I would not blot out the great inalienable rights of the white men for all the negroes that ever existed. Hence, I say, let us maintain this government on the principles that our fathers made it, recognizing the right of each State to keep slavery as long as its people determine, or to abolish it when they please. But Mr. Lincoln says that when our fathers made this government they did not look forward to the state of things now existing; and therefore he thinks the doctrine was wrong; and he quotes Brooks, of South Carolina, to prove that our fathers then thought that probably slavery would be abolished, by each State acting for itself before this time. Suppose they did; suppose they did not foresee what has occurred,—does that change the principles of our government? They did not probably foresee the telegraph that transmits intelligence by lightning, nor did they foresee the railroads that now form the bonds of union between the different States, or the thousand mechanical inventions that have elevated mankind. But do these things change the principles of the government? Our fathers, I say, made this government on the principle of the right of each State to do as it pleases in its own domestic affairs, subject to the constitution, and allowed the people of each to apply to every new
change of circumstance such remedy as they may see fit to improve their condition. This right they have for all time to come....
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I proceed to the discussion. And first a word about the question. Much will be gained at the outset if we fully and clearly understand the real question under discussion. Indeed, nothing is or can be understood. This are often confounded and treated as the same, for no better reason than that they resemble each other, even while they are in their nature and character totally distinct and even directly opposed to each other. This jumbling up things is a sort of dust-throwing which is often indulged in by small men who argue for victory rather than for truth.

Thus, for instance, the American Government and the American Constitution are spoken of in a manner which would naturally lead the hearer to believe that one is identical with the other; when the truth is, they are distinct in character as is a ship and a compass. The one may point right and the other steer wrong. A chart is one thing, the course of the vessel is another. The Constitution may be right, the Government is wrong. If the Government has been governed by mean, sordid, and wicked passions, it does not follow that the Constitution is mean, sordid, and wicked.

What, then, is the question? I will state it. But first let me state what is not the question. It is not whether slavery existed in the United States at the time of the adoption of the Constitution; it is not whether slaveholders took part in the framing of the Constitution; it is not whether those slaveholders, in their hearts, intended to secure certain advantages in that instrument for slavery; it is not whether the American Government has been wielded during seventy-two years in favour of the propagation and permanence of slavery; it is not whether a pro-slavery interpretation has been put upon the Constitution by the American Courts — all these points may be true or they may be false, they may be accepted or they may be rejected, without in any wise affecting the real question in debate.

The real and exact question between myself and the class of persons represented by the speech at the City Hall may be fairly stated thus: — 1st, Does the United States Constitution guarantee to any class or description of people in that country the right to enslave, or hold as property, any other class or description of people in that country? 2nd, Is the dissolution of the union between the slave and free States required by fidelity to the slaves, or by the
just demands of conscience? Or, in other words, is the refusal to exercise the elective franchise, and to hold office in America, the surest, wisest, and best way to abolish slavery in America?

To these questions the Garrisonians say Yes. They hold the Constitution to be a slaveholding instrument, and will not cast a vote or hold office, and denounce all who vote or hold office, no matter how faithfully such persons labour to promote the abolition of slavery. I, on the other hand, deny that the Constitution guarantees the right to hold property in man, and believe that the way to abolish slavery in America is to vote such men into power as well use their powers for the abolition of slavery. This is the issue plainly stated, and you shall judge between us. Before we examine into the disposition, tendency, and character of the Constitution, I think we had better ascertain what the Constitution itself is. Before looking for what it means, let us see what it is. Here, too, there is much dust to be cleared away.

What, then, is the Constitution? I will tell you. It is not even like the British Constitution, which is made up of enactments of Parliament, decisions of Courts, and the established usages of the Government. The American Constitution is a written instrument full and complete in itself. No Court in America, no Congress, no President, can add a single word thereto, or take a single word thereto. It is a great national enactment done by the people, and can only be altered, amended, or added to by the people. I am careful to make this statement here; in America it would not be necessary. It would not be necessary here if my assailant had shown the same desire to be set before you the simple truth, which he manifested to make out a good case for himself and friends. Again, it should be borne in mind that the mere text, and only the text, and not any commentaries or creeds written by those who wished to give the text a meaning apart from its plain reading, was adopted as the Constitution of the United States. It should also be borne in mind that the intentions of those who framed the Constitution, be they good or bad, for slavery or against slavery, are so respected so far, and so far only, as we find those intentions plainly stated in the Constitution. It would be the wildest of absurdities, and lead to endless confusion and mischiefs, if, instead of looking to the written paper itself, for its meaning, it were attempted to make us search it out, in the secret motives, and dishonest intentions, of some of the men who
took part in writing it. It was what they said that was adopted by the people, not what they were ashamed or afraid to say, and really omitted to say. Bear in mind, also, and the fact is an important one, that the framers of the Constitution sat with doors closed, and that this was done purposely, that nothing but the result of their labours should be seen, and that that result should be judged of by the people free from any of the bias shown in the debates. It should also be borne in mind, and the fact is still more important, that the debates in the convention that framed the Constitution, and by means of which a pro-slavery interpretation is now attempted to be forced upon that instrument, were not published till more than a quarter of a century after the presentation and the adoption of the Constitution.

These debates were purposely kept out of view, in order that the people should adopt, not the secret motives or unexpressed intentions of any body, but the simple text of the paper itself. Those debates form no part of the original agreement. I repeat, the paper itself, and only the paper itself, with its own plainly written purposes, is the Constitution. It must stand or fall, flourish or fade, on its own individual and self-declared character and objects. Again, where would be the advantage of a written Constitution, if, instead of seeking its meaning in its words, we had to seek them in the secret intentions of individuals who may have had something to do with writing the paper? What will the people of America a hundred years hence care about the intentions of the scriveners who wrote the Constitution? These men are already gone from us, and in the course of nature were expected to go from us. They were for a generation, but the Constitution is for ages. Whatever we may owe to them, we certainly owe it to ourselves, and to mankind, and to God, to maintain the truth of our own language, and to allow no villainy, not even the villainy of holding men as slaves — which Wesley says is the sum of all villainies — to shelter itself under a fair-seeming and virtuous language. We owe it to ourselves to compel the devil to wear his own garments, and to make wicked laws speak out their wicked intentions. Common sense, and common justice, and sound rules of interpretation all drive us to the words of the law for the meaning of the law. The practice of the Government is dwelt upon with much fervour and eloquence as conclusive as to the slaveholding character of the Constitution. This is really the strong
point and the only strong point, made in the speech in the City Hall. But good as this argument is, it is not conclusive. A wise man has said that few people have been found better than their laws, but many have been found worse. To this last rule America is no exception. Her laws are one thing, her practice is another thing. We read that the Jews made void the law by their tradition, that Moses permitted men to put away their wives because of the hardness of their hearts, but that this was not so at the beginning. While good laws will always be found where good practice prevails, the reverse does not always hold true. Far from it. The very opposite is often the case. What then? Shall we condemn the righteous law because wicked men twist it to the support of wickedness? Is that the way to deal with good and evil? Shall we blot out all distinction between them, and hand over to slavery all that slavery may claim on the score of long practice? Such is the course commended to us in the City Hall speech. After all, the fact that men go out of the Constitution to prove it pro-slavery, whether that going out is to the practice of the Government, or to the secret intentions of the writers of the paper, the fact that they do go out is very significant. It is a powerful argument on my side. It is an admission that the thing for which they are looking is not to be found where only it ought to be found, and that is in the Constitution itself. If it is not there, it is nothing to the purpose, be it wheresoever else it may be. But I shall have no more to say on this point hereafter.

The very eloquent lecturer at the City Hall doubtless felt some embarrassment from the fact that he had literally to give the Constitution a pro-slavery interpretation; because upon its face it of itself conveys no such meaning, but a very opposite meaning. He thus sums up what he calls the slaveholding provisions of the Constitution. I quote his own words: — “Article 1, section 9, provides for the continuance of the African slave trade for the 20 years, after the adoption of the Constitution. Art. 4, section 9, provides for the recovery from the other States of fugitive slaves. Art. 1, section 2, gives the slave States a representation of the three-fifths of all the slave population; and Art. 1, section 8, requires the President to use the military, naval, ordnance, and militia resources of the entire country for the suppression of slave insurrection, in the same manner as he would employ them to repel invasion.” Now any man reading this statement, or hearing it made with such a show of exactness,
would unquestionably suppose that he speaker or writer had given the plain written text of the Constitution itself. I can hardly believe that the intended to make any such impression.

It would be a scandalous imputation to say he did. Any yet what are we to make of it? How can we regard it? How can he be screened from the charge of having perpetrated a deliberate and point-blank misrepresentation? That individual has seen fit to place himself before the public as my opponent, and yet I would gladly find some excuse for him. I do not wish to think as badly of him as this trick of his would naturally lead me to think. Why did he not read the Constitution? Why did he read that which was not the Constitution? He pretended to be giving chapter and verse, section and clause, paragraph and provision. The words of the Constitution were before him. Why then did he not give you the plain words of the Constitution? Oh, sir, I fear that the gentleman knows too well why he did not. It so happens that no such words as “African slave trade,” no such words as “slave insurrections,” are anywhere used in that instrument. These are the words of that orator, and not the words of the Constitution of the United States. Now you shall see a slight difference between my manner of treating this subject and what which my opponent has seen fit, for reasons satisfactory to himself, to pursue. What he withheld, that I will spread before you: what he suppressed, I will bring to light: and what he passed over in silence, I will proclaim: that you may have the whole case before you, and not be left to depend upon either his, or upon my inferences or testimony. Here then are several provisions of the Constitution to which reference has been made. I read them word for word just as they stand in the paper, called the United States Constitution, Art. I, sec. 2. “Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included in this Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons; Art. I, sec. 9. The migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think fit to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a tax or duty may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding tend dollars for each person; Art. 4, sec. 2. No person held to service or labour in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from service or
labour; but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labour may be due; Art. I, sec. 8. To provide for calling for the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions.” Here then, are those provisions of the Constitution, which the most extravagant defenders of slavery can claim to guarantee a right of property in man. These are the provisions which have been pressed into the service of the human fleshmongers of America. Let us look at them just as they stand, one by one. Let us grant, for the sake of the argument, that the first of these provisions, referring to the basis of representation and taxation, does refer to slaves. We are not compelled to make that admission, for it might fairly apply to aliens — persons living in the country, but not naturalized. But giving the provisions the very worse construction, what does it amount to? I answer — It is a downright disability laid upon the slaveholding States; one which deprives those States of two-fifths of their natural basis of representation. A black man in a free State is worth just two-fifths more than a black man in a slave State, as a basis of political power under the Constitution. Therefore, instead of encouraging slavery, the Constitution encourages freedom by giving an increase of “two-fifths” of political power to free over slave States. So much for the three-fifths clause; taking it at is worst, it still leans to freedom, not slavery; for, be it remembered that the Constitution nowhere forbids a coloured man to vote. I come to the next, that which it is said guaranteed the continuance of the African slave trade for twenty years. I will also take that for just what my opponent alleges it to have been, although the Constitution does not warrant any such conclusion. But, to be liberal, let us suppose it did, and what follows? Why, this — that this part of the Constitution, so far as the slave trade is concerned, became a dead letter more than 50 years ago, and now binds no man’s conscience for the continuance of any slave trade whatsoever. Mr. Thompson is just 52 years too late in dissolving the Union on account of this clause. He might as well dissolve the British Government, because Queen Elizabeth granted to Sir John Hawkins to import Africans into the West Indies 300 years ago! But there is still more to be said about this abolition of the slave trade. Men, at that time, both in England and in America, looked upon the slave trade as the life of slavery. The abolition of the slave trade was supposed to be the certain death of slavery. Cut off the stream, and the pond will dry up, was the common notion at the time.
Wilberforce and Clarkson, clear-sighted as they were, took this view; and the American statesmen, in providing for the abolition of the slave trade, thought they were providing for the abolition of the slavery. This view is quite consistent with the history of the times. All regarded slavery as an expiring and doomed system, destined to speedily disappear from the country. But, again, it should be remembered that this very provision, if made to refer to the African slave trade at all, makes the Constitution anti-slavery rather than for slavery; for it says to the slave States, the price you will have to pay for coming into the American Union is, that the slave trade, which you would carry on indefinitely out of the Union, shall be put an end to in twenty years if you come into the Union. Secondly, if it does apply, it expired by its own limitation more than fifty years ago. Thirdly, it is anti-slavery, because it looked to the abolition of slavery rather than to its perpetuity. Fourthly, it showed that the intentions of the framers of the Constitution were good, not bad. I think this is quite enough for this point.

I go to the “slave insurrection” clause, though, in truth, there is no such clause. The one which is called so has nothing whatever to do with slaves or slaveholders any more than your laws for suppression of popular outbreaks has to do with making slaves of you and your children. It is only a law for suppression of riots or insurrections. But I will be generous here, as well as elsewhere, and grant that it applies to slave insurrections. Let us suppose that an anti-slavery man is President of the United States (and the day that shall see this the case is not distant) and this very power of suppressing slave insurrections would put an end to slavery. The right to put down an insurrection carries with it the right to determine the means by which it shall be put down. If it should turn out that slavery is a source of insurrection, that there is no security from insurrection while slavery lasts, why, the Constitution would be best obeyed by putting an end to slavery, and an anti-slavery Congress would do the very same thing. Thus, you see, the so-called slave-holding provisions of the American Constitution, which a little while ago looked so formidable, are, after all, no defence or guarantee for slavery whatever. But there is one other provision. This is called the “Fugitive Slave Provision.” It is called so by those who wish to make it subserv the interest of slavery in America, and the same by those who wish to uphold the views of a party in this country.
It is put thus in the speech at the City Hall: — “Let us go back to 1787, and enter Liberty
Hall, Philadelphia, where sat in convention the illustrious men who framed the Constitu-
tion — with George Washington in the chair. On the 27th of September, Mr. Butler and
Mr. Pinckney, two delegates from the State of South Carolina, moved that the Constitution
should require that fugitive slaves and servants should be delivered up like criminals, and
after a discussion on the subject, the clause, as it stands in the Constitution, was adopted.
After this, in the conventions held in the several States to ratify the Constitution, the same
meaning was attached to the words. For example, Mr. Madison (afterwards President),
when recommending the Constitution to his constituents, told them that the clause would
secure them their property in slaves.” I must ask you to look well to this statement. Upon
its face, it would seem a full and fair statement of the history of the transaction it professes
to describe and yet I declare unto you, knowing as I do the facts in the case, my utter amaze-
ment at the downright untruth conveyed under the fair seeming words now quoted. The
man who could make such a statement may have all the craftiness of a lawyer, but who can
accord to him the candour of an honest debater? What could more completely destroy all
confidence in his statements? Mark you, the orator had not allowed his audience to hear
read the provision of the Constitution to which he referred. He merely characterized it as
one to “deliver up fugitive slaves and servants like criminals,” and tells you that this was
done “after discussion.” But he took good care not to tell you what was the nature of that
discussion. He have would have spoiled the whole effect of his statement had he told you
the whole truth. Now, what are the facts connected with this provision of the Constitution?
You shall have them. It seems to take two men to tell the truth. It is quite true that Mr.
Butler and Mr. Pinckney introduced a provision expressly with a view to the recapture of
fugitive slaves: it is quite true also that there was some discussion on the subject — and just
here the truth shall come out. These illustrious kidnappers were told promptly in that dis-
cussion that no such idea as property in man should be admitted into the Constitution. The
speaker in question might have told you, and he would have told you but the simple truth,
if he had told you that he proposition of Mr. Butler and Mr. Pinckney — which he leads
you to infer was adopted by the convention that from the Constitution — was, in fact,
promptly and indignantly rejected by that convention. He might have told you, had it
suited his purpose to do so, that the words employed in the first draft of the fugitive slave clause were such as applied to the condition of slaves, and expressly declared that persons held to “servitude” should be given up; but that the word “servitude” was struck from the provision, for the very reason that it applied to slaves. He might have told you that the same Mr. Madison declared that the word was struck out because the convention would not consent that the idea of property in men should be admitted into the Constitution. The fact that Mr. Madison can be cited on both sides of this question is another evidence of the folly and absurdity of making the secret intentions of the framers the criterion by which the Constitution is to be construed. But it may be asked — if this clause does not apply to slaves, to whom does it apply?

I answer, that when adopted, it applies to a very large class of persons — namely, redemptioners — persons who had come to America from Holland, from Ireland, and other quarters of the globe — like the Coolies to the West Indies — and had, for a consideration duly paid, become bound to “serve and labour” for the parties two whom their service and labour was due. It applies to indentured apprentices and others who have become bound for a consideration, under contract duly made, to serve and labour, to such persons this provision applies, and only to such persons. The plain reading of this provision shows that it applies, and that it can only properly and legally apply, to persons “bound to service.” Its object plainly is, to secure the fulfillment of contracts for “service and labour.” It applies to indentured apprentices, and any other persons from whom service and labour may be due. The legal condition of the slave puts him beyond the operation of this provision. He is not described in it. He is a simple article of property. He does not owe and cannot owe service. He cannot even make a contract. It is impossible for him to do so. He can no more make such a contract than a horse or an ox can make one. This provision, then, only respects persons who owe service, and they only can owe service who can receive an equivalent and make a bargain. The slave cannot do that, and is therefore exempted from the operation of this fugitive provision. In all matters where laws are taught to be made the means of oppression, cruelty, and wickedness, I am for strict construction. I will concede nothing. It must be shown that it is so nominated in the bond. The pound of flesh, but not one drop
of blood. The very nature of law is opposed to all such wickedness, and makes it difficult to accomplish such objects under the forms of law. Law is not merely an arbitrary enactment with regard to justice, reason, or humanity. Blackstone defines it to be a rule prescribed by the supreme power of the State commanding what is right and forbidding what is wrong.

The speaker at the City Hall laid down some rules of legal interpretation. These rules send us to the history of the law for its meaning. I have no objection to such a course in ordinary cases of doubt. But where human liberty and justice are at stake, the case falls under an entirely different class of rules. There must be something more than history — something more than tradition. The Supreme Court of the United States lays down this rule, and it meets the case exactly — “Where rights are infringed — where the fundamental principles of the law are overthrown — where the general system of the law is departed from, the legislative intention must be expressed with irresistible clearness.” The same court says that the language of the law must be construed strictly in favour of justice and liberty. Again, there is another rule of law. It is — Where a law is susceptible of two meanings, the one making it accomplish an innocent purpose, and the other making it accomplish a wicked purpose, we must in all cases adopt that which makes it accomplish an innocent purpose. Again, the details of a law are to be interpreted in the light of the declared objects sought by the law. I set these rules down against those employed at the City Hall. To me they seem just and rational. I only ask you to look at the American Constitution in the light of them, and you will see with me that no man is guaranteed a right of property in man, under the provisions of that instrument. If there are two ideas more distinct in their character and essence than another, those ideas are “persons” and “property,” “men” and “things.” Now, when it is proposed to transform persons into “property” and men into beasts of burden, I demand that the law that completes such a purpose shall be expressed with irresistible clearness. The thing must not be left to inference, but must be done in plain English. I know how this view of the subject is treated by the class represented at the City Hall. They are in the habit of treating the Negro as an exception to general rules. When their own liberty is in question they will avail themselves of all rules of law which protect and defend their freedom; but when the black man’s rights are in question they concede everything, admit everything for slavery, and put liberty to the proof. They reserve the common law usage,
and presume the Negro a slave unless he can prove himself free. I, on the other hand, presume him free unless he is proved to be otherwise. Let us look at the objects for which the Constitution was framed and adopted, and see if slavery is one of them. Here are its own objects as set forth by itself: — “We, the people of these United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America.”

The objects here set forth are six in number: union, defence, welfare, tranquility, justice, and liberty. These are all good objects, and slavery, so far from being among them, is a foe of them all. But it has been said that Negroes are not included within the benefits sought under this declaration. This is said by the slaveholders in America — it is said by the City Hall orator — but it is not said by the Constitution itself. Its language is “we the people;” not we the white people, not even we the citizens, not we the privileged class, not we the high, not we the low, but we the people; not we the horses, sheep, and swine, and wheelbarrows, but we the people, we the human inhabitants; and, if Negroes are people, they are included in the benefits for which the Constitution of America was ordained and established. But how dare any man who pretends to be a friend to the Negro thus gratuitously concede away what the Negro has a right to claim under the Constitution? Why should such friends invent new arguments to increase the hopelessness of his bondage? This, I undertake to say, as the conclusion of the whole matter, that the constitutionality of slavery can be made out only by disregarding the plain and common-sense reading of the Constitution itself; by discrediting and casting away as worthless the most beneficent rules of legal interpretation; by ruling the Negro outside of these beneficent rules; by claiming that the Constitution does not mean what it says, and that it says what it does not mean; by disregarding the written Constitution, and interpreting it in the light of a secret understanding.

It is in this mean, contemptible, and underhand method that the American Constitution is pressed into the service of slavery. They go everywhere else for proof that the Constitution declares that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; it secures to every man the right of trial by jury, the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus — the great writ that put an end to slavery and slave-hunting in England — and it
secures to every State a republican form of government. Anyone of these provisions in the hands of abolition statesmen, and backed up by a right moral sentiment, would put an end to slavery in America. The Constitution forbids the passing of a bill of attainder: that is, a law entailing upon the child the disabilities and hardships imposed upon the parent. Every slave law in America might be repealed on this very ground. The slave is made a slave because his mother is a slave. But to all this it is said that the practice of the American people is against my view. I admit it. They have given the Constitution a slaveholding interpretation. I admit it. They have committed innumerable wrongs against the Negro in the name of the Constitution. Yes, I admit it all; and I go with him who goes farthest in denouncing these wrongs. But it does not follow that the Constitution is in favour of these wrongs because the slaveholders have given it that interpretation. To be consistent in his logic, the City Hall speaker must follow the example of some of his brothers in America — he must not only fling away the Constitution, but the Bible. The Bible must follow the Constitution, for that, too, has been interpreted for slavery by American divines. Nay, more, he must not stop with the Constitution of America, but make war with the British Constitution, for, if I mistake not, the gentleman is opposed to the union of Church and State. In America he called himself a Republican. Yet he does not go for breaking down the British Constitution, although you have a Queen on the throne, and bishops in the House of Lords.

My argument against the dissolution of the American Union is this: It would place the slave system more exclusively under the control of the slaveholding States, and withdraw it from the power in the Northern States which is opposed to slavery. Slavery is essentially barbarous in its character. It, above all things else, dreads the presence of an advanced civilization. It flourishes best where it meets no reproving frowns, and hears no condemning voices. While in the Union it will meet with both. Its hope of life, in the last resort, is to get out of the Union. I am, therefore, for drawing the bond of the Union more completely under the power of the Free States. What they most dread, that I most desire. I have much confidence in the instincts of the slaveholders. They see that the Constitution will afford slavery no protection when it shall cease to be administered by slaveholders. They see, moreover, that if there is once a will in the people of America to abolish slavery, this is no
word, no syllable in the Constitution to forbid that result. They see that the Constitution has not saved slavery in Rhode Island, in Connecticut, in New York, or Pennsylvania; that the Free States have only added three to their original number. There were twelve Slave States at the beginning of the Government: there are fifteen now. They dissolution of the Union would not give the North a single advantage over slavery, but would take from it many. Within the Union we have a firm basis of opposition to slavery. It is opposed to all the great objects of the Constitution. The dissolution of the Union is not only an unwise but a cowardly measure — 15 millions running away from three hundred and fifty thousand slaveholders. Mr. Garrison and his friends tell us that while in the Union we are responsible for slavery. He and they sing out “No Union with slaveholders,” and refuse to vote. I admit our responsibility for slavery while in the Union but I deny that going out of the Union would free us from that responsibility. There now clearly is no freedom from responsibility for slavery to any American citizen short to the abolition of slavery. The American people have gone quite too far in this slaveholding business now to sum up their whole business of slavery by singing out the cant phrase, “No union with slaveholders.” To desert the family hearth may place the recreant husband out of the presence of his starving children, but this does not free him from responsibility. If a man were on board of a pirate ship, and in company with others had robbed and plundered, his whole duty would not be preformed simply by taking the longboat and singing out, “No union with pirates.” His duty would be to restore the stolen property. The American people in the Northern States have helped to enslave the black people. Their duty will not have been done till they give them back their plundered rights. Reference was made at the City Hall to my having once held other opinions, and very different opinions to those I have now expressed. An old speech of mine delivered fourteen years ago was read to show — I know not what. Perhaps it was to show that I am not infallible. If so, I have to say in defence, that I never pretended to be. Although I cannot accuse myself of being remarkably unstable, I do not pretend that I have never altered my opinion both in respect to men and things. Indeed, I have been very much modified both in feeling and opinion within the last fourteen years. When I escaped from slavery, and was introduced to the Garrisonians, I adopted very many of their opinions, and defended them just as long as I deemed them true. I was young, had read but
little, and naturally took some things on trust. Subsequent experience and reading have led me to examine for myself. This had brought me to other conclusions. When I was a child, I thought and spoke as a child. But the question is not as to what were my opinions fourteen years ago, but what they are now. If I am right now, it really does not matter what I was fourteen years ago. My position now is one of reform, not of revolution. I would act for the abolition of slavery through the Government — not over its ruins. If slaveholders have ruled the American Government for the last fifty years, let the anti-slavery men rule the nation for the next fifty years. If the South has made the Constitution bend to the purposes of slavery, let the North now make that instrument bend to the cause of freedom and justice. If 350,000 slaveholders have, by devoting their energies to that single end, been able to make slavery the vital and animating spirit of the American Confederacy for the last 72 years, now let the freemen of the North, who have the power in their own hands, and who can make the American Government just what they think fit, resolve to blot out for ever the foul and haggard crime, which is the blight and mildew, the curse and the disgrace of the whole United States.
PRESIDENT-ELECT ABRAHAM LINCOLN (R-IL)
On the Constitution and Union
UNPUBLISHED WRITING FRAGMENT
January 1861

BACKGROUND

Abraham Lincoln scrawled these words on the relationship between the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, potentially as part of his drafts for his First Inaugural Address, though they were not used in the final speech nor in any other public comments.

ANNOTATIONS

All this is not the result of accident. It has a philosophical cause. Without the Constitution and the Union, we could not have attained the result; but even these, are not the primary cause of our great prosperity. There is something back of these, entwining itself more closely about the human heart. That something, is the principle of "Liberty to all"—the principle that clears the path for all—gives hope to all—and, by consequence, enterprise, and industry to all.

The expression of that principle, in our Declaration of Independence, was most happy, and fortunate. Without this, as well as with it, we could have declared our independence of Great Britain; but without it, we could not, I think, have secured our free government, and consequent prosperity. No oppressed, people will fight, and endure, as our fathers did, without the promise of something better, than a mere change of masters.

The assertion of that principle, at that time, was the word, "fitly spoken" which has proved an "apple of gold" to us. The Union, and the Constitution, are the picture of silver, subsequently framed around it. The picture was made, not to conceal, or destroy the apple; but

to adorn, and preserve it. The picture was made for the apple—not the apple for the picture.

So let us act, that neither picture, or apple shall ever be blurred, or bruised or broken.

That we may so act, we must study, and understand the points of danger.
President Abraham Lincoln (R)
First Inaugural Address

Speech

March 4, 1861
U.S. Capitol | Washington, D.C.

Background

Abraham Lincoln delivered this speech at his inauguration amidst declarations of secession by southern states.

Guiding Questions

1. How does Lincoln try to assuage the fears of Southerners?

2. Why does Lincoln believe that the Union is perpetual?

3. What is Lincoln’s understanding of the purpose of the executive power now confided in him?

4. On constitutional questions, what role does the Supreme Court have with respect to the other branches, in Lincoln’s understanding?

5. What is "the only substantial dispute," and what are its possible resolutions as Lincoln sees them?

Fellow citizens of the United States:

In compliance with a custom as old as the government itself, I appear before you to address you briefly, and to take, in your presence, the oath prescribed by the Constitution of the United States, to be taken by the President "before he enters on the execution of his office."

I do not consider it necessary, at present for me to discuss those matters of administration about which there is no special anxiety, or excitement.

Apprehension seems to exist among the people of the Southern States, that by the accession of a Republican Administration, their property, and their peace, and personal security, are to be endangered. There has never been any reasonable cause for such apprehension. Indeed, the most ample evidence to the contrary has all the while existed, and been open to their inspection. It is found in nearly all the published speeches of him who now addresses you. I do but quote from one of those speeches when I declare that "I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so." Those who nominated and elected me did so with full knowledge that I had made this, and many similar declarations, and had never recanted them. And more than this, they placed in the platform, for my acceptance, and as a law to themselves, and to me, the clear and emphatic resolution which I now read:

"Resolved, That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depend; and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force of the soil of any State or Territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes."
I now reiterate these sentiments: and in doing so, I only press upon the public attention the most conclusive evidence of which the case is susceptible, that the property, peace and security of no section are to be in anywise endangered by the now incoming Administration. I add too, that all the protection which, consistently with the Constitution and the laws, can be given, will be cheerfully given to all the States when lawfully demanded, for whatever cause—as cheerfully to one section, as to another.

There is much controversy about the delivering up of fugitives from service or labor. The clause I now read is as plainly written in the Constitution as any other of its provisions:

"No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."

It is scarcely questioned that this provision was intended by those who made it, for the reclaiming of what we call fugitive slaves; and the intention of the law-giver is the law. All members of Congress swear their support to the whole Constitution—to this provision as much as to any other. To the proposition, then, that slaves whose cases come within the terms of this clause, "shall be delivered up," their oaths are unanimous. Now, if they would make the effort in good temper, could they not, with nearly equal unanimity, frame and pass a law, by means of which to keep good that unanimous oath?

There is some difference of opinion whether this clause should be enforced by national or by state authority; but surely that difference is not a very material one. If the slave is to be surrendered, it can be of but little consequence to him, or to others, by which authority it is done. And should any one, in any case, be content that his oath shall go unkept, on a merely unsubstantial controversy as to how it shall be kept?

Again, in any law upon this subject, ought not all the safeguards of liberty known in civilized and humane jurisprudence to be introduced, so that a free man be not, in any case,
surrendered as a slave? And might it not be well, at the same time, to provide by law for the enforcement of that clause in the Constitution which guarantees that "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States?"

I take the official oath today, with no mental reservations, and with no purpose to construe the Constitution or laws, by any hypercritical rules. And while I do not choose now to specify particular acts of Congress as proper to be enforced, I do suggest, that it will be much safer for all, both in official and private stations, to conform to, and abide by, all those acts which stand unrepealed, than to violate any of them, trusting to find impunity in having them held to be unconstitutional.

It is seventy-two years since the first inauguration of a President under our national Constitution. During that period fifteen different and greatly distinguished citizens, have, in succession, administered the executive branch of the government. They have conducted it through many perils; and, generally, with great success. Yet, with all this scope for precedent, I now enter upon the same task for the brief constitutional term of four years, under great and peculiar difficulty. A disruption of the Federal Union heretofore only menaced, is now formidably attempted.

I hold, that in contemplation of universal law, and of the Constitution, the Union of these States is perpetual. Perpetuity is implied, if not expressed, in the fundamental law of all national governments. It is safe to assert that no government proper, ever had a provision in its organic law for its own termination. Continue to execute all the express provisions of our national Constitution, and the Union will endure forever—it being impossible to destroy it, except by some action not provided for in the instrument itself.

Again, if the United States be not a government proper, but an association of States in the nature of contract merely, can it, as a contract, be peaceably unmade, by less than all the parties who made it? One party to a contract may violate it—break it, so to speak; but does it not require all to lawfully rescind it?
Descending from these general principles, we find the proposition that, in legal contemplation, the Union is perpetual, confirmed by the history of the Union itself. The Union is much older than the Constitution. It was formed in fact, by the Articles of Association in 1774. It was matured and continued by the Declaration of Independence in 1776. It was further matured and the faith of all the then thirteen States expressly plighted and engaged that it should be perpetual, by the Articles of Confederation in 1778. And finally, in 1787, one of the declared objects for ordaining and establishing the Constitution, was "to form a more perfect union."

But if destruction of the Union, by one, or by a part only, of the States, be lawfully possible, the Union is less perfect than before the Constitution, having lost the vital element of perpetuity.

It follows from these views that no State, upon its own mere motion, can lawfully get out of the Union,—that resolves and ordinances to that effect are legally void; and that acts of violence, within any State or States, against the authority of the United States, are insurrectionary or revolutionary, according to circumstances.

I therefore consider that, in view of the Constitution and the laws, the Union is unbroken; and, to the extent of my ability, I shall take care, as the Constitution itself expressly enjoins upon me, that the laws of the Union be faithfully executed in all the States. Doing this I deem to be only a simple duty on my part; and I shall perform it, so far as practicable, unless my rightful masters, the American people, shall withhold the requisite means, or, in some authoritative manner, direct the contrary. I trust this will not be regarded as a menace, but only as the declared purpose of the Union that it will constitutionally defend, and maintain itself.

In doing this there needs to be no bloodshed or violence; and there shall be none, unless it be forced upon the national authority. The power confided to me, will be used to hold, occupy, and possess the property, and places belonging to the government, and to collect
the duties and imposts; but beyond what may be necessary for these objects, there will be no invasion—no using of force against, or among the people anywhere. Where hostility to the United States, in any interior locality, shall be so great and so universal, as to prevent competent resident citizens from holding the Federal offices, there will be no attempt to force obnoxious strangers among the people for that object. While the strict legal right may exist in the government to enforce the exercise of these offices, the attempt to do so would be so irritating, and so nearly impracticable with all, that I deem it better to forego, for the time, the uses of such offices.

The mails, unless repelled, will continue to be furnished in all parts of the Union. So far as possible, the people everywhere shall have that sense of perfect security which is most favorable to calm thought and reflection. The course here indicated will be followed, unless current events, and experience, shall show a modification, or change, to be proper; and in every case and exigency, my best discretion will be exercised, according to circumstances actually existing, and with a view and a hope of a peaceful solution of the national troubles, and the restoration of fraternal sympathies and affections.

That there are persons in one section, or another who seek to destroy the Union at all events, and are glad of any pretext to do it, I will neither affirm or deny; but if there be such, I need address no word to them. To those, however, who really love the Union, may I not speak?

Before entering upon so grave a matter as the destruction of our national fabric, with all its benefits, its memories, and its hopes, would it not be wise to ascertain precisely why we do it? Will you hazard so desperate a step, while there is any possibility that any portion of the ills you fly from, have no real existence? Will you, while the certain ills you fly to, are greater than all the real ones you fly from? Will you risk the commission of so fearful a mistake? All profess to be content in the Union, if all constitutional rights can be maintained. Is it true, then, that any right, plainly written in the Constitution, has been denied? I think not.
Happily the human mind is so constituted, that no party can reach to the audacity of doing this. Think, if you can, of a single instance in which a plainly written provision of the Constitution has ever been denied. If, by the mere force of numbers, a majority should deprive a minority of any clearly written constitutional right, it might, in a moral point of view, justify revolution—certainly would, if such right were a vital one. But such is not our case. All the vital rights of minorities, and of individuals, are so plainly assured to them, by affirmations and negations, guarantees and prohibitions, in the Constitution, that controversies never arise concerning them. But no organic law can ever be framed with a provision specifically applicable to every question which may occur in practical administration. No foresight can anticipate, nor any document of reasonable length contain express provisions for all possible questions. Shall fugitives from labor be surrendered by national or by State authority? The Constitution does not expressly say. May Congress prohibit slavery in the territories? The Constitution does not expressly say. Must Congress protect slavery in the territories? The Constitution does not expressly say.

From questions of this class spring all our constitutional controversies, and we divide upon them into majorities and minorities. If the minority will not acquiesce, the majority must, or the government must cease. There is no other alternative; for continuing the government, is acquiescence on one side or the other. If a minority, in such case, will secede rather than acquiesce, they make a precedent which, in turn, will divide and ruin them; for a minority of their own will secede from them, whenever a majority refuses to be controlled by such minority. For instance, why may not any portion of a new confederacy, a year or two hence, arbitrarily secede again, precisely as portions of the present Union now claim to secede from it. All who cherish disunion sentiments, are now being educated to the exact temper of doing this. Is there such perfect identity of interests among the States to compose a new Union, as to produce harmony only, and prevent renewed secession?

Plainly, the central idea of secession, is the essence of anarchy. A majority, held in restraint by constitutional checks, and limitations, and always changing easily, with deliberate changes of popular opinions and sentiments, is the only true sovereign of a free people.
Whoever rejects it, does, of necessity, fly to anarchy or to despotism. Unanimity is impossible; the rule of a minority, as a permanent arrangement, is wholly inadmissible; so that, rejecting the majority principle, anarchy, or despotism in some form, is all that is left.

I do not forget the position assumed by some, that constitutional questions are to be decided by the Supreme Court; nor do I deny that such decisions must be binding in any case, upon the parties to a suit, as to the object of that suit, while they are also entitled to very high respect and consideration, in all parallel cases, by all other departments of the government. And while it is obviously possible that such decision may be erroneous in any given case, still the evil effect following it, being limited to that particular case, with the chance that it may be over-ruled, and never become a precedent for other cases, can better be borne than could the evils of a different practice. At the same time the candid citizen must confess that if the policy of the government, upon vital questions, affecting the whole people, is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the instant they are made, in ordinary litigation between parties, in personal actions, the people will have ceased, to be their own rulers, having, to that extent, practically resigned their government, into the hands of that eminent tribunal. Nor is there, in this view, any assault upon the court, or the judges. It is a duty, from which they may not shrink, to decide cases properly brought before them; and it is no fault of theirs, if others seek to turn their decisions to political purposes.

One section of our country believes slavery is right, and ought to be extended, while the other believes it is wrong, and ought not to be extended. This is the only substantial dispute. The fugitive slave clause of the Constitution, and the law for the suppression of the foreign slave trade, are each as well enforced, perhaps, as any law can ever be in a community where the moral sense of the people imperfectly supports the law itself. The great body of the people abide by the dry legal obligation in both cases, and a few break over in each. This, I think, cannot be perfectly cured; and it would be worse in both cases after the separation of the sections, than before. The foreign slave trade, now imperfectly suppressed, would be ultimately revived without restriction, in one section; while fugitive slaves, now only partially surrendered, would not be surrendered at all, by the other.
Physically speaking, we cannot separate. We cannot remove our respective sections from each other, nor build an impassable wall between them. A husband and wife may be divorced, and go out of the presence, and beyond the reach of each other; but the different parts of our country cannot do this. They cannot but remain face to face; and intercourse, either amicable or hostile, must continue between them. Is it possible then to make that intercourse more advantageous, or more satisfactory, after separation than before? Can aliens make treaties easier than friends can make laws? Can treaties be more faithfully enforced between aliens, than laws can among friends? Suppose you go to war, you cannot fight always; and when, after much loss on both sides, and no gain on either, you cease fighting, the identical old questions, as to terms of intercourse, are again upon you.

This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember, or overthrow it. I can not be ignorant of the fact that many worthy, and patriotic citizens are desirous of having the national constitution amended. While I make no recommendation of amendments, I fully recognize the rightful authority of the people over the whole subject, to be exercised in either of the modes prescribed in the instrument itself; and I should, under existing circumstances, favor, rather than oppose, a fair opportunity being afforded the people to act upon it.

I will venture to add that, to me, the convention mode seems preferable, in that it allows amendments to originate with the people themselves, instead of only permitting them to take, or reject, propositions, originated by others, not especially chosen for the purpose, and which might not be precisely such, as they would wish to either accept or refuse. I understand a proposed amendment to the Constitution—which amendment, however, I have not seen, has passed Congress, to the effect that the federal government, shall never interfere with the domestic institutions of the States, including that of persons held to service. To avoid misconstruction of what I have said, I depart from my purpose not to speak of particular amendments, so far as to say that, holding such a provision to now be implied constitutional law, I have no objection to its being made express, and irrevocable.
The Chief Magistrate derives all his authority from the people, and they have referred none upon him to fix terms for the separation of the States. The people themselves can do this also if they choose; but the executive, as such, has nothing to do with it. His duty is to administer the present government, as it came to his hands, and to transmit it, unimpaired by him, to his successor.

Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people? Is there any better, or equal hope, in the world? In our present differences, is either party without faith of being in the right? If the Almighty Ruler of nations, with his eternal truth and justice, be on your side of the North, or on yours of the South, that truth, and that justice, will surely prevail, by the judgment of this great tribunal, the American people.

By the frame of the government under which we live, this same people have wisely given their public servants but little power for mischief; and have, with equal wisdom, provided for the return of that little to their own hands at very short intervals.

While the people retain their virtue, and vigilance, no administration, by any extreme of wickedness or folly, can very seriously injure the government, in the short space of four years.

My countrymen, one and all, think calmly and well, upon this whole subject. Nothing valuable can be lost by taking time. If there be an object to hurry any of you, in hot haste, to a step which you would never take deliberately, that object will be frustrated by taking time; but no good object can be frustrated by it. Such of you as are now dissatisfied, still have the old Constitution unimpaired, and, on the sensitive point, the laws of your own framing under it; while the new administration will have no immediate power, if it would, to change either. If it were admitted that you who are dissatisfied, hold the right side in the dispute, there still is no single good reason for precipitate action. Intelligence, patriotism, Christianity, and a firm reliance on Him, who has never yet forsaken this favored land, are still competent to adjust, in the best way, all our present difficulty.
In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The government will not assail you. You can have no conflict, without being yourselves the aggressors. You have no oath registered in Heaven to destroy the government, while I shall have the most solemn one to "preserve, protect and defend it."

I am loath to close. We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battle-field, and patriot grave, to every living heart and hearthstone, all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.
PRESIDENT ABRAHAM LINCOLN (R-IL)

A Proclamation

AN ORDER

January 1, 1863

Executive Mansion | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

On September 22, 1862 after the Union victory in the Battle of Antietam, Abraham Lincoln announced this order concerning property in slaves in the rebelling states, which took effect January 1, 1863.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Whom did the proclamation free?
2. In which places did this order apply?
3. By what authority did Lincoln issue this order?
4. What military purpose did the order serve?
5. What did Lincoln implore of slaves freed by the order?

By the President of the United States of America: A Proclamation.

Whereas, on the twenty-second day of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-two, a proclamation was issued by the President of the United States, containing, among other things, the following, to wit:

"That on the first day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, all persons held as slaves within any State or designated part of a State, the people whereof shall then be in rebellion against the United States, shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free; and the Executive Government of the United States, including the military and naval authority thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of such persons, and will do no act or acts to repress such persons, or any of them, in any efforts they may make for their actual freedom.

"That the Executive will, on the first day of January aforesaid, by proclamation, designate the States and parts of States, if any, in which the people thereof, respectively, shall then be in rebellion against the United States; and the fact that any State, or the people thereof, shall on that day be, in good faith, represented in the Congress of the United States by members chosen thereto at elections wherein a majority of the qualified voters of such State shall have participated, shall, in the absence of strong countervailing testimony, be deemed conclusive evidence that such State, and the people thereof, are not then in rebellion against the United States."

Now, therefore I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, by virtue of the power in me vested as Commander-in-Chief, of the Army and Navy of the United States in time of actual armed rebellion against authority and government of the United States, and as a fit and necessary war measure for suppressing said rebellion, do, on this first day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, and in accordance with my purpose so to do publicly proclaimed for the full period of one hundred days, from the day first above mentioned, order and designate as the States and parts of States wherein
The Emancipation Proclamation
Abraham Lincoln

the people thereof respectively, are this day in rebellion against the United States, the follow-
ing, to wit:

Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana, (except the Parishes of St. Bernard, Plaquemines, Jefferson, St. Johns, St. Charles, St. James, Ascension, Assumption, Terrebonne, Lafourche, St. Mary, St. Martin, and Orleans, including the City of New Orleans) Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South-Carolina, North-Carolina, and Virginia, (except the forty-eight counties designated as West Virginia, and also the counties of Berkley, Accomac, Northampton, Elizabeth-City, York, Princess Ann, and Norfolk, including the cities of Norfolk and Ports-
mouth); and which excepted parts are, for the present, left precisely as if this proclamation were not issued.

And by virtue of the power, and for the purpose aforesaid, I do order and declare that all persons held as slaves within said designated States, and parts of States, are, and hencefor-
ward shall be free; and that the Executive government of the United States, including the military and naval authorities thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of said persons.

And I hereby enjoin upon the people so declared to be free to abstain from all violence, unless in necessary self-defense; and I recommend to them that, in all cases when allowed, they labor faithfully for reasonable wages.

And I further declare and make known, that such persons of suitable condition, will be received into the armed service of the United States to garrison forts, positions, stations, and other places, and to man vessels of all sorts in said service.

And upon this act, sincerely believed to be an act of justice, warranted by the Constitution, upon military necessity, I invoke the considerate judgment of mankind, and the gracious favor of Almighty God.
In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington, this first day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the eighty-seventh.

By the President:

Abraham Lincoln

William H. Seward, Secretary of State.
PRESIDENT ABRAHAM LINCOLN (r)

On the Consecration of the
Soldiers’ National Cemetery

SPEECH

November 19, 1863
Soldiers’ National Cemetery | Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

BACKGROUND

Abraham Lincoln delivered these remarks at the dedication of the Union cemetery for those soldiers killed in the Battle of Gettysburg in the summer of 1863.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. For Lincoln, what is the central idea of the American Founding?

2. For what cause did the soldiers buried in Gettysburg give their lives?

3. What were they fighting to defend?

4. To what cause does Lincoln wish for listeners to dedicate themselves?

Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth, on this continent, a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived, and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battle-field of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting-place for those who here gave their lives, that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But, in a larger sense, we can not dedicate—we can not consecrate—we can not hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they here gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.
PRESIDENT ABRAHAM LINCOLN (R)

Second Inaugural Address

SPEECH

March 4, 1865

U.S. Capitol | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

Having been reelected and with the end of the Civil War in sight, Abraham Lincoln delivered this speech at his inauguration to a second term as president.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. According to Lincoln, who caused the Civil War?

2. What role in the war does Lincoln ascribe to God?

3. How does Lincoln think the North should treat the South when the war ends?

Fellow Countrymen:

At this second appearing to take the oath of the presidential office, there is less occasion for an extended address than there was at the first. Then a statement, somewhat in detail, of a course to be pursued, seemed fitting and proper. Now, at the expiration of four years, during which public declarations have been constantly called forth on every point and phase of the great contest which still absorbs the attention, and engrosses the energies of the nation, little that is new could be presented. The progress of our arms, upon which all else chiefly depends, is as well known to the public as to myself; and it is, I trust, reasonably satisfactory and encouraging to all. With high hope for the future, no prediction in regard to it is ventured.

On the occasion corresponding to this four years ago, all thoughts were anxiously directed to an impending civil-war. All dreaded it—all sought to avert it. While the inaugural address was being delivered from this place, devoted altogether to saving the Union without war, insurgent agents were in the city seeking to destroy it without war—seeking to dissolve the Union, and divide effects, by negotiation. Both parties deprecated war; but one of them would make war rather than let the nation survive; and the other would accept war rather than let it perish. And the war came.

One eighth of the whole population were colored slaves, not distributed generally over the Union, but localized in the Southern part of it. These slaves constituted a peculiar and powerful interest. All knew that this interest was, somehow, the cause of the war. To strengthen, perpetuate, and extend this interest was the object for which the insurgents would rend the Union, even by war; while the government claimed no right to do more than to restrict the territorial enlargement of it. Neither party expected for the war, the magnitude, or the duration, which it has already attained. Neither anticipated that the cause of the conflict might cease with, or even before, the conflict itself should cease. Each looked for an easier triumph, and a result less fundamental and astounding. Both read the same Bible, and pray to the same God; and each invokes His aid against the other. It may seem strange that any men should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of
other men’s faces; but let us judge not that we be not judged. The prayers of both could not be answered; that of neither has been answered fully. The Almighty has His own purposes. "Woe unto the world because of offenses! for it must needs be that offenses come; but woe to that man by whom the offense cometh!" If we shall suppose that American Slavery is one of those offenses which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which, having continued through His appointed time, He now wills to remove, and that He gives to both North and South, this terrible war, as the woe due to those by whom the offense came, shall we discern therein any departure from those divine attributes which the believers in a Living God always ascribe to Him? Fondly do we hope—fervently do we pray—that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue, until all the wealth piled by the bond-man’s two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash, shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so still it must be said "the judgments of the Lord, are true and righteous altogether."

With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just, and a lasting peace, among ourselves, and with all nations.
UNITED STATES CONGRESS

Civil Rights Act

BACKGROUND

Congress passed this Civil Rights Act of 1866 on the first anniversary of the end to the Civil War.

ANNOTATIONS

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all persons born in the United States and not subject to any foreign power, excluding Indians not taxed, are hereby declared to be citizens of the United States; and such citizens, of every race and color, without regard to any previous condition of slavery or involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall have the same right, in every State and Territory in the United States, to make and enforce contracts, to sue, be parties, and give evidence, to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold, and convey real and personal property, and to full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of person and property, as is enjoyed by white citizens, and shall be subject to like punishment, pains, and penalties, and to none other, any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, to the contrary notwithstanding.

Sec. 2. And be it further enacted, That any person who, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, shall subject, or cause to be subjected, any inhabitant of any State or Territory to the deprivation of any right secured or protected by this act, or to different punishment, pains, or penalties on account of such person having at any time

been held in a condition of slavery or involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, or by reason of his color or race, than is prescribed for the punishment of white persons, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, on conviction, shall be punished by fine not exceeding one thousand dollars, or imprisonment not exceeding one year, or both . . . .

Sec. 3. And be it further enacted, That the district courts of the United States . . . shall have, exclusively of the courts of the several States, cognizance of all crimes and offences committed against the provisions of this act, and also, concurrently with the circuit courts of the United States, of all causes, civil and criminal, affecting persons who are denied or cannot enforce in the courts or judicial tribunals of the State or locality where they may be any of the rights secured to them by the first section of this act . . .

Sec. 4. And be it further enacted, That the district attorneys, marshals, and deputy marshals of the United States, the commissioners appointed by the circuit and territorial courts of the United States, with powers of arresting, imprisoning, or bailing offenders against the laws of the United States . . . and every other officer who may be specially empowered by the President of the United States, shall be . . . specially authorized and required, at the expense of the United States, to institute proceedings against . . . every person who shall violate the provisions of this act, and cause him or them to be arrested and imprisoned, or bailed . . . for trial before such court of the United States or territorial court as by this act has cognizance of the offence . . .

Sec. 6. And be it further enacted, That any person who shall knowingly and willfully obstruct, hinder, or prevent any officer . . . charged with the execution of any warrant . . . or shall rescue or attempt to rescue such person from the custody of the officer . . . or shall aid, abet, or assist any person so arrested . . . to escape from the custody of the officer . . . or shall harbor or conceal any person for whose arrest a warrant or process shall have been issued . . . so as to prevent his discovery and arrest after notice or knowledge of the fact that a warrant has been issued for the apprehension of such person, shall . . . be subject to a fine . . . and imprisonment not exceeding six months . . .
Sec. 8. And be it further enacted, That whenever the President of the United States shall have reason to believe that offences have been or are likely to be committed against the provisions of this act . . . it shall be lawful for him . . . to direct the judge, marshal, and district attorney . . . to attend at such place . . . for the purpose of the more speedy arrest and trial of persons charged with a violation of this act; and it shall be the duty of every judge or other officer, when any such requisition shall be received by him, to attend at the place and for the time therein designated.

Sec. 9. And be it further enacted, That it shall be lawful for the President of the United States, or such person as he may empower for that purpose, to employ such part of the land or naval forces of the United States, or of the militia, as shall be necessary to prevent the violation and enforce the due execution of this act.

Sec. 10. And be it further enacted, That upon all questions of law arising in any cause under the provisions of this act a final appeal may be taken to the Supreme Court of the United States.
U.S. CONGRESS AND STATES

Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution

December 18, 1865
United States of America

BACKGROUND

The U.S. Congress passed and three-quarters of states ratified the Thirteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution by December 6, 1865, and the amendment was acknowledged as effective by Secretary of State William Seward on December 18, 1865.

ANNOTATIONS

Section 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

Section 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

U.S. Const. amend. XIII.
U.S. CONGRESS AND STATES

Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution

BACKGROUND

The U.S. Congress passed and three-quarters of states ratified the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution by July 21, 1868, and the amendment was acknowledged as effective by Secretary of State William Seward on July 28, 1868.

ANNOTATIONS

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of

U.S. Const. amend. XIV.
such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

Section 3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice-President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

Section 4. The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.

Section 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.
U.S. CONGRESS AND STATES

Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution

BACKGROUND

The U.S. Congress passed and three-quarters of states ratified the Fifteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution by February 3, 1870, and the amendment was acknowledged as effective by Secretary of State Hamilton Fish on March 30, 1870.

ANNOTATIONS

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.
E.D. ESTILLETTE, PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF POLICE

To the Police of Recently Emancipated Negroes

ORDINANCE

July 3, 1865
Opelousas, Louisiana

BACKGROUND

As slavery was outlawed and African Americans were freed in southern states, many communities created new laws and regulations to infringe upon the newfound freedom of former slaves. This is one example of such a “black code” from a town in Louisiana in the first months after the Civil War.

ANNOTATIONS


Whereas the relations formerly subsis[ti]ng between master and slave have b[e]come changed by the action of the controlling authorities; and whereas it i[s] necessary to provide for the proper police and government of the recently emancipated negroes or freedmen, in their new relations to the municipal authorities;

Sect. 1. Be it therefore ordained by [t]he Board of Police of the Town of Ope[ll]ousas: That no negro or freedman shall be allowed to come within the limits of the Town of Opelousas, without special permission from his employer, specifying the object of his visit, and the time necessary for the accomplishment of the same. Whoever shall violate this provision, shall suffer imprisonment and two days work on the public streets, or shall pay a fine of two dollars and fifty cents.

Sect. 2. Be it further ordained that every negro or freedman who shall be found on the streets of Opelousas, after 10 o’clock at night, without a written pass or permit from his

Sect. 3. No negro or freedman shall be permitted to rent or keep a house within the limits of the town under any circumstances, and any one thus offending, shall be ejected and compelled to find an employer, or leave the town within twenty-four hours. The lessor or furnisher of the house leased or kept as above, shall pay a fine of ten dollars for each offense.

Sect. 4. No negro or freedman shall reside within the limits of the Town of Opelousas, who is not in the regular service of some white person or former owner, who shall be held responsible for the conduct of said freedman. But said employer or former owner may permit said freedman to hire his time, by special permission in writing, which permission shall not extend over twenty-four hours at any one time. Any one violating the provisions of this section, shall be imprisoned and forced to work for two days on the public streets.

Sect. 5. No public meetings or congregations of negroes or freedmen, shall be allowed within the limits of the Town of Opelousas, under any circumstances or for any purpose, without the permission of the Mayor or President of the Board. This prohibition is not intended, however, to prevent freedmen from attending the usual Church services conducted by established ministers of religion. Every freedman violating this law shall be imprisoned and made to work five days on the public streets.

Sect. 6. No negro or freedman shall be permitted to preach, exhort or otherwise declaim, to congregations of colored people, without a special permission from the Mayor or President of the Board of Police, under the penalty of a fine of ten dollars or twenty days work on the public streets.

Sect. 7. No freedman, who is not in the military service, shall be allowed to carry fire-arms or any kind of weapons, within the limits of the Town of Opelousas, without the special permission of his employer in writing, and approved by the Mayor or President of the Board of Police. Any one thus offending shall forfeit his weapons and shall be imprisoned and made to work five days on the public streets, or pay a fine of five dollars in lieu of said work.
Sect. 8. No freedman shall sell, barter or exchange any articles of merchandise or traffic, within the limits of Opelousas, without permission in writing from his employer or the Mayor or President of the Board, under the penalty of the forfeiture of said articles, and imprisonment and one day's labor, or a fine of one dollar in lieu of said work.

Sect. 9. Any freedman found drunk within the limits of the town shall be imprisoned and made to labor five days on the public streets, or pay five dollars in lieu of said labor.

Sect. 10. Any freedman not residing in Opelousas, who shall be found within its corporate limits after the hour of 3 o'clock P.M. on Sunday, without a special written permission from his employer or the Mayor, shall be arrested and imprisoned and made to work two days on the public streets, or pay two dollars in lieu of said work.

Sect. 11. All the foregoing provisions apply to freed men and freed women, or both sexes.

Sect. 12. It shall be the special duty of the Mayor or President of the Board, to see that all the provisions of this ordinance are faithfully executed.

Sect. 13. Be it further ordained, Th[at] this ordinance to take effect from [and] after its first publication.

Ordained the 3d day of July, 1865,

E. D. ESTILLET[E]

President of the Board of Po[lice.]

JOS. D. RICHARD, Clerk.
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### Why Teach the Turn of the Century

There has perhaps never been a period of more dramatic transformation in America than the final decades of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth. The ways of life for tens of millions of Americans and immigrants changed frequently and rapidly in but a single lifetime. And amid all that was gained, some things were lost, and new challenges arose. Most poignantly, these years put to the test the country’s faith that the ideas and legacy of the American Founding could still be fruitfully applied in a modern age of industrialization and mass markets.
Enduring Ideas from This Unit

1. The Gilded Age brought a great transformation to the American economy, society, and way of life—a transformation that included unparalleled benefits to the lives of millions of Americans, along with unprecedented challenges.
2. The closing of the frontier in the West marked the end of an era in American history; the pioneering character of American society began to diminish, or shift its focus, as American energies became redirected to overseas interests.
3. A group of reformers and political thinkers known as the Progressives sought to answer challenges associated with the Gilded Age through new ideas about the purpose and structure of government—ideas they themselves considered to be a critique of the American Founding.
4. The Great War was one of the greatest disasters in the history of mankind, and it forever changed America’s place on the world stage.

What Teachers Should Consider

The chief experience students should take away from the study of this unit is the great transformation that Americans living at the turn of the 20th century experienced. In a single lifetime, countless Americans went from a quiet, agrarian nation of dispersed small communities to an industrial and urban giant and world power. The texture of American life, especially for those in cities or near them, changed dramatically.

Students should recognize the great benefits most Americans enjoyed from such changes, especially in their material standard of living. These changes did not “just happen”; entrepreneurial individuals made them happen. We should acknowledge, alongside these advantages, that there were disadvantages that some unskilled workers, small businesses, and new immigrants had to endure.

Students should be directed toward aspects of the American past beyond its urban centers, particularly those of the Eastern Seaboard. There is much to be learned from the histories of the Old West, the frontier, and the American South during these decades, especially regarding U.S. government policy toward Native Americans and the status of African American civil rights.

The challenges of the “Gilded Age” gave rise to new ways of thinking and a new generation of social and political thinkers who sought to solve the problems of the day through a more active government. The Progressives rethought the very concept of government, basing it on a new view of human nature and a “scientific” understanding of government as an activity that should be based on the application of expert knowledge. The changes that Progressives brought to the Constitution and government in the United States in many respects endure to the present day.

Finally, the Great War is of paramount importance in the history of the 20th century, both for the world and for America. So many observers had begun the new century believing that the world was entering a century of peace and enlightenment, but their expectations were cruelly dashed, as the war’s unprecedented destruction left much of Europe in ruins. But at the same time, the power and responsibility the United States assumed in fighting the war established its essential place of leadership in the world order.
How Teachers Can Learn More

**TEXTS**

* A Fierce Discontent, Michael McGerr
* The Myth of the Robber Barons, Burton Folsom
* The Guns of August, Barbara Tuchman
* The First World War, John Keegan
* World War I and America, A. Scott Berg
* American Heritage: A Reader, ed. Hillsdale College History Faculty

**ONLINE COURSES** | Online.Hillsdale.edu

* The Great American Story
* American Heritage
* Civil Rights in American History
* Introduction to the Constitution
* Constitution 101
* Constitution 201

**Lesson Planning Resources**

**TEACHER RESOURCES**

* A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope, Wilfred McClay and John McBride
* A Student Workbook for Land of Hope, Wilfred McClay and John McBride
* A Short History of World War I, James Stokesbury
* Fighting the Great War, Michael Neiberg

**STUDENT RESOURCES**

* Land of Hope, Wilfred McClay

**PRIMARY SOURCES**

* “Surrender,” Chief Joseph
* “Wealth,” Andrew Carnegie
* “The Triumph of America,” Andrew Carnegie
* “The Cross of Gold,” William Jennings Bryan
* “The March of the Flag,” Albert J. Beveridge
* Platform, American Anti-Imperialist League
* Atlanta Exposition Address, Booker T. Washington
* “The Significance of the Frontier in American History,” Frederick Jackson Turner
“What Is Progress?”, Woodrow Wilson
“Natural Law,” Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr.
“The Presidency,” Theodore Roosevelt
“The Study of Administration,” Woodrow Wilson
War Message to Congress, Woodrow Wilson
Fourteen Points, Woodrow Wilson
League of Nations Speech, Henry Cabot Lodge
LESSON PLANS, ASSIGNMENTS, AND FORMATIVE QUIZ
Lesson 1 — The Gilded Age

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the rapid changes America underwent in the decades following the Civil War, especially in the realms of industrialization, technology, economics, and foreign policy.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
Land of Hope  Pages 205-239
Primary Sources  See below.

Teacher Texts
A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope  Pages 200-208, 211-217, 234-236
A Student Workbook for Land of Hope  Pages 120-123, 125-127, 142-143

Online.Hillsdale.edu
The Great American Story  Lectures 12-13
Civil Rights in American History  Lectures 5-6

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students read Land of Hope, pages 205-214, and either complete the reading questions handout in A Student Workbook for Land of Hope (pages 120-121) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 2: Students read Land of Hope, pages 214-224, and either complete the reading questions handout in A Student Workbook for Land of Hope (pages 121-123 & 142-143) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 3: Students read Land of Hope, pages 225-239, and either complete the reading questions handout in A Student Workbook for Land of Hope (pages 125-127) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places
Pittsburgh  Alaska
Great Lakes  North Dakota
Promontory Point  South Dakota
Ellis Island  Montana
Coney Island  Washington
Lower East Side  Idaho
Wyoming                      Santiago Bay
Utah                         San Juan Hill
Hawaiian Islands             Philippines
Spain                        Manila Bay
Cuba                         China
Puerto Rico                  

Persons
Mark Twain                   Antonín Dvořák
Elijah McCoy                 George Armstrong Custer
Thomas Edison                Sitting Bull
Cornelius Vanderbilt         Rutherford B. Hayes
Andrew Carnegie              James A. Garfield
John D. Rockefeller          Chester A. Arthur
J. Pierpont Morgan           Grover Cleveland
Samuel Gompers               Benjamin Harrison
Booker T. Washington         William Jennings Bryan
Anna Julia Cooper            William McKinley
George Washington Carver     Queen Lili‘uokalani
Winslow Homer                Sanford Dole
Thomas Eakins                Theodore Roosevelt
N. C. Wyeth                  

Terms and Topics
Homestead Act                pollution
railroads                     Tuskegee Institute
Transcontinental Railroad    Plessy v. Ferguson
industrialization            frontier
patent                        cowboys
steel                         Plains Indians
Bessemer process             Buffalo Soldiers
deflation                     Dawes Act
self-made man                 Battle of Little Bighorn
cow coal                      Wounded Knee
cow oil refining             political boss
cow Standard Oil Co.         special interests
cow economies of scale       Granger Movement
cow mass production          Panic of 1893
cow division of labor         labor unions
cow vertical integration      Populist Party
cow general incorporation laws gold standard
cow monopoly                  deflation
cow “captains of industry”   bimetallism
cow “robber barons”          inflation
philanthropy                 Cross of Gold
urbanization                 social gospel
Brooklyn Bridge              The Influence of Sea Power
immigration                  upon History
tenement                     Great White Fleet
Chinese Exclusion Act
USS Maine
yellow journalism
Spanish-American War
Rough Riders

Gatling gun
Philippine-American War
Open Door Policy
Boxer Rebellion

Primary Sources
“Surrender,” Chief Joseph
“Wealth,” Andrew Carnegie
“The Triumph of America,” Andrew Carnegie
“The Cross of Gold,” William Jennings Bryan
“The March of the Flag,” Albert J. Beveridge
Platform, American Anti-Imperialist League
Atlanta Exposition Address, Booker T. Washington
“The Significance of the Frontier in American History,” Frederick Jackson Turner

To Know by Heart
“The New Colossus”—Emma Lazarus
“The cause of freedom is not the cause of a race or a sect, a party or a class—it is the cause of human kind, the very birthright of humanity.” —Anna Julia Cooper
“Lift Every Voice and Sing”—James Weldon Johnson
“Pledge of Allegiance”—Francis Bellamy
“America the Beautiful”—Katharine Lee Bates

Timeline
1869 Transcontinental Railroad completed
1898 Spanish-American War
1901 Oil discovered in Beaumont, Texas

Images
Historical figures and events
New inventions
The “Golden spike” picture
First professional sports teams
Western settlement under the Homestead Act
Maps of railroad lines over time
Mansions of industrial leaders
Philanthropic buildings
Brooklyn Bridge
First skyscrapers
Cityscapes
Factories and workers
Life in tenement buildings
Immigrants on boats and at Ellis Island
Statue of Liberty construction
First greenbacks
Electoral maps
American battleships
Images and uniforms of Spanish and American officers and soldiers
Depictions of figures at various scenes and moments in battle
Maps: overall strategies, specific battles
Medical equipment
Reenactment photos

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Grenville Dodge’s account of the completion of the Transcontinental Railroad at Promontory Point, Utah
- Thomas Edison’s account of the first successful lightbulb
- Albert Goodwill Spalding’s account of innovations in baseball
- James Naismith’s account of inventing basketball
- J. P. Morgan’s bailouts of the federal government
- Frank Lloyd Wright on first seeing a city
- Accounts of the Great Chicago Fire
- Jacob Riis photographing life of the poor in the cities
- Barton Simonson’s account of the Haymarket Square riot
- Immigrant stories
- Edward Steiner’s account from Ellis Island
- Robert Louis Stevenson’s travel with immigrants on a train from New York to California
- Chief White Bull’s account of Custer’s Last Stand at Little Bighorn
- The exploits of Jesse James
- Hamilton Wick’s account of the Oklahoma Land Rush
- Black Elk’s account of the massacre at Wounded Knee
- Rutherford B. Hayes’s promotion of Frederick Douglass to marshal in Washington, D.C.
- The assassination of James Garfield
- William Jennings Bryan’s “Cross of Gold” speech
- The overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy
- The explosion of the USS Maine
- The surrender of Guam
- Theodore Roosevelt and the Rough Riders in the Spanish-American War
- Richard Harding Davis’s account of the Battle of San Juan Hill

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- How did America change after the Civil War with respect to the agrarian makeup of its economy, workforce, and population distribution?
- What sorts of technological changes were developed in the late 19th century? Which were the most important and why?
- What is the importance of patent law to American prosperity?
- Why were the railroads so significant to the transformation of the American economy?
- What are some of the beneficial developments produced during the Gilded Age?
- What is the relationship between economies of scale, mass production, and the division of labor?
- How did general incorporation laws come into existence in America in the Jacksonian era? How did they help larger American businesses expand in the late 19th century?
- What were some of the characteristics of America's most successful companies and businessmen? In what ways were they similar and in what ways different?
- In what ways might America's leading businessmen be considered “captains of industry,” and in what ways might they be considered “robber barons”?
- What challenges emerged from the technological and economic changes during the Gilded Age?
- What problems did farmers face during the Gilded Age?
- Why did so many people immigrate to the United States in the late 19th century?
- How did this immigration wave differ demographically from previous migration patterns?
- To what extent did immigrants assimilate into the American populace? What are the advantages and disadvantages of this situation?
- How did the relationship between the employer and employee change relative to the size of a business?
- How did labor unions organize, and how did businesses and government officials sometimes respond?
- What was life like for African Americans in the late 19th century?
- What were Booker T. Washington’s ideas for improving conditions for African Americans?
- What did the U.S. Supreme Court rule in Plessy v. Ferguson?
- What happened in the western United States with respect to relations between Native Americans and the U.S. government?
- What was the nature of the gold standard–bimetallism debates? What groups preferred which standard, and why?
- Who belonged to the Populist Party, and what was its platform?
- What was the significance of the frontier in American history? What effects might its “closing” have on America?
- What motivations led some Americans to seek out certain overseas lands?
- How did the idea of a more active foreign policy and imperialism contend with the American founding and foreign policy precedent?
- What was Alfred Thayer Mahan’s thesis in The Influence of Sea Power upon History? How did this book influence the American military?
- Where did America expand during the McKinley administration, and why?
- How did the Spanish-American War begin, and why was it fought?
- For what reasons did the Americans soundly defeat the Spanish in the Spanish-American War?
- What issues did America face in the Philippines and Cuba following the Spanish-American War?
- How did America’s imperial ventures compare to those of Europe and Japan at the time?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 67: Name two promises that new citizens make in the Oath of Allegiance.
  - Question 68: How can people become United States citizens?
  - Question 117: Name one American Indian tribe in the United States.
  - Question 118: Name one example of an American innovation.
  - Question 120: Where is the Statue of Liberty?
KEYS TO THE LESSON

The lives of Americans underwent an unprecedented transformation in the decades following Reconstruction. Many of the policies and practices of centralized action forged during the Civil War continued and expanded into other parts of the American economy and society. Simultaneously, the entire developed world was undergoing a period of remarkable and rapid technological development. The benefits from these changes were immense, but they also presented a number of new challenges to the lives of ordinary Americans. Students should come to appreciate the great extent of this upheaval and transformation of daily life that Americans experienced within a single lifetime. They should also understand the many benefits of these changes and be asked to consider the balance between those benefits and their costs.

Teachers might best plan and teach The Gilded Age with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Introduce students to Mark Twain and his branding of the final decades of the 19th century as a “gilded age.” Ask students what “gilded” means, then have them think throughout the lesson about why Mark Twain applied this term to these decades—and whether he was right to do so.
- The Gilded Age is one period in teaching American history where the narrative form is more difficult to employ, simply because so much was changing all at once, while isolatable events of great historical import were less common. Because the Gilded Age is a period for which a conventional chronological narrative form is difficult to employ, consider dividing this lesson into halves. First, teach about the major changes in American life, the economy, and society from Reconstruction to 1900, giving students an experience of the rapid and rather disorienting pace of change that defined the period. Then move on to a more chronological treatment of political history during the same years. The political events of the era will remain more muted than in other periods, reflecting the primacy of large structural forces over politics.
- Help students to recognize and understand two critical causes of the great changes America experienced after the Civil War: the use of mass organization and the development of mass production—both derived from fighting and supplying the war. With many of the institutions, policies, skills, and even equipment still in place following the war, it was natural to apply these practices and knowledge to peacetime endeavors, especially in manufacturing. At the same time, a series of new inventions worked together within the mass production mechanisms from wartime America to expand at a breakneck pace the capacity of production, as well as the size of markets.
- In general, help students to understand the significant shift away from agrarianism and toward urban living and working, and how this shift marked a major change in most Americans’ way of life.
- Highlight for students the most significant inventions created or significantly improved during the mid- to late 19th century. These would include, among others: improved railroads (including standard gauges, time zones, the automatic lubricator, and the air brake); the steel cast plow; the mechanical reaper; the light bulb; the flush toilet and sewer system; the elevator brake; the Bessemer process; steel cable; and the telephone. Most such inventions were developed or at least monetized in America. Ask students to imagine life without these things. Also include the inventions that responded to the growing capacity for leisure in the life of the middle class: the gramophone, professional sports, department stores, mail-order retail, amusement parks, etc. With each major invention, explain briefly how it worked, the need it met, and the impact it had. Students should especially appreciate America’s revolutionary patent system, which vigorously protected inventions and innovations—including intellectual property rights—all under the banner of private property.
Above all, spend time on the foundational inventions that made most of the others possible and drove the many changes American life was undergoing. If iron, coal, and textiles undergirded the First Industrial Revolution, then steel, oil, and electricity drove the Second Industrial Revolution. Take the time to explain the importance of these inventions and industries, including the major figures associated with them, such as Andrew Carnegie, John D. Rockefeller, and Thomas Edison.

Review with students the main tenets of the American economic system: free-market capitalism, private property, the rule of law, contract enforcement, and patents. Remind students that this system had largely defined America from colonial times through the Gilded Age and was responsible for much of America’s prosperity, upward mobility, and economic opportunity afforded to its people.

In the course of teaching about these industries, walk students through some of the major economic and business practices that allowed for the tremendous rate of change and the scale of production, such as economies of scale, mass production, and the division of labor. Alongside these practices were general incorporation laws that continued from emergency measures enacted during the Civil War. Thanks to such instruments, capital was easier to raise than ever before, allowing entrepreneurs to take full advantage of the possibilities new technology afforded them.

In discussing the major business leaders of the Gilded Age, present the two disparate ways these leaders are sometimes described: “captains of industry” and “robber barons.” As with all historical figures, teach these figures as the facts lead you. The accomplishments and benefits these men provided are impossible to ignore, while there are also broader questions that might be raised about certain specific business practices. Specificity is key, as in all historical controversies. Discourage your students from making sweeping generalizations, either favorable or unfavorable.

From the conversation on business practices, pivot to other underlying challenges that economic changes brought to American life. This conversation should include the livelihood of small businesses and farmers, working conditions for unskilled laborers, and general life in America’s growing cities. Accompanying these changes and challenges was a massive immigration wave—“nearly 12 million immigrants …[arrived] between 1870 and 1900” (link). Students should understand the many reasons why these immigrants came to America, especially its positive attraction compared to their status in the Old World. Students should appreciate the effects of so many immigrants all at once settling in already crowded cities and joining the urban workforce. They should also learn about the various reasons for ethnic and religious resistance of the native-born to the Catholic, Jewish, and Orthodox immigrants of eastern and southern Europe, and how the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 was the only law in American history to outlaw immigration based solely on national origin. Students should also consider the importance of citizenship education with so many new people added to the country.

Discuss the emergence of some labor unions to advocate for better working conditions and wages. Note also the several major strikes and sometimes violence that accompanied these efforts, such as the Molly Maguires, the Great Railroad Strike, the Haymarket Square riot, the Homestead Strike, and the Pullman Strike.

Teach about the political machines and bosses that emerged in the cities in this period of rapid urban growth.

Consider changes in life outside of America’s major cities. Include in these conversations the status of African Americans, who faced continued discrimination, literacy tests, poll taxes, Jim Crow, convict leasing, and violence, particularly (but not exclusively) in the states of the former Confederacy. Many of these practices were led by members of the Ku Klux Klan as it terrorized
African Americans, immigrants, Catholics, Jews, and Republicans. At the same time, discuss the response of Anna Julia Cooper, Booker T. Washington, and the Tuskegee Institute to these circumstances, and record the successes African Americans achieved in other places in America. Teach also about the U.S. Supreme Court’s declaration in Plessy v. Ferguson that discrimination that was “separate, but equal” was constitutional. Students should consider the extent to which such a ruling is consistent with the principles they studied about the American Founding.

- Teach about the American West, from cowboys and cattle drives to the Plains Indians and U.S. government policy toward them. As with the other lessons on relationships between Native Americans, settlers, and the U.S. government, important questions of justice and prudence should be directed toward the actions of all parties.
- Finally, while teaching about the West, briefly share with students the developing art of the American West; the gradual development of an American culture in music; and the literary output of Louisa May Alcott, Mark Twain, Emily Dickinson, Stephen Crane, and Laura Ingalls Wilder.
- Review with students the Compromise of 1877 that put Rutherford B. Hayes in the White House. As for his administration itself, show how it was a welcomed reprieve from the corruption of the Grant administration. In his otherwise uneventful term, Hayes is noteworthy for vetoing legislation against Chinese immigrants and African Americans.
- With the Benjamin Harrison administration, introduce the growing debate over the gold standard vs. bimetallism, which should be viewed along with trusts and tariffs as the defining economic issues of the late 19th century. Students should be made to understand that, although this subject seems a bit esoteric, it was of great importance for ordinary American families.
- Against this backdrop, discuss the rise of the Populist Party and William Jennings Bryan, including his 1896 campaign against William McKinley, during which he delivered his “Cross of Gold” speech at the Democratic National Convention.
- Discuss the new military technology that had been developed since the Civil War, the growing U.S. Navy, the “closing” of the Western frontier, the “social gospel,” and shifts in the European balance of power that further fueled colonization and imperialism among those powers, especially in Africa and Asia. Pages 225-231 of Land of Hope are helpful for highlighting America’s first forays into overseas possessions and the inherent tension between this policy and the principles of the American Founding—a tension evident in the debates of the time.
- Teach the Spanish-American War with brevity, in accordance with the way it was fought. Give proper attention to the role of yellow journalism leading up to the war, the tales of Theodore Roosevelt and the Rough Riders, America’s resounding victory, and the challenges that followed the war.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Explain how America changed in the decades following Reconstruction and what accounted for those changes (2-3 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Explain the difficulties that accompanied America’s rapid economic and societal changes in the late 19th century and how various groups of people addressed these issues (2-3 paragraphs).
Assignment 3: Explain the extent to which American foreign policy under William McKinley both departed from and held to America’s traditional stance toward international affairs (2-3 paragraphs).
Reading Quiz

**Directions:** Answer each question.

1. What was the date of the Grand Review?

2. What were two areas of business that became dominant in post-Civil War America?

3. Name a positive benefit described in the book of the influence of the railroad industry.

4. Name two prominent businessmen, and their respective industries, who emerged in post-Civil War America.

5. What was the main principle behind “Morganization”?  

---

The Turn of the Century | Lesson 1, Quiz #1
*Land of Hope*, Pages 205-214
Reading Quiz

The Turn of the Century | Lesson 1, Quiz #2
Land of Hope, Pages 214-224

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question.

1. Name one reason why labor unions were slow to gain a foothold in America in the late 19th century.

2. What political development was a result of the increasing poverty of American cities?

3. Name three ethnic groups that comprised the growing immigration population in America in the late 19th century.

4. Who wrote the 1893 essay “The Significance of the Frontier in American History”?

5. Briefly describe one argument advanced by the above essay relevant to late 19th-century America.
Reading Quiz

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question.

1. Which American statesman delivered an influential foreign policy address in 1821?

2. What term best describes the Western nations’ quest for foreign territorial acquisitions in the 19th century?

3. Who was the author of the 1890 book *The Influence of Sea Power upon History*?

4. What event in 1898 directly led to the Spanish-American War?

5. Name three foreign countries the United States became involved in following the Spanish-American War.
Lesson 2 — The Progressive Era

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the issues the Progressive movement sought to address, how its political philosophy compared to that of the American Founding, and how Progressive policy changed American government, politics, and economics.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
- Land of Hope Pages 240–258
- Primary Sources See below.

Teacher Texts
- A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope Pages 232–239
- A Student Workbook for Land of Hope Pages 142–145

Online.Hillsdale.edu
- The Great American Story Lectures 14–15
- American Heritage Lecture 8
- Introduction to the Constitution Lecture 12
- Constitution 101 Lecture 8
- Constitution 201 Lectures 1-4
- Civil Rights in American History Lecture 6

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students read Land of Hope, pages 240-249, and either complete the reading questions handout in A Student Workbook for Land of Hope (pages 143-144) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 2: Students read Land of Hope, pages 249-258, and either complete the reading questions handout in A Student Workbook for Land of Hope (pages 144-145) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places
- Panama Canal
- New Mexico
- Oklahoma
- Arizona

Persons
- Jacob Riis
- Ida Tarbell
Eugene V. Debs  W. E. B. DuBois  
John Dewey  William Howard Taft  
Woodrow Wilson  Pancho Villa  

John Muir

Terms and Topics  
muckrakers  The Square Deal  
The Jungle  conservationism  
The Communist Manifesto  national parks  
Hegelianism  Roosevelt Corollary  
social Darwinism  Bull Moose Party  
socialism  The New Freedom  
social gospel  Election of 1912  
Progressivism  Niagara Movement  
living Constitution  National Association for the  
politics  Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)  
delegation of power  Baltimore redlining  
experts  Black Wall Street  
bureaucracy  eugenics  
administration  Buck v. Bell  
Pendleton Civil Service Act  San Francisco Earthquake  
Sherman Antitrust Act  income tax  
trust-busting  16th Amendment  
Interstate Commerce Act  17th Amendment

Primary Sources
“What Is Progress?”, Woodrow Wilson
“Natural Law,” Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr.
“The Presidency,” Theodore Roosevelt
“The Study of Administration,” Woodrow Wilson

To Know by Heart
“I aimed for the public’s heart, and … hit it in the stomach.” — Upton Sinclair
“Speak softly and carry a big stick.” — Theodore Roosevelt
“Chicago” — Carl Sandburg
“The Road Not Taken” — Robert Frost

Timeline
1901  William McKinley assassinated  
1908  Theodore Roosevelt becomes president  
1912  William Howard Taft elected  
June 14  Woodrow Wilson defeats Taft and Roosevelt

Images
Historical figures and events  
Muckraker newspapers and cartoons  
Building the Panama Canal
National Parks
Eugenics propaganda

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Biographies and the roles of Woodrow Wilson, Theodore Roosevelt, and William Howard Taft
- Stories of working conditions within various industries
- Pauline Cuio Pepe’s account of the Triangle Shirtwaist Company fire
- Stories from Theodore Roosevelt’s life
- Jack London’s account of the San Francisco earthquake of 1906
- Theodore Roosevelt’s account of building the Panama Canal

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- How did journalists, churches, and charitable organizations seek to address the social challenges that came with a society of mass production, rapid industrialization, and urbanization?
- What ideas relating to democracy, the general will, class identity and struggle, human nature, government, and the processes of historical change (from sources including the French Revolution, Karl Marx, G.W.F. Hegel, and Charles Darwin) influenced the thought of American Progressives?
- What were early 20th-century socialists’ main suggestions for controlling what they perceived as the dangers of private businesses, and what counterarguments were offered to their ideas?
- What legal reforms did Progressives pursue to deal with problems of urbanization and industrialization?
- What contributions did Woodrow Wilson make to Progressivism, both as a thinker and as president?
- How did Progressives explain their argument that human nature, truth, and politics were inevitably evolving and improving over the course of history?
- How did Progressives come to view human nature, history, and government in “Darwinian” terms, as a continual process of evolutionary improvement? Why did these ideas lead to a partial critique of the Declaration of Independence, natural rights, and social contract theory?
- What did Progressives mean by equality, and why did they believe equality of opportunity and dignity for ordinary citizens necessitated a powerfully activist government?
- How did Progressives critique individualism and the power of special interests, monopolies, and the wealthy in politics?
- In what ways did Progressives critique the Constitution as being too slow, mechanical, and at odds with itself, as presented in their critique of the separation of powers and of checks and balances?
- Why did Progressives believe that many of the Founders’ worries over the dangers of tyranny (especially majority tyranny) and constitutional limits on governmental power were outdated?
- In what ways did Progressives promote direct democracy, and how was this concept to solve the problems posed by the influence of special interests? What limits, if any, did Progressives place on the role of the people in making laws?
- What was “government by expertise,” and why did the Progressives argue for it?
- How did Progressives believe special interests and prejudices could be overcome by an administrative state insulated from the sway of politics that could enact the people’s true will?
By creating administrative bureaus, both during and after the Progressive era, how did Congress delegate its legislative power to executive agencies that combined into a single unelected body legislative, executive, and judicial functions?

What were the problems some argued would arise through centralized decisions made by knowledgeable yet unelected experts? How did they compare to problems arising through dispersed decisions made by elected and accountable officials?

In foreign policy, why did Progressives believe the world would become freer and more peaceful with the spread of democracy and international institutions?

How did Progressives reframe the president as a visionary and rhetorical leader who sets the legislative agenda and guides general legislation through Congress?

How did Theodore Roosevelt embrace Progressivism in his politics, in his presidential actions addressing the issues of the day, and in his foreign policy positions?

To what extent did early Progressives seek to advance the civil rights of African Americans?

What were the main ideas of W. E. B. DuBois? How were they both alike and different from those of other commentators on improving the condition of African Americans?

How did the practice of eugenics fit with Progressives’ ideas on human improvement, government, and rights?

Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
- Question 5: How are changes made to the U.S. Constitution?
- Question 32: Who elects U.S. senators?

**Keys to the Lesson**

As America entered the 20th century, economic and social changes moved reformers toward new ideas, particularly about human nature, the purpose of government, and consequently the form of government institutions. Those who developed and adopted these beliefs worked to change American government. Their loosely coordinated social, political, and intellectual movement became known as Progressivism. Adherents to this new political philosophy explicitly critiqued in their own words some of the fundamental presumptions of the American Founders’ political theory. Students should understand what challenges the Progressives sought to address, the substance of their new philosophy, and how they ultimately changed American government.

Teachers might best plan and teach The Progressive Era with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Review from the previous lesson the challenges that came with industrialization and urbanization during the Gilded Age. Many of these challenges were not new, but were, like so many other things, multiplied on a mass scale as the American economy rapidly grew and changed.
- Highlight those Progressives who did investigative and advocacy work, including muckraker journalists and those who served the poor, workers, and immigrants in charity.
- Briefly talk about the Progressive idea of Christianity as primarily a movement for social reform, especially through government action—a view best expressed by the term “the social gospel,” which shaped public debate over religion for much of the 20th century.
- Clarify with students that many of the issues highlighted by Progressives—such as child labor, workplace and consumer safety, problems of conservation, and monopolies—were issues that many Founders also recognized as inappropriate or unjust in their own time. Progressives, however, believed the federal government should address these issues, instead of only state and...
local governments, or private institutions (such as individuals, charities, businesses, consumers, churches, and civic associations), as many of the Founders generally maintained.

- Consider with students the similarities between the ideas of the French Revolution, Marxism, Hegelianism, and social Darwinism. As they themselves acknowledged, Progressives were influenced by certain elements of each of these political philosophies, either in their critiques of the Founding and the issues of the day or in their confidence in changing government and society. Included in this conversation should be the work of socialist and anarchist groups in the United States, which were distinct from Progressivism but shared many critiques of modern America and some ideas on how to address them.

- Introduce Woodrow Wilson as a key Progressive theorist. Include his biography and his writings during the 1880s and 1890s on these topics.

- Help students consider Progressivism’s general critique of the Founders’ theory of rights. The Progressives generally argued against the insistence that rights were natural, that they were part of what made one human, and that they existed only at the individual level. Instead, leading Progressive thinkers maintained that rights were conditioned on social circumstances and belonged to groups of people, usually organized by class. They feared that the Founding system of equally protected natural rights seemed to favor the wealthy and powerful. Progressives believed that government should redefine rights according to class or group, and should not necessarily protect rights equally when it came to the wealthy and other “special interests” if equality required it. Indeed, since rights were not based on natural personhood, they were instead derived from elsewhere, as determined, distributed, secured, and—if necessary—revoked by government. Students should consider the extent to which this position aligned or contrasted with leading Founders’ understanding of unalienable rights grounded in human nature.

- Review with students the American Founders’ understanding of human nature. In brief, leading Founders understood human nature to be fixed and unchanging, good but also flawed, and thus tending toward becoming corrupted by power. In response to these tendencies of human nature, government must guard against the opposite dangers of lawlessness and tyranny, accounting for the realities of human nature and rejecting the possibility of utopia. The Constitution, therefore, did not deny, demonize, or elevate human nature, but rather tried to channel human energy and interests into constructive institutions while mitigating man’s baser tendencies. The Constitution was constructed on a deep understanding of fixed human nature and was born from the Founders’ prudence, experience, and knowledge of history.

- Share with students that while both the Founders and Progressives believed in a moral foundation to politics, Progressives viewed the above-mentioned understanding of human nature and government as overly pessimistic and simplistic. Progressives generally thought of human nature not as fixed but as evolving toward betterment—the core idea from which the movement’s name is derived. When looking at technological gains, improvements in the standard of living, and the general pace of scientific discovery, Progressives believed that these factors demonstrated that human beings, and even human nature itself, would also improve. Moreover, government ought to be a key agent in that improvement and perfection. Progressives, however, resisted the Founders’ argument that government’s primary purpose was to secure unchanging rights and maintain a framework for self-government. Instead, they held that the purpose of government was to keep up with evolving rights and constant social change.

- Explain to students how the Progressives departed from what they considered the negative understanding of rights and equality, i.e., that justice and morality require that the natural rights of individuals be equally protected. Instead, the Progressives viewed government as a positive force not only to protect rights but also to empower people and grant groups of people
special advantages in order to fulfill the potential outcomes of having certain rights. For example, it was not enough to be free to earn a living if there was no job by which to earn it. Government must not only preserve the right to have a job, but also supply the job itself if necessary.

- Emphasize for students how such a relatively idealistic philosophy and view of human nature might lead one to assume that the bad qualities of human nature (such as a desire for political power or human fallibility) are not a permanent problem, and that one thus need not worry as the Founders did about the accumulation of power in any one place. James Madison’s concern that “[t]he accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hands, whether of one, a few, or many, and whether hereditary, self[-]-appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny” (link) therefore becomes far less of a concern to Progressives than it was to the Founders. Were the Progressives right to see matters in this way?

- Make sure students appreciate the shift in the purpose and operation of government under such a view: government is no longer [1] the defender of certain fundamental rights, rights that exist prior to government itself; [2] limited in size to basic functions (lawmaking, executing law, and adjudicating law); and [3] limited in core responsibilities (such as maintaining courts of law and the nation’s security). Rather, government is to be a central active force for change in America, bringing about personal fulfillment of individuals and progress for society. Moreover, these ends were meant to be attained not merely in domestic matters, but also on the world stage in foreign affairs.

- Talk about the Progressive vision for practical politics. A more optimistic view of human nature made them supportive of direct democratic rule. A prime example of this change was the 17th Amendment, which implemented the direct election of senators by the people. The use of initiative, referendum, and recall at the state level are other examples.

- Help students to understand the role of elected officials in this new paradigm. Elected officials were not merely to reflect consent and refine the views of the people, but rather to show (or convince) the people of what they should truly want through the effective use of rhetoric. Progressives were especially interested in making the president the national leader of popular opinion.

- Consider with students how this emphasis on direct democracy could be undermined by actual experience. “Politics” became about expressing general ideas and establishing popular support to get those ideas codified into law. Separate from the democratic process is the difficult task of turning these general ideas into actual governance. The Progressives (particularly Woodrow Wilson) called this task “administration.”

- Explain how the Progressives argued that the technical and time-consuming work of actually carrying out the broad, general ideas of the law—detailing how it is to be done, implementing the laws, and making sure those laws are enforced to achieve their objectives—is not the work of Congress or even the president. Rather, a new body of experts and bureaucrats do the real work of governing (i.e., administration) apart from the realm of politics. Congress would delegate some of its lawmaking power to these bureaucrats, most of whom would exist under the executive branch and could thus execute the “laws” or regulations they made (for example, clean air and water experts would create the specific details of the respective laws). The president can also delegate his power to enforce the laws. The bureaucrats may also assume quasi-judicial powers and have their own courts to adjudicate claims against their own laws and regulations. This shift of legislative, executive, and judicial powers away from the branches in which these powers had been separately vested by the people through the Constitution, as well as the accumulation of unelected officials in various departments and agencies, both amounted to the second great shift in the Progressive worldview: government needed to be rearranged.
through the creation of the administrative state in order to circumvent the Constitution’s political checks and bring about “progress.”

- Stress for students the importance of this shift away from government by representatives of the people to government by bureaucratic expertise. Ask them to consider the extent to which it is compatible with the principle of representative and limited self-government on which the Founders established the United States.

- Emphasize how the advent of the administrative state changed the Founders’ careful arrangement in which powers were separated and dispersed through checks and balances and federalism. All three types of government power (legislative, executive, and judicial) are instead consolidated into bureaucratic agencies that are, in fact, removed from the people. This is done in the name of efficiency—trusting in improved human nature and scientific expertise to achieve higher aims via government than the Founding generation ever thought possible. The Progressives’ confidence in expert knowledge, centralized planning, and improved human nature ensured that only just and effective regulations would be made, without the risk of corruption, incompetence, or tyranny.

- Teach students about the several pieces of Progressive legislation that were enacted at the federal level even before government institutions were adjusted, especially the Pendleton Civil Service Act that ushered in the permanent bureaucracy after the assassination of President James Garfield, the Sherman Antitrust Act, and the Interstate Commerce Act.

- With Theodore Roosevelt’s presidency, note for students that the Progressive movement had adherents in both political parties. As for Roosevelt himself, discuss his colorful biography and captivating personality. When teaching his presidency, highlight his embrace of the Progressive view of “politics,” his desire to use the power of government to regulate business, his efforts in conservation, and his keen interest in a more active foreign policy, including his “Roosevelt Corollary” to the Monroe Doctrine.

- Discuss certain famous regulations and busted trusts, such as the Pure Food and Drug Act, the Meat Inspection Act, and the breakups of the Standard Oil Company and the Northern Securities railroad trust.

- Explain the administration of William Howard Taft and the subsequently contentious election of 1912, in which Woodrow Wilson—a Progressive “mastermind,” as it were—was elected president. After Republican critics of Progressivism blocked Theodore Roosevelt’s nomination for the party, Roosevelt’s formation of the Bull Moose third party split the Republican vote and allowed Wilson to win the election as a Democrat.

- Discuss the Niagara Movement and the work of W. E. B. DuBois: his appeal to a liberal education as part of the uplift of African Americans; his concept of the “talented tenth”; and the creation of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Compare these efforts and ideas to those of other African American leaders, such as Booker T. Washington.

- Have students explore the extent to which early Progressives, and especially Progressive leaders, sought to advance or hinder civil rights for African Americans and women.

- Mention how an aspect of Progressivism was its support for eugenics, based on its confidence that science and government could help society evolve past criminality and the need to support those whom they considered to be “undesirable.” This movement was later partially backed by the Supreme Court, especially by Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr. in *Buck v. Bell* (1927), and led to the creation of groups such as the American Eugenics Society.

- Help students to understand the various changes the Progressives made to the functioning of the government. Include in this treatment the 16th and 17th Amendments, as well as the creation of the Federal Reserve System.
STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS

Assignment 1: Compare and contrast Progressive ideas with those of the American Founding (2-3 paragraphs).

Assignment 2: Describe examples of Progressive ideas being implemented during the Progressive era. Explain how these changes impacted American society (2-3 paragraphs).
Reading Quiz

The Turn of the Century | Lesson 2, Quiz #1
Land of Hope, Pages 240-249

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. Which term best describes the general Progressive attitude toward political and economic entities?

2. Which state became well-known for its implementation of Progressive government?

3. What societal issue demonstrated the Progressive tendency to act as a “social intelligence”?

4. Which Progressive intellectual emphasized the role of the society over the individual?

5. Which scientific/biological theory was widely promoted among Progressives?
Reading Quiz

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question.

1. What were the terms for the two Progressive understandings of economic action?

2. What important piece of regulatory legislation was passed by Congress in 1887?

3. Who succeeded William McKinley as president of the United States after his assassination in 1901?

4. Briefly summarize one aspect of Woodrow Wilson’s Progressive political thought.

5. Who won the 1912 United States presidential election?
Unit 5 — Formative Quiz

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. What sorts of technological changes were developed in the late 19th century? Which were the most important and why?

2. How did general incorporation laws come into existence in America in the Jacksonian era? How did they help larger American businesses expand in the late 19th century?

3. What were some of the characteristics of America’s most successful companies and businessmen? In what ways were they similar and in what ways different?

4. What happened in the western United States with respect to relations between Native Americans and the U.S. government?

5. What were early 20th-century socialists’ main suggestions for controlling what they perceived as the dangers of private businesses? What counterarguments were offered to their ideas?
6. What legal reforms did Progressives pursue to deal with problems of urbanization and industrialization?

7. What were the problems some argued would arise through centralized decisions made by knowledgeable yet unelected experts? How did these problems compare to those from decisions made by elected and accountable officials?
Lesson 3 — The Great War

1914–1919

4–5 classes

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the start of the Great War, America’s neutrality and eventual declaration of war, the history of the war, and the Treaty of Versailles.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
- Land of Hope
- Primary Sources

Teacher Texts
- A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope
- A Student Workbook for Land of Hope
- A Short History of World War I
- Fighting the Great War

Online.Hillsdale.edu
- The Great American Story
- American Heritage

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students read Land of Hope, pages 259–268, and either complete the reading questions handout in A Student Workbook for Land of Hope (pages 155–157) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 2: Students read Land of Hope, pages 268–275, and either complete the reading questions handout in A Student Workbook for Land of Hope (pages 157–159) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography & Places
- Alsace-Lorraine
- Austria-Hungary
- Ottoman Empire
- Balkans
- Serbia
- Sarajevo
- Meuse River
- Ardennes Forest
- Soviet Union
- Argonne Forest
Persons

Orville and Wilbur Wright  Paul von Hindenburg
Henry Ford  Winston Churchill
Franz Ferdinand  John Pershing
Wilhelm II  Vladimir Lenin
Nicholas II  Carrie Nation
Woodrow Wilson  Susan B. Anthony
Helmuth von Moltke

Terms and Topics

airplane  No Man’s Land
Model T  war of attrition
assembly line  shell shock
nationalism  gas attacks
militarism  U-Boats
balance of power  unrestricted submarine warfare
Triple Alliance  Lusitania
Triple Entente  Battle of Gallipoli
Eastern Question  Battle of Verdun
reserve system  Battle of the Somme
industrial warfare  Armenian Genocide
airplane  Zimmerman Telegram
automobile  Bolshevik Revolution
assembly line  Brest-Litovsk Treaty
mobilization schedules  War Industries Board
“blank check”  Sedition Act
ultimatum  Schenck v. United States
Allied Powers  doughboys
Central Powers  tank
two-front war  Battle of Belleau Wood
Schlieffen Plan  Second Battle of the Marne
Plan 17  Meuse-Argonne Offensive
Pact of London  Lost Battalion
Battle of Tannenberg  Fourteen Points
First Battle of the Marne  Treaty of Versailles
trench warfare  League of Nations
machine gun
barbed wire

Primary Sources

War Message to Congress, Woodrow Wilson
Fourteen Points, Woodrow Wilson
League of Nations Speech, Henry Cabot Lodge

To Know by Heart

“If there is ever another war in Europe, it will come out of some damned silly thing in the Balkans.” —Otto von Bismarck

“Dulce et Decorum Est” —Wilfred Owen

“The Soldier” —Rupert Brooke
“The world must be made safe for democracy.” — Woodrow Wilson
“Over There” — George Cohan
“Break of Day” — Siegfried Sassoon
“In Flanders Fields” — John McCrae

Timeline

1914–1918  The Great War
June 28, 1914  Archduke Franz Ferdinand assassinated
1915   Battle of Gallipoli
1916   Battles of Verdun and the Somme; Woodrow Wilson reelected
1917   U.S. declaration of war; Bolshevik Revolution
1918   Hundred Days Offensive
November 11 (1918) Veterans Day (Armistice Day)

Images

Historical figures and events
First flight and airplanes
First assembly lines
Union and Confederate veterans at Gettysburg in 1913
Images and uniforms of Allied and Central Powers officers and soldiers
Depictions and photographs of figures at various scenes and moments in battle
Video footage of soldiers
Trench warfare
Maps: alliances, overall strategies, specific battles
Military equipment and weaponry
War propaganda
Medical equipment
Reenactment photos
Facsimiles of documents and letters
Home front and factory production
Wounded veterans
Depictions of the sinking of the Lusitania
Destruction from the war
Postwar maps

Stories for the American Heart

- Orville Wright’s account of the first flight
- Henry Ford’s description of the first assembly line
- Borijove Jevtic’s account of the assassination of Austria-Hungary Archduke Franz Ferdinand by the Serbian terrorist organization, the Black Hand
- Nicholas II’s exaggerated support for Serbia against Austria-Hungary’s ultimatum
- The Willy-Nicky Telegrams
- Helmuth von Moltke’s deceptions of Wilhelm II regarding mobilization against France
- German atrocities in Belgium
- The French capture of a map of the Schlieffen Plan
- Alexander von Kluck’s erroneous turn to the east of Paris
- Paris taxis taking reinforcements to the First Battle of the Marne
- Life in trenches and trench warfare, including firsthand accounts from any of the following figures: Leonard Thompson, Hugh Walpole, Oskar Kokoschka, Robert Graves, John Walker, H. H. Munro, William Pressey, Edwin Vaughan, et al.
- Enduring machine gun fire, artillery bombardments, and gas attacks
- The Christmas Truce
- Walther Schwieger’s account of the sinking of the *Lusitania*
- The zeppelin bombing of London
- The Red Baron
- Eddie Rickenbacker’s accounts of his dogfights
- Ernest Francis’ account of the Battle of Jutland
- Grigori Rasputin and the Romanovs
- The February and Bolshevik Revolutions
- Bert Chaney’s account of the first tanks at the Somme
- Pavel Medvedev’s account of the assassination of the Romanovs
- The Lost Battalion
- Sergeant Alvin York
- Ambulance driver James McConnell
- Harry Truman’s service commanding a field gun battery
- Elmer Sherwood’s account of Americans in battle in 1918
- The Fighting Eighth Army Infantry and the Harlem Hellfighters
- Harold Nicolson’s account of the signing of the Treaty of Versailles

**QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND**

- How did Germany’s unification and military production affect the balance of power in Europe?
- What was the Eastern Question and its significance to Europe?
- What military and nationalist ideas emerged during the late 19th century in Europe?
- Why was rapid and decisive mobilization considered key to winning a modern industrialized war?
- How did European alliances change after the ascension of Kaiser Wilhelm II in Germany?
- Why was Franz Ferdinand assassinated?
- What were the key decisions that led from Franz Ferdinand’s assassination to war a month later?
- What did the initial predictions about the war entail?
- Why did the Germans want to avoid a two-front war?
- How was the Schlieffen Plan supposed to work?
- Why did countries reject the idea that defensive warfare would be important?
- What did the Pact of London do and why did the Allies sign it?
- How did Russia’s early attack, especially at Tannenberg, help their French allies in the First Battle of the Marne?
- How did German general Alexander von Kluck make a mistake that allowed for French victory in the First Battle of the Marne?
- Why did the Ottoman Empire join the Central Powers?
- How were the Americans, though neutral, really only helping the Allies?
- What three elements of trench warfare made attacking a position so deadly?
- Why did German U-boat *U-20* sink the British luxury liner *Lusitania*?
- Why did the Allies launch the Dardanelles Campaign? Why did it fail?
Why did the pattern of artillery barrage followed by an infantry attack actually assist the defenders?

For which reasons did generals continue the fight at Verdun and the Somme for months on end?

Although the Germans technically won the Battle of Jutland, why was their victory a strategic loss?

Why did the leaders of European nations and armies fight and continue to fight the Great War?

What is unrestricted submarine warfare, and why did the Germans resume it in February 1917?

For what two main reasons did the United States declare war on Germany in 1917?

How did the February Revolution come about in Russia?

What tactical innovations did the Allies test out in 1917?

How did the tank eventually solve the problems of trench warfare?

How did the Allies stop the German U-boat threat?

Who won the first half of 1918, and who won the second half?

How did the Allies stop the German U-boat threat?

For what reasons was the Allies’ Hundred Days Offensive so successful?

What were Woodrow Wilson’s main ideas as outlined in his Fourteen Points?

Why did the Allies win the second half of 1918?

What were the negotiations like at the Versailles Peace Conference?

Why did Woodrow Wilson struggle to gain American support for his League of Nations?

What were three main ways that the Treaty of Versailles changed the map of Europe?

In what ways did the Treaty of Versailles punish Germany?

Why might it be said that Germany was “forced” to sign the Treaty of Versailles?

Why did some argue that these terms were unjust to Germany?

Compare and contrast Europe before and after the Great War, politically, physically (for individuals and in infrastructure), culturally, and philosophically.

Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:

- Question 100: Name one war fought by the United States in the 1900s.
- Question 101: Why did the United States enter World War I?
- Question 118: Name one example of an American innovation.

**Keys to the Lesson**

The Great War (later known as the First World War or World War I) is one of the greatest tragedies of the 20th century, even in all of human history. It has been eclipsed in the collective memory of the world by World War II. But at the time it was fought, the Great War’s beginnings, rate of slaughter, and lasting effects had no parallel (as that name implies), and its violence would prove arguably more senseless than that which followed it. The fact that the Great War appeared almost out of nowhere at a time when much of the Western world believed mankind was on the verge of a kind of utopian 20th century makes the war all the more remarkable to study. For the purposes of American history, the war would catapult the United States onto the world stage, forever changing its history and its role in the world. While this study focuses especially on American actions toward the belligerent powers and then on its own participation in the conflict, there is plenty for students to learn about Europe and the broader war to give the proper context to understand America and the Great War.

Teachers might best plan and teach The Great War with emphasis on the following approaches:
Provide a brief background to European political history since the unifications of Italy and then, especially, Germany. In short, the unification of Germany following Prussia’s resounding military defeat of France in 1871 upset Europe’s post-Napoleonic balance of power. It meant that a sizeable German industrial powerhouse with a strong Prussian military organization was now anchored in the middle of Europe. Traditional rivalries with Russia and a vengeful France made for an uneasy peace across Europe. Meanwhile, the waning of the Ottoman Empire left a power vacuum in the Balkans, amid which Slavic nationalists appealed to their fellow Slavs in Russia against the encroachments of Germanic Austria-Hungary. Both Russia and Austria-Hungary sought ethnic influence in the Balkans, partly to stave off their own declines and internal troubles. Meanwhile, the industrialization of Europe was directed not only to peaceful goods but also to new industrial weapons by the millions, including a German navy that was racing to match the traditional top naval power, the United Kingdom. New military war colleges and generals believed this new technology and the proliferation of the Napoleonic reserve system would demand decisive, quick, and total war in order to achieve victory. Against the backdrop of decades of distrust among European leaders, alliances were discreetly made behind the scenes. In the end, these alliances wove Europe into one great tripwire with a very short fuse and plenty of powder. Contrary to the “great illusion” that war was impossible and a utopia was coming, we see in retrospect that all that was needed was one misstep in a seemingly isolated incident to unleash a war the likes of which the world had never experienced before.

Review the achievements of the Gilded Age, especially those that improved the material standard of living of Americans and, in this case, Europeans. This should include new instruction on the Wright Brothers’ invention of the airplane in 1903 and Henry Ford’s assembly line system for mass-producing the automobile, begun in 1908. Add to this review Progressive ideas of ever-improving human nature, human knowledge, and government administration—ideas that were widely shared among elite ruling classes around the Western world. Many European and American thinkers believed the world was on the cusp of a utopian future, in which government power would not go astray and war was essentially impossible.

Begin the war discussion with a careful account of the assassination of Franz Ferdinand, as well as the events from his death to the United Kingdom’s eventual declaration of war almost two months later. Pay special attention to the roles of figures such as Kaiser Wilhelm II of Germany, the Russian General Staff, and German General Helmuth von Moltke. Dwell also on key decisions such as Germany’s “blank check” to their fellow Germans in Austria-Hungary, Russia’s mobilization of its army, and von Moltke’s missteps—willful and otherwise—regarding German mobilization against France.

Have students think through and compare the various advantages and disadvantages each side had at the outset of the war and how these shifted throughout its duration. Having students record simple notes in a “T-Chart” can be effective for this part of the lesson.

Build students’ familiarity with the style of warfare in 1914, and show them plenty of images to do so. Students need this foundation for their subsequent study of battles. This helps them to imagine and understand what happens in battle and to appreciate the courage of soldiers fighting on both sides.

Present to students explanations of each side’s strategy at various stages of the war and the tactics and battle plans employed in specific battles. Have students track strategic changes on a map of Europe during the Great War. Spend time especially covering the first presumptions and strategies of the war, including the beliefs that the war would be one of rapid movement, that artillery and the offensive would be keys to victory, and that the fighting would be over relatively quickly. This would change into a defensive war of attrition made possible by trenches,
barbed wire, and machine guns. Students should understand why these three modern features of warfare combined to form almost impregnable lines of defense.

- As with any conflict, dwell on the key contributions of both leaders and common soldiers in the war, especially Helmuth von Moltke, Wilhelm II, Nicholas II, Paul von Hindenburg, Douglas Haig, Winston Churchill, Woodrow Wilson, and John Pershing.

- Teach the war in some detail, especially the major battles and military campaigns. Students should understand how the battles came to be, the key stories, factors, and moments from the battle itself, and the significance of their various outcomes to subsequent events. Employ battle maps often, and have students track battles and campaigns on a map of Europe during the Great War. A Short History of World War I and Fighting the Great War are both great aids for teaching these battles; students may enjoy reading select accounts of battles from these works, too.

- Help students to note major themes that might loosely describe each year of the war: opening salvos, the near capture of Paris, and the race to the sea in 1914; stalemate in 1915; fruitless efforts to break the stalemate in 1916, constituting a war of attrition; the Russian upheaval and Allied experimentation in 1917; and the German offensive followed by American- and tank-led counterattacks in 1918 that ultimately led to the armistice.

- As the war devolved into trench warfare, consider with students the American position. As with the War of 1812, the Americans sought to trade with all parties possible while remaining neutral. The British blockade of largely landlocked Germany made this trading impossible for the Germans; as a result, American trade overwhelmingly benefited the British and the Allies. The Germans believed they were forced to disrupt this trade by sinking neutral ships sailing to the United Kingdom. After the sinking of the Lusitania in 1915, the ensuing outcry nearly led America to declare war, but Woodrow Wilson was able to convince Germany to halt “unrestricted submarine warfare.” Wilson was committed to staying out of the war and campaigned on that pledge in 1916, winning reelection. But the resumption of unrestricted submarine warfare in early 1917, along with the intercepted Zimmerman Telegram, eventually brought the United States into the war. Despite his initial reluctance, Wilson saw America’s entry into the war as an opportunity to apply his Progressive ideas to foreign policy and the world order. Study with students Wilson’s stated reasons for going to war in his War Message to Congress, especially as reflecting his Progressive thought and echoing the opening characterization of the war as a “war to end all wars.”

- While discussing America’s entry into the war, be sure to distinguish between the February Revolution in Russia—in which democratic forces forced out the Russian monarchy—and the October/Bolshevik Revolution—in which Bolshevik communists overthrew the new democratic government via military coup. Abetted by Germany—who enabled Vladimir Lenin to return to Russia to seize power—the latter event removed Russia from the war, casting it into a multiyear civil war, while Germany was finally free to fight a one-front war just as American troops were arriving in meaningful numbers. Taking some time to study communism in action in Russia will be fruitful for teaching the rest of American history in subsequent units, especially noting that the Communists immediately looked to expand their revolution into the rest of Europe and beyond.

- Note with students how the first months of 1918 saw impressive German advances with Russia now absent, but the presence of tanks en masse, the perfection of the rolling barrage, and most importantly the American troops—with their freshness, daring, innovative form of fighting, and industrial backing—turned the war for the Allies.

- Read with students Woodrow Wilson’s Fourteen Points and discuss his vision for a world after the “war to end all wars.” Students should be asked to identify the Progressive tenets intrinsic to the Points, but also the paradoxical encouragement of nationalism through the idea of “self-
determination.” Point out that the promises of the Fourteen Points were key to convincing the Germans to sign the armistice.

- Describe the Versailles peace negotiations, especially the vindictive desire of the United Kingdom and France to punish Germany, while Woodrow Wilson was largely sidelined. Back in the United States, discuss Wilson’s campaign to attract support for the League of Nations, his unorthodox methods for doing so, and his ultimate failure and eventual debilitating stroke. In covering the terms of the Treaty of Versailles—which Germany was effectively forced to sign—discuss whether the terms accurately reflected the facts of the war’s beginning or the extent to which Germany was actually defeated at its end. Note also the absence of many of Wilson’s Fourteen Points—which the Germans had originally requested as a condition of halting the fighting—and the ongoing blockade of Germany. Does this raise questions of how free the Germans really were in signing a treaty that treated them as the clearly defeated and guilty power?

- Recap the war by considering major statistics, including the vast number of casualties and fatalities on each side, and how it transformed Europe and America in opposite ways. Overall, note the tremendous disillusionment with the idea of inevitable human progress, as well as with Europe’s traditional heritage and institutions.

- Conclude the lesson with a conversation on why the war began and, perhaps more importantly, why it continued, focusing especially on the ideas of European leaders in light of the recent changes in philosophical thought.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Explain how the Great War began, from the state of affairs in Europe prior to the assassination of Franz Ferdinand through the United Kingdom’s declaration of war (2-3 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Retell the history of the Great War, with particular focus on America’s involvement and the terms of the Treaty of Versailles (3-4 paragraphs).
Reading Quiz

The Turn of the Century | Lesson 3, Quiz #1
Land of Hope, Pages 259-268

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question.

1. What event was the primary cause of World War I?

2. What event in 1915 contributed to America’s eventual entry into World War I?

3. On what date did the United States officially enter World War I?

4. What two pieces of legislation drastically curtailed freedom of speech during World War I?

5. What influential 1910 essay began to shape the way Progressive thinkers considered the “positive” societal effects of World War I?
Reading Quiz

The Turn of the Century | Lesson 3, Quiz #2
Land of Hope, Pages 268-275

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question.

1. What was the name given to the American forces sent to fight in World War I?

2. What was the name of President Wilson’s proposed peace plan for World War I?

3. What organization did President Wilson hope to create as a result of the negotiations for the Treaty of Versailles?

4. Who was the primary opponent of Wilson’s World War I peace settlement?

5. Who won the 1920 United States presidential election?
APPENDIX A

Study Guide

Test

Writing Assignment
Study Guide—The Turn of the Century Test

Unit 5

Test on __________

TIMELINE

When given chronological dates, match events from a list to the years or dates that they happened.

1869 Transcontinental Railroad completed
1898 Spanish-American War
1901 Oil discovered in Beaumont, TX; William McKinley assassinated; Theodore Roosevelt becomes president
1908 William Howard Taft elected
1912 Woodrow Wilson defeats Taft and Roosevelt
1914–1918 The Great War
   June 28, 1914 Archduke Franz Ferdinand assassinated
   1915 Battle of Gallipoli
   1916 Battles of Verdun and the Somme; Woodrow Wilson reelected
   1917 U.S. declaration of war; Bolshevik Revolution
   1918 Hundred Days Offensive
   November 11 (1918) Veterans Day (Armistice Day)

GEOGRAPHY AND PLACES

Identify each on a map and/or tell where it is and explain its significance.

Promontory Point Puerto Rico Alsace-Lorraine
Ellis Island Santiago Bay Austria-Hungary
Coney Island San Juan Hill Ottoman Empire
Alaska Philippines Balkans
Hawaiian Islands Manila Bay Serbia
Spain China Sarajevo
Cuba Panama Canal Soviet Union

PERSONS

Identify each, provide biographical details, and explain what he or she thought or did in specific periods or events.

Thomas Edison Samuel Gompers Sitting Bull
Cornelius Vanderbilt Booker T. Washington Rutherford B. Hayes
Andrew Carnegie George Washington Carver James A. Garfield
John D. Rockefeller Winslow Homer Chester A. Arthur
J. Pierpont Morgan George Armstrong Custer Grover Cleveland
Benjamin Harrison
William Jennings Bryan
William McKinley
Theodore Roosevelt
Eugene V. Debs
John Dewey
Woodrow Wilson

W. E. B. DuBois
William Howard Taft
Orville and Wilbur Wright
Henry Ford
Franz Ferdinand
Wilhelm II
Nicholas II

Helmuth von Moltke
Paul von Hindenburg
Winston Churchill
Vladimir Lenin
Carrie Nation
Susan B. Anthony

**TERMS AND TOPICS**

Identify each and explain its significance to the period of history studied.

railroads
Transcontinental Railroad
industrialization
oil refining
Standard Oil Co.
mass production
division of labor
vertical integration
monopoly
urbanization
immigration
tenement
Chinese Exclusion Act
Tuskegee Institute
_Plessy v. Ferguson_
frontier
Plains Indians
Dawes Act
Battle of Little Bighorn
Wounded Knee
political boss
labor unions
Populist Party
Cross of Gold
Great White Fleet
USS Maine
Spanish-American War

_The Communist Manifesto_
Hegelianism
social Darwinism
socialism
Progressivism
living Constitution
experts
bureaucracy
administration
Pendleton Civil Service Act
Interstate Commerce Act
The Square Deal
conservatism
Roosevelt Corollary
Bull Moose Party
The New Freedom
Election of 1912
Niagara Movement
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)

16th Amendment
17th Amendment

nationalism
militarism
balance of power
Triple Alliance
Triple Entente
reserve system
industrial warfare
“blank check”
Allied Powers
Central Powers
Schlieffen Plan
Plan 17
Pact of London
trench warfare
machine gun
barbed wire
gas attacks
unrestricted submarine warfare
_Lusitania_
Zimmerman Telegram
Bolshevik Revolution
tank
Fourteen Points
Treaty of Versailles
League of Nations

**PRIMARY SOURCES**

Based on annotations and notes from seminar conversations, be able to answer questions on each primary source. While you will not necessarily be asked why each primary source was created, what it did or argued, and what its effects were, being able to answer these kinds of questions will make you well prepared.
“Surrender,” Chief Joseph
“Wealth,” Andrew Carnegie
“The Triumph of America,” Andrew Carnegie
“The Cross of Gold,” William Jennings Bryan
“The March of the Flag,” Albert Beveridge
Platform, American Anti-Imperialist League
Atlanta Exposition Address, Booker T. Washington
“The Significance of the Frontier in American History,” Frederick Jackson Turner
“What Is Progress?”, Woodrow Wilson
“Natural Law,” Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr.
“The Presidency,” Theodore Roosevelt
“The Study of Administration,” Woodrow Wilson
War Message to Congress, Woodrow Wilson
Fourteen Points, Woodrow Wilson
League of Nations Speech, Henry Cabot Lodge

TO KNOW BY HEART

Fill in missing words and/or identify the speaker and context.

“The cause of freedom is not the cause of a race or a sect, a party or a class—it is the cause of human kind, the very birthright of humanity.” — Anna Julia Cooper
“Pledge of Allegiance” — Francis Bellamy
“America the Beautiful” — Katharine Lee Bates
“I aimed for the public’s heart, and … hit it in the stomach.” — Upton Sinclair
“Speak softly and carry a big stick.” — Theodore Roosevelt
“If there is ever another war in Europe, it will come out of some damned silly thing in the Balkans.” — Otto von Bismarck
“The world must be made safe for democracy.” — Woodrow Wilson
“Over There” — George Cohan
“In Flanders Fields” — John McCrae

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be middle school students.

- Immigrant stories
- Chief White Bull’s account of Custer’s Last Stand at Little Bighorn
- Black Elk’s account of the massacre at Wounded Knee
- William Jennings Bryan’s “Cross of Gold” speech
- The explosion of the USS Maine
- Biographies and the roles of Woodrow Wilson, Theodore Roosevelt, and William Howard Taft
- Stories of working conditions within various industries
- Orville Wright’s account of the first flight
- Henry Ford’s description of the first assembly line
- Borijove Jevtic’s account of the assassination of Austria-Hungary Archduke Franz Ferdinand by the Serbian terrorist organization, the Black Hand
- Life in trenches and trench warfare, including firsthand accounts from any of the following figures: Leonard Thompson, Hugh Walpole, Oskar Kokoschka, Robert Graves, John Walker, H. H. Munro, William Pressey, Edwin Vaughan, et al.
- The February and Bolshevik Revolutions
- Harold Nicolson’s account of the signing of the Treaty of Versailles

**QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND**

Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.

**Lesson 1 | The Gilded Age**

☐ How did America change after the Civil War with respect to the agrarian makeup of its economy, workforce, and population distribution?
☐ What sorts of technological changes were developed in the late 19th century? Which were the most important and why?
☐ Why were the railroads so significant to the transformation of the American economy?
☐ What are some of the beneficial developments produced during the Gilded Age?
☐ What were some of the characteristics of America’s most successful companies and businessmen? In what ways were they similar and in what ways different?
☐ In what ways might America’s leading businessmen be considered “captains of industry,” and in what ways might they be considered “robber barons”?
☐ Why did so many people immigrate to the United States in the late 19th century?
☐ To what extent did immigrants assimilate into the American populace? What are the advantages and disadvantages of this situation?
☐ What was life like for African Americans in the late 19th century?
☐ What were Booker T. Washington’s ideas for improving conditions for African Americans?
☐ What did the U.S. Supreme Court rule in *Plessy v. Ferguson*?
☐ What happened in the western United States with respect to relations between Native Americans and the U.S. government?
☐ How did the idea of a more active foreign policy and imperialism contend with the American founding and foreign policy precedent?
☐ How did the Spanish-American War begin, and why was it fought?

**Lesson 2 | The Progressive Era**

☐ What ideas relating to democracy, the general will, class identity and struggle, human nature, government, and the processes of historical change (from sources including the French Revolution, Karl Marx, George Hegel, and Charles Darwin) influenced the thought of American Progressives?
☐ What contributions did Woodrow Wilson make to Progressivism, both as a thinker and as president?
How did Progressives come to view human nature, history, and government in “Darwinian” terms, as a continual process of evolutionary improvement? Why did these ideas lead to a partial critique of the Declaration of Independence, natural rights, and social contract theory?

What did Progressives mean by equality, and why did they believe equality of opportunity and dignity for ordinary citizens necessitated a powerfully activist government?

How did Progressives critique individualism and the power of special interests, monopolies, and the wealthy in politics?

In what ways did Progressives critique the Constitution as being too slow, mechanical, and at odds with itself, as presented in their critique of the separation of powers and of checks and balances?

In what ways did Progressives promote direct democracy, and how was this concept to solve the problems posed by the influence of special interests? What limits, if any, did Progressives place on the role of the people in making laws?

What was “government by expertise,” and why did the Progressives argue for it?

What were the problems some argued would arise through centralized decisions made by knowledgeable yet unelected experts? How did they compare to problems arising through dispersed decisions made by elected and accountable officials?

How did Theodore Roosevelt embrace Progressivism in his politics, in his presidential actions addressing the issues of the day, and in his foreign policy positions?

What were the main ideas of W. E. B. DuBois? How were they both alike and different from those of other commentators on improving the condition of African Americans?

How did the practice of eugenics fit with Progressives’ ideas on human improvement, government, and rights?

Lesson 3 | The Great War

Why was Franz Ferdinand assassinated?

What were the key decisions that led from Franz Ferdinand’s assassination to war a month later?

Why did the Ottoman Empire join the Central Powers?

How were the Americans, though neutral, really only helping the Allies?

What three elements of trench warfare made attacking a position so deadly?

Why did German U-boat U-20 sink the British luxury liner Lusitania?

Why did the leaders of European nations and armies fight and continue to fight the Great War?

For what two main reasons did the United States declare war on Germany in 1917?

How did the February Revolution come about in Russia?

How did the October or Bolshevik Revolution come about?

What were Woodrow Wilson’s main ideas as outlined in his “Fourteen Points”?

Why did Woodrow Wilson struggle to gain American support for his League of Nations?

In what ways did the Treaty of Versailles punish Germany?

Compare and contrast Europe before and after the Great War, politically, physically (for individuals and in infrastructure), culturally, and philosophically.
Test — The Turn of the Century

**TIMELINE**

Write the letter of each event next to the date or years it took place.

1869  
1898  
1901  
1908  
1912  
1914-1918  
June 28, 1914  
1915  
1916  
1917  
1918  

A. Woodrow Wilson defeats William Howard Taft and Theodore Roosevelt  
B. Battle of Gallipoli  
C. Battles of Verdun and the Somme; Wilson reelected  
D. Taft elected  
E. Archduke Franz Ferdinand assassinated  
F. Oil discovered in Beaumont, Texas; William McKinley assassinated; Roosevelt becomes president  
G. Hundred Days Offensive  
H. Spanish-American War  
I. U.S. declaration of war; Bolshevik Revolution  
J. Transcontinental Railroad completed  
K. The Great War/World War I

**GEOGRAPHY & PLACES**

1. Name three countries that were on the side of the Allied Powers.

2. Name three countries that were on the side of the Central Powers.

3. Name at least one country that remained neutral during the war.

(Map from the Delaware Division of Historical and Cultural Affairs)
PERSONS, TERMS, AND TOPICS

Fill in the blanks.

4. The development of the ___________________________ following the Civil War was the primary cause for America’s economic and business expansion during that period.

5. ___________________________________ was the prominent American financier who had and wielded substantial influence in both private business and public financial policy in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

6. The control exerted by Standard Oil Company over the oil industry by the late 1870s is an example of a ___________________________, which was a significant economic concern for many Americans.

7. ___________________________________ and ___________________________________ were two influential intellectuals who offered competing answers to the problems faced by African Americans following the Civil War and their gradual integration into American society.

8. The “______________________________” speech, given by William Jennings Bryan in 1896, typified the controversy over the United States’ financial policies in the late 19th century.

9. The Republican president ___________________________, whose most notable accomplishment was the Spanish-American War, was succeeded by his vice president, ___________________________, who would go one to become one of the most domestically and internationally influential “modern” American presidents.

10. ___________________________ is the term for the new American political philosophy that emerged in the late 19th and early 20th centuries as a radical alternative to the principles of the American Founding.

11. The popularity of the American socialist ___________________________, in particular his 1912 presidential campaign, showed how the American people were increasingly open to meaningful change throughout American politics and society.

12. The Progressive emphasis on ___________________________, or a body of intelligent officials detached from the everyday business and action of politics, was exemplified by the formation of the state and federal ___________________________ that would later come to impose significant regulations on all aspects of American life.

13. ___________________________ was not only the first academic to be a presidential candidate, but also was a dedicated Progressive who contributed to America’s gradual acceptance of Progressive political theory.

14. Founded by former president Theodore Roosevelt, the ___________________________ was a third party in the 1912 election that espoused a highly Progressive-leaning platform.
15. ______________________________________ was the third candidate in the 1912 election, running as the Republican Party nominee.

16. In the decades leading up to World War I, a primary cause of unrest plaguing Europe was ______________________________________, as various countries sought to assert or solidify their identity against empires such as Austria-Hungary and Russia.

17. The assassination of ______________________________________ was the primary catalyst for starting World War I, as it activated numerous international agreements that escalated the military situation.

18. The two opposing factions of World War I were the ______________________________________ and the ______________________________________.

19. Despite the controversy surrounding his role in the failed Dardanelles/Gallipoli campaign during World War I, ______________________________________ would go on to serve as British prime minister during World War II.

20. The primary goal of Wilson’s “Fourteen Points” was the formation of the ______________________________________, which was an international body designed to prevent another war on the scale of World War I.

21. ______________________________________ led the October Revolution of 1917 in Russia, and later became dictator of the Communist government there.

**Know by Heart**

*Fill in missing words and/or identify the speaker/author.*

22. “Pledge of Allegiance”— ______________________________________

23. “____________________________________”—Katharine Lee Bates

24. “____________________________________ softly and carry ______________________________________.”—Theodore Roosevelt

25. “The __________________________ must be made safe for __________________________.”—Woodrow Wilson

26. “Over There”— ______________________________________
STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be middle school students.

27. Tell the story of the explosion of the USS Maine.

28. Retell Orville Wright’s account of the first flight or Henry Ford’s description of the first assembly line.
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and writing should be employed, and responses must fully answer each question.

29. Why were the railroads so significant to the transformation of the American economy?

30. Why did so many people immigrate to the United States in the late 19th century?

31. What was life like for African Americans in the late 19th century?

32. What happened in the western United States with respect to relations between Native Americans and the U.S. government?

33. How did the idea of a more active and imperialist American foreign policy compare to the Founding’s understanding of the concept?

34. How did the Spanish-American War begin, and why was it fought?

35. What contributions did Woodrow Wilson make to Progressivism, both as a thinker and as President?

36. In what ways did Progressives critique the Constitution as being too slow, mechanical, and at odds with itself, particularly with regard to separation of powers & checks and balances?

37. What was “government by expertise,” and why did the Progressives argue for it?

38. How did Theodore Roosevelt embrace Progressivism in his politics, in his presidential actions addressing the issues of the day, and in his foreign policy positions?
39. What were the main ideas of W. E. B. DuBois? How were they both alike and different from those of other commentators on improving the condition of African Americans?

40. How did the practice of eugenics fit with Progressives’ ideas on human improvement, government, and rights?

41. What were the key decisions made from June-August 1914 that ultimately led to World War I?

42. Why did the leaders of European nations and armies fight and continue to fight the Great War?

43. For what two main reasons did the United States finally declare war on Germany in World War I?

44. What were Woodrow Wilson’s main ideas as outlined in his “Fourteen Points”?

45. In what ways did the Treaty of Versailles punish Germany?

46. Briefly compare and contrast Europe before and after the Great War as viewed politically, physically (for individuals and in infrastructure), culturally, or philosophically.
Writing Assignment — The Turn of the Century

Unit 5

Due on ______________

DIRECTIONS

Citing events and primary sources in your argument, write an essay of 500–800 words answering the following question:

How did America as a nation develop politically from after the Civil War to the Treaty of Versailles? (Limit your answer to one [1] aspect of either domestic or foreign policy.)
APPENDIX B

Primary Sources

Chief Joseph
Andrew Carnegie
William A. Peffer
William Jennings Bryan
Albert J. Beveridge
American Anti-Imperialist League
Booker T. Washington
Frederick Jackson Turner
Woodrow Wilson
Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr.
Theodore Roosevelt
W. E. B. DuBois
Henry Cabot Lodge
American westward expansion in the mid-19th century often brought settlers into contact with the native Indian tribes. Hin-mah-too-yah-lat-kekt, also known as Chief Joseph, was a leader of the Nez Percé tribe during this period. When the U.S. government attempted to remove the tribe forcibly from their ancestral lands in the late 19th century, Chief Joseph and his tribe resisted in what became known as the Nez Percé War in 1877. After months of violent conflict, Chief Joseph finally delivered this surrender document to his fellow chiefs and United States General Nelson A. Miles.

GUIDING QUESTION

Who was Chief Joseph primarily concerned with as indicated in his surrender, and why?
… I am tired of fighting. Our chiefs are killed; Looking-glass is dead. Too-hul-hul-suit is dead. The old men are all dead. It is the young men, now, who say ‘yes’ or ‘no’ [that is, vote in council]. He who led on the young men [Joseph’s brother, Ollicut] is dead. It is cold, and we have no blankets. The little children are freezing to death. My people—some of them—have run away to the hills, and have no blankets, no food. No one knows where they are—perhaps freezing to death. I want to have time to look for my children, and see how many of them I can find; maybe I shall find them among the dead. Hear me, my chiefs; my heart is sick and sad. From where the sun now stands, I will fight no more forever!
BACKGROUND

The Gilded Age marked a time of unprecedented industrial and economic growth in America. With the advent of many new industries, the possibility of amassing great wealth was open to those who were financially intelligent and shrewd. One of these figures was Andrew Carnegie, who rose out of poverty to create a massive fortune from his pioneering work in the steel industry. However, as he discusses in this article, Carnegie firmly advocated for not only the economic progress of the day, but also the duty of the wealthy to engage in philanthropy.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What does Carnegie say about the “good old times”?
2. What are the effects of equality and inequality in society?
3. What should the rich ultimately do with their money, according to Carnegie?
4. What does his ideal millionaire look like?
5. How does Carnegie tie wealth to Christianity?
The problem of our age is the proper administration of wealth, so that the ties of brotherhood may still bind together the rich and poor in harmonious relationship. The conditions of human life have not only been changed, but revolutionized, within the past few hundred years. In former days there was little difference between the dwelling, dress, food, and environment of the chief and those of his retainers. The Indians are to-day where civilized man then was. When visiting the Sioux, I was led to the wigwam of the chief. It was just like the others in external appearance, and even within the difference was trifling between it and those of the poorest of his braves. The contrast between the palace of the millionaire and the cottage of the laborer with us to-day measures the change which has come with civilization.

This change, however, is not to be deplored, but welcomed as highly beneficial. It is well, nay, essential for the progress of the race, that the houses of some should be homes for all that is highest and best in literature and the arts, and for all the refinements of civilization, rather than that none should be so. Much better this great irregularity than universal squalor. Without wealth there can be no Mæcenas. The “good old times” were not good old times. Neither master nor servant was as well situated then as to-day. A relapse to old conditions would be disastrous to both—not the least so to him who serves—and would sweep away civilization with it. But whether the change be for good or ill, it is upon us, beyond our power to alter, and therefore to be accepted and made the best of. It is a waste of time to criticise the inevitable.

It is easy to see how the change has come. One illustration will serve for almost every phase of the cause. In the manufacture of products we have the whole story. It applies to all combinations of human industry, as stimulated and enlarged by the inventions of this scientific age. Formerly articles manufactured at the domestic hearth or in small shops which formed part of the household. The master and his apprentices worked side by side, the latter living with the master, and therefore subject to the same conditions. When these apprentices rose to be masters, there was little or no change in their mode of life, and they, in turn, educated in the same routine succeeding apprentices. There was, substantially social equality, and even political equality, for those engaged in industrial pursuits had then little or no political voice in the State.
But the inevitable result of such a mode of manufacture was crude articles at high prices. To-day the world obtains commodities of excellent quality at prices which even the generation preceding this would have deemed incredible. In the commercial world similar causes have produced similar results, and the race is benefited thereby. The poor enjoy what the rich could not before afford. What were the luxuries have become the necessaries of life. The laborer has now more comforts than the landlord had a few generations ago. The farmer has more luxuries than the landlord had, and is more richly clad and better housed. The landlord has books and pictures rarer, and appointments more artistic, than the King could then obtain.

The price we pay for this salutary change is, no doubt, great. We assemble thousands of operatives in the factory, in the mine, and in the counting-house, of whom the employer can know little or nothing, and to whom the employer is little better than a myth. All intercourse between them is at an end. Rigid Castes are formed, and, as usual, mutual ignorance breeds mutual distrust. Each Caste is without sympathy for the other, and ready to credit anything disparaging in regard to it. Under the law of competition, the employer of thousands is forced into the strictest economies, among which the rates paid to labor figure prominently, and often there is friction between the employer and the employed, between capital and labor, between rich and poor. Human society loses homogeneity.

The price which society pays for the law of competition, like the price it pays for cheap comforts and luxuries, is also great; but the advantage of this law are [sic] also greater still, for it is to this law that we owe our wonderful material development, which brings improved conditions in its train. But, whether the law be benign or not, we must say of it, as we say of the change in the conditions of men to which we have referred: It is here; we cannot evade it; no substitutes for it have been found; and while the law may be sometimes hard for the individual, it is best for the race, because it insures the survival of the fittest in every department. We accept and welcome therefore, as conditions to which we must accommodate ourselves, great inequality of environment, the concentration of business, industrial and commercial, in the hands of a few, and the law
of competition between these, as being not only beneficial, but essential for the future progress of the race. Having accepted these, it follows that there must be great scope for the exercise of special ability in the merchant and in the manufacturer who has to conduct affairs upon a great scale. That this talent for organization and management is rare among men is proved by the fact that it invariably secures for its possessor enormous rewards, no matter where or under what laws or conditions. The experienced in affairs always rate the MAN whose services can be obtained as a partner as not only the first consideration, but such as to render the question of his capital scarcely worth considering, for such men soon create capital; while, without the special talent required, capital soon takes wings. Such men become interested in firms or corporations using millions; and estimating only simple interest to be made upon the capital invested, it is inevitable that their income must exceed their expenditures, and that they must accumulate wealth. Nor is there any middle ground which such men can occupy, because the great manufacturing or commercial concern which does not earn at least interest upon its capital soon becomes bankrupt. It, must either go forward or fall behind: to stand still is impossible. It is a condition essential for its successful operation that it should be thus far profitable, and even that, in addition to interest on capital, it should make profit. It is a law, as certain as any of the others named, that men possessed of this peculiar talent for affair, under the free play of economic forces, must, of necessity, soon be in receipt of more revenue than can be judiciously expended upon themselves; and this law is as beneficial for the race as the others.

Objections to the foundations upon which society is based are not in order, because the condition of the race is better with these than it has been with any others which have been tried. Of the effect of any new substitutes proposed we cannot be sure. The Socialist or Anarchist who seeks to overturn present conditions is to be regarded as attacking the foundation upon which civilization itself rests, for civilization took its start from the day that the capable, industrious workman said to his incompetent and lazy fellow, “If thou dost [not] sow, thou shalt [not] reap,” and thus ended primitive Communism by separating the drones from the bees. One who studies this subject will soon be brought face to face with the conclusion that upon the sacredness of property civilization itself depends--the right of the laborer to his hundred dollars in the savings bank, and equally
the legal right of the millionaire to his millions. To these who propose to substitute 
Communism for this intense Individualism the answer, therefore, is: The race has tried 
that. All progress from that barbarous day to the present time has resulted from its 
displacement. Not evil, but good, has come to the race from the accumulation of wealth 
by those who have the ability and energy that produce it. But even if we admit for a 
moment that it might be better for the race to discard its present foundation, 
Individualism,—that it is a nobler ideal that man should labor, not for himself alone, but 
in and for a brotherhood of his fellows, and share with them all in common, realizing 
Swedenborg’s idea of Heaven, where, as he says, the angels derive their happiness, not 
from laboring for self, but for each other,—even admit all this, and a sufficient answer is, 
This is not evolution, but revolution. It necessitates the changing of human nature itself 
a work of oeons, even if it were good to change it, which we cannot know. It is not 
practicable in our day or in our age. Even if desirable theoretically, it belongs to another 
and long-succeeding sociological stratum. Our duty is with what is practicable now; with 
the next step possible in our day and generation. It is criminal to waste our energies in 
efforting to uproot, when all we can profitably or possibly accomplish is to bend the 
universal tree of humanity a little in the direction most favorable to the production of 
good fruit under existing circumstances. We might as well urge the destruction of the 
highest existing type of man because he failed to reach our ideal as favor the destruction 
of Individualism, Private Property, the Law of Accumulation of Wealth, and the Law of 
Competition; for these are the highest results of human experience, the soil in which 
society so far has produced the best fruit. Unequally or unjustly, perhaps, as these laws 
sometimes operate, and imperfect as they appear to the Idealist, they are, nevertheless, 
like the highest type of man, the best and most valuable of all that humanity has yet 
accomplished.

We start, then, with a condition of affairs under which the best interests of the race are 
promoted, but which inevitably gives wealth to the few. Thus far, accepting conditions 
as they exist, the situation can be surveyed and pronounced good. The question then 
arises, --and, if the foregoing be correct, it is the only question with which we have to 
deal, --What is the proper mode of administering wealth after the laws upon which 
civilization is founded have thrown it into the hands of the few? And it is of this great
question that I believe I offer the true solution. It will be understood that *fortunes* are here spoken of, not moderate sums saved by many years of effort, the returns on which are required for the comfortable maintenance and education of families. This is not *wealth*, but only *competence* which it should be the aim of all to acquire.

There are but three modes in which surplus wealth can be disposed of. It can call *{sic}* be left to the families of the decedents; or it can be bequeathed for public purposes; or, finally, it can be administered during their lives by its possessors. Under the first and second modes most of the wealth of the world that has reached the few has hitherto been applied. Let us in turn consider each of these modes. The first is the most injudicious. In monarchical countries, the estates and the greatest portion of the wealth are left to the first son, that the vanity of the parent may be gratified by the thought that his name and title are to descend to succeeding generations unimpaired. The condition of this class in Europe to-day teaches the futility of such hopes or ambitions. The successors have become impoverished through their follies or from the fall in the value of land. Even in Great Britain the strict law of entail has been found inadequate to maintain the status of an hereditary class. Its soil is rapidly passing into the hands of the stranger. Under republican institutions the division of property among the children is much fairer, but the question which forces itself upon thoughtful men in all lands is: Why should men leave great fortunes to their children? If this is done from affection, is it not misguided affection? Observation teaches that, generally speaking, it is not well for the children that they should be so burdened. Neither is it well for the state. Beyond providing for the wife and daughters moderate sources of income, and very moderate allowances indeed, if any, for the sons, men may well hesitate, for it is no longer questionable that great *{sums}* bequeathed oftener work more for the injury than for the good of the recipients. Wise men will soon conclude that, for the best interests of the members of their families and of the state, such bequests are an improper use of their means.

It is not suggested that men who have failed to educate their sons to earn a livelihood shall cast them adrift in poverty. If any man has seen fit to rear his sons with a view to their living idle lives, or, what is highly commendable, has instilled in them the sentiment
that they are in a position to labor for public ends without reference to pecuniary considerations, then, of course, the duty of the parent is to see that such are provided for moderation. There are instances of millionaires' sons unspoiled by wealth, who, being rich, still perform great services in the community. Such are the very salt of the earth, as valuable as, unfortunately, they are rare; still it is not the exception, but the rule, that men must regard, and, looking at the usual result of enormous sums conferred upon legatees, the thoughtful man must shortly say, “I would as soon leave to my son a curse as the almighty dollar,” and admit to himself that it is not the welfare of the children, but family pride, which inspires these enormous legacies.

As to the second mode, that of leaving wealth at death for public uses, it may be said that this is only a means for the disposal of wealth, provided a man is content to wait until he is dead before it becomes of much good in the world. Knowledge of the results of legacies bequeathed is not calculated to inspire the brightest hopes of much posthumous good being accomplished. The cases are not few in which the real object sought by the testator is not attained, nor are they few in which his real wishes are thwarted. In many cases the bequests are so used as to become only monuments of his folly. It is well to remember that it requires the exercise of not less ability than that which acquired the wealth to use it so as to be really beneficial to the community. Besides this, it may fairly be said that no man is to be extolled for doing what he cannot help doing, nor is he to be thanked by the community to which he only leaves wealth at death. Men who leave vast sums in this way may fairly be thought men who would not have left it at all, had they been able to take it with them. The memories of such cannot be held in grateful remembrance, for there is no grace in their gifts. It is not to be wondered at that such bequests seem so generally to lack the blessing. –

The growing disposition to tax more and more heavily large estates left at death is a cheering indication of the growth of a salutary change in public opinion. The State of Pennsylvania now takes—subject to some exceptions—one-tenth of the property left by its citizens. The budget presented in the British Parliament the other day proposes to increase the death-duties; and, most significant of all, the new tax is to be a graduated one. Of all forms of taxation, this seems the wisest. Men who continue hoarding great
sums all their lives, the proper use of which for public ends would work good to the community, should be made to feel that the community, in the form of the state, cannot thus be deprived of its proper share. By taxing estates heavily at death the state marks its condemnation of the selfish millionaire’s unworthy life.

It is desirable; that nations should go much further in this direction. Indeed, it is difficult to set bounds to the share of a rich man’s estate which should go at his death to the public through the agency of the state, and by all means such taxes should be graduated, beginning at nothing upon moderate sums to dependents, and increasing rapidly as the amounts swell, until of the millionaire’s hoard, as of Shylock’s, at least

“_____ The other half
Comes to the privy coffer of the state.”

This policy would work powerfully to induce the rich man to attend to the administration of wealth during his life, which is the end that society should always have in view, as being that by far most fruitful for the people. Nor need it be feared that this policy would sap the root of enterprise and render men less anxious to accumulate, for to the class whose ambition it is to leave great fortunes and be talked about after their death, it will attract even more attention, and, indeed, be a somewhat nobler ambition to have enormous sums paid over to the state from their fortunes.

There remains, then, only one mode of using great fortunes; but in this we have the true antidote for the temporary unequal distribution of wealth, the reconciliation of the rich and the poor—a reign of harmony—another ideal, differing, indeed, from that of the Communist in requiring only the further evolution of existing conditions, not the total overthrow of our civilization. It is founded upon the present most intense individualism, and the race is projected to put it in practice by degree whenever it pleases. Under its sway we shall have an ideal state, in which the surplus wealth of the few will become, in the best sense the property of the many, because administered for the common good, and this wealth, passing through the hands of the few, can be made a much more potent force for the elevation of our race than if it had been distributed in small sums to the people themselves. Even the poorest can be made to see this, and to agree that great sums
gathered by some of their fellow-citizens and spent for public purposes, from which the masses reap the principal benefit, are more valuable to them than if scattered among them through the course of many years in trifling amounts.

If we consider what results flow from the Cooper Institute, for instance, to the best portion of the race in New York not possessed of means, and compare these with those which would have arisen for the good of the masses from an equal sum distributed by Mr. Cooper in his lifetime in the form of wages, which is the highest form of distribution, being for work done and not for charity, we can form some estimate of the possibilities for the improvement of the race which lie embedded in the present law of the accumulation of wealth. Much of this sum if distributed in small quantities among the people, would have been wasted in the indulgence of appetite, some of it in excess, and it may be doubted whether even the part put to the best use, that of adding to the comforts of the home, would have yielded results for the race, as a race, at all comparable to those which are flowing and are to flow from the Cooper Institute from generation to generation. Let the advocate of violent or radical change ponder well this thought.

We might even go so far as to take another instance, that of Mr. Tilden's bequest of five millions of dollars for a free library in the city of New York, but in referring to this one cannot help saying involuntarily, how much better if Mr. Tilden had devoted the last years of his own life to the proper administration of this immense sum; in which case neither legal contest nor any other cause of delay could have interfered with his aims. But let us assume that Mr. Tilden's millions finally become the means of giving to this city a noble public library, where the treasures of the world contained in books will be open to all forever, without money and without price. Considering the good of that part of the race which congregates in and around Manhattan Island, would its permanent benefit have been better promoted had these millions been allowed to circulate in small sums through the hands of the masses? Even the most strenuous advocate of Communism must entertain a doubt upon this subject. Most of those who think will probably entertain no doubt whatever.
Poor and restricted are our opportunities in this life; narrow our horizon; our best work most imperfect; but rich men should be thankful for one inestimable boon. They have it in their power during their lives to busy themselves in organizing benefactions from which the masses of their fellows will derive lasting advantage, and thus dignify their own lives. The highest life is probably to be reached, not by such imitation of the life of Christ as Count Tolstoi gives us, but, while animated by Christ's spirit, by recognizing the changed conditions of this age, and adopting modes of expressing this spirit suitable to the changed conditions under which we live; still laboring for the good of our fellows, which was the essence of his life and teaching, but laboring in a different manner.

This, then, is held to be the duty of the man of Wealth: First, to set an example of modest, unostentatious living, shunning display or extravagance; to provide moderately for the legitimate wants of those dependent upon him; and after doing so to consider all surplus revenues which come to him simply as trust funds, which he is called upon to administer, and strictly bound as a matter of duty to administer in the manner which, in his judgment, is best calculated to produce the most beneficial results for the community--the man of wealth thus becoming the mere agent and trustee for his poorer brethren, bringing to their service his superior wisdom, experience and ability to administer, doing for them better than they would or could do for themselves.

We are met here with the difficulty of determining what are moderate sums to leave to members of the family; what is modest, unostentatious living; what is the test of extravagance. There must be different standards for different conditions. The answer is that it is as impossible to name exact amounts or actions as it is to define good manners, good taste, or the rules of propriety; but, nevertheless, these are verities, well known although undefinable. Public sentiment is quick to know and to feel what offends these. So in the case of wealth. The rule in regard to good taste in the dress of men or women applies here. Whatever makes one conspicuous offends the canon. If any family be chiefly known for display, for extravagance in home, table, equipage, for enormous sums ostentatiously spent in any form upon itself, if these be its chief distinctions, we have no difficulty in estimating its nature or culture. So likewise in regard to the use or abuse of its surplus wealth, or to generous, freehanded cooperation in good public uses, or to
unabated efforts to accumulate and hoard to the last, whether they administer or
bequeath. The verdict rests with the best and most enlightened public sentiment. The
community will surely judge and its judgments will not often be wrong.

The best uses to which surplus wealth can be put have already been indicated. These who,
would administer wisely must, indeed, be wise, for one of the serious obstacles to the
improvement of our race is indiscriminate charity. It were better for mankind that the
millions of the rich were thrown in to the sea than so spent as to encourage the slothful,
the drunken, the unworthy. Of every thousand dollars spent in so called charity to-day,
it is probable that $950 is unwisely spent; so spent, indeed as to produce the very evils
which it proposes to mitigate or cure. A well-known writer of philosophic books
admitted the other day that he had given a quarter of a dollar to a man who approached
him as he was coming to visit the house of his friend. He knew nothing of the habits of
this beggar; knew not the use that would be made of this money, although he had every
reason to suspect that it would be spent improperly. This man professed to be a disciple
of Herbert Spencer; yet the quarter-dollar given that night will probably work more
injury than all the money which its thoughtless donor will ever be able to give in true
charity will do good. He only gratified his own feelings, saved himself from annoyance—
and this was probably one of the most selfish and very worst actions of his life, for in all
respects he is most worthy.

In bestowing charity, the main consideration should be to help those who will help
themselves; to provide part of the means by which those who desire to improve may do
so; to give those who desire to use the aids by which they may rise; to assist, but rarely or
never to do all. Neither the individual nor the race is improved by alms-giving. Those
worthy of assistance, except in rare cases, seldom require assistance. The really valuable
men of the race never do, except in cases of accident or sudden change. Every one has,
of course, cases of individuals brought to his own knowledge where temporary assistance
can do genuine good, and these he will not overlook. But the amount which can be wisely
given by the individual for individuals is necessarily limited by his lack of knowledge of
the circumstances connected with each. He is the only true reformer who is as careful
and as anxious not to aid the unworthy as he is to aid the worthy, and, perhaps, even
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more so, for in alms-giving more injury is probably done by rewarding vice than by relieving virtue.

The rich man is thus almost restricted to following the examples of Peter Cooper, Enoch Pratt of Baltimore, Mr. Pratt of Brooklyn, Senator Stanford, and others, who know that the best means of benefiting the community is to place within its reach the ladders upon which the aspiring can rise—parks, and means of recreation, by which men are helped in body and mind; works of art, certain to give pleasure and improve the public taste, and public institutions of various kinds, which will improve the general condition of the people; —in this manner returning their surplus wealth to the mass of their fellows in the forms best calculated to do them lasting good.

Thus is the problem of Rich and Poor to be solved. The laws of accumulation will be left free; the laws of distribution free. Individualism will continue, but the millionaire will be but a trustee for the poor; {entrusted} for a season with a great part of the increased wealth of the community, but administering it for the community far better than it could or would have done for itself. The best minds will thus have reached a stage in the development of the race which it is clearly seen that there is no mode of disposing of surplus wealth creditable to thoughtful and earnest men into whose hands it flows save by using it year by year for the general good. This day already dawns. But a little while, and although, without incurring the pity of their fellows, men may die sharers in great business enterprises from which their capital cannot be or has not been withdrawn, and is left chiefly at death for public uses, yet the man who dies leaving behind many millions of available wealth, which was his to administer during life, will pass away “unwept, unhonored, and unsung,” no matter to what uses he leaves the dross which he cannot take with him. Of such as these the public verdict will then be: “The man who dies thus rich dies disgraced.”

Such, in my opinion, is the true Gospel concerning Wealth, obedience to which is destined some day to solve the problem of the Rich and the Poor, and to bring “Peace on earth, among men Good-Will.”
ANDREW CARNEGIE

The Triumph of America

ESSAY EXCERPTS

BACKGROUND

In this essay, the famous steel magnate Andrew Carnegie explores the many reasons behind America’s cultural, political, and economic successes up to the late 19th century.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What does Carnegie see as the future of America from the perspective of 1885?
2. What does Carnegie understand to be the impact of race on America’s development?
3. How does Carnegie see the American continent itself as beneficial to the nation?
4. How does Carnegie see politics as key to America’s continued progress?
5. What does Carnegie see as the role of education in America?

The old nations of the earth creep on at a snail’s pace; the Republic thunders past with the rush of the express. The United States, the growth of a single century, has already reached the foremost rank among nations, and is destined soon to out-distance all others in the race. In population, in wealth, in annual savings, and in public credit; in freedom from debt, in agriculture, and in manufactures, America already leads the civilized world […].

Into the distant future of this giant nation we need not seek to peer; but if we cast a glance forward, as we have done backward, for only fifty years, and assume that in that short interval no serious change will occur, the astounding fact startles us that in 1935, fifty years from now, when many in manhood will still be living, one hundred and eighty millions of English-speaking republicans will exist under one flag and possess more than two hundred and fifty thousand millions of dollars, or fifty thousand millions sterling of national wealth. Eighty years ago the whole of America and Europe did not contain so many people; and, if Europe and America continue their normal growth, it will be little more than another eighty years ere the mighty Republic may boast as many loyal citizens as all the rulers of Europe combined, for before the year 1980 Europe and America will each have a population of about six hundred millions.

The causes which have led to the rapid growth and aggrandizement of this latest addition to the family of nations constitute one of the most interesting problems in the social history of mankind. What has brought about such stupendous results — so unparalleled a development of a nation within so ethnic character of the people, the topographical and climatic conditions under which they developed, and the influence of political institutions founded upon the equality of the citizen.

Certain writers in the past have maintained that the ethnic type of a people has less influence upon its growth as a nation than the conditions of life under which it is developing. The modern ethnologist knows better. We have only to imagine what America would be today if she had fallen, in the beginning, into the hands of any other people than the colonizing British, to see how vitally important is this question of race. America was indeed fortunate in the seed planted upon her soil. With the exception of a
few Dutch and French it was wholly British; and ... the American of today remains true
to this noblestrain and is four-fifths British. The specialaptitude of this race for
colonization, its vigor and enterprise, and its capacity forgoverning, althoughbrilliantly
manifested in all partsof the world, have never been shown to such advantage as in
American. Freed here from the pressure of feudal institutions no longer fitted to their
present development, and freed also from the dominion of the upper classes, which have
kept the people at home from effective management of affairs and sacrificed the nation’s
interest for their own, as is the nature of classes, these masses of the lower ranks of
Britons, called upon to found a new state, have proved themselves possessors of a positive
genius for political administration.

The second, and perhaps equally important factor in the problem of the rapid
advancement of this branch of the British race, is the superiority of the conditions under
which it has developed. The home which has fallen to its lot, a domain more magnificent
than has cradled any other race in the history of the world, presents no obstructions to
unity — to the thorough amalgamation of its dwellers, North, South, East, and West, into
one homogeneous mass — for the conformation of the American continent differs in
important respects from that of every other great division of the globe. In Europe the
Alps occupy a central position, forming on each sidewatersheds of rivers which flow into
opposite seas. In Asia the Himalaya, the Hindu Kush, and the Altai Mountains divide the
continent, rolling from their sides many great rivers which pour their floods into widely
separated oceans. But in North America the mountains rise up on each coast, and from
them the land slopes gradually together in one valley, offering to commerce many
thousand miles of navigable streams. The map thus proclaims the unity of North
America, for in this great central basin, three million square miles in extent, free from
impassable rivers or mountain barriers great enough to hinder free intercourse, political
integration is a necessity and consolidation a certainty{.} …

The unity of the American people is further powerfully promoted by the foundation
upon which the political structure rests, the equality of the citizen. There is not one shred
of privilege to be met with anywhere in all the laws. One man’s right is every man’s right.
The flag is the guarantor and symbol of equality. The people are not emasculated by being
made to feel that their own country decrees their inferiority, and holds them unworthy
of privileges accorded to others. No ranks, no titles, no hereditary dignities, and therefore no classes. Suffrage is universal, and votes are of equal weight. Representatives are paid, and political life and usefulness thereby thrown open to all. Thus there is brought about a community of interests and aims which a Briton, accustomed to monarchical and aristocratic institutions, dividing the people into classes with separate interests, aims, thoughts, and feelings, can only with difficulty understand.

The free common school system of the land is probably, after all, the greatest single power in the unifying process which is producing the new American race. Through the crucible of a good common English education, furnished free by the State, pass the various racial elements — children of Irishmen, Germans, Italians, Spaniards, and Swedes, side by side with the native American, all to be fused into one, in language, in thought, in feeling, and in patriotism. The Irish boy loses his brogue, and the German child learns English. The sympathies suited to the feudal systems of Europe, which they inherit from their fathers, pass off as dross, leaving behind the pure gold of the only noble political creed: “All men are created free and equal.” Taught now to live and work for the common weal, and not for the maintenance of a royal family or an overbearing aristocracy, not for the continuance of a social system which ranks them beneath an arrogant class of drones, children of Russian and German serfs, of Irish evicted tenants, Scotch crofters, and other victims of feudal tyranny, are translated into republican Americans, and are made in one love for a country which provides equal rights and privileges for all her children. There is no class so intensely patriotic, so wildly devoted to the Republic as the naturalized citizen and his child, for little does the native-born citizen know of the value of rights which have never been denied. Only the man born abroad, like myself, under institutions which insult him at his birth, can know the full meaning of Republicanism{.} …

It is these causes which render possible the growth of a great homogeneous nation, alike in race, language, literature, interest, patriotism — an empire of such overwhelming power and proportions as to require neither army nor navy to ensure its safety, and a people so educated and advanced as to value the victories of peace.
The student of American affairs today sees no influences at work save those which make for closer and closer union. The Republic has solved the problem of governing large areas by adopting the federal, or home-rule system, and has proved to the world that the freest self-government of the parts produces the strongest government of the whole.
The Hillsdale 1776 Curriculum                             American History

BACKGROUND

The rapid changes caused by the Gilded Age produced negative as well as positive benefits for American society. The American people responded to the drawbacks of this advancement by calling for many reforms, especially in the economic sphere. One manifestation of this reform spirit was the creation of the People’s (or Populist) Party, which sought to fight the economic corruption of the Gilded Age by calling for the dismantling of monopolies, the regulation of railroads, and the granting of legislative power to the people via electoral initiative and referendum. In 1890, William Peffer of Kansas was the first Populist Party member elected to the Senate (there would eventually be 6), and wrote this article three years later explaining the principles behind the Party.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What is the purpose of government, according to Peffer?
2. What are the four points that define the mission of the Populist Party?
3. What does Peffer say about the Party’s views on monetary policy?
4. What is the Party’s view of American railroads?
5. According to Peffer, how do banks and excessive wealth undermine American government?
The Populist Party is an organized demand that the functions of government shall be exercised only for the mutual benefit of all the people. It asserts that government is useful only to the extent that it serves to advance the common weal. Believing that the public good is paramount to private interests, it protests against the delegation of sovereign powers to private agencies. Its motto is: “Equal rights to all; special privileges to none.” Its creed is written in a single line of the Declaration of Independence—“All men are created equal.” Devoted to the objects for which the Constitution of the United States was adopted, it proposes to “form a more perfect union” by cultivating a national sentiment among the people; to “insure domestic tranquility” by securing to every man and woman what they earn; to “establish justice” by procuring an equitable distribution of the products and profits of labor; to “provide for the common defence” by interesting every citizen in the ownership of his home; to “promote the general welfare” by abolishing class legislation and limiting the government to its proper functions; and to “secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity” by protecting the producing masses against the spoliation of speculators and usurers.

The Populist claims that the mission of his party is to emancipate labor. He believes that men are not only created equal, but that they are equally entitled to the use of natural resources in procuring means of subsistence and comfort. He believes that an equitable distribution of the products and profits of labor is essential to the highest form of civilization; that taxation should only be for public purposes, and that all moneys raised by taxes should go into the public treasury; that public needs should be supplied by public agencies, and that the people should be served equally and alike.

The party believes in popular government. Its demands may be summarized fairly to be—

1. An exclusively national currency in amount amply sufficient for all the uses for which money is needed by the people, to consist of gold and silver coined on equal terms, and government paper, each and all legal tender in payment of debts of whatever nature or amount, receivable for taxes and all public dues.
The Populist Party is the only party that honestly favors good money. ... We have seven different kinds of money, and only one of them is good, according to the determination of the Treasury officials. Bank notes are not legal tender, neither are silver certificates, nor gold certificates. Treasury notes are not legal tender in cases where another kind of money is expressed in the contract, and United States notes (greenbacks) will not pay either principal or interest on any government bond. None of our paper money is taxable. Silver dollars are by law full legal tender in payment of debts to any amount whatever, but the Treasury does not pay them out on any obligation unless they are specially requested. In practice, we have but one full legal tender money—gold coin; and Republicans and Democrats are agreed on continuing that policy; while Populists demand gold, silver, and paper money, all equally full legal tender.

The fact that we have now out about $700,000,000 in paper is proof that our stock of coin is utterly inadequate to perform all the money duty required in the people’s business transactions. The discontinuance of silver coinage stops the supply from that source. It is believed by men best informed on the subject that the gold used in the arts has reached an amount about equal to the annual output of the mines. Then the world’s stock of gold coin will not be increased unless the arts are drawn upon, and that can be done successfully only at a price above the money value of the coin. Russia, Austria, Italy, and the United States all want more gold. Where is it to come from? And what will it cost the purchaser? Are we to drop back to Roman methods of procuring treasure? When all the nations set out on gold-hunting expeditions, who will be the victor and what will become of the spoils?
It is evident that we must have more money, and Congress alone is authorized to prepare it. States are prohibited by the Constitution of the United States from making anything but gold and silver coin a legal tender in payment of debts, and nothing is money that is not a tender. The people can rely only on Congress for a safe circulating medium.

Populists demand not only a sufficiency of money, but a reduction of interest rates at least as low as the general level of the people’s savings. They aver that with interest at present legal and actual rates, an increase in the volume of money in the country would be of little permanent benefit, for bankers and brokers would control its circulation, just as they do now. But with interest charges reduced to 3 or 2 percent, the business of the money-lender would be no more profitable than that of the farmer—and why should it be? …

… The rate of interest ought to be what, with prudent management through a reasonable number of average seasons, he [the farmer] can pay yearly, with part of the principal, until he has paid out and has the farm left.

Three percent, compounded annually is a fair average the world over for labor’s saving. It has been a little more in the United States, but a gold basis will soon bring us to the general level, and that will settle lower as population and trade increase.

While the Populist Party favors government ownership and control of railroads, it wisely leaves for future consideration the means by which such ownership and control can best be brought about. The conditions which seem to make necessary such a change in our transportation system preclude all probability of its ever being practicable, if it were desirable, to purchase existing railway lines. The total capitalization of railroads in the United States in 1890 was put at $9,871,378,389—nearly ten thousand million dollars. It would be putting the figures high to say that the roads are worth one-half the amount of their capital stock. This leaves a fictitious value of $5,000,000,000 which the people must maintain for the roads by transportation charges twice as high as they would be if the capitalization were only half as much. It is the excessive capitalization
which the people have to maintain that they complain about. It would be an unbusinesslike proceeding for the people to purchase roads when they could build better ones just where and when they are needed for less than half the money that would be required to clear these companies’ books. It is conceded that none of the highly capitalized railroad corporations expect to pay their debts. If they can keep even on interest account, they do well, and that is all they are trying to do. While charges have been greatly reduced, they are still based on capitalization, and courts have held that the companies are entitled to reasonable profits on their investment. The people have but one safe remedy—to construct their own roads as needed, and then they will “own and control” them.

This is not a new doctrine. A select committee of the Senate of the United States, at the head of which was Hon. William Windom, then a senator and afterward secretary of the Treasury appointed in December 1872, reported among other recommendations one proposing the construction of a “government freight railway,” for the purpose of effectively regulating interstate commerce. A government freight railway would have no capitalization, no debt, bonded or otherwise; its charges would be only what it would cost to handle the traffic and keep the road in repair. That would reduce cost of carriage to a minimum, and nothing else will.

Populists complain of legislation in the interest of favored classes. At the very time when the homestead law was passed a scheme was hatching to absorb the public lands by railway corporations. Scarcely had the great war begun when a plan was laid to establish a system of national banking based on the people’s debts; and while customs duties were raised to increase the public revenues, cheap foreign labor was brought in under contract to man the factories. Banks have been specially favored.

When it was to their interest to withdraw their notes it was done with impunity. They have been permitted to openly violate the law that authorizes their existence, and this without rebuke.

The U.S. Senate shields them from exposure. When the Treasury was flush, public moneys were lavishly left with the banks to use without interest, and when the great
banks in New York City needed funds to relieve the stringency in the “money market” there, they had only to ask and they received. And now that the Treasury is running short in gold reserves, there is a demand for more bonds to purchase more gold to be used in redeeming Treasury notes which the law requires to be redeemed in silver, thus again reducing the reserves, making another bond issue necessary to procure more gold; and so on, as the “money market” may require. These “Napoleons of Finance” are playing a bold game. …

Rapid accumulation of wealth by a few citizens, as we have seen it in the United States during the last thirty years, is evidence of morbidly abnormal conditions. It is inconsistent with free institutions. It is breeding anarchy and trouble. No man can honestly take to himself what he does not earn; and if he does no more than that, riches will come to him slowly. It is only when he gets what he does not earn that his “success” attracts attention. Fortunes running into millions of dollars must be made up of property and profits mostly produced and earned by persons other than those who claim them.

No man ever earned a million dollars. If he was moved to great undertakings, nature’s God inspired him. And if, in the play of his ambition he marshaled effective forces, his equipment cost him little. To a great mind success is compensation. The value of its labor cannot be measured with money. A strong man’s intellect moves as easily as a blacksmith’s arm. Both are gifts.

The best men are content with little. Vast enterprises that move the world are maintained by contributions from the labor of the poor. Leaders do but organize and direct; the rank and file do all the rest. Apply the “iron law of wages” equally to all that work and you scale down the salaries of many useless people. If the Republic is to endure we must encourage the average man.
The spirit of reform championed by the Populist Party found moderate success in the last quarter of the 19th century. However, their greatest triumph would occur in the 1896 presidential election, albeit under the auspices of the Democratic Party. Former Nebraska Congressman William Jennings Bryan, the Democrat (as well as Populist) nominee, was a firm advocate for retaining silver as well as gold for the monetary standard in America, rather than using gold alone. At the Democratic National Convention that year, Bryan gave this speech which garnered massive support for his campaign, but he ultimately lost to William McKinley.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What is the “paramount issue,” according to Bryan?

2. Does Bryan agree that the government should be able to impose an income tax?

3. How does Bryan explain the relationship between banks and government?

4. Why does he object to the gold standard?

5. What are the “two ideas of government” that Bryan describes?
I would be presumptuous, indeed, to present myself against the distinguished gentlemen to whom you have listened if this were but a measuring of ability; but this is not a contest among persons. The humblest citizen in all the land when clad in the armor of a righteous cause is stronger than all the whole hosts of error that they can bring. I come to speak to you in defense of a cause as holy as the cause of liberty—the cause of humanity. When this debate is concluded, a motion will be made to lay upon the table the resolution offered in commendation of the administration and also the resolution in condemnation of the administration. I shall object to bringing this question down to a level of persons. The individual is but an atom; he is born, he acts, he dies; but principles are eternal; and this has been a contest of principle.

Never before in the history of this country has there been witnessed such a contest as that through which we have passed. Never before in the history of American politics has a great issue been fought out as this issue has been by the voters themselves.

On the 4th of March, 1895, a few Democrats, most of them members of Congress, issued an address to the Democrats of the nation asserting that the money question was the paramount issue of the hour; asserting also the right of a majority of the Democratic Party to control the position of the party on this paramount issue; concluding with the request that all believers in free coinage of silver in the Democratic Party should organize and take charge of and control the policy of the Democratic Party. Three months later, at Memphis, an organization was perfected, and the silver Democrats went forth openly and boldly and courageously proclaiming their belief and declaring that if successful they would crystallize in a platform the declaration which they had made; and then began the conflict with a zeal approaching the zeal which inspired the crusaders who followed Peter the Hermit. Our silver Democrats went forth from victory unto victory, until they are assembled now, not to discuss, not to debate, but to enter up the judgment rendered by the plain people of this country.

But in this contest, brother has been arrayed against brother, and father against son. The warmest ties of love and acquaintance and association have been disregarded. Old leaders have been cast aside when they refused to give expression to the sentiments of those
whom they would lead, and new leaders have sprung up to give direction to this cause of freedom. Thus has the contest been waged, and we have assembled here under as binding and solemn instructions as were ever fastened upon the representatives of a people.

We do not come as individuals. Why, as individuals we might have been glad to compliment the gentleman from New York [Senator Hill], but we knew that the people for whom we speak would never be willing to put him in a position where he could thwart the will of the Democratic Party. I say it was not a question of persons; it was a question of principle; and it is not with gladness, my friends, that we find ourselves brought into conflict with those who are now arrayed on the other side. The gentleman who just preceded me [Governor Russell] spoke of the old state of Massachusetts. Let me assure him that not one person in all this convention entertains the least hostility to the people of the state of Massachusetts.

But we stand here representing people who are the equals before the law of the largest cities in the state of Massachusetts. When you come before us and tell us that we shall disturb your business interests, we reply that you have disturbed our business interests by your action. We say to you that you have made too limited in its application the definition of a businessman. The man who is employed for wages is as much a businessman as his employer. The attorney in a country town is as much a businessman as the corporation counsel in a great metropolis. The merchant at the crossroads store is as much a businessman as the merchant of New York. The farmer who goes forth in the morning and toils all day, begins in the spring and toils all summer, and by the application of brain and muscle to the natural resources of this country creates wealth, is as much a businessman as the man who goes upon the Board of Trade and bets upon the price of grain. The miners who go 1,000 feet into the earth or climb 2,000 feet upon the cliffs and bring forth from their hiding places the precious metals to be poured in the channels of trade are as much businessmen as the few financial magnates who in a backroom corner the money of the world.

We come to speak for this broader class of businessmen. Ah. my friends, we say not one word against those who live upon the Atlantic Coast; but those hardy pioneers who
braved all the dangers of the wilderness, who have made the desert to blossom as the rose—those pioneers away out there, rearing their children near to nature's heart, where they can mingle their voices with the voices of the birds—out there where they have erected schoolhouses for the education of their children and churches where they praise their Creator, and the cemeteries where sleep the ashes of their dead—are as deserving of the consideration of this party as any people in this country.

It is for these that we speak. We do not come as aggressors. Our war is not a war of conquest. We are fighting in the defense of our homes, our families, and posterity. We have petitioned, and our petitions have been scorned. We have entreated, and our entreaties have been disregarded. We have begged, and they have mocked when our calamity came.

We beg no longer; we entreat no more; we petition no more. We defy them!

The gentleman from Wisconsin has said he fears a Robespierre. My friend, in this land of the free you need fear no tyrant who will spring up from among the people. What we need is an Andrew Jackson to stand as Jackson stood, against the encroachments of aggregated wealth.

They tell us that this platform was made to catch votes. We reply to them that changing conditions make new issues; that the principles upon which rest Democracy are as everlasting as the hills; but that they must be applied to new conditions as they arise. Conditions have arisen and we are attempting to meet those conditions. They tell us that the income tax ought not to be brought in here; that is not a new idea. They criticize us for our criticism of the Supreme Court of the United States. My friends, we have made no criticism. We have simply called attention to what you know. If you want criticisms, read the dissenting opinions of the Court. That will give you criticisms.

They say we passed an unconstitutional law. I deny it. The income tax was not unconstitutional when it was passed. It was not unconstitutional when it went before the Supreme Court for the first time. It did not become unconstitutional until one judge
changed his mind; and we cannot be expected to know when a judge will change his mind.

The income tax is a just law. It simply intends to put the burdens of government justly upon the backs of the people. I am in favor of an income tax. When I find a man who is not willing to pay his share of the burden of the government which protects him, I find a man who is unworthy to enjoy the blessings of a government like ours.

He says that we are opposing the national bank currency. It is true. If you will read what Thomas Benton said, you will find that he said that in searching history he could find but one parallel to Andrew Jackson. That was Cicero, who destroyed the conspiracies of Cataline and saved Rome. He did for Rome what Jackson did when he destroyed the bank conspiracy and saved America.

We say in our platform that we believe that the right to coin money and issue money is a function of government. We believe it. We believe it is a part of sovereignty and can no more with safety be delegated to private individuals than can the power to make penal statutes or levy laws for taxation.

Mr. Jefferson, who was once regarded as good Democratic authority, seems to have a different opinion from the gentleman who has addressed us on the part of the minority. Those who are opposed to this proposition tell us that the issue of paper money is a function of the bank and that the government ought to go out of the banking business. I stand with Jefferson rather than with them, and tell them, as he did, that the issue of money is a function of the government and that the banks should go out of the governing business.

They complain about the plank which declares against the life tenure in office. They have tried to strain it to mean that which it does not mean. What we oppose in that plank is the life tenure that is being built up in Washington which establishes an office-holding class and excludes from participation in the benefits the humbler members of our society.

…
Let me call attention to two or three great things. The gentleman from New York says that he will propose an amendment providing that this change in our law shall not affect contracts which, according to the present laws, are made payable in gold. But if he means to say that we cannot change our monetary system without protecting those who have loaned money before the change was made, I want to ask him where, in law or in morals, he can find authority for not protecting the debtors when the act of 1873 was passed when he now insists that we must protect the creditor. He says he also wants to amend this platform so as to provide that if we fail to maintain the parity within a year that we will then suspend the coinage of silver. We reply that when we advocate a thing which we believe will be successful we are not compelled to raise a doubt as to our own sincerity by trying to show what we will do if we are wrong.

I ask him, if he will apply his logic to us, why he does not apply it to himself. He says that he wants this country to try to secure an international agreement. Why doesn’t he tell us what he is going to do if they fail to secure an international agreement. There is more reason for him to do that than for us to expect to fail to maintain the parity. They have tried for thirty years—thirty years—to secure an international agreement, and those are waiting for it most patiently who don’t want it at all.

Now, my friends, let me come to the great paramount issue. If they ask us here why it is we say more on the money question than we say upon the tariff question, I reply that if protection has slain its thousands the gold standard has slain its tens of thousands. If they ask us why we did not embody all these things in our platform which we believe, we reply to them that when we have restored the money of the Constitution, all other necessary reforms will be possible, and that until that is done there is no reform that can be accomplished.

Why is it that within three months such a change has come over the sentiments of the country? Three months ago, when it was confidently asserted that those who believed in the gold standard would frame our platforms and nominate our candidates, even the advocates of the gold standard did not think that we could elect a President; but they had
good reasons for the suspicion, because there is scarcely a state here today asking for the gold standard that is not within the absolute control of the Republican Party.

But note the change. Mr. McKinley was nominated at St. Louis upon a platform that declared for the maintenance of the gold standard until it should be changed into bimetallism by an international agreement. Mr. McKinley was the most popular man among the Republicans; and everybody three months ago in the Republican Party prophesied his election. How is it today? Why, that man who used to boast that he looked like Napoleon, that man shudders today when he thinks that he was nominated on the anniversary of the Battle of Waterloo. Not only that, but as he listens he can hear with ever increasing distinctness the sound of the waves as they beat upon the lonely shores of St. Helena.

Why this change? Ah, my friends. is not the change evident to anyone who will look at the matter? It is because no private character, however pure, no personal popularity, however great, can protect from the avenging wrath of an indignant people the man who will either declare that he is in favor of fastening the gold standard upon this people, or who is willing to surrender the right of self-government and place legislative control in the hands of foreign potentates and powers. …

We go forth confident that we shall win. Why? Because upon the paramount issue in this campaign there is not a spot of ground upon which the enemy will dare to challenge battle. Why, if they tell us that the gold standard is a good thing, we point to their platform and tell them that their platform pledges the party to get rid of a gold standard and substitute bimetallism. If the gold standard is a good thing, why try to get rid of it? If the gold standard, and I might call your attention to the fact that some of the very people who are in this convention today and who tell you that we ought to declare in favor of international bimetallism and thereby declare that the gold standard is wrong and that the principles of bimetallism are better—these very people four months ago were open and avowed advocates of the gold standard and telling us that we could not legislate two metals together even with all the world.
I want to suggest this truth, that if the gold standard is a good thing we ought to declare in favor of its retention and not in favor of abandoning it; and if the gold standard is a bad thing, why should we wait until some other nations are willing to help us to let it go?

Here is the line of battle. We care not upon which issue they force the fight. We are prepared to meet them on either issue or on both. If they tell us that the gold standard is the standard of civilization, we reply to them that this, the most enlightened of all nations of the earth, has never declared for a gold standard, and both the parties this year are declaring against it. If the gold standard is the standard of civilization, why, my friends, should we not have it? So if they come to meet us on that, we can present the history of our nation. More than that, we can tell them this, that they will search the pages of history in vain to find a single instance in which the common people of any land ever declared themselves in favor of a gold standard. They can find where the holders of fixed investments have.

Mr. Carlisle said in 1878 that this was a struggle between the idle holders of idle capital and the struggling masses who produce the wealth and pay the taxes of the country; and my friends, it is simply a question that we shall decide upon which side shall the Democratic Party fight. Upon the side of the idle holders of idle capital, or upon the side of the struggling masses? That is the question that the party must answer first; and then it must be answered by each individual hereafter. The sympathies of the Democratic Party, as described by the platform, are on the side of the struggling masses, who have ever been the foundation of the Democratic Party.

There are two ideas of government. There are those who believe that if you just legislate to make the well-to-do prosperous, that their prosperity will leak through on those below. The Democratic idea has been that if you legislate to make the masses prosperous their prosperity will find its way up and through every class that rests upon it.

You come to us and tell us that the great cities are in favor of the gold standard. I tell you that the great cities rest upon these broad and fertile prairies. Burn down your cities and
leave our farms, and your cities will spring up again as if by magic. But destroy our farms
and the grass will grow in the streets of every city in the country.

My friends, we shall declare that this nation is able to legislate for its own people on every
question without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation on earth, and upon
that issue we expect to carry every single state in the Union.

I shall not slander the fair state of Massachusetts nor the state of New York by saying that
when citizens are confronted with the proposition, “Is this nation able to attend to its
own business?”—I will not slander either one by saying that the people of those states
will declare our helpless impotency as a nation to attend to our own business. It is the
issue of 1776 over again. Our ancestors, when but 3 million, had the courage to declare
their political independence of every other nation upon earth. Shall we, their
descendants, when we have grown to 70 million, declare that we are less independent
than our forefathers? No, my friends, it will never be the judgment of this people.
Therefore, we care not upon what lines the battle is fought. If they say bimetallism is
good but we cannot have it till some nation helps us, we reply that, instead of having a
gold standard because England has, we shall restore bimetallism, and then let England
have bimetallism because the United States have.

If they dare to come out in the open field and defend the gold standard as a good thing,
we shall fight them to the uttermost, having behind us the producing masses of the nation
and the world. Having behind us the commercial interests and the laboring interests and
all the toiling masses, we shall answer their demands for a gold standard by saying to
them, you shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns. You shall
not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold.
ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE

The March of the Flag

SPEECH EXCERPTS

September 16, 1898
Indianapolis, IN

BACKGROUND

Following the conclusion of the Spanish-American War in 1898, Spain handed over its territories of Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines to the United States. Having these new lands under American control raised many questions among the people, many of whom were unsure if the United States should be so involved abroad. Senator Albert Beveridge, running for reelection in Indiana, argued in this speech that it was indeed America’s mission to expand itself to those islands—perhaps even beyond—and to spread its principles across the world.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. How does Beveridge describe America?

2. What is America’s mission to the world?

3. What are the limitations to rule by consent?

4. What is the “march of the flag”?

5. What opposition does Beveridge face? How does he respond to it?

6. What is the “greatest fact of the future”?

Fellow citizens, it is a noble land that God has given us; a land that can feed and clothe
the world; a land whose coastlines would enclose half the countries of Europe; a land
set like a sentinel between the two imperial oceans of the globe, a greater England with
a nobler destiny. It is a mighty people that He has planted on this soil; a people sprung
from the most masterful blood of history; a people perpetually revitalized by the virile,
man-producing working-folk of all the earth; a people imperial by virtue of their power,
by right of their institutions, by authority of their heaven-directed purposes—the
propagandists and not the misers of liberty. It is a glorious history our God has
bestowed upon His chosen people; a history whose keynote was struck by [the] Liberty
Bell; a history heroic with faith in our mission and our future; a history of statesmen
who flung the boundaries of the Republic out into unexplored lands and savage
wildernesses; a history of soldiers who carried the flag across the blazing deserts and
through the ranks of hostile mountains, even to the gates of sunset; a history of a
multiplying people who overran a continent in half a century; a history of prophets
who saw the consequences of evils inherited from the past and of martyrs who died to
save us from them; a history divinely logical, in the process of whose tremendous
reasoning we find ourselves today.

Therefore, in this campaign, the question is larger than a party question. It is an
American question. It is a world question. Shall the American people continue their
resistless march toward the commercial supremacy of the world? Shall free institutions
broaden their blessed reign as the children of liberty wax in strength, until the empire
of our principles is established over the hearts of all mankind?

Have we no mission to perform, no duty to discharge to our fellow man? Has God
endowed us with gifts beyond our deserts and marked us as the people of His peculiar
favor, merely to rot in our own selfishness, as men and nations must, who take
cowardice for their companion and self for their deity as China has, as India has, as
Egypt has? Shall we be as the man who had one talent and hid it, or as he who had ten
talents and used them until they grew to riches? And shall we reap the reward that waits
on the discharge of our high duty as the sovereign power of earth; shall we occupy new
markets for what our farmers raise, new markets for what our factories make, new
markets for what our merchants sell—aye, and, please God, new markets for what our ships shall carry? Shall weavail ourselves of new sources of supply of what we do not raise or make, so that what are luxuries today will be necessities to-morrow? …

For William McKinley is continuing the policy that Jefferson began, Monroe continued, Seward advanced, Grant promoted, Harrison championed, and the growth of the Republic has demanded. Hawaii is ours; Puerto Rico is to be ours; at the prayer of the people Cuba will finally be ours; in the islands of the east, even to the gates of Asia, coaling stations are to be ours; at the very least the flag of a liberal government is to float over the Philippines, and it will be the stars and stripes of glory. And the burning question of this campaign is, whether the American people will accept the gifts of events; whether they will rise, as lifts their soaring destiny; whether they will proceed upon the lines of national development surveyed by the statesmen of our past; or whether, for the first time, the American people doubt their mission, question fate, prove apostate to the spirit of their race, and halt the ceaseless march of free institutions?

The opposition tells us that we ought not to govern a people without their consent. I answer, the rule of liberty that all just government derives its authority from the consent of the governed, applies only to those who are capable of self-government. We govern the Indians without their consent, we govern our territories without their consent, we govern our children without their consent. How do they know what our government would be without their consent? Would not the people of the Philippines prefer the just, humane, civilizing government of this Republic to the savage, bloody rule of pillage and extortion from which we have rescued them? Do not the blazing fires of joy and the ringing bells of gladness in Puerto Rico prove the welcome of our flag? And, regardless of this formula of words made only for enlightened, self-governing peoples, do we owe no duty to the world? Shall we turn these peoples back to the reeking hands from which we have taken them? Shall we abandon them to their fate with the wolves of conquest all about them? Shall we save them from those nations, to give them a self-rule of tragedy? It would be like giving a razor to a babe and telling
it to shave itself. It would be like giving a typewriter to an Eskimo and telling him to publish one of the great dailies of the world.

They ask us how we will govern these new possessions. I answer: out of local conditions and the necessities of the case methods of government will grow. If England can govern foreign lands so can America. If Germany can govern foreign lands so can America. If they can supervise protectorates so can America. Why is it more difficult to administer Hawaii than New Mexico or California? Both had a savage and an alien population; both were more remote from the seat of government when they came under our dominion than Hawaii is today. Will you say by your vote that American ability to govern has decayed, that you are an infidel to American vigor and practical sense? Or that we are of the ruling race of the world; that ours is the blood of government; ours the heart of dominion; ours the brain and the genius of administration? We do but what our fathers did—but pitch the tents of liberty farther westward, farther southward—we only continue the march of the flag.

The march of the flag! In 1789 the flag of the Republic waved over 4 million souls in thirteen States, and their savage territory which stretched to the Mississippi, to Canada, to the Floridas. The timid minds of that day said that no new territory was needed, and, for the hour, they were right. But Jefferson … acquired the territory which swept from the Mississippi to the mountains, from Texas to the British possessions, and the march of the flag began. The infidels to the gospel of liberty raved, but the flag swept on. The title to that noble land out of which Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana have been carved was uncertain; Jefferson … obeyed the Anglo-Saxon impulse within him … and another empire was added to the Republic and the march of the flag went on. Those who deny the power of free institutions to expand urged every argument, and more, that we hear today, but the march of the flag went on. A screen of land from New Orleans to Florida shut us from the gulf, and over this and the Everglade Peninsula waved the saffron flag of Spain. Andrew Jackson seized both, the American people stood at his back, and under Monroe the Floridas came under the dominion of the Republic, and the march of the flag went on. The Cassandras prophesied every prophecy of despair we hear today, but the march of the flag went on. Then Texas
responded to the bugle calls of liberty and the march of the flag went on. And at last
we waged war with Mexico and the flag swept over the Southwest, over peerless
California, past the Gate of Gold to Oregon on the north, and from ocean to ocean its
folds of glory blazed. And now, obeying the same voice that Jefferson heard and obeyed,
that Jackson heard and obeyed, that Seward heard and obeyed, that Grant and Harrison
heard and obeyed, William McKinley plants the flag over the islands of the sea, outposts
of commerce, citadels of national security, and the march of the flag goes on. …

Distance and oceans are no arguments. The fact that all the territory our fathers bought
and seized is contiguous is no argument. In 1819 Florida was farther from New York
than Puerto Rico is from Chicago today; Texas farther from Washington in 1845 than
Hawaii is from Boston in 1898; California more inaccessible in 1847 than the
Philippines are now. Gibraltar is farther from London than Havana is from
Washington; Melbourne is farther from Liverpool than Manila is from San Francisco.
The ocean does not separate us from the lands of our duty and desire—the ocean joins
us, a river never to be dredged, a canal never to be repaired. Steam joins us; electricity
joins us—the very elements are in league with our destiny. Cuba not contiguous! Puerto
Rico not contiguous! Hawaii and the Philippines not contiguous! Our navy will make
them contiguous. Dewey and Sampson and Schley have made them contiguous and
American speed, American guns, American heart and brain and nerve will keep them
contiguous forever.

But the opposition is right—there is a difference. We did not need the western
Mississippi Valley when we acquired it, nor Florida, nor Texas, nor California, nor the
royal provinces of the far Northwest. We had no emigrants to people this imperial
wilderness, no money to develop it, even no highways to cover it. No trade awaited us
in its savage fastnesses. Our productions were not greater than our internal trade. There
was not one reason for the land lust of our statesmen from Jefferson to Grant, other
than the prophet and the Saxon within them. But, today, we are raising more than we
can consume. Today, we are making more than we can use. … Therefore, we must find
new markets for our produce, new occupation for our capital, new work for our labor.
And so, while we did not need the territory taken during the past century at the time it
was acquired, we do need what we have taken in 1898, and we need it now. Think of
the thousands of Americans who will pour into Hawaii and Puerto Rico when the Republic’s laws cover those islands with justice and safety. Think of the tens of thousands of Americans who will invade the Philippines when a liberal government, protected and controlled by this Republic, if not the government of the Republic itself, shall establish order and equity there. Think of the hundreds of thousands of Americans who will build a soap-and-water, common school civilization of energy and industry in Cuba, when a government of law replaces the double reign of anarchy and tyranny. Think of the prosperous millions that empress of islands will support when, obedient to the law of political gravitation, her people ask for the highest honor liberty can bestow—the sacred order of the stars and stripes, the citizenship of the great Republic!

What does all this mean for every one of us? It means opportunity for all the glorious young manhood of the Republic. … It means that the resources and the commerce of these immensely rich dominions will be increased as much as American energy is greater than Spanish sloth; for Americans, henceforth, will monopolize those resources and that commerce. In Cuba, alone, there are 15 million acres of forest unacquainted with the ax. There are exhaustless mines of iron. There are priceless deposits of manganese. … There are millions of acres yet unexplored. The resources of Puerto Rico have only been trifled with. The riches of the Philippines have hardly been touched by the fingertips of modern methods. And they produce what we cannot, and they consume what we produce—the very predestination of reciprocity. … And William McKinley intends that their trade shall be ours. … It means … an opportunity for the rich man to do something with his money, besides hoarding it or lending it. It means occupation for every workingman in the country at wages which the development of new resources, the launching of new enterprises, the monopoly of new markets always brings. Cuba is as large as Pennsylvania, and is the richest spot on all the globe. Hawaii is as large as New Jersey; Puerto Rico half as large as Hawaii; the Philippines larger than all New England, New York, New Jersey, and Delaware. All these are larger than the British Isles, larger than France, larger than Germany, larger than Japan. The trade of these islands, developed as we will develop it, … monopolized as we will monopolize
it, will set every reaper in this Republic singing, every spindle whirling, every furnace spouting the flames of industry. …

… The commercial empire of the Republic! That is the greatest fact of the future. And that is why these islands involve considerations larger than their own commerce. The commercial supremacy of the Republic means that this nation is to be the sovereign factor in the peace of the world. For the conflicts of the future are to be conflicts of trade—struggles for markets—commercial wars for existence. And the golden rule of peace is impregnability of position and invincibility of preparation. So we see England, the greatest strategist of history, plant her flag and her cannon on Gibraltar, at Quebec, the Bermudas, Vancouver—everywhere—until from every point of vantage her royal banner flashes in the sun. So Hawaii furnishes us a naval base in the heart of the Pacific; the Ladrones another, a voyage further into the region of sunset and commerce; Manila, another, at the gates of Asia—Asia, to the trade of whose hundreds of millions American merchants, American manufacturers, American farmers have as good a right as those of Germany, or France, or Russia, or England; Asia, whose commerce with England alone amounts to billions of dollars every year; Asia, to whom Germany looks to take the surplus of her factories, and foundries, and mills; Asia, whose doors shall not be shut against American trade!

Within two decades the bulk of Oriental commerce will be ours—the richest commerce in the world. In the light of that golden future our chain of new-won stations rise like ocean sentinels from the night of waters—Puerto Rico, a nobler Gibraltar; the Isthmian canal, a greater Suez; Hawaii, the Ladrones, the Philippines, commanding the Pacific! Ah! as our commerce spreads, the flag of liberty will circle the globe and the highways of the ocean-carrying trade of all mankind be guarded by the guns of the Republic. And, as their thunders salute the flag, benighted peoples will know that the voice of Liberty is speaking, at last, for them; that civilization is dawning, at last for them—Liberty and Civilization, those children of Christ’s gospel, who follow and never precede the preparing march of commerce! It is the tide of God’s great purposes made manifest in the instincts of our race, whose present phase is our personal profit, but
whose far-off end is the redemption of the world and the Christianization of mankind.
{
...}

... Shall this future of the race be left with those who, under God, began this career of sacred duty and immortal glory; or, shall we risk it to those who would build a dam in the current of destiny's large designs{?} ...

Fellow Americans, we are God’s chosen people. Yonder at Bunker Hill and Yorktown His providence was above us. At New Orleans and on ensanguined seas His hand sustained us. Abraham Lincoln was His minister; and His was the altar of freedom, the boys in blue set on a hundred smoking battlefields. His power directed Dewey in the East, and He delivered the Spanish fleet into our hands on the eve of Liberty’s natal day as He delivered the elder Armada into the hands of our English sires two centuries ago. His great purposes are revealed in the progress of the flag, which surpasses the intentions of Congresses and cabinets, and leads us, like a holier pillar of cloud by day and pillar of fire by night, into situations unforeseen by finite wisdom and duties unexpected by the unprophetic heart of selfishness. The American people cannot use a dishonest medium of exchange; it is ours to set the world its example of right and honor. We cannot fly from our world duties; it is ours to execute the purpose of a fate that has driven us to be greater than our small intentions. We cannot retreat from any soil where Providence has unfurled our banner; it is ours to save that soil for liberty and civilization. For liberty and civilization and God’s promises fulfilled, the flag must henceforth be the symbol and the sign to all mankind. ...
**THE AMERICAN ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE**

**Platform of the American Anti-Imperialist League**

**PARTY PLATFORM**

1899

**BACKGROUND**

Founded in 1899 by Andrew Carnegie and William James, the American Anti-Imperialist League was a response to the United States’ occupation of Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippine Islands following the Spanish-American War. This platform expressed their fundamental differences with American expansion. (Note the contrasts to the previous speech of Sen. Beveridge defending the islands’ possession by the United States.)

**GUIDING QUESTIONS**

1. Where does the League say imperialism often leads a nation?
2. What does the League condemn?
3. How does 1899 compare to 1861, according to the League?
4. Does it say citizens should always support their government?
5. What does the League say about self-government?

We hold that the policy known as imperialism is hostile to liberty and tends toward militarism, an evil from which it has been our glory to be free. We regret that it has become necessary in the land of Washington and Lincoln to reaffirm that all men, of whatever race or color, are entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. We maintain that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. We insist that the subjugation of any people is “criminal aggression” and open disloyalty to the distinctive principles of our Government.

We earnestly condemn the policy of the present National Administration in the Philippines. It seeks to extinguish the spirit of 1776 in those islands. We deplore the sacrifice of our soldiers and sailors, whose bravery deserves admiration even in an unjust war. We denounce the slaughter of the Filipinos as a needless horror. We protest against the extension of American sovereignty by Spanish methods.

We demand the immediate cessation of the war against liberty, begun by Spain and continued by us. We urge that Congress be promptly convened to announce to the Filipinos our purpose to concede to them the independence for which they have so long fought and which of right is theirs.

The United States have always protested against the doctrine of international law which permits the subjugation of the weak by the strong. A self-governing state cannot accept sovereignty over an unwilling people. The United States cannot act upon the ancient heresy that might makes right.

Imperialists assume that with the destruction of self-government in the Philippines by American hands, all opposition here will cease. This is a grievous error. Much as we abhor the war of “criminal aggression” in the Philippines, greatly as we regret that the blood of the Filipinos is on American hands, we more deeply resent the betrayal of American institutions at home. The real firing line is not in the suburbs of Manila. The foe is of our own household. The attempt of 1861 was to divide the country. That of 1899 is to destroy its fundamental principles and noblest ideals.
Whether the ruthless slaughter of the Filipinos shall end next month or next year is but an incident in a contest that must go on until the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States are rescued from the hands of their betrayers. Those who dispute about standards of value while the foundation of the Republic is undermined will be listened to as little as those who would wrangle about the small economies of the household while the house is on fire. The training of a great people for a century, the aspiration for liberty of a vast immigration are forces that will hurl aside those who in the delirium of conquest seek to destroy the character of our institutions.

We deny that the obligation of all citizens to support their Government in times of grave National peril applies to the present situation. If an Administration may with impunity ignore the issues upon which it was chosen, deliberately create a condition of war anywhere on the face of the globe, debauch the civil service for spoils to promote the adventure, organize a truth suppressing censorship and demand of all citizens a suspension of judgment and their unanimous support while it chooses to continue the fighting, representative government itself is imperiled.

We propose to contribute to the defeat of any person or party that stands for the forcible subjugation of any people. We shall oppose for reelection all who in the White House or in Congress betray American liberty in pursuit of un-American ends. We still hope that both of our great political parties will support and defend the Declaration of Independence in the closing campaign of the century.

We hold, with Abraham Lincoln, that “no man is good enough to govern another man without that other’s consent. When the white man governs himself, that is self-government, but when he governs himself and also governs another man, that is more than self-government—that is despotism.” “Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men in all lands. Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and under a just God cannot long retain it.”
We cordially invite the cooperation of all men and women who remain loyal to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.
BOOKER T. WASHINGTON

Atlanta Exposition Address

SPEECH

September 18, 1895

Cotton States and International Exposition | Atlanta, GA

BACKGROUND

Following the Civil War, African Americans—many of whom were former slaves—struggled to be fully accepted into American society due to white racial prejudice in the North and South alike, despite the presence of the Reconstruction Amendments to the Constitution. Thus, different schools of thought developed in the African American community as to how best to address this issue given the present circumstances. Booker T. Washington, himself a former slave, gave his views on the subject and the problems facing a changing America in this speech at the Cotton States and International Exposition.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. How does Washington say friendship can grow between the two races?
2. By what means does he suggest blacks can improve their position in American society?
3. For what reason does Washington believe that blacks will find success even in the South?
4. What public activity does he say most African Americans would consider ill-advised?
5. What virtue does Washington say is crucial to making progress in racial relationships?
Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Board of Directors and Citizens:

One-third of the population of the South is of the Negro race. No enterprise seeking the material, civil, or moral welfare of this section can disregard this element of our population and reach the highest success. I but convey to you, Mr. President and Directors, the sentiment of the masses of my race when I say that in no way have the value and manhood of the American Negro been more fittingly and generously recognized than by the managers of this magnificent exposition at every stage of its progress. It is a recognition that will do more to cement the friendship of the two races than any occurrence since the dawn of our freedom.

Not only this, but the opportunity here afforded will awaken among us a new era of industrial progress. Ignorant and inexperienced, it is not strange that in the first years of our new life we began at the top instead of at the bottom; that a seat in Congress or the state legislature was more sought than real estate or industrial skill; that the political convention or stump speaking had more attractions than starting a dairy farm or truck garden.

A ship lost at sea for many days suddenly sighted a friendly vessel. From the mast of the unfortunate vessel was seen a signal: “Water, water; we die of thirst.” The answer from the friendly vessel at once came back: “Cast down your bucket where you are.” A second time the signal, “Water, water, send us water!” ran up from the distressed vessel, and was answered: “Cast down your bucket where you are.” And a third and fourth signal for water was answered: “Cast down your bucket where you are.” The captain of the distressed vessel, at last heeding the injunction, cast down his bucket, and it came up full of fresh, sparkling water from the mouth of the Amazon River.

To those of my race who depend on bettering their condition in a foreign land or who underestimate the importance of cultivating friendly relations with the southern white man, who is their next-door neighbor, I would say: Cast down your bucket where you are; cast it down in making friends, in every manly way, of the people of all races by whom we are surrounded. Cast it down in agriculture, mechanics, in commerce, in
domestic service, and in the professions. And in this connection it is well to bear in mind that whatever other sins the South may be called to bear, when it comes to business, pure and simple, it is in the South that the Negro is given a man’s chance in the commercial world, and in nothing is this exposition more eloquent than in emphasizing this chance.

Our greatest danger is that, in the great leap from slavery to freedom, we may overlook the fact that the masses of us are to live by the productions of our hands and fail to keep in mind that we shall prosper in proportion as we learn to dignify and glorify common labor, and put brains and skill into the common occupations of life; shall prosper in proportion as we learn to draw the line between the superficial and the substantial, the ornamental gewgaws of life and the useful. No race can prosper till it learns that there is as much dignity in tilling a field as in writing a poem. It is at the bottom of life we must begin, and not at the top. Nor should we permit our grievances to overshadow our opportunities.

To those of the white race who look to the incoming of those of foreign birth and strange tongue and habits for the prosperity of the South, were I permitted I would repeat what I say to my own race, "Cast down your bucket where you are." Cast it down among the 8 million Negroes whose habits you know, whose fidelity and love you have tested in days when to have proved treacherous meant the ruin of your firesides. Cast down your bucket among these people who have, without strikes and labor wars, tilled your fields, cleared your forests, built your railroads and cities, and brought forth treasures from the bowels of the earth and helped make possible this magnificent representation of the progress of the South. Casting down your bucket among my people, helping and encouraging them as you are doing on these grounds, and, with education of head, hand, and heart, you will find that they will buy your surplus land, make blossom the waste places in your fields, and run your factories.

While doing this, you can be sure in the future, as in the past, that you and your families will be surrounded by the most patient, faithful, law-abiding, and unresentful people that the world has seen. As we have proved our loyalty to you in the past, in nursing
your children, watching by the sickbed of your mothers and fathers, and often following them with tear-dimmed eyes to their graves, so in the future, in our humble way, we shall stand by you with a devotion that no foreigner can approach, ready to lay down our lives, if need be, in defense of yours; interlacing our industrial, commercial, civil, and religious life with yours in a way that shall make the interests of both races one. In all things that are purely social we can be as separate as the fingers, yet one as the hand in all things essential to mutual progress.

There is no defense or security for any of us except in the highest intelligence and development of all. If anywhere there are efforts tending to curtail the fullest growth of the Negro, let these efforts be turned into stimulating, encouraging, and making him the most useful and intelligent citizen. Effort or means so invested will pay a thousand percent interest. These efforts will be twice blessed—“blessing him that gives and him that takes.”

There is no escape, through law of man or God, from the inevitable:

The laws of changeless justice bind
Oppressor with oppressed;
And close as sin and suffering joined
We march to fate abreast.

Nearly 16 million hands will aid you in pulling the load upward, or they will pull against you the load downward. We shall constitute one-third and more of the ignorance and crime of the South, or one-third its intelligence and progress; we shall contribute one-third to the business and industrial prosperity of the South, or we shall prove a veritable body of death, stagnating, depressing, retarding every effort to advance the body politic.

Gentlemen of the exposition, as we present to you our humble effort at an exhibition of our progress, you must not expect overmuch. Starting thirty years ago with ownership here and there in a few quilts and pumpkins and chickens (gathered from miscellaneous sources), remember: the path that has led from these to the invention and production of agricultural implements, buggies, steam engines, newspapers, books,
statuary, carving, paintings, the management of drugstores and banks, has not been trodden without contact with thorns and thistles. While we take pride in what we exhibit as a result of our independent efforts, we do not for a moment forget that our part in this exhibition would fall far short of your expectations but for the constant help that has come to our educational life, not only from the southern states but especially from northern philanthropists who have made their gifts a constant stream of blessing and encouragement.

The wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremest folly, and that progress in the enjoyment of all the privileges that will come to us must be the result of severe and constant struggle rather than of artificial forcing. No race that has anything to contribute to the markets of the world is long in any degree ostracized. It is important and right that all privileges of the law be ours, but it is vastly more important that we be prepared for the exercise of those privileges.

The opportunity to earn a dollar in a factory just now is worth infinitely more than the opportunity to spend a dollar in an opera house.

In conclusion, may I repeat that nothing in thirty years has given us more hope and encouragement and drawn us so near to you of the white race as this opportunity offered by the exposition; and here bending, as it were, over the altar that represents the results of the struggles of your race and mine, both starting practically empty-handed three decades ago, I pledge that, in your effort to work out the great and intricate problem which God has laid at the doors of the South, you shall have at all times the patient, sympathetic help of my race; only let this be constantly in mind that, while from representations in these buildings of the product of field, of forest, of mine, of factory, letters, and art, much good will come—yet far above and beyond material benefits will be that higher good, that let us pray God will come, in a blotting out of sectional differences and racial animosities and suspicions, in a determination to administer absolute justice, in a willing obedience among all classes to the mandates of law. This, coupled with our material prosperity, will bring into our beloved South a new heaven and a new earth.
BACKGROUND

The open expanse of the American West provided substantial room for settlement, national growth, and exploration even before the Civil War. By the close of the 19th century, however, due to continued expansion and the relegation of the Indians to comparatively small reservations, the Western frontier could be said to have faded into irrelevancy—there was simply not as much (if anything) left to explore. In 1890, the U.S. Census Bureau itself officially declared that the frontier no longer existed. In response, American scholar Frederick Jackson Turner published this essay exploring the tangible, lasting effects of the Western frontier’s exploration on the United States.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. How does Turner describe the Western frontier?

2. What are the multiple “frontiers” that have existed throughout American history?

3. How did economic development influence the settlement of the West, according to Turner?

4. How does he describe the evolution of Western farming and its effects?

5. Whom does Turner say presented the biggest potential obstacle to Western expansion?

6. In what ways does he say the West shaped the rest of America both culturally and politically?

In a recent bulletin of the Superintendent of the Census for 1890 appear these significant words: “Up to and including 1880 the country had a frontier of settlement, but at present the unsettled area has been so broken into by isolated bodies of settlement that there can hardly be said to be a frontier line. In the discussion of its extent, its westward movement, etc., it can not, therefore, any longer have a place in the census reports.” This brief official statement marks the closing of a great historic movement. Up to our own day American history has been in a large degree the history of the colonization of the Great West. The existence of an area of free land, its continuous recession, and the advance of American settlement westward, explain American development.

Behind institutions, behind constitutional forms and modifications, lie the vital forces that call these organs into life and shape them to meet changing conditions. The peculiarity of American institutions is, the fact that they have been compelled to adapt themselves to the changes of an expanding people—to the changes involved in crossing a continent, in winning a wilderness, and in developing at each area of this progress out of the primitive economic and political conditions of the frontier into the complexity of city life. Said Calhoun in 1817, “We are great, and rapidly—I was about to say fearfully—growing!” [1] So saying, he touched the distinguishing feature of American life. All peoples show development; the germ theory of politics has been sufficiently emphasized.

In the case of most nations, however, the development has occurred in a limited area; and if the nation has expanded, it has met other growing peoples whom it has conquered. But in the case of the United States we have a different phenomenon. Limiting our attention to the Atlantic coast, we have the familiar phenomenon of the evolution of institutions in a limited area, such as the rise of representative government; the differentiation of simple colonial governments into complex organs; the progress from primitive industrial society, without division of labor, up to manufacturing civilization. But we have in addition to this a recurrence of the process of evolution in each western area reached in the process of expansion. Thus American development has exhibited not merely advance along a single line, but a return to primitive conditions on a continually advancing frontier line, and a new development for that area. American social development has been continually beginning over again on the frontier. This perennial rebirth, this fluidity of American life, this expansion westward with its new opportunities,
its continuous touch with the simplicity of primitive society, furnish the forces dominating American character. The true point of view in the history of this nation is not the Atlantic coast, it is the great West. Even the slavery struggle, which is made so exclusive an object of attention by writers like Prof. von Holst, occupies its important place in American history because of its relation to westward expansion.

In this advance, the frontier is the outer edge of the wave—the meeting point between savagery and civilization. Much has been written about the frontier from the point of view of border warfare and the chase, but as a field for the serious study of the economist and the historian it has been neglected.

The American frontier is sharply distinguished from the European frontier—a fortified boundary line running through dense populations. The most significant thing about the American frontier is, that it lies at the hither edge of free land. In the census reports it is treated as the margin of that settlement which has a density of two or more to the square mile. The term is an elastic one, and for our purposes does not need sharp definition. We shall consider the whole frontier belt, including the Indian country and the outer margin of the “settled area” of the census reports. This paper will make no attempt to treat the subject exhaustively; its aim is simply to call attention to the frontier as a fertile field for investigation, and to suggest some of the problems which arise in connection with it.

In the settlement of America we have to observe how European life entered the continent, and how America modified and developed that life and reacted on Europe. Our early history is the study of European germs developing in an American environment. Too exclusive attention has been paid by institutional students to the Germanic origins, too little to the American factors. The frontier is the line of most rapid and effective Americanization. The wilderness masters the colonist. It finds him a European in dress, industries, tools, modes of travel, and thought. It takes him from the railroad car and puts him in the birch canoe. It strips off the garments of civilization and arrays him in the hunting shirt and the moccasin. It puts him in the log cabin of the Cherokee and Iroquois and runs an Indian palisade around him. Before long he has gone to planting Indian corn and plowing with a sharp stick; he shouts the war cry and takes the scalp in
orthodox Indian fashion. In short, at the frontier the environment is at first too strong for the man. He must accept the conditions which it furnishes, or perish, and so he fits himself into the Indian clearings and follows the Indian trails. Little by little he transforms the wilderness; but the outcome is not the old Europe, not simply the development of Germanic germs, any more than the first phenomenon was a case of reversion to the Germanic mark. The fact is, that here is a new product that is American. At first, the frontier was the Atlantic coast. It was the frontier of Europe in a very real sense. Moving westward, the frontier became more and more American. As successive terminal moraines result from successive glaciations, so each frontier leaves its traces behind it, and when it becomes a settled area the region still partakes of the frontier characteristics. Thus the advance of the frontier has meant a steady movement away from the influence of Europe, a steady growth of independence on American lines. And to study this advance, the men who grew up under these conditions, and the political, economic, and social results of it, is to study the really American part of our history.

Stages of Frontier Advance
In the course of the seventeenth century the frontier was advanced up the Atlantic river courses, just beyond the "fall line," and the tidewater region became the settled area. In the first half of the eighteenth century another advance occurred. Traders followed the Delaware and Shawnee Indians to the Ohio as early as the end of the first quarter of the century. [2] Gov. Spotswood, of Virginia, made an expedition in 1714 across the Blue Ridge. The end of the first quarter of the century saw the advance of the Scotch-Irish and the Palatine Germans up the Shenandoah Valley into the western part of Virginia, and along the Piedmont region of the Carolinas. [3] The Germans in New York pushed the frontier of settlement up the Mohawk to German Flats. [4] In Pennsylvania the town of Bedford indicates the line of settlement. Settlements had begun on New River, a branch of the Kanawha, and on the sources of the Yadkin and French Broad. [5] The King attempted to arrest the advance by his proclamation of 1763, [6] forbidding settlements beyond the sources of the rivers flowing into the Atlantic; but in vain. In the period of the Revolution the frontier crossed the Alleghanies into Kentucky and Tennessee, and the upper waters of the Ohio were settled. [7] When the first census was taken in 1790, the continuous settled area was bounded by a line which ran near the coast of Maine, and
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included New England except a portion of Vermont and New Hampshire, New York along the Hudson and up the Mohawk about Schenectady, eastern and southern Pennsylvania, Virginia well across the Shenandoah Valley, and the Carolinas and eastern Georgia. [8] Beyond this region of continuous settlement were the small settled areas of Kentucky and Tennessee, and the Ohio, with the mountains intervening between them and the Atlantic area, thus giving a new and important character to the frontier. The isolation of the region increased its peculiarly American tendencies, and the need of transportation facilities to connect it with the East called out important schemes of internal improvement, which will be noted farther on. The “West,” as a self-conscious section, began to evolve.

From decade to decade distinct advances of the frontier occurred. By the census of 1820, [9] the settled area included Ohio, southern Indiana and Illinois, southeastern Missouri, and about one-half of Louisiana. This settled area had surrounded Indian areas, and the management of these tribes became an object of political concern. The frontier region of the time lay along the Great Lakes, where Astor’s American Fur Company operated in the Indian trade, [10] and beyond the Mississippi, where Indian traders extended their activity even to the Rocky Mountains; Florida also furnished frontier conditions. The Mississippi River region was the scene of typical frontier settlements. [11]

The rising steam navigation [12] on western waters, the opening of the Erie Canal, and the westward extension of cotton [13] culture added five frontier states to the Union in this period. Grund, writing in 1836, declares: “It appears then that the universal disposition of Americans to emigrate to the western wilderness, in order to enlarge their dominion over inanimate nature, is the actual result of an expansive power which is inherent in them, and which by continually agitating all classes of society is constantly throwing a large portion of the whole population on the extreme confines of the State, in order to gain space for its development. Hardly is a new State or Territory formed before the same principle manifests itself again and gives rise to a further emigration; and so is it destined to go on until a physical barrier must finally obstruct its progress.” [14]
In the middle of this century the line indicated by the present eastern boundary of Indian Territory, Nebraska, and Kansas marked the frontier of the Indian country. [15] Minnesota and Wisconsin still exhibited frontier conditions, [16] but the distinctive frontier of the period is found in California, where the gold discoveries had sent a sudden tide of adventurous miners, and in Oregon, and the settlements in Utah. [17] As the frontier has leaped over the Alleghanies, so now it skipped the Great Plains and the Rocky Mountains; and in the same way that the advance of the frontiersmen beyond the Alleghanies had caused the rise of important questions of transportation and internal improvement, so now the settlers beyond the Rocky Mountains needed means of communication with the East, and in the furnishing of these arose the settlement of the Great Plains and the development of still another kind of frontier life. Railroads, fostered by land grants, sent an increasing tide of immigrants into the far West. The United States Army fought a series of Indian wars in Minnesota, Dakota, and the Indian Territory.

By 1880 the settled area had been pushed into northern Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, along Dakota rivers, and in the Black Hills region, and was ascending the rivers of Kansas and Nebraska. The development of mines in Colorado had drawn isolated frontier settlements into that region, and Montana and Idaho were receiving settlers. The frontier was found in these mining camps and the ranches of the Great Plains. The superintendent of the census for 1890 reports, as previously stated, that the settlements of the West lie so scattered over the region that there can no longer be said to be a frontier line.

In these successive frontiers we find natural boundary lines which have served to mark and to affect the characteristics of the frontiers, namely: The “fall line;” the Alleghany Mountains; the Mississippi; the Missouri, where its direction approximates north and south; the line of the arid lands, approximately the ninety-ninth meridian; and the Rocky Mountains. The fall line marked the frontier of the seventeenth century; the Alleghanies that of the eighteenth; the Mississippi that of the first quarter of the nineteenth; the Missouri that of the middle of this century (omitting the California movement); and the belt of the Rocky Mountains and the arid tract, the present frontier. Each was won by a series of Indian wars.
The Significance of the Frontier in American History
Frederick Jackson Turner

The Frontier Furnishes a Field for Comparative Study of Social Development

At the Atlantic frontier one can study the germs of processes repeated at each successive frontier. We have the complex European life sharply precipitated by the wilderness into the simplicity of primitive conditions. The first frontier had to meet its Indian question, its question of the disposition of the public domain, of the means of intercourse with older settlements, of the extension of political organization, of religious and educational activity. And the settlement of these and similar questions for one frontier served as a guide for the next. [...] Each frontier has made similar contributions to American character, as will be discussed farther on.

But with all these similarities there are essential differences, due to the place element and the time element. It is evident that the farming frontier of the Mississippi Valley presents different conditions from the mining frontier of the Rocky Mountains. The frontier reached by the Pacific Railroad, surveyed into rectangles, guarded by the United States Army, and recruited by the daily immigrant ship, moves forward at a swifter pace and in a different way than the frontier reached by the birch canoe or the pack horse. The geologist traces patiently the shores of ancient seas, maps their areas, and compares the older and the newer. It would be a work worth the historian’s labors to mark these various frontiers and in detail compare one with another. Not only would there result a more adequate conception of American development and characteristics, but invaluable additions would be made to the history of society. [...] 

The Atlantic frontier was compounded of fisherman, far trader, miner, cattle-raiser, and farmer. Excepting the fisherman, each type of industry was on the march toward the West, impelled by an irresistible attraction. Each passed in successive waves across the continent. [...] The unequal rate of advance compels us to distinguish the frontier into the trader’s frontier, the rancher’s frontier, or the miner’s frontier, and the farmer’s frontier. When the mines and the cow pens were still near the fall line the traders’ pack trains were tinkling across the Alleghanies, and the French on the Great Lakes were fortifying their posts, alarmed by the British trader’s birch canoe. When the trappers scaled the Rockies, the farmer was still near the mouth of the Missouri.
The Indian Trader’s Frontier

Why was it that the Indian trader passed so rapidly across the continent? What effects followed from the trader’s frontier? The trade was coeval with American discovery [...] […] All along the coast from Maine to Georgia the Indian trade opened up the river courses. Steadily the trader passed westward, utilizing the older lines of French trade. The Ohio, the Great Lakes, the Mississippi, the Missouri, and the Platte, the lines of western advance, were ascended by traders. They found the passes in the Rocky Mountains and guided Lewis and Clarke, [24] Fremont, and Bidwell. The explanation of the rapidity of this advance is connected with the effects of the trader on the Indian. The trading post left the unarmed tribes at the mercy of those that had purchased fire-arms—a truth which the Iroquois Indians wrote in blood, and so the remote and unvisited tribes gave eager welcome to the trader. “The savages,” wrote La Salle, “take better care of us French than of their own children; from us only can they get guns and goods.” This accounts for the trader’s power and the rapidity of his advance. Thus the disintegrating forces of civilization entered the wilderness. Every river valley and Indian trail became a fissure in Indian society, and so that society became honeycombed. Long before the pioneer farmer appeared on the scene, primitive Indian life had passed away. The farmers met Indians armed with guns. The trading frontier, while steadily undermining Indian power by making the tribes ultimately dependent on the whites, yet, through its sale of guns, gave to the Indians increased power of resistance to the farming frontier. French colonization was dominated by its trading frontier; English colonization by its farming frontier. There was an antagonism between the two frontiers as between the two nations. […] And yet, in spite of this opposition of the interests of the trader and the farmer, the Indian trade pioneered the way for civilization. The buffalo trail became the Indian trail, and this because the trader’s “trace;” the trails widened into roads, and the roads into turnpikes, and these in turn were transformed into railroads. The same origin can be shown for the railroads of the South, the far West, and the Dominion of Canada. [25] The trading posts reached by these trails were on the sites of Indian villages which had been placed in positions suggested by nature; and these trading posts, situated so as to command the water systems of the country, have grown into such cities as Albany,
Pittsburg, Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis, Council Bluffs, and Kansas City. Thus civilization in America has followed the arteries made by geology, pouring an ever richer tide through them, until at last the slender paths of aboriginal intercourse have been broadened and interwoven into the complex mazes of modern commercial lines; the wilderness has been interpenetrated by lines of civilization growing ever more numerous. It is like the steady growth of a complex nervous system for the originally simple, inert continent. If one would understand why we are to-day one nation, rather than a collection of isolated states, he must study this economic and social consolidation of the country. In this progress from savage conditions lie topics for the evolutionist. [26]

The effect of the Indian frontier as a consolidating agent in our history is important. [...] The Indian was a common danger, demanding united action. [...] 

The Rancher’s Frontier

It would not be possible in the limits of this paper to trace the other frontiers across the continent. Travelers of the eighteenth century found the “cowpens” among the canebrakes and peavine pastures of the South, and the “cow drivers” took their droves to Charleston, Philadelphia, and New York. [27] Travelers at the close of the War of 1812 met droves of more than a thousand cattle and swine from the interior of Ohio going to Pennsylvania to fatten for the Philadelphia market. [28] The ranges of the Great Plains, with ranch and cowboy and nomadic life, are things of yesterday and of to-day. The experience of the Carolina cowpens guided the ranchers of Texas. One element favoring the rapid extension of the rancher’s frontier is the fact that in a remote country lacking transportation facilities the product must be in small bulk, or must be able to transport itself, and the cattle raiser could easily drive his product to market. The effect of these great ranches on the subsequent agrarian history of the localities in which they existed should be studied.

The Farmer’s Frontier

The maps of the census reports show an uneven advance of the farmer’s frontier, with tongues of settlement pushed forward and with indentations of wilderness. In part this is due to Indian resistance, in part to the location of river valleys and passes, in part to the unequal force of the centers of frontier attraction. Among the important centers of
attraction may be mentioned the following: fertile and favorably situated soils, salt springs, mines, and army posts.

**Army Posts**

The frontier army post, serving to protect the settlers from the Indians, has also acted as a wedge to open the Indian country, and has been a nucleus for settlement. [29] In this connection mention should also be made of the Government military and exploring expeditions in determining the lines of settlement. But all the more important expeditions were greatly indebted to the earliest pathmakers, the Indian guides, the traders and trappers, and the French voyageurs, who were inevitable parts of governmental expeditions from the days of Lewis and Clarke. [30] Each expedition was an epitome of the previous factors in western advance.

**Salt Springs**

In an interesting monograph, Victor Hehn [31] has traced the effect of salt upon early European development, and has pointed out how it affected the lines of settlement and the form of administration. A similar study might be made for the salt springs of the United States. The early settlers were tied to the coast by the need of salt, without which they could not preserve their meats or live in comfort. Writing in 1752, Bishop Spangenburg says of a colony for which he was seeking lands in North Carolina, “They will require salt & other necessaries which they can neither manufacture nor raise. Either they must go to Charleston, which is 300 miles distant * * * Or else they must go to Boling’s Point in Va on a branch of the James & is also 300 miles from here * * * Or else they must go down the Roanoke—I know not how many miles—where salt is brought up from the Cape Fear.” [32] This may serve as a typical illustration. An annual pilgrimage to the coast for salt thus became essential. Taking flocks or furs and ginseng root, the early settlers sent their pack trains after seeding time each year to the coast. [33] This proved to be an important educational influence, since it was almost the only way in which the pioneer learned what was going on in the East. But when discovery was made of the salt springs of the Kanawha, and the Holston, and Kentucky, and central New York, the West began to be freed from dependence on the coast. It was in part the effect of finding these salt springs that enabled settlement to cross the mountains.
From the time the mountains rose between the pioneer and the seaboard, a new order of Americanism arose. The West and the East began to get out of touch of each other. The settlements from the sea to the mountains kept connection with the rear and had a certain solidarity. But the overmountain men grew more and more independent. The East took a narrow view of American advance, and nearly lost these men. Kentucky and Tennessee history bears abundant witness to the truth of this statement. The East began to try to hedge and limit westward expansion. Though Webster could declare that there were no Alleghanies in his politics, yet in politics in general they were a very solid factor.

Land

The exploitation of the beasts took hunter and trader to the west, the exploitation of the grasses took the rancher west, and the exploitation of the virgin soil of the river valleys and prairies attracted the farmer. Good soils have been the most continuous attraction to the farmer’s frontier. The land hunger of the Virginians drew them down the rivers into Carolina, in early colonial days; the search for soils took the Massachusetts men to Pennsylvania and to New York. As the eastern lands were taken up migration flowed across them to the west. […]

The farmer’s advance came in a distinct series of waves. In Peck’s New Guide to the West, published in Boston in 1837, occurs this suggestive passage:

Generally, in all the western settlements, three classes, like the waves of the ocean, have rolled one after the other. First comes the pioneer, who depends for the subsistence of his family chiefly upon the natural growth of vegetation, called the “range,” and the proceeds of hunting. His implements of agriculture are rude, chiefly of his own make, and his efforts directed mainly to a crop of corn and a “truck patch.” The last is a rude garden for growing cabbage, beans, corn for roasting ears, cucumbers, and potatoes. A log cabin, and, occasionally, a stable and corn-crib, and a field of a dozen acres, the timber girdled or “deadened,” and fenced, are enough for his occupancy. It is quite immaterial whether he ever becomes the owner of the soil. He is the occupant for the time being, pays no rent, and feels as independent as the “lord of the manor.” With a horse, cow, and one or two breeders of swine, he strikes into the woods with his family, and becomes the founder of a new county, or perhaps state. He builds his cabin, gathers around him a few other families of similar tastes and habits, and occupies till the range is somewhat subdued, and hunting a little precarious, or, which is more frequently the case, till the neighbors crowd around, roads, bridges, and fields annoy him, and he lacks elbow room.
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The preemption law enables him to dispose of his cabin and cornfield to the next class of emigrants; and, to employ his own figures, he “breaks for the high timber,” “clears out for the New Purchase,” or migrates to Arkansas or Texas, to work the same process over.

The next class of emigrants purchase the lands, add field to field, clear out the roads, throw rough bridges over the streams, put up hewn log houses with glass windows and brick or stone chimneys, occasionally plant orchards, build mills, schoolhouses, court-houses, etc., and exhibit the picture and forms of plain, frugal, civilized life.

Another wave rolls on. The men of capital and enterprise come. The settler is ready to sell out and take the advantage of the rise in property, push farther into the interior and become, himself, a man of capital and enterprise in turn. The small village rises to a spacious town or city; substantial edifices of brick, extensive fields, orchards, gardens, colleges, and churches are seen. Broadcloths, silks, leghorns, crapes, and all the refinements, luxuries, elegancies, frivolities, and fashions are in vogue. Thus wave after wave is rolling westward; the real Eldorado is still farther on.

A portion of the two first classes remain stationary amidst the general movement, improve their habits and condition, and rise in the scale of society.

The writer has traveled much amongst the first class, the real pioneers. He has lived many years in connection with the second grade; and now the third wave is sweeping over large districts of Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri. Migration has become almost a habit in the west. Hundreds of men can be found, not over 50 years of age, who have settled for the fourth, fifth, or sixth time on a new spot. To sell out and remove only a few hundred miles makes up a portion of the variety of backwoods life and manners. [35]

Omitting those of the pioneer farmers who move from the love of adventure, the advance of the more steady farmer is easy to understand. Obviously the immigrant was attracted by the cheap lands of the frontier, and even the native farmer felt their influence strongly. Year by year the farmers who lived on soil whose returns were diminished by unrotated crops were offered the virgin soil of the frontier at nominal prices. Their growing families demanded more lands, and these were dear. The competition of the unexhausted, cheap, and easily tilled prairie lands compelled the farmer either to go west and continue the exhaustion of the soil on a new frontier, or to adopt intensive culture. […]

Having now roughly outlined the various kinds of frontiers, and their modes of advance, chiefly from the point of view of the frontier itself, we may next inquire what were the
influences on the East and on the Old World. A rapid enumeration of some of the more noteworthy effects is all that I have time for.

Composite Nationality

First, we note that the frontier promoted the formation of a composite nationality for the American people. The coast was preponderantly English, but the later tides of continental immigration flowed across to the free lands. This was the case from the early colonial days. The Scotch Irish and the Palatine Germans, or “Pennsylvania Dutch,” furnished the dominant element in the stock of the colonial frontier. With these peoples were also the freed indented servants, or redemptioners, who at the expiration of their time of service passed to the frontier. Governor Spottswood of Virginia writes in 1717, “The inhabitants of our frontiers are composed generally of such as have been transported hither as servants, and, being out of their time, settle themselves where laud is to be taken up and that will produce the necessarys of life with little labour.” [36] Very generally these redemptioners were of non-English stock. In the crucible of the frontier the immigrants were Americanized, liberated, and fused into a mixed race, English in neither nationality or characteristics. The process has gone on from the early days to our own. Burke and other writers in the middle of the eighteenth century believed that Pennsylvania [37] was “threatened with the danger of being wholly foreign in language, manners, and perhaps even inclinations.” The German and Scotch-Irish elements in the frontier of the South were only less great. In the middle of the present century the German element in Wisconsin was already so considerable that leading publicists looked to the creation of a German state out of the commonwealth by concentrating their colonization. [38] Such examples teach us to beware of misinterpreting the fact that there is a common English speech in America into a belief that the stock is also English.

Industrial Independence

In another way the advance of the frontier decreased our dependence on England. The coast, particularly of the South, lacked diversified industries, and was dependent on England for the bulk of its supplies. In the South there was even a dependence on the Northern colonies for articles of food. Governor Glenn, of South Carolina, writes in the middle of the eighteenth century: “Our trade with New York and Philadelphia was of this
sort, draining us of all the little money and bills we could gather from other places for
their bread, flour, beer, hams, bacon, and other things of their produce, all which, except
beer, our new townships begin to supply us with, which are settled with very industrious
and thriving Germans. This no doubt diminishes the number of shipping and the
appearance of our trade, but it is far from being a detriment to us." [39] Before long the
frontier created a demand for merchants. As it retreated from the coast it became less
and less possible for England to bring her supplies directly to the consumer’s wharfs, and
carry away staple crops, and staple crops began to give way to diversified agriculture for
a time. The effect of this phase of the frontier action upon the northern section is
perceived when we realize how the advance of the frontier aroused seaboard cities like
Boston, New York, and Baltimore, to engage in rivalry for what Washington called “the
extensive and valuable trade of a rising empire.”

Effects on National Legislation

The legislation which most developed the powers of the National Government, and
played the largest part in its activity, was conditioned on the frontier. Writers have
discussed the subjects of tariff, land, and internal improvement, as subsidiary to the
slavery question. But when American history comes to be rightly viewed it will be seen
that the slavery question is an incident. In the period from the end of the first half of the
present century to the close of the civil war slavery rose to primary, but far from exclusive,
importance. […] The growth of nationalism and the evolution of American political
institutions were dependent on the advance of the frontier. […]

[…] The pioneer needed the goods of the coast, and so the grand series of internal
improvement and railroad legislation began, with potent nationalizing effects. Over
internal improvements occurred great debates, in which grave constitutional questions
were discussed. Sectional groupings appear in the votes, profoundly significant for the
historian. Loose construction increased as the nation marched westward. [40] But the
West was not content with bringing the farm to the factory. Under the lead of Clay—
“Harry of the West”—protective tariffs were passed, with the cry of bringing the factory
to the farm. The disposition of the public lands was a third important subject of national
legislation influenced by the frontier.
The Public Domain

The public domain has been a force of profound importance in the nationalization and development of the Government. The effects of the struggle of the landed and the landless States, and of the ordinance of 1787, need no discussion. [41] Administratively the frontier called out some of the highest and most vitalizing activities of the General Government. The purchase of Louisiana was perhaps the constitutional turning point in the history of the Republic, inasmuch as it afforded both a new area for national legislation and the occasion of the downfall of the policy of strict construction. But the purchase of Louisiana was called out by frontier needs and demands. As frontier States accrued to the Union the national power grew. In a speech on the dedication of the Calhoun monument Mr. Lamar explained: “In 1789 the States were the creators of the Federal Government; in 1861 the Federal Government was the creator of a large majority of the States.”

When we consider the public domain from the point of view of the sale and disposal of the public lands we are again brought face to face with the frontier. The policy of the United States in dealing with its lands is in sharp contrast with the European system of scientific administration. Efforts to make this domain a source of revenue, and to withhold it from emigrants in order that settlement might be compact, were in vain. The jealousy and the fears of the East were powerless in the face of the demands of the frontiersmen. John Quincy Adams was obliged to confess: “My own system of administration, which was to make the national domain the inexhaustible fund for progressive and unceasing internal improvement, has failed.” The reason is obvious; a system of administration was not what the West demanded; it wanted land. Adams states the situation as follows: “The slaveholders of the South have bought the cooperation of the western country by the bribe of the western lands, abandoning to the new Western States their own proportion of the public property and aiding them in the design of grasping all the lands into their own hands.” […]

“No subject,” said Henry Clay, “which has presented itself to the present, or perhaps any preceding, Congress, is of greater magnitude than that of the public lands.” When we
consider the far-reaching effects of the Government's land policy upon political, economic, and social aspects of American life, we are disposed to agree with him. But this legislation was framed under frontier influences, and under the lead of Western statesmen like Benton and Jackson. […]

National Tendencies of the Frontier

It is safe to say that the legislation with regard to land, tariff, and internal improvements—the American system of the nationalizing Whig party—was conditioned on frontier ideas and needs. But it was not merely in legislative action that the frontier worked against the sectionalism of the coast. The economic and social characteristics of the frontier worked against sectionalism. The men of the frontier had closer resemblances to the Middle region than to either of the other sections. Pennsylvania had been the seed-plot of frontier emigration, and, although she passed on her settlers along the Great Valley into the west of Virginia and the Carolinas, yet the industrial society of these Southern frontiersmen was always more like that of the Middle region than like that of the tide-water portion of the South, which later came to spread its industrial type throughout the South.

The Middle region, entered by New York harbor, was an open door to all Europe. The tide-water part of the South represented typical Englishmen, modified by a warm climate and servile labor, and living in baronial fashion on great plantations; New England stood for a special English movement—Puritanism. The Middle region was less English than the other sections. It had a wide mixture of nationalities, a varied society, the mixed town and county system of local government, a varied economic life, many religious sects. In short, it was a region mediating between New England and the South, and the East and the West. It represented that composite nationality which the contemporary United States exhibits, that juxtaposition of non-English groups, occupying a valley or a little settlement, and presenting reflections of the map of Europe in their variety. It was democratic and nonsectional, if not national; “easy, tolerant, and contented;” rooted strongly in material prosperity. It was typical of the modern United States. It was least sectional, not only because it lay between North and South, but also because with no barriers to shut out its frontiers from its settled region, and with a system of connecting
waterways, the Middle region mediated between East and West as well as between North and South. Thus it became the typically American region. […]

The spread of cotton culture into the interior of the South finally broke down the contrast between the “tide-water” region and the rest of the State, and based Southern interests on slavery. Before this process revealed its results the western portion of the South, which was akin to Pennsylvania in stock, society, and industry, showed tendencies to fall away from the faith of the fathers into internal improvement legislation and nationalism. […]

It was this nationalizing tendency of the West that transformed the democracy of Jefferson into the national republicanism of Monroe and the democracy of Andrew Jackson. The West of the war of 1812, the West of Clay, and Benton, and Harrison, and Andrew Jackson, shut off by the Middle States and the mountains from the coast sections, had a solidarity of its own with national tendencies. [44] On the tide of the Father of Waters, North and South met and mingled into a nation. Interstate migration went steadily on—a process of cross-fertilization of ideas and institutions. The fierce struggle of the sections over slavery on the western frontier does not diminish the truth of this statement; it proves the truth of it. Slavery was a sectional trait that would not down, but in the West it could not remain sectional. It was the greatest of frontiersmen who declared: “I believe this Government can not endure permanently half slave and half free. It will become all of one thing or all of the other.” Nothing works for nationalism like intercourse within the nation. Mobility of population is death to localism, and the western frontier worked irresistibly in unsettling population. The effects reached back from the frontier and affected profoundly the Atlantic coast and even the Old World.

**Growth of Democracy**

But the most important effect of the frontier has been in the promotion of democracy here and in Europe. As has been indicated, the frontier is productive of individualism. Complex society is precipitated by the wilderness into a kind of primitive organization based on the family. The tendency is anti-social. It produces antipathy to control, and particularly to any direct control. The tax-gatherer is viewed as a representative of
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oppression. {...} The frontier individualism has from the beginning promoted democracy.

The frontier States that came into the Union in the first quarter of a century of its existence came in with democratic suffrage provisions, and had reactive effects of the highest importance upon the older States whose peoples were being attracted there. An extension of the franchise became essential. It was western New York that forced an extension of suffrage in the constitutional convention of that State in 1821; and it was western Virginia that compelled the tide-water region to put a more liberal suffrage provision in the constitution framed in 1830, and to give to the frontier region a more nearly proportionate representation with the tide-water aristocracy. The rise of democracy as an effective force in the nation came in with western preponderance under Jackson and William Henry Harrison, and it meant the triumph of the frontier—with all of its good and with all of its evil elements. [46] An interesting illustration of the tone of frontier democracy in 1830 comes from the same debates in the Virginia convention already referred to. A representative from western Virginia declared:

But, sir, it is not the increase of population in the West which this gentleman ought to fear. It is the energy which the mountain breeze and western habits impart to those emigrants. They are regenerated, politically I mean, sir. They soon become working politicians; and the difference, sir, between a talking and a working politician is immense. The Old Dominion has long been celebrated for producing great orators; the ablest metaphysicians in policy; men that can split hairs in all abstruse questions of political economy. But at home, or when they return from Congress, they have negroes to fan them asleep. But a Pennsylvania, a New York, an Ohio, or a western Virginia statesman, though far inferior in logic, metaphysics, and rhetoric to an old Virginia statesman, has this advantage, that when he returns home he takes off his coat and takes hold of the plow. This gives him bone and muscle, sir, and preserves his republican principles pure and uncontaminated.

So long as free land exists, the opportunity for a competency exists, and economic power secures political power. But the democracy born of free land, strong in selfishness and individualism, intolerant of administrative experience and education, and pressing individual liberty beyond its proper bounds, has its dangers as well as it benefits. Individualism in America has allowed a laxity in regard to governmental affairs which has rendered possible the spoils system and all the manifest evils that follow from the
lack of a highly developed civic spirit. In this connection may be noted also the influence of frontier conditions in permitting lax business honor, inflated paper currency and wild-cat banking. The colonial and revolutionary frontier was the region whence emanated many of the worst forms of an evil currency. [47] The West in the war of 1812 repeated the phenomenon on the frontier of that day, while the speculation and wild-cat banking of the period of the crisis of 1837 occurred on the new frontier belt of the next tier of States. Thus each one of the periods of lax financial integrity coincides with periods when a new set of frontier communities had arisen, and coincides in area with these successive frontiers, for the most part. The recent Populist agitation is a case in point. Many a State that now declines any connection with the tenets of the Populists, itself adhered to such ideas in an earlier stage of the development of the State. A primitive society can hardly be expected to show the intelligent appreciation of the complexity of business interests in a developed society. The continual recurrence of these areas of paper-money agitation is another evidence that the frontier can be isolated and studied as a factor in American history of the highest importance. [48]

Attempts to Check and Regulate the Frontier

The East has always feared the result of an unregulated advance of the frontier, and has tried to check and guide it. The English authorities would have checked settlement at the headwaters of the Atlantic tributaries and allowed the “savages to enjoy their deserts in quiet lest the peltry trade should decrease.” This called out Burke’s splendid protest:

If you stopped your grants, what would be the consequence? The people would occupy without grants. They have already so occupied in many places. You cannot station garrisons in every part of these deserts. If you drive the people from one place, they will carry on their annual tillage and remove with their flocks and herds to another. Many of the people in the back settlements are already little attached to particular situations. Already they have topped the Appalachian mountains. From thence they behold before them an immense plain, one vast, rich, level meadow; a square of five hundred miles. Over this they would wander without a possibility of restraint; they would change their manners with their habits of life; would soon forget a government by which they were disowned; would become hordes of English Tartars; and, pouring down upon your unfortified frontiers a fierce and irresistible cavalry, become masters of your governors and your counselors, your collectors and comptrollers, and of all the slaves that adhered to them. Such would, and in no long time must, be the effect of attempting to forbid as a crime and to suppress as an evil the command and blessing of Providence, “Increase and
multiply.” Such would be the happy result of an endeavor to keep as a lair of wild beasts that earth which God, by an express charter, has given to the children of men.

But the English Government was not alone in its desire to limit the advance of the frontier and guide its destinies. Tidewater Virginia [49] and South Carolina [50] gerrymandered those colonies to insure the dominance of the coast in their legislatures. Washington desired to settle a State at a time in the Northwest; Jefferson would reserve from settlement the territory of his Louisiana purchase north of the thirty-second parallel, in order to offer it to the Indians in exchange for their settlements east of the Mississippi.

“When we shall be full on this side,” he writes, “we may lay off a range of States on the western bank from the head to the mouth, and so range after range, advancing compactly as we multiply.” Madison went so far as to argue to the French minister that the United States had no interest in seeing population extend itself on the right bank of the Mississippi, but should rather fear it. When the Oregon question was under debate, in 1824, Smyth, of Virginia, would draw an unchangeable line for the limits of the United States at the outer limit of two tiers of States beyond the Mississippi, complaining that the seaboard States were being drained of the flower of their population by the bringing of too much land into market. Even Thomas Becton, the man of widest views of the destiny of the West, at this stage of his career declared that along the ridge of the Rocky mountains “the western limits of the Republic should be drawn, and the statue of the fabled god Terminus should be raised upon its highest peak, never to be thrown down.” [51] But the attempts to limit the boundaries, to restrict land sales and settlement, and to deprive the West of its share of political power were all in vain. Steadily the frontier of settlement advanced and carried with it individualism, democracy, and nationalism, and powerfully affected the East and the Old World.

Missionary Activity

The most effective efforts of the East to regulate the frontier came through its educational and religious activity, exerted by interstate migration and by organized societies. Speaking in 1835, Dr. Lyman Beecher declared: “It is equally plain that the religious and political destiny of our nation is to be decided in the West,” and he pointed out that the population of the West “is assembled from all the States of the Union and from all the
nations of Europe, and is rushing in like the waters of the flood, demanding for its moral preservation the immediate and universal action of those institutions which discipline the mind and arm the conscience, and the heart. And so various are the opinions and habits, and so recent and imperfect is the acquaintance, and so sparse are the settlements of the West, that no homogeneous public sentiment can be formed to legislate immediately into being the requisite institutions. And yet they are all needed immediately in their utmost perfection and power. A nation is being ‘born in a day.’ * * *

* But what will become of the West if her prosperity rushes up to such a majesty of power, while those great institutions linger which are necessary to form the mind and the conscience and the heart of that vast world. It must not be permitted. * * * Let no man at the East quiet himself and dream of liberty, whatever may become of the West. * * * Her destiny is our destiny.” [52]

With the appeal to the conscience of New England, he adds appeals to her fears lest other religious sects anticipate her own. The New England preacher and school-teacher left their mark on the West. The dread of Western emancipation from New England’s political and economic control was paralleled by her fears lest the West cut loose from her religion. Commenting in 1850 on reports that settlement was rapidly extending northward in Wisconsin, the editor of the Home Missionary writes: “We scarcely know whether to rejoice or mourn over this extension of our settlements. While we sympathize in whatever tends to increase the physical resources and prosperity of our country, we can not forget that with all these dispersions into remote and still remoter corners of the land the supply of the means of grace is becoming relatively less and less.” Acting in accordance with such ideas, home missions were established and Western colleges were erected. As seaboard cities like Philadelphia, New York, and Baltimore strove for the mastery of Western trade, so the various denominations strove for the possession of the West. Thus an intellectual stream from New England sources fertilized the West. Other sections sent their missionaries; but the real struggle was between sects. The contest for power and the expansive tendency furnished to the various sects by the existence of a moving frontier must have had important results on the character of religious organization in the United States. The multiplication of rival churches in the little
frontier towns had deep and lasting social effects. The religious aspects of the frontier make a chapter in our history which needs study.

**Intellectual Traits**

From the conditions of frontier life came intellectual traits of profound importance. The works of travelers along each frontier from colonial days onward describe certain common traits, and these traits have, while softening down, still persisted as survivals in the place of their origin, even when a higher social organization succeeded. The result is that to the frontier the American intellect owes its striking characteristics. That coarseness and strength combined with acuteness and inquisitiveness; that practical, inventive turn of mind, quick to find expedients; that masterful grasp of material things, lacking in the artistic but powerful to effect great ends; that restless, nervous energy; [53] that dominant individualism, working for good and for evil, and withal that buoyancy and exuberance which comes with freedom—these are traits of the frontier, or traits called out elsewhere because of the existence of the frontier. Since the days when the fleet of Columbus sailed into the waters of the New World, America has been another name for opportunity, and the people of the United States have taken their tone from the incessant expansion which has not only been open but has even been forced upon them. He would be a rash prophet who should assert that the expansive character of American life has now entirely ceased. Movement has been its dominant fact, and, unless this training has no effect upon a people, the American energy will continually demand a wider field for its exercise. But never again will such gifts of free land offer themselves. For a moment, at the frontier, the bonds of custom are broken and unrestraint is triumphant. There is not tabula rasa. The stubborn American environment is there with its imperious summons to accept its conditions; the inherited ways of doing things are also there; and yet, in spite of environment, and in spite of custom, each frontier did indeed furnish a new field of opportunity, a gate of escape from the bondage of the past; and freshness, and confidence, and scorn of older society, impatience of its restraints and its ideas, and indifference to its lessons, have accompanied the frontier. What the Mediterranean Sea was to the Greeks, breaking the bond of custom, offering new experiences, calling out new institutions and activities, that, and more, the ever retreating frontier has been to the United States directly, and to the nations of Europe more
remotely. And now, four centuries from the discovery of America, at the end of a hundred years of life under the Constitution, the frontier has gone, and with its going has closed the first period of American history.
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What is Progress?
CAMPAIGN SPEECH EXCERPTS

1912/December 31, 1913

BACKGROUND

As noted in previous selections, the Gilded Age produced a variety of new problems and issues that Americans were initially unprepared to solve. However, the rise of the “new” political philosophy of Progressivism promised to provide a blueprint guaranteeing not only solutions to America’s current problems, but also the nation’s future development. Woodrow Wilson, the governor of New Jersey—as well as the former president of Princeton University and one of the earliest Progressives—ran his 1912 American presidential campaign on a promise to reform America’s ideals and structures to meet the challenges of the ever-changing political landscape. Such rhetoric is typified by this campaign speech of Wilson’s, published after he had won the presidency.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. With what parable does Wilson begin his speech?
2. What does it mean to be Progressive?
3. What is “progress,” according to Wilson?
4. Does he consider change to always be good?
5. What does Wilson say about the American Founding?
6. How does he think modern Americans should understand the Constitution?

In that sage and veracious chronicle, Alice through the Looking-Glass, it is recounted how, on a noteworthy occasion, the little heroine is seized by the Red Chess Queen, who races her off at a terrific pace. They run until both of them are out of breath; then they stop, and Alice looks around her and says, “Why, we are just where we were when we started!” “Oh, yes,” says the Red Queen; “you have to run twice as fast as that to get anywhere else.”

That is a parable of progress. The laws of this country have not kept up with the change of economic circumstances in this country; they have not kept up with the change of political circumstances; and therefore we are not even where we were when we started. We shall have to run, not until we are out of breath, but until we have caught up with our own conditions, before we shall be where we were when we started; when we started this great experiment which has been the hope and the beacon of the world. And we should have to run twice as fast as any rational program I have seen in order to get anywhere else.

I am, therefore, forced to be a progressive, if for no other reason, because we have not kept up with our changes of conditions, either in the economic field or in the political field. We have not kept up as well as other nations have. We have not kept our practices adjusted to the facts of the case, and until we do, and unless we do, the facts of the case will always have the better of the argument; because if you do not adjust your laws to the facts, so much the worse for the laws, not for the facts, because law trails along after the facts. Only that law is unsafe which runs ahead of the facts and beckons to it and makes it follow the will-o’-the-wisps of imaginative projects. …

Politics in America is in a case which sadly requires attention. The system set up by our law and our usage doesn’t work—or at least it can’t be depended on; it is made to work only by a most unreasonable expenditure of labor and pains. The government, which was designed for the people, has got into the hands of bosses and their employers, the special interests. An invisible empire has been set up above the forms of democracy. …
Now, movement has no virtue in itself. Change is not worth while for its own sake. I am not one of those who love variety for its own sake. If a thing is good today, I should like to have it stay that way tomorrow. Most of our calculations in life are dependent upon things staying the way they are. For example, if, when you got up this morning, you had forgotten how to dress, if you had forgotten all about those ordinary things which you do almost automatically, which you can almost do half awake, you would have to find out what you did yesterday. I am told by the psychologists that if I did not remember who I was yesterday, I should not know who I am today, and that, therefore, my very identity depends upon my being able to tally today with yesterday. If they do not tally, then I am confused; I do not know who I am, and I have to go around and ask somebody to tell me my name and where I came from.

I am not one of those who wish to break connection with the past; I am not one of those who wish to change for the mere sake of variety. The only men who do that are the men who want to forget something, the men who filled yesterday with something they would rather not recollect today, and so go about seeking diversion, seeking abstraction in something that will blot out recollection, or seeking to put something into them which will blot out all recollection. Change is not worth while unless it is improvement. If I move out of my present house because I do not like it, then I have got to choose a better house, or build a better house, to justify the change. …

Progress! Did you ever reflect that that word is almost a new one? No word comes more often or more naturally to the lips of modern man, as if the thing it stands for were almost synonymous with life itself, and yet men through many thousand years never talked or thought of progress. They thought in the other direction. Their stories of heroisms and glory were tales of the past. The ancestor wore the heavier armor and carried the larger spear. “There were giants in those days.” Now all that has altered. We think of the future, not the past, as the more glorious time in comparison with which the present is nothing. Progress, development—those are modern words. The modern idea is to leave the past and press onward to something new.
But what is progress going to do with the past, and with the present? How is it going to treat them? With ignominy, or respect? Should it break with them altogether, or rise out of them, with its roots still deep in the older time? What attitude shall progressives take toward the existing order, toward those institutions of conservatism, the Constitution, the laws, and the courts?

Are those thoughtful men who fear that we are now about to disturb the ancient foundations of our institutions justified in their fear? If they are, we ought to go very slowly about the processes of change. If it is indeed true that we have grown tired of the institutions which we have so carefully and sedulously built up, then we ought to go very slowly and very carefully about the very dangerous task of altering them. We ought, therefore, to ask ourselves, first of all, whether thought in this country is tending to do anything by which we shall retrace our steps, or by which we shall change the whole direction of our development?

I believe, for one, that you cannot tear up ancient rootages and safely plant the tree of liberty in soil which is not native to it. I believe that the ancient traditions of a people are its ballast; you cannot make a *tabula rasa* upon which to write a political program. You cannot take a new sheet of paper and determine what your life shall be tomorrow. You must knit the new into the old. You cannot put a new patch on an old garment without ruining it; it must be not a patch, but something woven into the old fabric, of practically the same pattern, of the same texture and intention. If I did not believe that to be progressive was to preserve the essentials of our institutions, I for one could not be a progressive.

One of the chief benefits I used to derive from being president of a university was that I had the pleasure of entertaining thoughtful men from all over the world. I cannot tell you how much has dropped into my granary by their presence. I had been casting around in my mind for something by which to draw several parts of my political thought together when it was my good fortune to entertain a very interesting Scotsman who had been devoting himself to the philosophical thought of the seventeenth century. His talk was so engaging that it was delightful to hear him speak of anything,
and presently there came out of the unexpected region of his thought the thing I had been waiting for. He called my attention to the fact that in every generation all sorts of speculation and thinking tend to fall under the formula of the dominant thought of the age. For example, after the Newtonian theory of the universe had been developed, almost all thinking tended to express itself in the analogies of the Newtonian theory, and since the Darwinian theory has reigned amongst us, everybody is likely to express whatever he wishes to expound in terms of development and accommodation to environment.

Now, it came to me, as this interesting man talked, that the Constitution of the United States had been made under the dominion of the Newtonian theory. You have only to read the papers of *The Federalist* to see that fact written on every page. They speak of the “checks and balances” of the Constitution, and use to express their idea the simile of the organization of the universe, and particularly of the solar system—how by the attraction of gravitation the various parts are held in their orbits; and then they proceed to represent Congress, the judiciary, and the president as a sort of imitation of the solar system.

They were only following the English Whigs, who gave Great Britain its modern constitution. Not that those Englishmen analyzed the matter, or had any theory about it; Englishmen care little for theories. It was a Frenchman, Montesquieu, who pointed out to them how faithfully they had copied Newton’s description of the mechanism of the heavens.

The makers of our federal Constitution read Montesquieu with true scientific enthusiasm. They were scientists in their way—the best way of their age—those fathers of the nation. Jefferson wrote of “the laws of Nature”—and then by way of afterthought—“and of Nature’s God.” And they constructed a government as they would have constructed an orrery—to display the laws of nature. Politics in their thought was a variety of mechanics. The Constitution was founded on the law of gravitation. The government was to exist and move by virtue of the efficacy of “checks and balances.”
The trouble with the theory is that government is not a machine but a living thing. It falls not under the theory of the universe, but under the theory of organic life. It is accountable to Darwin, not to Newton. It is modified by its environment, necessitated by its tasks, shaped to its functions by the sheer pressure of life. No living thing can have its organs offset against each other, as checks, and live. On the contrary, its life is dependent upon their quick cooperation, their ready response to the commands of instinct or intelligence, their amicable community of purpose. Government is not a body of blind forces; it is a body of men, with highly differentiated functions, no doubt, in our modern day, of specialization, with a common task and purpose. Their cooperation is indispensable, their warfare fatal. There can be no successful government without the intimate, instinctive coordination of the organs of life and action. This is not theory, but fact, and displays its force as fact, whatever theories may be thrown across its track. Living political constitutions must be Darwinian in structure and in practice. Society is a living organism and must obey the laws of life, not of mechanics; it must develop.

All that progressives ask or desire is permission—in an era when “development,” “evolution,” is the scientific word—to interpret the Constitution according to the Darwinian principle; all they ask is recognition of the fact that a nation is a living thing and not a machine.

Some citizens of this country have never got beyond the Declaration of Independence, signed in Philadelphia, July 4th, 1776. Their bosoms swell against George III, but they have no consciousness of the war for freedom that is going on today.

The Declaration of Independence did not mention the questions of our day. It is of no consequence to us unless we can translate its general terms into examples of the present day and substitute them in some vital way for the examples it itself gives, so concrete, so intimately involved in the circumstances of the day in which it was conceived and written. It is an eminently practical document, meant for the use of practical men; not a thesis for philosophers, but a whip for tyrants; not a theory of government, but a
program of action. Unless we can translate it into the questions of our own day, we are not worthy of it, we are not the sons of the sires who acted in response to its challenge.

What form does the contest between tyranny and freedom take today? What is the special form of tyranny we now fight? How does it endanger the rights of the people, and what do we mean to do in order to make our contest against it effectual? What are to be the items of our new declaration of independence?

By tyranny, as we now fight it, we mean control of the law, of legislation and adjudication, by organizations which do not represent the people, by means which are private and selfish. We mean, specifically, the conduct of our affairs and the shaping of our legislation in the interest of special bodies of capital and those who organize their use. We mean the alliance, for this purpose, of political machines with selfish business. We mean the exploitation of the people by legal and political means. We have seen many of our governments under these influences cease to be representative governments, cease to be governments representative of the people, and become governments representative of special interests, controlled by machines, which in their turn are not controlled by the people. …

Well, we have started now at all events. The procession is under way. The stand-patter doesn’t know there is a procession. He is asleep in the back part of his house. He doesn’t know that the road is resounding with the tramp of men going to the front. And when he wakes up, the country will be empty. He will be deserted, and he will wonder what has happened. Nothing has happened. The world has been going on. The world has a habit of going on. The world has a habit of leaving those behind who won’t go with it. The world has always neglected stand-patters. And, therefore, the stand-patter does not excite my indignation; he excites my sympathy. He is going to be so lonely before it is all over. And we are good fellows, we are good company; why doesn’t he come along? We are not going to do him any harm. We are going to show him a good time. We are going to climb the slow road until it reaches some upland where the air is fresher, where the whole talk of mere politicians is stilled, where men can look in each other’s faces and see that there is nothing to conceal, that all they have to talk about
they are willing to talk about in the open and talk about with each other; and whence, looking back over the road, we shall see at last that we have fulfilled our promise to mankind. We had said to all the world, “America was created to break every kind of monopoly, and to set men free, upon a footing of equality, upon a footing of opportunity, to match their brains and their energies.” And now we have proved that we meant it.
It is not enough for the knight of romance that you agree that his lady is a very nice girl—if you do not admit that she is the best that God ever made or will make, you must fight. There is in all men a demand for the superlative, so much so that the poor devil who has no other way of reaching it attains it by getting drunk. It seems to me that this demand is at the bottom of the philosopher’s effort to prove that truth is absolute and of the jurist’s search for criteria of universal validity which he collects under the head of natural law.

I used to say when I was young, that truth was the majority vote of that nation that could lick all others. Certainly we may expect that the received opinion about the present war will depend a good deal upon which side wins (I hope with all my soul it will be mine), and I think that the statement was correct insofar as it implied that our test of truth is a reference to either a present or an imagined future majority in favor of our view. If … the truth may be defined as the system of my (intellectual) limitations, what gives it objectivity is the fact that I find my fellow man to a greater or less extent (never wholly) subject to the same Can’t Helps. If I think that I am sitting at a table I find that the other persons present agree with me; so if I say that the sum of the angles of a triangle is equal to two right angles. If I am in a minority of one they send for a doctor or lock me up; and I am so far able to transcend the to me convincing testimony of my sense or my reason as to recognize that if I am alone probably something is wrong with my works.

Certitude is not the test of certainty. We have been cocksure of many things that were not so. If I may quote myself again, property, friendship, and truth have a common root in time. One cannot be wrenched from the rocky crevices into which one has grown for many years without feeling that one is attacked in one’s life. What we most love and revere generally is determined by early associations. I love granite rocks and barberry bushes, no doubt because with them were my earliest joys that reach back through the past eternity of my life. But while one’s experience thus makes certain preferences dogmatic for oneself, recognition of how they came to be so leaves one able to see that others, poor souls, may be equally dogmatic about something else. And this again means skepticism. Not that one’s belief or love does not remain. Not that we
would not fight and die for it if important—we all, whether we know it or not, are
fighting to make the kind of a world that we should like—but that we have learned to
recognize that others will fight and die to make a different world, with equal sincerity
or belief. Deep-seated preferences cannot be argued about—you cannot argue a man
into liking a glass of beer—and therefore, when differences are sufficiently far reaching,
we try to kill the other man rather than let him have his way. But that is perfectly
consistent with admitting that, so far as appears, his grounds are just as good as ours.

The jurists who believe in natural law seem to me to be in that naïve state of mind that
accepts what has been familiar and accepted by all men everywhere. No doubt it is true
that, so far as we can see ahead, some arrangements and the rudiments of familiar
institutions seem to be necessary elements in any society that may spring from our own
and that would seem to us to be civilized—some form of permanent association
between the sexes—some residue of property individually owned—some mode of
binding oneself to specified future conduct—at the bottom of all, some protection for
the person. But without speculating whether a group is imaginable in which all but the
last of these might disappear and the last be subject to qualifications that most of us
would abhor, the question remains as to the Ought of natural law.

It is true that beliefs and wishes have a transcendental basis in the sense that their
foundation is arbitrary. You cannot help entertaining and feeling them, and there is an
end of it. As an arbitrary fact people wish to live, and we say with various degrees of
certainty that they can do so only on certain conditions. To do it they must eat and
drink. That necessity is absolute. It is a necessity of less degree but practically general
that they should live in society. If they live in society, so far as we can see, there are
further conditions. Reason working on experience does tell us, no doubt, that if our
wish to live continues, we can do it only on those terms. But that seems to me the whole
of the matter. I see no a priori duty to live with others and in that way, but simply a
statement of what I must do if I wish to remain alive. If I do live with others they tell
me that I must do and abstain from doing various things or they will put the screws on
to me. I believe that they will, and being of the same mind as to their conduct I not only
accept the rules but come in time to accept them with sympathy and emotional
affirmation and begin to talk about duties and rights. But for legal purposes a right is only the hypostasis of a prophecy—the imagination of a substance supporting the fact that the public force will be brought to bear upon those who do things said to contravene it—just as we talk of the force of gravitation accounting for the conduct of bodies in space. One phrase adds no more than the other to what we know without it. No doubt behind these legal rights is the fighting will of the subject to maintain them, and the spread of his emotions to the general rules by which they are maintained; but that does not seem to me the same thing as the supposed a priori discernment of a duty or the assertion of a preexisting right. A dog will fight for his bone.

The most fundamental of the supposed preexisting rights—the right to life—is sacrificed without a scruple not only in war, but whenever the interest of society, that is, of the predominant power in the community, is thought to demand it. Whether that interest is the interest of mankind in the long run no one can tell, and as, in any event, to those who do not think with Kant and Hegel it is only an interest, the sanctity disappears. I remember a very tender-hearted judge being of opinion that closing a hatch to stop a fire and the destruction of a cargo was justified even if it was known that doing so would stifle a man below. It is idle to illustrate further, because to those who agree with me I am uttering commonplaces and to those who disagree I am ignoring the necessary foundations of thought. The a priori men generally call the dissentients superficial. But I do agree with them in believing that one’s attitude on these matters is closely connected with one’s general attitude toward the universe. Proximately, as has been suggested, it is determined largely by early associations and temperament, coupled with the desire to have an absolute guide. Men to a great extent believe what they want to—although I see in that no basis for a philosophy that tells us what we should want to want.

Now when we come to our attitude toward the universe I do not see any rational ground for demanding the superlative—for being dissatisfied unless we are assured that our truth is cosmic truth, if there is such a thing—that the ultimates of a little creature on this little earth are the last word of the unimaginable whole. If a man sees no reason for believing that significance, consciousness and ideals are more than marks of the
finite, that does not justify what has been familiar in French skeptics; getting upon a pedestal and professing to look with haughty scorn upon a world in ruins. The real conclusion is that the part cannot swallow the whole—that our categories are not, or may not be, adequate to formulate what we cannot know. If we believe that we come out of the universe, not it out of us, we must admit that we do not know what we are talking about when we speak of brute matter. We do know that a certain complex of energies can wag its tail and another can make syllogisms. These are among the powers of the unknown, and if, as may be, it has still greater powers that we cannot understand, as Fabre in his studies of instinct would have us believe, studies that gave Bergson one of the strongest strands for his philosophy and enabled Maeterlinck to make us fancy for a moment that we heard a clang from behind phenomena—if this be true, why should we not be content? Why should we employ the energy that is furnished to us by the cosmos to defy it and shake our fist at the sky? It seems to me silly.

That the universe has in it more than we understand, that the private soldiers have not been told the plan of campaign, or even that there is one, rather than some vaster unthinkable to which every predicate is an impertinence, has no bearing upon our conduct. We still shall fight—all of us because we want to live, some, at least, because we want to realize our spontaneity and prove our powers, for the joy of it, and we may leave to the unknown the supposed final valuation of that which in any event has value to us. It is enough for us that the universe has produced us and has within it, as less than it, all that we believe and love. If we think of our existence not as that of a little god outside, but as that of a ganglion within, we have the infinite behind us. It gives us our only but our adequate significance. A grain of sand has the same, but what competent person supposes that he understands a grain of sand? That is as much beyond our grasp as man. If our imagination is strong enough to accept the vision of ourselves as parts inseverable from the rest, and to extend our final interest beyond the boundary of our skins, it justifies the sacrifice even of our lives for ends outside of ourselves. The motive, to be sure, is the common wants and ideals that we find in man. Philosophy does not furnish motives, but it shows men that they are not fools for doing what they already want to do. It opens to the forlorn hopes on which we throw
ourselves away, the vista of the farthest stretch of human thought, the chords of a
harmony that breathes from the unknown.
Theodore Roosevelt

The Presidency; Making an Old Party Progressive

BACKGROUND

Following the assassination of President William McKinley in September 1901, his vice president Theodore Roosevelt assumed office. A relatively young and energetic president, Roosevelt enacted many reforms and Progressive-leaning policies during his administration, including food safety protections, natural conservation laws, and legislation aimed at “trust busting.” After failing to secure the presidency for a third term as the Republican (and then Progressive Party) nominee in 1912, Roosevelt published his autobiography the following year. The chapter excerpted below (Chapter 10) details the aftermath of his first accession to the presidency.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What does Roosevelt generally do upon succeeding McKinley?
2. What does he see as the good and bad aspects of the Republican Party of his day?
3. Who are examples Roosevelt cites as excellent politicians of his time?
4. What does he imply is a major reason for his presidency’s success?
5. How does Roosevelt understand executive power?
6. What two broad schools of American political thought does he discuss?
On September 6, 1901, President McKinley was shot by an Anarchist in the city of Buffalo. I went to Buffalo at once. The President’s condition seemed to be improving, and after a day or two we were told that he was practically out of danger. I then joined my family, who were in the Adirondacks, near the foot of Mount Tahawus. A day or two afterwards we took a long tramp through the forest, and in the afternoon I climbed Mount Tahawus. After reaching the top I had descended a few hundred feet to a shelf of land where there was a little lake, when I saw a guide coming out of the woods on our trail from below. I felt at once that he had bad news, and, sure enough, he handed me a telegram saying that the President’s condition was much worse and that I must come to Buffalo immediately. It was late in the afternoon, and darkness had fallen by the time I reached the clubhouse where we were staying. It was some time afterwards before I could get a wagon to drive me out to the nearest railway station, North Creek, some forty or fifty miles distant.

The roads were the ordinary wilderness roads and the night was dark. But we changed horses two or three times – when I say “we” I mean the driver and I, as there was no one else with us – and reached the station just at dawn, to learn from Mr. Loeb, who had a special train waiting, that the President was dead. That evening I took the oath of office, in the house of Ansley Wilcox, at Buffalo.

On three previous occasions the Vice-President had succeeded to the Presidency on the death of the President. In each case there had been a reversal of party policy, and a nearly immediate and nearly complete change in the personnel of the higher offices, especially the Cabinet. I had never felt that this was wise from any standpoint. If a man is fit to be President, he will speedily so impress himself in the office that the policies pursued will be his anyhow, and he will not have to bother as to whether he is changing them or not; while as regards the offices under him, the important thing for him is that his subordinates shall make a success in handling their several departments. The subordinate is sure to desire to make a success of his department for his own sake, and if he is a fit man, whose views on public policy are sound, and whose abilities entitle him to his position, he will do excellently under almost any chief with the same purposes.
I at once announced that I would continue unchanged McKinley’s policies for the honor and prosperity of the country, and I asked all the members of the Cabinet to stay. There were no changes made among them save as changes were made among their successors whom I myself appointed. I continued Mr. McKinley’s policies, changing and developing them and adding new policies only as the questions before the public changed and as the needs of the public developed. Some of my friends shook their heads over this, telling me that the men I retained would not be “loyal to me,” and that I would seem as if I were “a pale copy of McKinley.” I told them that I was not nervous on this score, and that if the men I retained were loyal to their work they would be giving me the loyalty for which I most cared; and that if they were not, I would change them anyhow; and that as for being “a pale copy of McKinley,” I was not primarily concerned with either following or not following in his footsteps, but in facing the new problems that arose; and that if I were competent I would find ample opportunity to show my competence by my deeds without worrying myself as to how to convince people of the fact.

For the reasons I have already given in my chapter on the Governorship of New York, the Republican party, which in the days of Abraham Lincoln was founded as the radical progressive party of the Nation, had been obliged during the last decade of the nineteenth century to uphold the interests of popular government against a foolish and ill-judged mock-radicalism. It remained the Nationalist as against the particularist or State’s rights party, and in so far it remained absolutely sound; for little permanent good can be done by any party which worships the State’s rights fetish or which fails to regard the State, like the county or the municipality, as merely a convenient unit for local self-government, while in all National matters, of importance to the whole people, the Nation is to be supreme over State, county, and town alike. But the State’s rights fetish, although still effectively used at certain times by both courts and Congress to block needed National legislation directed against the huge corporations or in the interests of workingmen, was not a prime issue at the time of which I speak. In 1896, 1898, and 1900 the campaigns were waged on two great moral issues: (1) the imperative need of a sound and honest currency; (2) the need, after 1898, of meeting in manful and straightforward fashion the extraterritorial problems arising from the Spanish War. On these great moral issues the Republican party was right, and the men who were opposed to it, and who claimed to be
the radicals, and their allies among the sentimentalists, were utterly and hopeless-
ly wrong. This had, regrettable but perhaps inevitably, tended to throw the party into the
hands not merely of the conservatives but of the reactionaries; of men who, sometimes
for personal and improper reasons, but more often with entire sincerity and uprightness
of purpose, distrusted anything that was progressive and dreaded radicalism. These men
still from force of habit applauded what Lincoln had done in the way of radical dealing
with the abuses of his day; but they did not apply the spirit in which Lincoln worked to
the abuses of their own day. Both houses of Congress were controlled by these men. Their
leaders in the Senate were Messrs. Aldrich and Hale. The Speaker of the House when I
became President was Mr. Henderson, but in a little over a year he was succeeded by Mr.
Cannon, who, although widely differing from Senator Aldrich in matters of detail,
represented the same type of public sentiment. There were many points on which I
agreed with Mr. Cannon and Mr. Aldrich, and some points on which I agreed with Mr.
Hale. I made a resolute effort to get on with all three and with their followers, and I have
no question that they made an equally resolute effort to get on with me. We succeeded
in working together, although with increasing friction, for some years, I pushing forward
and they hanging back. Gradually, however, I was forced to abandon the effort to
persuade them to come my way, and then I achieved results only by appealing over the
heads of the Senate and House leaders to the people, who were the masters of both of us.
I continued in this way to get results until almost the close of my term; and the
Republican party became once more the progressive and indeed the fairly radical
progressive party of the Nation. When my successor was chosen, however, the leaders of
the House and Senate, or most of them, felt that it was safe to come to a break with me,
and the last or short session of Congress, held between the election of my successor and
his inauguration four months later, saw a series of contests between the majorities in the
two houses of Congress and the President,-myself,- quite as bitter as if they and I had
belonged to opposite political parties. However, I held my own. I was not able to push
through the legislation I desired during these four months, but I was able to prevent them
doing anything I did not desire, or undoing anything that I had already succeeded in
getting done.
There were, of course, many Senators and members of the lower house with whom up to the very last I continued to work in hearty accord, and with a growing understanding. I have not the space to enumerate, as I would like to, these men. For many years Senator Lodge had been my close personal and political friend, with whom I discussed all public questions, that arose, usually with agreement; and our intimately close relations were of course unchanged by my entry into the White House. He was of all our public men the man who had made the closest and wisest study of our foreign relations, and more clearly than almost any other man he understood the vital fact that the efficiency of our navy conditioned our national efficiency in foreign affairs. Anything relating to our international relations, from Panama and the navy to the Alaskan boundary question, the Algeciras negotiations, or the peace of Portsmouth, I was certain to discuss with Senator Lodge and also with certain other members of Congress, such as Senator Turner of Washington and Representative Hitt of Illinois. Anything relating to labor legislation and to measures for controlling big business or efficiently regulating the giant railway systems, I was certain to discuss with Senator Dolliver or Congressman Hepburn or Congressman Cooper. With men like Senator Beveridge, Congressman (afterwards Senator) Dixon, and Congressman Murdock, I was apt to discuss pretty nearly everything relating to either our internal or our external affairs. There were many, many others. The present President of the Senate, Senator Clark, of Arkansas, was as fearless and high-minded a representative of the people of the United States as I ever dealt with. He was one of the men who combined loyalty to his own State with an equally keen loyalty to the people of all the United States. He was politically opposed to me; but when the interests of the country were at stake, he was incapable of considering party differences; and this was especially his attitude in international matters – including certain treaties which most of his party colleagues, with narrow lack of patriotism, and complete subordination of National to factional interest, opposed. I have never anywhere met finer, more faithful, more disinterested, and more loyal public servants than Senator O. H. Platt, a Republican, from Connecticut, and Senator Cockrell, a Democrat, from Missouri. They were already old men when I came to the Presidency; and doubtless there were points on which I seemed to them to be extreme and radical; but eventually they found that our motives and beliefs were the same, and they did all in their power to help any movement that was for the interest of our people as a whole. I had met them when I was Civil Service
Commissioner and Assistant Secretary of the Navy. All I ever had to do with either was to convince him that a given measure I championed was right, and he then at once did all he could to have it put into effect. If I could not convince them, why! that was my fault, or my misfortune; but if I could convince them, I never had to think again as to whether they would or would not support me. There were many other men of mark in both houses with whom I could work on some points, whereas on others we had to differ. There was one powerful leader – a burly, forceful man, of admirable traits – who had, however, been trained in the post-bellum school of business and politics, so that his attitude towards life, quite unconsciously, reminded me a little of Artemus Ward's view of the Tower of London – “If I like it, I’ll buy it.” There was a big governmental job in which this leader was much interested, and in reference to which he always wished me to consult a man whom he trusted, whom I will call Pitt Rodney. One day I answered him, “The trouble with Rodney is that he misestimates his relations to cosmos”; to which he responded, “Cosmos – Cosmos? Never heard of him. You stick to Rodney. He’s your man!” Outside of the public servants there were multitudes of men, in newspaper offices, in magazine offices, in business or the professions or on farms or in shops, who actively supported the policies for which I stood and did work of genuine leadership which was quite as effective as any work done by men in public office. Without the active support of these men I would have been powerless. In particular, the leading newspaper correspondents at Washington were as a whole a singularly able, trustworthy, and public-spirited body of men, and the most useful of all agents in the fight for efficient and decent government.

As for the men under me in executive office, I could not overstate the debt of gratitude I owe them. From the heads of the departments, the Cabinet officers, down, the most striking feature of the Administration was the devoted, zealous, and efficient work that was done as soon as it became understood that the one bond of interest among all of us was the desire to make the Government the most effective instrument in advancing the interests of the people as a whole, the interests of the average men and women of the United States and of their children. I do not think I overstate the case when I say that most of the men who did the best work under me felt that ours was a partnership, that we all stood on the same level of purpose and service, and that it mattered not what
position anyone of us held so long as in that position he gave the very best that was in him. We worked very hard; but I made a point of getting a couple of hours off each day for equally vigorous play. The men with whom I then played, whom we laughingly grew to call the “Tennis Cabinet,” have been mentioned in a previous chapter of this book in connection with the gift they gave me at the last breakfast which they took at the White House. There were many others in the public service under me with whom I happened not to play, but who did their share of our common work just as effectively as it was done by us who did play. Of course nothing could have been done in my Administration if it had not been for the zeal, intelligence, masterful ability, and downright hard labor of these men in countless positions under me. I was helpless to do anything except as my thoughts and orders were translated into action by them; and, moreover, each of them, as he grew specially fit for his job, used to suggest to me the right thought to have, and the right order to give, concerning that job. It is of course hard for me to speak with cold and dispassionate partiality of these men, who were as close to me as were the men of my regiment. But the outside observers best fitted to pass judgment about them felt as I did. At the end of my Administration Mr. Bryce, the British Ambassador, told me that in a long life, during which he had studied intimately the government of many different countries, he had never in any country seen a more eager, high-minded, and efficient set of public servants, men more useful and more creditable to their country, than the men then doing the work of the American Government in Washington and in the field. I repeat this statement with the permission of Mr. Bryce.

At about the same time, or a little before, in the spring of 1908, there appeared in the English Fortnightly Review an article, evidently by a competent eye witness, setting forth more in detail the same views to which the British Ambassador thus privately gave expression. It was in part as follows:

“Mr. Roosevelt has gathered around him a body of public servants who are nowhere surpassed, I question whether they are anywhere equaled, for efficiency, self-sacrifice, and an absolute devotion to their country’s interests. Many of them are poor men, without private means, who have voluntarily abandoned high professional ambitions and turned their backs on the rewards of business to serve their country on salaries that are not merely inadequate, but indecently so. There is not one of them who is not constantly assailed by offers of positions in the world of commerce, finance, and the law that would
satisfy every material ambition with which he began life. There is not one of them who could not, if he chose, earn outside Washington from ten to twenty times the income on which he economizes as a State official. But these men are as indifferent to money and to the power that money brings as to the allurements of Newport and New York, or to merely personal distinctions, or to the commercialized ideals which the great bulk of their fellow-countrymen accept without question. They are content, and more than content, to sink themselves in the National service without a thought of private advancement, and often at a heavy sacrifice of worldly honors, and to toil on ... sustained by their own native impulse to make of patriotism an efficient instrument of public betterment.”

The American public rarely appreciate the high quality of the work done by some of our diplomats – work, usually entirely unnoticed and unrewarded, which redounds to the interest and the honor of all of us. The most useful man in the entire diplomatic service, during my presidency, and for many years before, was Henry White; and I say this having in mind the high quality of work done by such admirable ambassadors and ministers as Bacon, Meyer, Straus, O’Brien, Rockhill, and Egan, to name only a few among many. When I left the presidency White was Ambassador to France; shortly afterwards he was removed by Mr. Taft, for reasons unconnected with the good of the service.

The most important factor in getting the right spirit in my Administration, next to the insistence upon courage, honesty, and a genuine democracy of desire to serve the plain people, was my insistence upon the theory that the executive power was limited only by specific restrictions and prohibitions appearing in the Constitution or imposed by the Congress under its Constitutional powers. My view was that every executive officer, and above all every executive officer in high position, was a steward of the people bound actively and affirmatively to do all he could for the people, and not to content himself with the negative merit of keeping his talents undamaged in a napkin. I declined to adopt the view that what was imperatively necessary for the Nation could not be done by the President unless he could find some specific authorization to do it. My belief was that it was not only his right but his duty to do anything that the needs of the Nation demanded unless such action was forbidden by the Constitution or by the laws. Under this interpretation of executive power I did and caused to be done many things not previously done by the President and the heads of the departments. I did not usurp power, but I did greatly broaden the use of executive power.
I acted for the common well-being of all our people, whenever and in whatever manner was necessary, unless prevented by direct constitutional or legislative prohibition. I did not care a rap for the mere form and show of power; I cared immensely for the use that could be made of the substance. The Senate at one time objected to my communicating with them in printing, preferring the expensive, foolish, and laborious practice of writing out the messages by hand. It was not possible to return to the outworn archaism of hand writing; but we endeavored to have the printing made as pretty as possible. Whether I communicated with the Congress in writing or by word of mouth, and whether the writing was by a machine, or a pen, were equally, and absolutely, unimportant matters. The importance lay in what I said and in the heed paid to what I said. So as to my meeting and consulting Senators, Congressmen, politicians, financiers, and labor men. I consulted all who wished to see me; and if I wished to see anyone, I sent for him; and where the consultation took place was a matter of supreme unimportance. I consulted every man with the sincere hope that I could profit by and follow his advice; I consulted every member of Congress who wished to be consulted, hoping to be able to come to an agreement of action with him; and I always finally acted as my conscience and common sense bade me act.

About appointments I was obliged by the Constitution to consult the Senate; and the long-established custom of the Senate meant that in practice this consultation was with individual Senators and even with big politicians who stood behind the Senators. I was only one-half the appointing power; I nominated; but the Senate confirmed. In practice, by what was called “the courtesy of the Senate,” the Senate normally refused to confirm any appointment if the Senator from the State objected to it. In exceptional cases, where I could arouse public attention, I could force through the appointment in spite of the opposition of the Senators; in all ordinary cases this was impossible. On the other hand, the Senator could of course do nothing for any man unless I chose to nominate him. In consequence the Constitution itself forced the President and the Senators from each State to come to a working agreement on the appointments in and from that State.

My course was to insist on absolute fitness, including honesty, as a prerequisite to every appointment; and to remove only for good cause, and, where there was such cause, to
refuse even to discuss with the Senator in interest the unfit servant’s retention. Subject to
these considerations, I normally accepted each Senator’s recommendations for offices of
a routine kind, such as most post-offices and the like, but insisted on myself choosing the
men for the more important positions. I was willing to take any good man for postmaster;
but in the case of a Judge or District Attorney or Canal Commissioner or Ambassador, I
was apt to insist either on a given man or else on any man with a given class of
qualifications. If the Senator deceived me, I took care that he had no opportunity to
repeat the deception.

I can perhaps best illustrate my theory of action by two specific examples. In New York
Governor Odell and Senator Platt sometimes worked in agreement and sometimes were
at swords’ points, and both wished to be consulted. To a friendly Congressman, who was
also their friend, I wrote as follows on July 22, 1903:

“I want to work with Platt. I want to work with Odell. I want to support both and take
the advice of both. But of course ultimately I must be the judge as to acting on the advice
given. When, as in the case of the judgeship, I am convinced that the advice of both is
wrong, I shall act as I did when I appointed Holt. When I can find a friend of Odell’s like
Cooley, who is thoroughly fit for the position I desire to fill, it gives me the greatest
pleasure to appoint him. When Platt proposes to me a man like Hamilton Fish, it is
equally a pleasure to appoint him.”

This was written in connection with events which led up to my refusing to accept Senator
Platt’s or Governor Odell’s sug[g]estions as to a Federal Judgeship and a Federal District
Attorneyship, and insisting on the appointment, first of Judge Hough and later of District
Attorney Stimson; because in each case I felt that the work to be done was of so high an
order that I could not take an ordinary man.

The other case was that of Senator Fulton, of Oregon. Through Francis Heney I was
prosecuting men who were implicated in a vast network of conspiracy against the law in
connection with the theft of public land in Oregon. I had been acting on Senator Fulton’s
recommendations for office, in the usual manner. Heney had been insisting that Fulton
was in league with the men we were prosecuting, and that he had recommended unfit
men. Fulton had been protesting against my following Heney’s advice, particularly as
regards appointing Judge Wolverton as United States Judge. Finally Heney laid before me a report which convinced me of the truth of his statements. I then wrote to Fulton as follows, on November 20, 1905:

“My dear Senator Fulton: I inclose you herewith a copy of the report made to me by Mr. Heney. I have seen the originals of the letters from you and Senator Mitchell quoted therein. I do not at this time desire to discuss the report itself, which of course I must submit to the Attorney-General. But I have been obliged to reach the painful conclusion that your own letters as therein quoted tend to show that you recommended for the position of District Attorney B when you had good reason to believe that he had himself been guilty of fraudulent conduct; that you recommended C for the same position simply because it was for B’s interest that he should be so recommended, and, as there is reason to believe, because he had agreed to divide the fees with B if he were appointed; and that you finally recommended the reappointment of H with the knowledge that if H were appointed he would abstain from prosecuting B for criminal misconduct, this being why B advocated H’s claims for reappointment. If you care to make any statement in the matter, I shall of course be glad to hear it. As the District Judge of Oregon I shall appoint Judge Wolverton.”

In the letter I of course gave in full the names indicated above by initials. Senator Fulton gave no explanation. I therefore ceased to consult him about appointments under the Department of Justice and the Interior, the two departments in which the crookedness had occurred – there was no question of crookedness in the other offices in the State, and they could be handled in the ordinary manner. Legal proceedings were undertaken against his colleague in the Senate, and one of his colleagues in the lower house, and the former was convicted and sentenced to the penitentiary.

In a number of instances the legality of executive acts of my Administration was brought before the courts. They were uniformly sustained. For example, prior to 1907 statutes relating to the disposition of coal lands had been construed as fixing the flat price at $10 to $20 per acre. The result was that valuable coal lands were sold for wholly inadequate prices, chiefly to big corporations. By executive order the coal lands were withdrawn and not opened for entry until proper classification was placed thereon by Government agents. There was a great clamor that I was usurping legislative power; but the acts were not assailed in court until we brought suits to set aside entries made by persons and associations to obtain larger areas than the statutes authorized. This position was opposed on the ground that the restrictions imposed were illegal; that the executive
orders were illegal. The Supreme Court sustained the Government. In the same way our attitude in the water power question was sustained, the Supreme Court holding that the Federal Government had the rights we claimed over streams that are or may be declared navigable by Congress. Again, when Oklahoma became a State we were obliged to use the executive power to protect Indian rights and property, for there had been an enormous amount of fraud in the obtaining of Indian lands by white men. Here we were denounced as usurping power over a State as well as usurping power that did not belong to the executive. The Supreme Court sustained our action.

In connection with the Indians, by the way, it was again and again necessary to assert the position of the President as steward of the whole people. I had a capital Indian Commissioner, Francis E. Leupp. I found that I could rely on his judgment not to get me into fights that were unnecessary, and therefore I always backed him to the limit when he told me that a fight was necessary. On one occasion, for example, Congress passed a bill to sell to settlers about half a million acres of Indian land in Oklahoma at one and a half dollars an acre. I refused to sign it, and turned the matter over to Leupp. The bill was accordingly withdrawn, amended so as to safeguard the welfare of the Indians, and the minimum price raised to five dollars an acre. Then I signed the bill. We sold that land under sealed bids, and realized for the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians more than four million dollars – three millions and a quarter more than they would have obtained if I had signed the bill in its original form. In another case, where there had been a division among the Sac and Fox Indians, part of the tribe removing to Iowa, the Iowa delegation in Congress, backed by two Iowans who were members of my Cabinet, passed a bill awarding a sum of nearly a half million dollars to the Iowa seceders. They had not consulted the Indian Bureau. Leupp protested against the bill, and I vetoed it. A subsequent bill was passed on the lines laid down by the Indian Bureau, referring the whole controversy to the courts, and the Supreme Court in the end justified our position by deciding against the Iowa seceders and awarding the money to the Oklahoma stay-at-homes.

As to all action of this kind there have long been two schools of political thought, upheld with equal sincerity. The division has not normally been along political, but
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The course I followed, of regarding the executive as subject only to the people, and, under the Constitution, bound to serve the people affirmatively in cases where the Constitution does not explicitly forbid him to render the service, was substantially the course followed by both Andrew Jackson and Abraham Lincoln. Other honorable and well-meaning Presidents, such as James Buchanan, took the opposite and, as it seems to me, narrowly legalistic view that the President is the servant of Congress rather than of the people, and can do nothing, no matter how necessary it be to act, unless the Constitution explicitly commands the action. Most able lawyers who are past middle age take this view, and so do large numbers of well-meaning, respectable citizens. My successor in office took this, the Buchanan, view of the President’s powers and duties.

For example, under my Administration we found that one of the favorite methods adopted by the men desirous of stealing the public domain was to carry the decision of the Secretary of the Interior into court. By vigorously opposing such action, and only by so doing, we were able to carry out the policy of properly protecting the public domain. My successor not only took the opposite view, but recommended to Congress the passage of a bill which would have given the courts direct appellate power over the Secretary of the Interior in these land matters. This bill was reported favorably by Mr. Mondell, Chairman of the House Committee on public lands, a Congressman who took the lead in every measure to prevent the conservation of our natural resources and the preservation of the National domain for the use of home-seekers. Fortunately, Congress declined to pass the bill. Its passage would have been a veritable calamity.

I acted on the theory that the President could at any time in his discretion withdraw from entry any of the public lands of the United States and reserve the same for forestry, for water-power sites, for irrigation, and other public purposes. Without such action it would have been impossible to stop the activity of the land thieves. No one ventured to test its legality by lawsuit. My successor, however, himself questioned it, and referred the matter to Congress. Again Congress showed its wisdom by passing a law which gave the President the power which he had long exercised, and of which my successor had shorn himself.
Perhaps the sharp difference between what may be called the Lincoln-Jackson and the Buchanan-Taft schools, in their views of the power and duties of the President, may be best illustrated by comparing the attitude of my successor toward his Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ballinger, when the latter was accused of gross misconduct in office, with my attitude towards my chiefs of department and other subordinate officers. More than once while I was President my officials were attacked by Congress, generally because these officials did their duty well and fearlessly. In every such case I stood by the official and refused to recognize the right of Congress to interfere with me excepting by impeachment or in other Constitutional manner. On the other hand, wherever I found the officer unfit for his position I promptly removed him, even although the most influential men in Congress fought for his retention. The Jackson-Lincoln view is that a President who is fit to do good work should be able to form his own judgment as to his own subordinates, and, above all, of the subordinates standing highest and in closest and most intimate touch with him. My secretaries and their subordinates were responsible to me, and I accepted the responsibility for all their deeds. As long as they were satisfactory to me I stood by them against every critic or assailant, within or without Congress; and as for getting Congress to make up my mind for me about them, the thought would have been inconceivable to me. My successor took the opposite, or Buchanan, view when he permitted and requested Congress to pass judgment on the charges made against Mr. Ballinger as an executive officer. These charges were made to the President; the President had the facts before him and could get at them at any time, and he alone had power to act if the charges were true. However, he permitted and requested Congress to investigate Mr. Ballinger. The party minority of the committee that investigated him, and one member of the majority, declared that the charges were well founded and that Mr. Ballinger should be removed. The other members of the majority declared the charges ill founded. The President abode by the view of the majority. Of course believers in the Jackson-Lincoln theory of the Presidency would not be content with this town meeting majority and minority method of determining by another branch of the Government what it seems the especial duty of the President himself to determine for himself in dealing with his own subordinate in his own department.
There are many worthy people who reprobate the Buchanan method as a matter of history, but who in actual life reprobate still more strongly the Jackson-Lincoln method when it is put into practice. These persons conscientiously believe that the President should solve every doubt in favor of inaction as against action, that he should construe strictly and narrowly the Constitutional grant of powers both to the National Government, and to the President within the National Government. In addition, however, to the men who conscientiously believe in this course from high, although as I hold misguided, motives, there are many men who affect to believe in it merely because it enables them to attack and to try to hamper, for partisan or personal reasons, an executive whom they dislike. There are other men in whom, especially when they are themselves in office, practical adherence to the Buchanan principle represents not well-thought-out devotion to an unwise course, but simple weakness of character and desire to avoid trouble and responsibility. Unfortunately, in practice it makes little difference which class of ideas actuates the President, who by his action sets a cramping precedent.

Whether he is high minded and wrongheaded or merely infirm of purpose, whether he means well feebly or is bound by a mischievous misconception of the powers and duties of the National Government and of the President, the effect of his actions is the same. The President’s duty is to act so that he himself and his subordinates shall be able to do efficient work for the people, and this efficient work he and they cannot do if Congress is permitted to undertake the task of making up his mind for him as to how he shall [perform] what is clearly his sole duty[.]
WOODROW WILSON
The Study of Administration

BACKGROUND

Prior to seeking elected office as governor of New Jersey and then president, Woodrow Wilson had a distinguished career in academia, culminating in his presidency of Princeton University from 1902-1910. In his academic career, Wilson espoused Progressive beliefs and frequently discussed them in his works. In this especially famous article, Wilson distinguishes between “politics” and “administration,” and discusses the implications for the American political system.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What does Wilson say is “the object of administrative study”?
2. How does Wilson tie the evolution of government to the development of administration?
3. How does he criticize Anglo-American political philosophy with regard to administration?
4. What is the relationship between administration and public opinion? Between administration and politics generally?
5. Does Wilson express concern over the expansion of a future American bureaucracy? Why or why not?
6. By what means does he suggest administration become successfully integrated into the American political system?

The Study of Administration
Woodrow Wilson

ANNOTATIONS

{…} It is the object of administrative study to discover, first, what government can properly and successfully do, and, secondly, how it can do these proper things with the utmost possible efficiency and at the least possible cost either of money or of energy. On both these points there is obviously much need of light among us; and only careful study can supply that light.

Before entering on that study, however, it is needful:

1. To take some account of what others have done in the same line; that is to say, of the history of the study.
2. To ascertain just what is its subject-matter.
3. To determine just what are the best methods by which to develop it, and the most clarifying political conceptions to carry with us into it.

Unless we know and settle these things, we shall set out without chart or compass.

I

The science of administration is the latest fruit of that study of the science of politics which was begun some twenty-two hundred years ago. It is a birth of our own century, almost of our own generation.

Why was it so late in coming? Why did it wait till this too busy century of ours to demand attention for itself? Administration is the most obvious part of government; it is government in action; it is the executive, the operative, the most visible side of government, and is of course as old as government itself. It is government in action, and one might very naturally expect to find that government in action had arrested the attention and provoked the scrutiny of writers of politics very early in the history of systematic thought.

But such was not the case. No one wrote systematically of administration as a branch of the science of government until the present century had passed its first youth and had begun to put forth its characteristic flower of the systematic knowledge. Up to our own day all the political writers whom we now read had thought, argued, dogmatized only about the constitution of government; about the nature of the state, the essence and seat
of sovereignty, popular power and kingly prerogative; about the greatest meanings lying at the heart of government, and the high ends set before the purpose of government by man’s nature and man’s aims. The central field of controversy was that great field of theory in which monarchy rode tilt against democracy, in which oligarchy would have built for itself strongholds of privilege, and in which tyranny sought opportunity to make good its claim to receive submission from all competitors. Amidst this high warfare of principles, administration could command no pause for its own consideration. The question was always: Who shall make law, and what shall that law be? The other question, how law should be administered with enlightenment, with equity, with speed, and without friction, was put aside as “practical detail” which clerks could arrange after doctors had agreed upon principles.

That political philosophy took this direction was of course no accident, no chance preference or perverse whim of political philosophers. The philosophy of any time is, as Hegel says, “nothing but the spirit of that time expressed in abstract thought”; and political philosophy, like philosophy of every other kind, has only held up the mirror to contemporary affairs. The trouble in early times was almost altogether about the constitution of government; and consequently that was what engrossed men’s thoughts. There was little or no trouble about administration,—at least little that was heeded by administrators. The functions of government were simple, because life itself was simple. Government went about imperatively and compelled men, without thought of consulting their wishes. There was no complex system of public revenues and public debts to puzzle financiers; there were, consequently, no financiers to be puzzled. No one who possessed power was long at a loss how to use it. The great and only question was: Who shall possess it? Populations were of manageable numbers; property was of simple sorts. There were plenty of farms, but no stocks and bonds: more cattle than vested interests. {…}

{…} The weightier debates of constitutional principle are even yet by no means concluded; but they are no longer of more immediate practical moment than questions of administration. It is getting to be harder to run a constitution than to frame one. {…}

There is scarcely a single duty of government which was once simple which is not now complex; government once had but a few masters; it now has scores of masters.
Majorities formerly only underwent government; they now conduct government. Where government once might follow the whims of a court, it must now follow the views of a nation.

And those views are steadily widening to new conceptions of state duty; so that, at the same time that the functions of government are every day becoming more complex and difficult, they are also vastly multiplying in number. Administration is everywhere putting its hands to new undertakings. The utility, cheapness, and success of the government’s postal service, for instance, point towards the early establishment of governmental control of the telegraph system. Or, even if our government is not to follow the lead of the governments of Europe in buying or building both telegraph and railroad lines, no one can doubt that in some way it must make itself master of masterful corporations. The creation of national commissioners of railroads, in addition to the older state commissions, involves a very important and delicate extension of administrative functions. Whatever hold of authority state or federal governments are to take upon corporations, there must follow cares and responsibilities which will require not a little wisdom, knowledge, and experience. Such things must be studied in order to be well done. And these, as I have said, are only a few of the doors which are being opened to offices of government. The idea of the state and the consequent ideal of its duty are undergoing noteworthy change; and “the idea of the state is the conscience of administration.” Seeing every day new things which the state ought to do, the next thing is to see clearly how it ought to do them.

This is why there should be a science of administration which shall seek to straighten the paths of government, to make its business less unbusinesslike, to strengthen and purify its organization, and to crown its duties with dutifulness. This is one reason why there is such a science.

But where has this science grown up? Surely not on this side {of} the sea. Not much impartial scientific method is to be discerned in our administrative practices. The poisonous atmosphere of city government, the crooked secrets of state administration, the confusion, sinecurism, and corruption ever and again discovered in the bureaux at
Washington forbid us to believe that any clear conceptions of what constitutes good administration are as yet very widely current in the United States. No; American writers have hitherto taken no very important part in the advancement of this science. It has found its doctors in Europe. It is not of our making; it is a foreign science, speaking very little of the language of English or American principle. It employs only foreign tongues; it utters none but what are to our minds alien ideas. Its aims, its examples, its conditions, are almost exclusively grounded in the histories of foreign races, in the precedents of foreign systems, in the lessons of foreign revolutions. It has been developed by French and German professors, and is consequently in all parts adapted to the needs of a compact state, and made to fit highly centralized forms of government; whereas, to answer our purposes, it must be adapted, not to a simple and compact, but to a complex and multiform state, and made to fit highly decentralized forms of government. If we would employ it, we must Americanize it, and that not formally, in language merely, but radically, in thought, principle, and aim as well. It must learn our constitutions by heart; must get the bureaucratic fever out of its veins; must inhale much free American air. […]

[…] In speaking of European governments I do not, of course, include England. She has not refused to change with the times. She has simply tempered the severity of the transition from a polity of aristocratic privilege to a system of democratic power by slow measures of constitutional reform which, without preventing revolution, has confined it to paths of peace. But the countries of the continent for a long time desperately struggled against all change, and would have diverted revolution by softening the asperities of absolute government. They sought so to perfect their machinery as to destroy all wearing friction, so to sweeten their methods with consideration for the interests of the governed as to placate all hindering hatred, and so assiduously and opportunely to offer their aid to all classes of undertakings as to render themselves indispensable to the industrious. They did at last give the people constitutions and the franchise; but even after that they obtained leave to continue despotic by becoming paternal. They made themselves too efficient to be dispensed with, too smoothly operative to be noticed, too enlightened to be inconsiderately questioned, too benevolent to be suspected, too powerful to be coped with. All this has required study; and they have closely studied it.
On this side {of} the sea, we, the while, had known no great difficulties of government. With a new country, in which there was room and remunerative employment for everybody, with liberal principles of government and unlimited skill in practical politics, we were long exempted from the need of being anxiously careful about plans and methods of administration. We have naturally been slow to see the use or significance of those many volumes of learned research and painstaking examination into the ways and means of conducting government which the presses of Europe have been sending to our libraries. Like a lusty child, government with us has expanded in nature and grown great in stature, but has also become awkward in movement. The vigor and increase of its life has been altogether out of proportion to its skill in living. It has gained strength, but it has not acquired deportment. […]

Judging by the constitutional histories of the chief nations of the modern world, there may be said to be three periods of growth through which government has passed in all the most highly developed of existing systems, and through which it promises to pass in all the rest. The first of these periods is that of absolute rulers, and of an administrative system adapted to absolute rule; the second is that in which constitutions are framed to do away with absolute rulers and substitute popular control, and in which administration is neglected for these higher concerns; and the third is that in which the sovereign people undertake to develop administration under this new constitution which has brought them into power.

Those governments are now in the lead in administrative practice which had rulers still absolute but also enlightened when those modern days of political illumination came in which it was made evident to all but the blind that governors are properly only the servants of the governed. In such governments administration has been organized to subserve the general weal with the simplicity and effectiveness vouchsafed only to the undertakings of a single will. […]

[…] Almost the whole of the admirable system has {thus} been developed by kingly initiative. […]
The recasting of French administration by Napoleon is [...] another example of the perfecting of civil machinery by the single will of an absolute ruler before the dawn of a constitutional era. No corporate, popular will could ever have effected arrangements such as those which Napoleon commanded. Arrangements so simple at the expense of local prejudice, so logical in their indifference to popular choice, might be decreed by a Constituent Assembly, but could be established only by the unlimited authority of a despot. [...] 

The English race [...] has long and successfully studied the art of curbing executive power to the constant neglect of the art of perfecting executive methods. It has exercised itself much more in controlling than in energizing government. It has been more concerned to render government just and moderate than to make it facile, well-ordered, and effective. English and American political history has been a history, not of administrative development, but of legislative oversight,—not of progress in governmental organization, but of advance in law-making and political criticism. 

Consequently, we have reached a time when administrative study and creation are imperatively necessary to the well-being of our governments saddled with the habits of a long period of constitution-making. That period has practically closed, so far as the establishment of essential principles is concerned, but we cannot shake off its atmosphere. We go on criticizing when we ought to be creating. We have reached the third of the periods I have mentioned,—the period, namely, when the people have to develop administration in accordance with the constitutions they won for themselves in a previous period of struggle with absolute power; but we are not prepared for the tasks of the new period. 

Such an explanation seems to afford the only escape from blank astonishment at the fact that, in spite of our vast advantages in point of political liberty, and above all in point of practical political skill and sagacity, so many nations are ahead of us in administrative organization and administrative skill. Why, for instance, have we but just begun purifying a civil service which was rotten full fifty years ago? To say that slavery diverted us is but to repeat what I have said—that flaws in our constitution delayed us.
Of course all reasonable preference would declare for this English and American course of politics rather than for that of any European country. We should not like to have had Prussia’s history for the sake of having Prussia’s administrative skill; and Prussia’s particular system of administration would quite suffocate us. It is better to be untrained and free than to be servile and systematic. 

What, then, is there to prevent?

Well, principally, popular sovereignty. It is harder for democracy to organize administration than for monarchy. The very completeness of our most cherished political successes in the past embarrasses us. We have enthroned public opinion; and it is forbidden us to hope during its reign for any quick schooling of the sovereign in executive expertness or in the conditions of perfect functional balance in government. The very fact that we have realized popular rule in its fulness has made the task of organizing that rule just so much the more difficult. In order to make any advance at all we must instruct and persuade a multitudinous monarch called public opinion,—a much less feasible undertaking than to influence a single monarch called a king. An individual sovereign will adopt a simple plan and carry it out directly: he will have but one opinion, and he will embody that one opinion in one command. But this other sovereign, the people, will have a score of differing opinions. They can agree upon nothing simple: advance must be made through compromise, by a compounding of differences, by a trimming of plans and a suppression of too straightforward principles. There will be a succession of resolves running through a course of years, a dropping fire of commands running through a whole gamut of modifications.
persons,—albeit there are hundreds who are wise. Once the advantage of the reformer was that the sovereign’s mind had a definite locality, that it was contained in one man’s head, and that consequently it could be gotten at; though it was his disadvantage that the mind learned only reluctantly or only in small quantities, or was under the influence of some one who let it learn only the wrong things. Now, on the contrary, the reformer is bewildered by the fact that the sovereign’s mind has no definite locality, but is contained in a voting majority of several million heads; and embarrassed by the fact that the mind of this sovereign also is under the influence of favorites, who are none the less favorites in a good old-fashioned sense of the word because they are not persons by preconceived opinions; i.e., prejudices which are not to be reasoned with because they are not the children of reason.

Wherever regard for public opinion is a first principle of government, practical reform must be slow and all reform must be full of compromises. For wherever public opinion exists it must rule. This is now an axiom half the world over, and will presently come to be believed even in Russia. Whoever would effect a change in a modern constitutional government must first educate his fellow-citizens to want some change. That done, he must persuade them to want the particular change he wants. He must first make public opinion willing to listen and then see to it that it listen to the right things. He must stir it up to search for an opinion, and then manage to put the right opinion in its way. […]

Even if we had clear insight into all the political past, and could form out of perfectly instructed heads a few steady, infallible, placidly wise maxims of government into which all sound political doctrine would be ultimately resolvable, would the country act on them? That is the question. The bulk of mankind is rigidly unphilosophical, and nowadays the bulk of mankind votes. A truth must become not only plain but also commonplace before it will be seen by the people who go to their work very early in the morning; and not to act upon it must involve great and pinching inconveniences before these same people will make up their minds to act upon it.

And where is this unphilosophical bulk of mankind more multifarious in its composition than in the United States? To know the public mind of this country, one must know the
mind, not of Americans of the older stocks only, but also of Irishmen, of Germans, of negroes. In order to get a footing for new doctrine, one must influence minds cast in every mold of race, minds inheriting every bias of environment, warped by the histories of a score of different nations, warmed or chilled, closed or expanded by almost every climate of the globe. […]

II

The field of administration is a field of business. It is removed from the hurry and strife of politics; it at most points stands apart even from the debatable ground of constitutional study. It is a part of political life only as the methods of the counting-house are a part of the life of society; only as machinery is part of the manufactured product. But it is, at the same time, raised very far above the dull level of mere technical detail by the fact that through its greater principles it is directly connected with the lasting maxims of political wisdom, the permanent truths of political progress.

The object of administrative study is to rescue executive methods from the confusion and costliness of empirical experiment and set them upon foundations laid deep in stable principle. […]

Let me expand a little what I have said of the province of administration. Most important to be observed is the truth already so much and so fortunately insisted upon by our civil-service reformers; namely, that administration lies outside the proper sphere of politics. Administrative questions are not political questions. Although politics sets the tasks for administration, it should not be suffered to manipulate its offices.

This is distinction of high authority; eminent German writers insist upon it as of course. Bluntschli, for instance, bids us separate administration alike from politics and from law. Politics, he says, is state activity “in things great and universal,” while “administration, on the other hand,” is “the activity of the state in individual and small things. Politics is thus the special province of the statesman, administration of the technical official.” “Policy does nothing without the aid of administration”; but administration is not therefore politics. […]
There is another distinction which must be worked into all our conclusions, which, though but another side of that between administration and politics, is not quite so easy to keep sight of: I mean the distinction between constitutional and administrative questions, between those governmental adjustments which are essential to constitutional principle and those which are merely instrumental to the possibly changing purposes of a wisely adapting convenience.

One cannot easily make clear to every one just where administration resides in the various departments of any practicable government without entering upon particulars so numerous as to confuse and distinctions so minute as to distract. No lines of demarcation, setting apart administrative from non-administrative functions, can be run between this and that department of government without being run up hill and down dale, over dizzy heights of distinction and through dense jungles of statutory enactment, hither and thither around “ifs” and “buts,” “whens” and “however,” until they become altogether lost to the common eye not accustomed to this sort of surveying, and consequently not acquainted with the use of the theodolite of logical discernment. A great deal of administration goes about incognito to most of the world, being confounded now with political “management,” and again with constitutional principle. {…}

{…} Liberty no more consists in easy functional movement than intelligence consists in the ease and vigor with which the limbs of a strong man move. The principles that rule within the man, or the constitution, are the vital springs of liberty or servitude. Because dependence and subjection are without chains, are lightened by every easy-working device of considerate, paternal government, they are not thereby transformed into liberty. Liberty cannot live apart from constitutional principle; and no administration, however perfect and liberal its methods, can give men more than a poor counterfeit of liberty if it rest upon illiberal principles of government.

A clear view of the difference between the province of constitutional law and the province of administrative function ought to leave no room for misconception; and it is possible to name some roughly definite criteria upon which such a view can be built. Public
administration is detailed and systematic execution of public law. Every particular application of general law is an act of administration. The assessment and raising of taxes, for instance, the hanging of a criminal, the transportation and delivery of the mails, the equipment and recruiting of the army and navy, etc., are all obviously acts of administration; but the general laws which direct these things to be done are as obviously outside of and above administration. The broad plans of governmental action are not administrative; the detailed execution of such plans is administrative. […]

[…] The administrator should [thus] have and does have a will of his own in the choice of means for accomplishing his work. He is not and ought not to be a mere passive instrument. The distinction is between general plans and special means.

There is, indeed, one point at which administrative studies trench on constitutional ground—or at least upon what seems constitutional ground. The study of administration, philosophically viewed, is closely connected with the study of the proper distribution of constitutional authority. To be efficient it must discover the simplest arrangements by which responsibility can be unmistakably fixed upon officials; the best way of dividing authority without hampering it, and responsibility without obscuring it. And this question of the distribution of authority, when taken into the sphere of the higher, the originating functions of government, is obviously a central constitutional question. If administrative study can discover the best principles upon which to base such distribution, it will have done constitutional study an invaluable service. Montesquieu did not, I am convinced, say the last word on this head. […]

And let me say that large powers and unhampered discretion seem to me the indispensable conditions of responsibility. Public attention must be easily directed, in each case of good or bad administration, to just the man deserving of praise or blame. There is no danger in power, if only it be not irresponsible. If it be divided, dealt out in shares to many, it is obscured; and if it be obscured, it is made irresponsible. But if it be centered in heads of the service and in heads of branches of the service, it is easily watched and brought to book. If to keep his office a man must achieve open and honest success, and if at the same time he feels himself intrusted with large freedom of discretion, the
greater his power the less likely is he to abuse it, the more is he nerved and sobered and elevated by it. The less his power, the more safely obscure and unnoticed does he feel his position to be, and the more readily does he relapse into remissness.

5 Just here we manifestly emerge upon the field of that still larger question,—the proper relations between public opinion and administration. {…}

The right answer seems to be, that public opinion shall play the part of authoritative critic.

10 But the method by which its authority shall be made to tell? Our peculiar American difficulty in organizing administration is not the danger of losing liberty, but the danger of not being able or willing to separate its essentials from its accidents. Our success is made doubtful by that besetting error of ours, the error of trying to do too much by vote. Self-government does not consist in having a hand in everything, any more than housekeeping consists necessarily in cooking dinner with one’s own hands. The cook must be trusted with a large discretion as to the management of the fires and the ovens.

15 In those countries in which public opinion has yet to be instructed in its privileges, yet to be accustomed to having its own way, this question as to the province of public opinion is much more readily soluble than in this country, where public opinion is wide awake and quite intent upon having its own way anyhow. {…} It may be sluggish, but it will not be meddlesome. It will submit to be instructed before it tries to instruct. Its political education will come before its political activity. In trying to instruct our own public opinion, we are dealing with a pupil apt to think itself quite sufficiently instructed beforehand.

20 The problem is to make public opinion efficient without suffering it to be meddlesome. Directly exercised, in the oversight of the daily details and in the choice of the daily means of government, public criticism is of course a clumsy nuisance, a rustic handling delicate machinery. But as superintending the greater forces of formative policy alike in politics and administration, public criticism is altogether safe and beneficent, altogether
indispensable. Let administrative study find the best means for giving public criticism this control and for shutting it out from all other interference. […]

 […] If we are to improve public opinion, which is the motive power of government, we must prepare better officials as the apparatus of government. If we are to put in new boilers and to mend the fires which drive our governmental machinery, we must not leave the old wheels and joints and valves and bands to creak and buzz and clatter on as best they may at bidding of the new force. We must put in new running parts wherever there is the least lack of strength or adjustment. […]

But to fear the creation of a domineering, illiberal officialism as a result of the studies I am here proposing is to miss altogether the principle upon which I wish most to insist. That principle is, that administration in the United States must be at all points sensitive to public opinion. A body of thoroughly trained officials serving during good behavior we must have in any case: that is a plain business necessity. But the apprehension that such a body will be anything un-American clears away the moment it is asked. What is to constitute good behavior? For that question obviously carries its own answer on its face. steadiness, hearty allegiance to the policy of the government they serve will constitute good behavior. That policy will have no taint of officialism about it. It will not be the creation of permanent officials, but of statesmen whose responsibility to public opinion will be direct and inevitable. Bureaucracy can exist only where the whole service of the state is removed from the common political life of the people, its chiefs as well as its rank and file. Its motives, its objects, its policy, its standards, must be bureaucratic. It would be difficult to point out any examples of impudent exclusiveness and arbitrariness on the part of officials doing service under a chief of department who really served the people, as all our chiefs of departments must be made to do. […]

The ideal for us is a civil service cultured and self-sufficient enough to act with sense and vigor, and yet so intimately connected with the popular thought, by means of elections and constant public counsel, as to find arbitrariness of class spirit quite out of the question.
Having thus viewed in some sort the subject-matter and the objects of this study of administration, what are we to conclude as to the methods best suited to it—the points of view most advantageous for it?

Government is so near us, so much a thing of our daily familiar handling, that we can with difficulty see the need of any philosophical study of it, or the exact point of such study, should it be undertaken. We have been on our feet too long to study now the art of walking. We are a practical people, made so apt, so adept in self-government by centuries of experimental drill, that we are scarcely any longer capable of perceiving the awkwardness of the particular system we may be using, just because it is so easy for us to use any system. We do not study the art of governing; we govern. But mere unschooled genius for affairs will not save us from sad blunders in administration. Though democrats by long inheritance and repeated choice, we are still rather crude democrats. Old as democracy is, its organization on a basis of modern ideas and conditions is still an unaccomplished work. The democratic state has yet to be equipped for carrying those enormous burdens of administration which the needs of this industrial and trading age are so fast accumulating. Without comparative studies in government we cannot rid ourselves of the misconception that administration stands upon an essentially different basis in a democratic state from that on which it stands in a non-democratic state.

After such study we could grant democracy the sufficient honor of ultimately determining by debate all essential questions affecting the public weal, of basing all structures of policy upon the major will; but we would have found but one rule of good administration for all governments alike. So far as administrative functions are concerned, all governments have a strong structural likeness; more than that, if they are to be uniformly useful and efficient, they must have a strong structural likeness. A free man has the same bodily organs, the same executive parts, as the slave, however different may be his motives, his services, his energies. Monarchies and democracies, radically different as they are in other respects, have in reality much the same business to look to.
It is abundantly safe nowadays to insist upon this actual likeness of all governments, because these are days when abuses of power are easily exposed and arrested, in countries like our own, by a bold, alert, inquisitive, detective public thought and a sturdy popular self-dependence such as never existed before. We are slow to appreciate this; but it is easy to appreciate it. […]

But, besides being safe, it is necessary to see that for all governments alike the legitimate ends of administration are the same, in order not to be frightened at the idea of looking into foreign systems of administration for instruction and suggestion; in order to get rid of the apprehension that we might perchance blindly borrow something incompatible with our principles. That man is blindly astray who denounces attempts to transplant foreign systems into this country. It is impossible: they simply would not grow here. But why should we not use such parts of foreign contrivances as we want, if they be in any way serviceable? We are in no danger of using them in a foreign way. We borrowed rice, but we do not eat it with chopsticks. We borrowed our whole political language from England, but we leave the words “king” and “lords” out of it. What did we ever originate, except the action of the federal government upon individuals and some of the functions of the federal supreme court?

We can borrow the science of administration with safety and profit if only we read all fundamental differences of condition into its essential tenets. We have only to filter it through our constitutions, only to put it over a slow fire of criticism and distil away its foreign gases.

I know that there is a sneaking fear in some conscientiously patriotic minds that studies of European systems might signalize some foreign methods as better than some American methods; and the fear is easily to be understood. But it would scarcely be avowed in any just company.

It is the more necessary to insist upon thus putting away all prejudices against looking anywhere in the world but at home for suggestions in this study[.] […] We can never learn either our own weaknesses or our own virtues by comparing ourselves with
ourselves. We are too used to the appearance and procedure of our own system to see its true significance. Perhaps even the English system is too much like our own to be used to the most profit in illustration. It is best on the whole to get entirely away from our own atmosphere and to be most careful in examining such systems as those of France and Germany. Seeing our own institutions through such media, we see ourselves as foreigners might see us were they to look at us without preconceptions. Of ourselves, so long as we know only ourselves, we know nothing.

Let it be noted that it is the distinction, already drawn, between administration and politics which makes the comparative method so safe in the field of administration. When we study the administrative systems of France and Germany, knowing that we are not in search of political principles, we need not care a peppercorn for the constitutional or political reasons which Frenchmen or Germans give for their practices when explaining them to us. If I see a murderous fellow sharpening a knife cleverly, I can borrow his way of sharpening the knife without borrowing his probable intention to commit murder with it; and so, if I see a monarchist dyed in the wool managing a public bureau well, I can learn his business methods without changing one of my republican spots. He may serve his king; I will continue to serve the people; but I should like to serve my sovereign as well as he serves his. By keeping this distinction in view, –that is, by studying administration as a means of putting our own politics into convenient practice, as a means of making what is democratically politic towards all administratively possible towards each, –we are on perfectly safe ground, and can learn without error what foreign systems have to teach us. We thus devise an adjusting weight for our comparative method of study. We can thus scrutinize the anatomy of foreign governments without fear of getting any of their diseases into our veins; dissect alien systems without apprehension of blood-poisoning.

Our own politics must be the touchstone for all theories. The principles on which to base a science of administration for America must be principles which have democratic policy very much at heart. And, to suit American habit, all general theories must, as theories, keep modestly in the background, not in open argument only, but even in our own minds, –lest opinions satisfactory only to the standards of the library should be
dogmatically used, as if they must be quite as satisfactory to the standards of practical politics as well. Doctrinaire devices must be postponed to tested practices. Arrangements not only sanctioned by conclusive experience elsewhere but also congenial to American habit must be preferred without hesitation to theoretical perfection. In a word, steady, practical statesmanship must come first, closet doctrine second. The cosmopolitan what-to-do must always be commanded by the American how-to-do-it.

Our duty is, to supply the best possible life to a federal organization, to systems within systems; to make town, city, county, state, and federal governments live with a like strength and an equally assured healthfulness, keeping each unquestionably its own master and yet making all interdependent and cooperative, combining independence with mutual helpfulness. The task is great and important enough to attract the best minds. {…}

{…} The question for us is, how shall our series of governments within governments be so administered that it shall always be to the interest of the public officer to serve, not his superior alone but the community also, with the best efforts of his talents and the soberest service of his conscience? How shall such service be made to his commonest interest by contributing abundantly to his sustenance, to his dearest interest by furthering his ambition, and to his highest interest by advancing his honor and establishing his character? And how shall this be done alike for the local part and for the national whole? {…}
W. E. B. DuBois

The Talented Tenth

E S S A Y  E X C E R P T S

B A C K G R O U N D

William Edward Burghardt DuBois was an early civil rights activist and the first African American to earn a doctorate from Harvard University. He realized that, even decades after the Emancipation Proclamation and the end of the Civil War, the integration of black and white communities was still greatly lacking. This famous essay of DuBois’ highlights his belief that African Americans’ societal development lay not exclusively in work, but also in education—a means both to better themselves as human beings and to prepare more readily for their future roles in American society. (Note the contrasts with Booker T. Washington’s speech.)

G U I D I N G  Q U E S T I O N S

1. What history does DuBois tell?
2. What is “the Talented Tenth?”
3. What is the importance of education, according to DuBois?
4. What is the importance of work, according to him?
5. How does DuBois understand the relationship between education and work?
6. What does he say are the effects of well-developed African-American leadership?

The Negro race, like all races, is going to be saved by its exceptional men. The problem of education, then, among Negroes must first of all deal with the Talented Tenth; it is the problem of developing the Best of this race that they may guide the Mass away from the contamination and death of the Worst, in their own and other races. Now the training of men is a difficult and intricate task. Its technique is a matter for educational experts, but its object is for the vision of seers. If we make money the object of man-training, we shall develop money-makers but not necessarily men; if we make technical skill the object of education, we may possess artisans but not, in nature, men. Men we shall have only as we make manhood the object of the work of the schools—intelligence, broad sympathy, knowledge of the world that was and is, and of the relation of men to it—this is the curriculum of that Higher Education which must underlie true life. On this foundation we may build bread winning, skill of hand and quickness of brain, with never a fear lest the child and man mistake the means of living for the object of life.

If this be true—and who can deny it—three tasks lay before me; first to show from the past that the Talented Tenth as they have risen among American Negroes have been worthy of leadership; secondly to show how these men may be educated and developed; and thirdly to show their relation to the Negro problem.

You misjudge us because you do not know us. From the very first it has been the educated and intelligent of the Negro people that have led and elevated the mass, and the sole obstacles that nullified and retarded their efforts were slavery and race prejudice; for what is slavery but the legalized survival of the unfit and the nullification of the work of natural internal leadership? Negro leadership therefore sought from the first to rid the race of this awful incubus that it might make way for natural selection and the survival of the fittest. In colonial days came Phillis Wheatley and Paul Cuffe striving against the bars of prejudice; and Benjamin Banneker, the almanac maker, voiced their longings when he said to Thomas Jefferson, “I freely and cheerfully acknowledge that I am of the African race and in colour which is natural to them, of the deepest dye; and it is under a sense of the most profound gratitude to the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, that I now confess to you that I am not under that state of tyrannical thraldom and inhuman captivity to which too many of my brethren are
doomed, but that I have abundantly tasted of the fruition of those blessings which proceed from that free and unequalled liberty with which you are favored, and which I hope you will willingly allow, you have mercifully received from the immediate hand of that Being from whom proceedeth every good and perfect gift.

"Suffer me to recall to your mind that time, in which the arms of the British crown were exerted with every powerful effort, in order to reduce you to a state of servitude; look back, I entreat you, on the variety of dangers to which you were exposed; reflect on that period in which every human aid appeared unavailable, and in which even hope and fortitude wore the aspect of inability to the conflict, and you cannot but be led to a serious and grateful sense of your miraculous and providential preservation, you cannot but acknowledge, that the present freedom and tranquility which you enjoy, you have mercifully received, and that a peculiar blessing of heaven.

"This, sir, was a time when you clearly saw into the injustice of a state of Slavery, and in which you had just apprehensions of the horrors of its condition. It was then that your abhorrence thereof was so excited, that you publicly held forth this true and invaluable doctrine, which is worthy to be recorded and remembered in all succeeding ages: "'We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed with certain inalienable rights, and that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.'"

Then came Dr. James Derham, who could tell even the learned Dr. Rush something of medicine, and Lemuel Haynes, to whom Middlebury College gave an honorary A. M. in 1804. These and others we may call the Revolutionary group of distinguished Negroes – they were persons of marked ability, leaders of a Talented Tenth, standing conspicuously among the best of their time. They strove by word and deed to save the color line from becoming the line between the bond and free, but all they could do was nullified by Eli Whitney and the Curse of Gold. So they passed into forgetfulness.

But their spirit did not wholly die; here and there in the early part of the century came other exceptional men. Some were natural sons of unnatural fathers and were given
often a liberal training and thus a race of educated mulattoes sprang up to plead for black men’s rights. There was Ira Aldridge, whom all Europe loved to honor; there was that Voice crying in the Wilderness, David Walker, and saying:

“I declare it does appear to me as though some nations think God is asleep, or that he made the Africans for nothing else but to dig their mines and work their farms, or they cannot believe history sacred or profane. I ask every man who has a heart, and is blessed with the privilege of believing—Is not God a God of justice to all his creatures? Do you say he is? Then if he gives peace and tranquility to tyrants and permits them to keep our fathers, our mothers, ourselves and our children in eternal ignorance and wretchedness to support them and their families, would he be to us a God of Justice? I ask, O, ye Christians, who hold us and our children in the most abject ignorance and degradation that ever a people were afflicted with since the world began—I say if God gives you peace and tranquility, and suffers you thus to go on afflicting us, and our children, who have never given you the least provocation—would He be to us a God of Justice? If you will allow that we are men, who feel for each other, does not the blood of our fathers and of us, their children, cry aloud to the Lord of Sabaoth against you for the cruelties and murders with which you have and do continue to afflict us?”

This was the wild voice that first aroused Southern legislators in 1829 to the terrors of abolitionism.

In 1831 there met that first Negro convention in Philadelphia, at which the world gaped curiously but which bravely attacked the problems of race and slavery, crying out against persecution and declaring that “Laws as cruel in themselves as they were unconstitutional and unjust, have in many places been enacted against our poor, unfriended and unoffending brethren (without a shadow of provocation on our part), at whose bare recital the very savage draws himself up for fear of contagion—looks noble and prides himself because he bears not the name of Christian.” Side by side this free Negro movement, and the movement for abolition, strove until they merged in to one strong stream. Too little notice has been taken of the work which the Talented Tenth among Negroes took in the great abolition crusade. From the very day that a Philadelphia colored man became the first subscriber to Garrison’s “Liberator,” to the day when Negro soldiers made the Emancipation Proclamation possible, black leaders worked shoulder to shoulder with white men in a movement, the success of which would have been impossible without them. There was Purvis and Remond, Pennington and Highland Garnett, Sojourner Truth and Alexander Crummel, and above, Frederick
Douglass—what would the abolition movement have been without them? They stood as living examples of the possibilities of the Negro race, their own hard experiences and well wrought culture said silently more than all the drawn periods of orators—they were the men who made American slavery impossible. As Maria Weston Chapman said, from the school of anti-slavery agitation, “a throng of authors, editors, lawyers, orators and accomplished gentlemen of color have taken their degree! It has equally implanted hopes and aspirations, noble thoughts, and sublime purposes, in the hearts of both races. It has prepared the white man for the freedom of the black man, and it has made the black man scorn the thought of enslavement, as does a white man, as far as its influence has extended. Strengthen that noble influence! Before its organization, the country only saw here and there in slavery some faithful Cudjoe or Dinah, whose strong natures blossomed even in bondage, like a fine plant beneath a heavy stone. Now, under the elevating and cherishing influence of the American Anti-slavery Society, the colored race, like the white, furnishes Corinthian capitals for the noblest temples.”

Where were these black abolitionists trained? Some, like Frederick Douglass, were self-trained, but yet trained liberally; others, like Alexander Crummell and McCune Smith, graduated from famous foreign universities. Most of them rose up through the colored schools of New York and Philadelphia and Boston, taught by college-bred men like Russworm, of Dartmouth, and college-bred white men like Neau and Benezet. After emancipation came a new group of educated and gifted leaders: Langston, Bruce and Elliot, Greener, Williams and Payne. Through political organization, historical and polemic writing and moral regeneration, these men strove to uplift their people. It is the fashion of to-day to sneer at them and to say that with freedom Negro leadership should have begun at the plow and not in the Senate—a foolish and mischievous lie; two hundred and fifty years that black serf toiled at the plow and yet that toiling was in vain till the Senate passed the war amendments; and two hundred and fifty years more the half-free serf of to-day may toil at his plow, but unless he have political rights and righteously guarded civic status, he will still remain the poverty-stricken and ignorant plaything of rascals, that he now is. This all sane men know even if they dare not say it.
And so we come to the present—a day of cowardice and vacillation, of strident wide-voiced wrong and faint hearted compromise; of double-faced dallying with Truth and Right. Who are to-day guiding the work of the Negro people? The “exceptions” of course. And yet so sure as this Talented Tenth is pointed out, the blind worshippers of the Average cry out in alarm: “These are exceptions, look here at death, disease and crime—these are the happy rule.”

Of course they are the rule, because a silly nation made them the rule: Because for three long centuries this people lynched Negroes who dared to be brave, raped black women who dared to be virtuous, crushed dark-hued youth who dared to be ambitious, and encouraged and made to flourish servility and lewdness and apathy. But not even this was able to crush all manhood and chastity and aspiration from black folk. A saving remnant continually survives and persists, continually aspires, continually shows itself in thrift and ability and character. Exceptional it is to be sure, but this is its chieffest promise; it shows the capability of Negro blood, the promise of black men. Do Americans ever stop to reflect that there are in this land a million men of Negro blood, well-educated, owners of homes, against the honor of whose womanhood no breath was ever raised, whose men occupy positions of trust and usefulness, and who, judged by any standard, have reached the full measure of the best type of modern European culture? Is it fair, is it decent, is it Christian to ignore these facts of the Negro problem, to belittle such aspiration, to nullify such leadership and seek to crush these people back into the mass out of which by toil and travail, they and their fathers have raised themselves?

Can the masses of the Negro people be in any possible way more quickly raised than by the effort and example of this aristocracy of talent and character? Was there ever a nation on God’s fair earth civilized from the bottom upward? Never; it is, ever was and ever will be from the top downward that culture filters. The Talented Tenth rises and pulls all that are worth the saving up to their vantage ground. This is the history of human progress; and the two historic mistakes which have hindered that progress were the thinking first that no more could ever rise save the few already risen; or second, that it would better the uprisen to pull the risen down.
How then shall the leaders of a struggling people be trained and the hands of the risen few strengthened? There can be but one answer: The best and most capable of their youth must be schooled in the colleges and universities of the land. We will not quarrel as to just what the university of the Negro should teach or how it should teach it—I willingly admit that each soul and each race-soul needs its own peculiar curriculum. But this is true: A university is a human invention for the transmission of knowledge and culture from generation to generation, through the training of quick minds and pure hearts, and for this work no other human invention will suffice, not even trade and industrial schools.

All men cannot go to college but some men must; every isolated group or nation must have its yeast, must have for the talented few centers of training where men are not so mystified and befuddled by the hard and necessary toil of earning a living, as to have no aims higher than their bellies, and no God greater than Gold. This is true training, and thus in the beginning were the favored sons of the freedmen trained. Out of the colleges of the North came, after the blood of war, Ware, Cravath, Chase, Andrews, Bumstead and Spence to build the foundations of knowledge and civilization in the black South. Where ought they to have begun to build? At the bottom, of course, quibbles the mole with his eyes in the earth. Aye! truly at the bottom, at the very bottom; at the bottom of knowledge, down in the very depths of knowledge there where the roots of justice strike into the lowest soil of Truth. And so they did begin; they founded colleges, and up from the colleges shot normal schools, and out from the normal schools went teachers, and around the normal teachers clustered other teachers to teach the public schools; the college trained in Greek and Latin and mathematics, 2,000 men; and these men trained full 50,000 others in morals and manners, and they in turn taught thrift and the alphabet to nine millions of men, who to-day hold $300,000,000 of property. It was a miracle – the most wonderful peace-battle of the 19th century, and yet to-day men smile at it, and in fine superiority tell us that it was all a strange mistake; that a proper way to found a system of education is first to gather the children and buy them spelling books and hoes; afterward men may look about for
teachers, if haply they may find them; or again they would teach men Work, but as for Life—why, what has Work to do with Life, they ask vacantly.

Was the work of these college founders successful; did it stand the test of time? Did the college graduates, with all their fine theories of life, really live? Are they useful men helping to civilize and elevate their less fortunate fellows? Let us see. Omitting all institutions which have not actually graduated students from a college course, there are to-day in the United States thirty-four institutions giving something above high school training to Negroes and designed especially for this race. {...}

... [The college-bred Negro] is, as he ought to be, the group leader, the man who sets the ideals of the community where he lives, directs its thoughts and heads its social movements. It need hardly be argued that the Negro people need social leadership more than most groups; that they have no traditions to fall back upon, no long established customs, no strong family ties, no well defined social classes. All these things must be slowly and painfully evolved. The preacher was, even before the war, the group leader of the Negroes, and the church their greatest social institution. Naturally this preacher was ignorant and often immoral, and the problem of replacing the older type by better educated men has been a difficult one. Both by direct work and by direct influence on other preachers, and on congregations, the college-bred preacher has an opportunity for reformatory work and moral inspiration, the value of which cannot be overestimated.

It has, however, been in the furnishing of teachers that the Negro college has found its peculiar function. Few persons realize how vast a work, how mighty a revolution has been thus accomplished. To furnish five millions and more of ignorant people with teachers of their own race and blood, in one generation, was not only a very difficult undertaking, but very important one, in that, it placed before the eyes of almost every Negro child an attainable ideal. It brought the masses of the blacks in contact with modern civilization, made black men the leaders of their communities and trainers of the new generation. In this work college-bred Negroes were first teachers, and then teachers of teachers. And here it is that the broad culture of college work has been of
peculiar value. Knowledge of life and its wider meaning, has been the point of the Negro’s deepest ignorance, and the sending out of teachers whose training has not been simply for bread winning, but also for human culture, has been of inestimable value in the training of these men.

5

In earlier years the two occupations of preacher and teacher were practically the only ones open to the black college graduate. Of later years a larger diversity of life among his people, has opened new avenues of employment. Nor have these college men been paupers and spendthrifts; 557 college-bred Negroes owned in 1899, $1,342,862.50 worth of real estate (assessed value), or $2,411 per family. The real value of the total accumulations of the whole group is perhaps about $10,000,000, or $5,000 a piece. Pitiful is it not beside the fortunes of oil kings and steel trusts, but after all is the fortune of the millionaire the only stamp of true and successful living? Alas! it is, with many and there’s the rub.

10

The problem of training the Negro is to-day immensely complicated by the fact that the whole question of the efficiency and appropriateness of our present systems of education, for any kind of child, is a matter of active debate, in which final settlement seems still afar off. Consequently it often happens that persons arguing for or against certain systems of education for Negroes, have these controversies in mind and miss the real question at issue. The main question, so far as the Southern Negro is concerned, is: What under the present circumstance, must a system of education do in order to raise the Negro as quickly as possible in the scale of civilization? The answer to this question seems to me clear: It must strengthen the Negro’s character, increase his knowledge and teach him to earn a living. Now it goes without saying that it is hard to do all these things simultaneously or suddenly and that at the same time it will not do to give all the attention to one and neglect the others; we could give black boys trades, but that alone will not civilize a race of ex-slaves; we might simply increase their knowledge of the world, but this would not necessarily make them wish to use this knowledge honestly; we might seek to strengthen character and purpose, but to what end if this people have nothing to eat or to wear? A system of education is not one thing, nor does it have a single definite object, nor is it a mere matter of schools.
Education is that whole system of human training within and without the school house walls, which molds and develops men. If then we start out to train an ignorant and unskilled people with a heritage of bad habits, our system of training must set before itself two great aims—the one dealing with knowledge and character, the other part seeking to give the child the technical knowledge necessary for him to earn a living under the present circumstances. These objects are accomplished in part by the opening of the common schools on the one, and of the industrial schools on the other. But only in part, for there must also be trained those who are to teach these schools—men and women of knowledge and culture and technical skill who understand modern civilization, and have the training and aptitude to impart it to the children under them. There must be teachers, and teachers of teachers, and to attempt to establish any sort of a system of common and industrial school training, without first (and I say first advisedly) without first providing for the higher training of the very best teachers, is simply throwing your money to the winds. School houses do not teach themselves—piles of brick and mortar and machinery do not send out men. It is the trained, living human soul, cultivated and strengthened by long study and thought, that breathes the real breath of life into boys and girls and makes them human, whether they be black or white, Greek, Russian or American. Nothing, in these latter days, has so dampened the faith of thinking Negroes in recent educational movements, as the fact that such movements have been accompanied by ridicule and denouncement and decrying of those very institutions of higher training which made the Negro public school possible, and make Negro industrial schools thinkable. It was: Fisk, Atlanta, Howard and Straight, those colleges born of the faith and sacrifice of the abolitionists, that placed in the black schools of the South the 30,000 teachers and more, which some, who depreciate the work of these higher schools, are using to teach their own new experiments. If Hampton, Tuskegee and the hundred other industrial schools prove in the future to be as successful as they deserve to be, then their success in training black artisans for the South, will be due primarily to the white colleges of the North and the black colleges of the South, which trained the teachers who to-day conduct these institutions. There was a time when the American people believed pretty devoutly that a log of wood with a boy at one end and Mark Hopkins at the other, represented the highest ideal of human training. But in these eager days it would seem that we have
changed all that and think it necessary to add a couple of saw-mills and a hammer to this outfit, and, at a pinch, to dispense with the services of Mark Hopkins.

I would not deny, or for a moment seem to deny, the paramount necessity of teaching the Negro to work, and to work steadily and skillfully; or seem to depreciate in the slightest degree the important part industrial schools must play in the accomplishment of these ends, but I do say, and insist upon it, that it is industrialism drunk with its vision of success, to imagine that its own work can be accomplished without providing for the training of broadly cultured men and women to teach its own teachers, and to teach the teachers of the public schools.

But I have already said that human education is not simply a matter of schools; it is much more a matter of family and group life – the training of one’s home, of one’s daily companions, of one’s social class. Now the black boy of the South moves in a black world – a world with its own leaders, its own thoughts, its own ideals. In this world he gets by far the larger part of his life training, and through the eyes of this dark world he peers into the veiled world beyond. Who guides and determines the education which he receives in his world? His teachers here are the group-leaders of the Negro people—the physicians and clergymen, the trained fathers and mothers, the influential and forceful men about him of all kinds; here it is, if at all, that the culture of the surrounding world trickles through and is handed on by the graduates of the higher schools. Can such culture training of group leaders be neglected? Can we afford to ignore it? Do you think that if the leaders of thought among Negroes are not trained and educated thinkers, that they will have no leaders? On the contrary a hundred half-trained demagogues will still hold the places they so largely occupy now, and hundreds of vociferous busy-bodies will multiply. You have no choice; either you must help to furnish this race from within its own ranks with thoughtful men of trained leadership, or you must suffer the evil consequences of a headless misguided rabble.

I am an earnest advocate of manual training and trade teaching for black boys, and for white boys, too. I believe that next to the founding of Negro colleges the most valuable addition to Negro education since the war, has been industrial training for black boys.
Nevertheless, I insist that the object of all true education is not to make men carpenters, it is to make carpenters men; there are two means of making the carpenter a man, each equally important: the first is to give the group and community in which he works, liberally trained teachers and leaders to teach him and his family what life means; the second is to give him sufficient intelligence and technical skill to make him an efficient workman; the first object demands the Negro college and college-bred men—not a quantity of such colleges, but a few of excellent quality; not too many college-bred men, but enough to leaven the lump, to inspire the masses, to raise the Talented Tenth to leadership; the second object demands a good system of common schools, well-taught, conveniently located and properly equipped.

The Sixth Atlanta Conference truly said in 1901:

“We call the attention of the Nation to the fact that less than one million of the three million Negro children of school age, are at present regularly attending school, and these attend a session which lasts only a few months.

“We are to-day deliberately rearing millions of our citizens in ignorance, and at the same time limiting the rights of citizenship by educational qualifications. This is unjust. Half the black youth of the land have no opportunities open to them for learning to read, write and cipher. In the discussion as to the proper training of Negro children after they leave the public schools, we have forgotten that they are not yet decently provided with public schools.

“Propositions are beginning to be made in the South to reduce the already meagre school facilities of Negroes. We congratulate the South on resisting, as much as it has, this pressure, and on the many millions it has spent on Negro education. But it is only fair to point out that Negro taxes and the Negroes’ share of the income from indirect taxes and endowments have fully repaid this expenditure, so that the Negro public school system has not in all probability cost the white taxpayers a single cent since the war.

“This is not fair. Negro schools should be a public burden, since they are a public benefit. The Negro has a right to demand good common school training at the hands of the States and the Nation since by their fault he is not in position to pay for this himself.”

What is the chief need for the building up of the Negro public school in the South? The Negro race in the South needs teachers to-day above all else. This is the concurrent testimony of all who know the situation. For the supply of this great demand two things
are needed – institutions of higher education and money for school houses and salaries. It is usually assumed that a hundred or more institutions for Negro training are to-day turning out so many teachers and college-bred men that the race is threatened with an over-supply. This is sheer nonsense. There are to-day less than 3,000 living Negro college graduates in the United States, and less than 1,000 Negroes in college. Moreover, in the 164 schools for Negroes, 95 percent. of their students are doing elementary and secondary work, work which should be done in the public schools. Over half the remaining 2,157 students are taking high school studies. The mass of so-called “normal” schools for the Negro, are simply doing elementary common school work, or, at most, high school work, with a little instruction in methods. The Negro colleges and the post-graduate courses at other institutions are the only agencies for the broader and more careful training of teachers. The work of these institutions is hampered for lack of funds. It is getting increasingly difficult to get funds for training teachers in the best modern methods, and yet all over the South, from State Superintendents, county officials, city boards and school principals comes the wail, “We need TEACHERS!” and teachers must be trained. As the fairest minded of all white Southerners, Atticus G. Haygood, once said: “The defects of colored teachers are so great as to create an urgent necessity for training better ones. Their excellencies and their successes are sufficient to justify the best hopes of success in the effort, and to vindicate the judgment of those who make large investments of money and service, to give to colored students opportunity for thoroughly preparing themselves for the work of teaching children of their people.”

The truth of this has been strikingly shown in the marked improvement of white teachers in the South. Twenty years ago the rank and file of white public school teachers were not as good as the Negro teachers. But they, by scholarships and good salaries, have been encouraged to thorough normal and collegiate preparation, while the Negro teachers have been discouraged by starvation wages and the idea that any training will do for a black teacher. If carpenters are needed it is well and good to train men as carpenters. But to train men as carpenters, and then set them to teaching is wasteful and criminal; and to train men as teachers and then refuse them living wages, unless they become carpenters, is rank nonsense. […]
{...} We need Negro teachers for the Negro common schools, and we need first-class normal schools and colleges to train them. This is the work of higher Negro education and it must be done.

Further than this, after being provided with group leaders of civilization, and a foundation of intelligence in the public schools, the carpenter, in order to be a man, needs technical skill. This calls for trade schools. Now trade schools are not nearly such simple things as people once thought. The original idea was that the “Industrial” school was to furnish education, practically free, to those willing to work for it; it was to “do” things—i.e.: become a center of productive industry, it was to be partially, if not wholly, self-supporting, and it was to teach trades. Admirable as were some of the ideas underlying this scheme, the whole thing simply would not work in practice; it was found that if you were to use time and material to teach trades thoroughly, you could not at the same time keep the industries on a commercial basis and make them pay. Many schools started out to do this on a large scale and went into virtual bankruptcy. Moreover, it was found also that it was possible to teach a boy a trade mechanically, without giving him the full educative benefit of the process, and, vice versa, that there was a distinctive educative value in teaching a boy to use his hands and eyes in carrying out certain physical processes, even though he did not actually learn a trade. It has happened, therefore, in the last decade, that a noticeable change has come over the industrial schools. In the first place the idea of commercially remunerative industry in a school is being pushed rapidly to the background. There are still schools with shops and farms that bring an income, and schools that use student labor partially for the erection of their buildings and the furnishing of equipment. It is coming to be seen, however, in the education of the Negro, as clearly as it has been seen in the education of the youths the world over, that it is the boy and not the material product, that is the true object of education. Consequently the object of the industrial school came to be the thorough training of boys regardless of the cost of the training, so long as it was thoroughly well done.
Even at this point, however, the difficulties were not surmounted. In the first place modern industry has taken great strides since the war, and the teaching of trades is no longer a simple matter. Machinery and long processes of work have greatly changed the work of the carpenter, the ironworker and the shoemaker. A really efficient workman must be to-day an intelligent man who has had good technical training in addition to thorough common school, and perhaps even higher training. To meet this situation the industrial schools began a further development; they established distinct Trade Schools for the thorough training of better class artisans, and at the same time they sought to preserve for the purposes of general education, such of the simpler processes of elementary trade learning as were best suited therefor. In this differentiation of the Trade School and manual training, the best of the industrial schools simply followed the plain trend of the present educational epoch. A prominent educator tells us that, in Sweden, “In the beginning the economic conception was generally adopted, and everywhere manual training was looked upon as a means of preparing the children of the common people to earn their living. But gradually it came to be recognized that manual training has a more elevated purpose, and one, indeed, more useful in the deeper meaning of the term. It came to be considered as an educative process for the complete moral, physical and intellectual development of the child.”

Thus, again, in the manning of trade schools and manual training schools we are thrown back upon the higher training as its source and chief support. There was a time when any aged and wornout carpenter could teach in a trade school. But not so to-day. Indeed the demand for college-bred men by a school like Tuskegee, ought to make Mr. Booker T. Washington the firmest friend of higher training. Here he has as helpers the son of a Negro senator, trained in Greek and the humanities, and graduated at Harvard; the son of a Negro congressman and lawyer, trained in Latin and mathematics, and graduated at Oberlin; he has as his wife, a woman who read Virgil and Homer in the same class room with me; he has as college chaplain, a classical graduate of Atlanta University; as teacher of science, a graduate of Fisk; as teacher of history, a graduate of Smith,—indeed some thirty of his chief teachers are college graduates, and instead of studying French grammars in the midst of weeds, or buying pianos for dirty cabins, they are at Mr. Washington’s right hand helping him in a noble work. And yet one of
the effects of Mr. Washington’s propaganda has been to throw doubt upon the expediency of such training for Negroes, as these persons have had.

Men of America, the problem is plain before you. Here is a race transplanted through the criminal foolishness of your fathers. Whether you like it or not the millions are here, and here they will remain. If you do not lift them up, they will pull you down. Education and work are the levers to uplift a people. Work alone will not do it unless inspired by the right ideals and guided by intelligence. Education must not simply teach work—it must teach Life. The Talented Tenth of the Negro race must be made leaders of thought and missionaries of culture among their people. No others can do this work and Negro colleges must train men for it. The Negro race, like all other races, is going to be saved by its exceptional men.
WOODROW WILSON

War Message to Congress

SPEECH

April 2, 1917
United States Congress | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

Although World War I began in mid-1914, the United States did not initially join the conflict, with President Woodrow Wilson opting instead to pursue neutrality. However, the 1915 sinking of the Lusitania and the 1917 resumption of unrestricted submarine warfare by Germany eventually drove the United States to side with the Allied Powers. Wilson gave this speech to a joint session of Congress in the latter year, advocating for a formal declaration of war against Germany and the Central Powers, but also explaining his radically different reasons for the United States’ fighting in the war.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What policy is not “constitutionally permissible” for Wilson to enact alone?
2. What is his primary grievance against Germany?
3. Why does Wilson advocate for joining World War I?
4. How does he say America should materially fight the war?
5. What does Wilson say are America’s objectives in fighting World War I?

Gentlemen of the Congress:

I have called the Congress into extraordinary session because there are serious, very serious, choices of policy to be made, and made immediately, which it was neither right nor constitutionally permissible that I should assume the responsibility of making.

On the third of February last I officially laid before you the extraordinary announcement of the Imperial German Government that on and after the first day of February it was its purpose to put aside all restraints of law or of humanity and use its submarines to sink every vessel that sought to approach either the ports of Great Britain and Ireland or the western coasts of Europe or any of the ports controlled by the enemies of Germany within the Mediterranean. That had seemed to be the object of the German submarine warfare earlier in the war, but since April of last year the Imperial Government had somewhat restrained the commanders of its undersea craft in conformity with its promise then given to us that passenger boats should not be sunk and that due warning would be given to all other vessels which its submarines might seek to destroy when no resistance was offered or escape attempted, and care taken that their crews were given at least a fair chance to save their lives in their open boats. The precautions taken were meager and haphazard enough, as was proved in distressing instance after instance in the progress of the cruel and unmanly business, but a certain degree of restraint was observed. The new policy has swept every restriction aside. Vessels of every kind, whatever their flag, their character, their cargo, their destination, their errand, have been ruthlessly sent to the bottom: without warning and without thought of help or mercy for those on board, the vessels of friendly neutrals along with those of belligerents. Even hospital ships and ships carrying relief to the sorely bereaved and stricken people of Belgium, though the latter were provided with safe conduct through the proscribed areas by the German Government itself and were distinguished by unmistakable marks of identity, have been sunk with the same reckless lack of compassion or of principle. I was for a little while unable to believe that such things would in fact be done by any government that had hitherto subscribed to the humane practices of civilized nations. International law had its origin in the attempt to set up some law which would be respected and observed upon the seas, where no nation had
right of dominion and where lay the free highways of the world. … This minimum of right the German Government has swept aside under the plea of retaliation and necessity and because it had no weapons which it could use at sea except these which it is impossible to employ as it is employing them without throwing to the winds all scruples of humanity or of respect for the understandings that were supposed to underlie the intercourse of the world. I am not now thinking of the loss of property involved, immense and serious as that is, but only of the wanton and wholesale destruction of the lives of noncombatants, men, women, and children, engaged in pursuits which have always, even in the darkest periods of modern history, been deemed innocent and legitimate. Property can be paid for; the lives of peaceful and innocent people cannot be. The present German submarine warfare against commerce is a warfare against mankind.

It is a war against all nations. American ships have been sunk, American lives taken, in ways which it has stirred us very deeply to learn of, but the ships and people of other neutral and friendly nations have been sunk and overwhelmed in the waters in the same way. There has been no discrimination. The challenge is to all mankind. Each nation must decide for itself how it will meet it. The choice we make for ourselves must be made with a moderation of counsel and a temperateness of judgment befitting our character and our motives as a nation. We must put excited feeling away. Our motive will not be revenge or the victorious assertion of the physical might of the nation, but only the vindication of right, of human right, of which we are only a single champion.

When I addressed the Congress on the twenty-sixth of February last I thought that it would suffice to assert our neutral rights with arms, our right to use the seas against unlawful interference, our right to keep our people safe against unlawful violence. But armed neutrality, it now appears, is impracticable. Because submarines are in effect outlaws when used as the German submarines have been used against merchant shipping, it is impossible to defend ships against their attacks as the law of nations has assumed that merchantmen would defend themselves against privateers or cruisers, visible craft giving chase upon the open sea. It is common prudence in such circumstances, grim necessity indeed, to endeavor to destroy them before they have
shown their own intention. They must be dealt with upon sight, if dealt with at all. The German Government denies the right of neutrals to use arms at all within the areas of the sea which it has proscribed, even in the defense of rights which no modern publicist has ever before questioned their right to defend. The intimation is conveyed that the armed guards which we have placed on our merchant ships will be treated as beyond the pale of law and subject to be dealt with as pirates would be. Armed neutrality is ineffectual enough at best; in such circumstances and in the face of such pretensions it is worse than ineffectual: it is likely only to produce what it was meant to prevent; it is practically certain to draw us into the war without either the rights or the effectiveness of belligerents. There is one choice we cannot make, we are incapable of making: we will not choose the path of submission and suffer the most sacred rights of our Nation and our people to be ignored or violated. The wrongs against which we now array ourselves are no common wrongs; they cut to the very roots of human life.

With a profound sense of the solemn and even tragical character of the step I am taking and of the grave responsibilities which it involves, but in unhesitating obedience to what I deem my constitutional duty, I advise that the Congress declare the recent course of the Imperial German Government to be in fact nothing less than war against the government and people of the United States; that it formally accept the status of belligerent which has thus been thrust upon it, and that it take immediate steps not only to put the country in a more thorough state of defense but also to exert all its power and employ all its resources to bring the Government of the German Empire to terms and end the war.

What this will involve is clear. It will involve the utmost practicable cooperation in counsel and action with the governments now at war with Germany, and, as incident to that, the extension to those governments of the most liberal financial credit, in order that our resources may so far as possible be added to theirs. It will involve the organization and mobilization of all the material resources of the country to supply the materials of war and serve the incidental needs of the Nation in the most abundant and yet the most economical and efficient way possible. It will involve the immediate full equipment of the navy in all respects but particularly in supplying it with the best means of dealing with the enemy’s submarines. It will involve the immediate addition
to the armed forces of the United States already provided for by law in case of war at least five hundred thousand men, who should, in my opinion, be chosen upon the principle of universal liability to service, and also the authorization of subsequent additional increments of equal force so soon as they may be needed and can be handled in training. It will involve also, of course, the granting of adequate credits to the Government, sustained, I hope, so far as they can equitably be sustained by the present generation, by well conceived taxation. I say sustained so far as may be equitable by taxation because it seems to me that it would be most unwise to base the credits which will now be necessary entirely on money borrowed. It is our duty, I most respectfully urge, to protect our people so far as we may against the very serious hardships and evils which would be likely to arise out of the inflation which would be produced by vast loans.

In carrying out the measures by which these things are to be accomplished we should keep constantly in mind the wisdom of interfering as little as possible in our own preparation and in the equipment of our own military forces with the duty—for it will be a very practical duty—of supplying the nations already at war with Germany with the materials which they can obtain only from us or by our assistance. They are in the field and we should help them in every way to be effective there.

I shall take the liberty of suggesting, through the several executive departments of the Government, for the consideration of your committees, measures for the accomplishment of the several objects I have mentioned. I hope that it will be your pleasure to deal with them as having been framed after very careful thought by the branch of the Government upon which the responsibility of conducting the war and safeguarding the Nation will most directly fall.

While we do these things, these deeply momentous things, let us be very clear, and make very clear to all the world what our motives and our objects are. My own thought has not been driven from its habitual and normal course by the unhappy events of the last two months, and I do not believe that the thought of the Nation has been altered or clouded by them. I have exactly the same things in mind now that I had in mind.
when I addressed the Senate on the twenty—second of January last, the same that I had in mind when I addressed the Congress on the third of February and on the twenty-sixth of February. Our object now, as then, is to vindicate the principles of peace and justice in the life of the world as against selfish and autocratic power and to set up amongst the really free and selfgoverned peoples of the world such a concert of purpose and of action as will henceforth insure the observance of those principles Neutrality is no longer feasible or desirable where the peace of the world is involved and the freedom of its peoples, and the menace to that peace and freedom lies in the existence of autocratic governments backed by organized force which is controlled wholly by their will, not by the will of their people. We have seen the last of neutrality in such circumstances. We are at the beginning of an age in which it will be insisted that the same standards of conduct and of responsibility for wrong done shall be observed among nations and their governments that are observed among the individual citizens of civilized states.

We have no quarrel with the German people. We have no feeling towards them but one of sympathy and friendship. It was not upon their impulse that their government acted in entering this war. It was not with their previous knowledge or approval. It was a war determined upon as wars used to be determined upon in the old, unhappy days when peoples were nowhere consulted by their rulers and wars were provoked and waged in the interest of dynasties or of little groups of ambitious men who were accustomed to use their fellow men as pawns and tools.

Selfgoverned nations do not fill their neighbor states with spies or set the course of intrigue to bring about some critical posture of affairs which will give them an opportunity to strike and make conquest. Such designs can be successfully worked out only under cover and where no one has the right to ask questions. Cunningly contrived plans of deception or aggression, carried, it may be, from generation to generation, can be worked out and kept from the light only within the privacy of courts or behind the carefully guarded confidences of a narrow and privileged class. They are happily impossible where public opinion commands and insists upon full information concerning all the nation’s affairs.
A steadfast concert for peace can never be maintained except by a partnership of democratic nations. No autocratic government could be trusted to keep faith within it or observe its covenants. It must be a league of honor, a partnership of opinion. Intrigue would eat its vitals away; the plottings of inner circles who could plan what they would and render account to no one would be a corruption seated at its very heart. Only free peoples can hold their purpose and their honor steady to a common end and prefer the interests of mankind to any narrow interest of their own.

Does not every American feel that assurance has been added to our hope for the future peace of the world by the wonderful and heartening things that have been happening within the last few weeks in Russia? Russia was known by those who knew it best to have been always in fact democratic at heart, in all the vital habits of her thought, in all the intimate relationships of her people that spoke their natural instinct, their habitual attitude towards life. The autocracy that crowned the summit of her political structure, long as it had stood and terrible as was the reality of its power, was not in fact Russian in origin, character, or purpose; and now it has been shaken off and the great, generous Russian people have been added in all their naive majesty and might to the forces that are fighting for freedom in the world, for justice, and for peace. Here is a fit partner for a League of Honor.

One of the things that has served to convince us that the Prussian, autocracy was not and could never be our friend is that from the very outset of the present war it has filled our unsuspecting communities and even our offices of government with spies and set criminal intrigues everywhere afoot against our national unity of counsel, our peace. Within and without, our industries and our commerce. Indeed it is now evident that its spies were here even before the war began; and it is unhappily not a matter of conjecture but a fact proved in our courts of justice that the intrigues which have more than once come perilously near to disturbing the peace and dislocating the industries of the country have been carried on at the instigation, with the support, and even under the personal direction of official agents of the Imperial Government accredited to the Government of the United States. Even in checking these things and trying to extirpate
them we have sought to put the most generous interpretation possible upon them because we knew that their source lay, not in any hostile feeling or purpose of the German people towards us (who were, no doubt, as ignorant of them as we ourselves were), but only in the selfish designs of a Government that did what it pleased and told its people nothing. But they have played their part in serving to convince us at last that that Government entertains no real friendship for us and means to act against our peace and security at its convenience. That it means to stir up enemies against us at our very doors the intercepted note to the German Minister at Mexico City is eloquent evidence.

We are accepting this challenge of hostile purpose because we know that in such a Government, following such methods, we can never have a friend; and that in the presence of its organized power, always lying in wait to accomplish we know not what purpose, there can be no assured security for the democratic Governments of the world. We are now about to accept gauge of battle with this natural foe to liberty and shall, if necessary, spend the whole force of the nation to check and nullify its pretensions and its power. We are glad, now that we see the facts with no veil of false pretense about them to fight thus for the ultimate peace of the world and for the liberation of its peoples, the German peoples included: for the rights of nations great and small and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of life and of obedience. The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty. We have no selfish ends to serve.

We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make. We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind. We shall be satisfied when those rights have been made as secure as the faith and the freedom of nations can make them. Just because we fight without rancor and without selfish object, seeking nothing for ourselves but what we shall wish to share with all free peoples, we shall, I feel confident, conduct our operations as belligerents without passion and ourselves observe with proud punctilio the principles of right and of fair play we profess to be fighting for.
I have said nothing of the Governments allied with the Imperial Government of Germany because they have not made war upon us or challenged us to defend our right and our honor. The Austro-Hungarian Government has, indeed, avowed its unqualified endorsement and acceptance of the reckless and lawless submarine warfare adopted now without disguise by the Imperial German Government, and it has therefore not been possible for this Government to receive Count Tarnowski, the Ambassador recently accredited to this Government by the Imperial and Royal Government of Austria-Hungary; but that Government has not actually engaged in warfare against citizens of the United States on the seas, and I take the liberty, for the present at least, of postponing a discussion of our relations with the authorities at Vienna. We enter this war only where we are clearly forced into it because there are no other means of defending our rights.

It will be all the easier for us to conduct ourselves as belligerents in a high spirit of right and fairness because we act without animus, not in enmity towards a people or with the desire to bring any injury or disadvantage upon them, but only in armed opposition to an irresponsible government which has thrown aside all considerations of humanity and of right and is running amuck. We are, let me say again, the sincere friends of the German people, and shall desire nothing so much as the early reestablishment of intimate relations of mutual advantage between us, — however hard it may be for them, for the time being, to believe that this is spoken from our hearts. We have borne with their present Government through all these bitter months because of that friendship, —exercising a patience and forbearance which would otherwise have been impossible. We shall, happily, still have an opportunity to prove that friendship in our daily attitude and actions towards the millions of men and women of German birth and native sympathy who live amongst us and share our life, and we shall be proud to prove it towards all who are in fact loyal to their neighbors and to the Government in the hour of test. They are, most of them, as true and loyal Americans as if they had never known any other fealty or allegiance. They will be prompt to stand with us in rebuking and restraining the few who may be of a different mind and purpose. If there should be disloyalty, it will be dealt with a firm hand of stern repression; but, if it lifts its head at
all, it will lift it only here and there and without countenance except from a lawless and malignant few.

It is a distressing and oppressive duty, Gentlemen of the Congress, which I have performed in thus addressing you. There are, it may be many months of fiery trial and sacrifice ahead of us. It is a fearful thing to lead this great peaceful people into war, into the most terrible and disastrous of all wars, civilization itself seeming to be in the balance.

But the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts,—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own Governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free. To such a task we can dedicate our lives and our fortunes, every thing that we are and everything that we have, with the pride of those who know that the day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace which she has treasured. God helping her, she can do no other.
WOODROW WILSON

Fourteen Points

SPEECH

January 8, 1918

United States Congress | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

With the United States’ entry into World War I in April 1917, the stalemate in Europe was finally broken, and the Allies at last defeated the Central Powers in November 1918. However, President Woodrow Wilson—motivated by his Progressive political philosophy—sought to make the subsequent peace lasting and beneficial for the world as a whole. This speech, delivered before a joint session of Congress prior to the war’s end, saw Wilson outline his vision of the terms of peace, and how the world would be better for accepting them.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What event does Wilson cite as a key development in the war effort?

2. What was the purpose of the war, according to him?

3. Why does Wilson suggest his plan for peace should be followed by other nations above all others?

4. What are the titular “Fourteen Points” he gives?

5. How does Wilson view the defeated Germany?

Gentlemen of the Congress, —

Once more, as repeatedly before, the spokesmen of the Central Empires have indicated their desire to discuss the objects of the war and the possible basis of a general peace. Parleys have been in progress at Brest-Litovsk between representatives of the Central Powers to which the attention of all the belligerents has been invited for the purpose of ascertaining whether it may be possible to extend these parleys into a general conference with regard to terms of peace and settlement.

The Russian representatives presented not only a perfectly definite statement of the principles upon which they would be willing to conclude peace, but also an equally definite program of the concrete application of those principles. The representatives of the Central Powers, on their part, presented an outline of settlement which, if much less definite, seemed susceptible of liberal interpretation until their specific program of practical terms was added. That program proposed no concessions at all either to the sovereignty of Russia or to the preferences of the populations with whose fortunes it dealt, but meant, in a word, that the Central Empires were to keep every foot of territory their armed forces had occupied, — every province, every city, every point of vantage, — as a permanent addition to their territories and their power. It is a reasonable conjecture that the general principles of settlement which they at first suggested originated with the more liberal statesmen of Germany and Austria, the men who have begun to feel the force of their own peoples’ thought and purpose, while the concrete terms of actual settlement came from the military leaders who have no thought but to keep what they have got. The negotiations have been broken off. The Russian representatives were sincere and in earnest. They cannot entertain such proposals of conquest and domination.

The whole incident is full of significance. It is also full of perplexity. With whom are the Russian representatives dealing? For whom are the representatives of the Central Empires speaking? Are they speaking for the majorities of their respective parliaments or for the minority parties, that military and imperialistic minority which has so far dominated their whole policy and controlled the affairs of Turkey and of the Balkan
states which have felt obliged to become their associates in this war? The Russian representatives have insisted, very justly, very wisely, and in the true spirit of modern democracy, that the conferences they have been holding with the Teutonic and Turkish statesmen should be held within open, not closed doors, and all the world has been audience, as was desired.

To whom have we been listening, then? To those who speak the spirit and intention of the Resolutions of the German Reichstag on the 9th of July last, the spirit and intention of the liberal leaders and parties of Germany, or to those who resist and defy that spirit and intention and insist upon conquest and subjugation? Or are we listening, in fact, to both, unreconciled and in open and hopeless contradiction? These are very serious and pregnant questions. Upon the answer to them depends the peace of the world. But, whatever the results of the parleys at Brest-Litovsk, whatever the confusions of counsel and of purpose in the utterances of the spokesmen of the Central Empires, they have again attempted to acquaint the world with their objects in the war and have again challenged their adversaries to say what their objects are and what sort of settlement they would deem just and satisfactory. There is no good reason why that challenge should not be responded to, and responded to with the utmost candor. We did not wait for it. Not once, but again and again, we have laid our whole thought and purpose before the world, not in general terms only, but each time with sufficient definition to make it clear what sort of definitive terms of settlement must necessarily spring out of them.

Within the last week Mr. Lloyd George has spoken with admirable candor and in admirable spirit for the people and Government of Great Britain. There is no confusion of counsel among the adversaries of the Central Powers, no uncertainty of principle, no vagueness of detail. The only secrecy of counsel, the only lack of fearless frankness, the only failure to make definite statement of the objects of the war, lies with Germany and her Allies. The issues of life and death hang upon these definitions. No statesman who has the least conception of his responsibility ought for a moment to permit himself to continue this tragical and appalling outpouring of blood and treasure unless he is sure beyond a peradventure that the objects of the vital sacrifice are part and parcel of
the very life of Society and that the people for whom he speaks think them right and imperative as he does.

There is, moreover, a voice calling for these definitions of principle and of purpose which is, it seems to me, more thrilling and more compelling than any of the many moving voices with which the troubled air of the world is filled. It is the voice of the Russian people. They are prostrate and all but helpless, it would seem, before the grim power of Germany, which has hitherto known no relenting and no pity. Their power, apparently, is shattered. And yet their soul is not subservient. They will not yield either in principle or in action. Their conception of what is right, of what is humane and honorable for them to accept, has been stated with a frankness, a largeness of view, a generosity of spirit, and a universal human sympathy which must challenge the admiration of every friend of mankind; and they have refused to compound their ideals or desert others that they themselves may be safe.

They call to us to say what it is that we desire, — in what, if in anything, our purpose and our spirit differ from theirs; and I believe that the people of the United States would wish me to respond, with utter simplicity and frankness. Whether their present leaders believe it or not, it is our heartfelt desire and hope that some way may be opened whereby we may be privileged to assist the people of Russia to attain their utmost hope of liberty and ordered peace.

It will be our wish and purpose that the processes of peace, when they are begun, shall be absolutely open and that they shall involve and permit henceforth no secret understandings of any kind. The day of conquest and aggrandizement is gone by; so is also the day of secret covenants entered into in the interest of particular governments and likely at some unlooked-for moment to upset the peace of the world. It is this happy fact, now clear to the view of every public man whose thoughts do not still linger in an age that is dead and gone, which makes it possible for every nation whose purposes are consistent with justice and the peace of the world to avow now or at any other time the objects it has in view.
We entered this war because violations of right had occurred which touched us to the quick and made the life of our own people impossible unless they were corrected and the world secured once for all against their recurrence. What we demand in this war, therefore, is nothing peculiar to ourselves. It is that the world be made fit and safe to live in; and particularly that it be made safe for every peace-loving nation which, like our own, wishes to live its own life, determine its own institutions, be assured of justice and fair dealing by the other peoples of the world as against force and selfish aggression. All the peoples of the world are in effect partners in this interest, and for our own part we see very clearly that unless justice be done to others it will not be done to us.

The program of the world's peace, therefore, is our program; and that program, the only possible program, as we see it, is this:

1. Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.

2. Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas, outside territorial waters, alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants.

3. The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance.

4. Adequate guarantees given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety.

5. A free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims, based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty the interests of the populations concerned must have equal weight with the equitable claims of the government whose title is to be determined.
6. The evacuation of all Russian territory and such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia as will secure the best and freest cooperation of the other nations of the world in obtaining for her an unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development and national policy and assure her of a sincere welcome into the society of free nations under institutions of her own choosing; and, more than a welcome, assistance also of every kind that she may need and may herself desire. The treatment accorded Russia by her sister nations in the months to come will be the acid test of their good will, of their comprehension of her needs as distinguished from their own interests, and of their intelligent and unselfish sympathy.

7. Belgium, the whole world will agree, must be evacuated and restored, without any attempt to limit the sovereignty which she enjoys in common with all other free nations. No other single act will serve as this will serve to restore confidence among the nations in the laws which they have themselves set and determined for the government of their relations with one another. Without this healing act the whole structure and validity of international law is forever impaired.

8. All French territory should be freed and the invaded portions restored, and the wrong done to France by Prussia in 1871 in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine, which has unsettled the peace of the world for nearly fifty years, should be righted, in order that peace may once more be made secure in the interests of all.

9. A readjustment of the frontiers of Italy should be effected along clearly recognizable lines of nationality.

10. The peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development.

11. Rumania, Serbia, and Montenegro should be evacuated; occupied territories restored; Serbia accorded free and secure access to the sea; and the relations of the several Balkan states to one another determined by friendly counsel along
historically established lines of allegiance and nationality; and international guarantees of the political and economic independence and territorial integrity of the several Balkan states should be entered into.

12. The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development, and the Dardanelles should be permanently opened as a free passage to the ships and commerce of all nations under international guarantees.

13. An independent Polish state should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations, which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant.

14. A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike.

In regard to these essential rectifications of wrong and assertions of right we feel ourselves to be intimate partners of all the governments and peoples associated together against the Imperialists. We cannot be separated in interest or divided in purpose. We stand together until the end.

For such arrangements and covenants we are willing to fight and to continue to fight until they are achieved; but only because we wish the right to prevail and desire a just and stable peace such as can be secured only by removing the chief provocations to war, which this program does remove. We have no jealousy of German greatness, and there is nothing in this program that impairs it. We grudge her no achievement or distinction of learning or of pacific enterprise, such as have made her record very bright and very enviable. We do not wish to injure her or to block in any way her legitimate influence or power. We do not wish to fight her either with arms or with hostile
arrangements of trade if she is willing to associate herself with us and the other peace-loving nations of the world in covenants of justice and law and fair dealing. We wish her only to accept a place of equality among the peoples of the world, — the new world in which we now live, — instead of a place of mastery.

Neither do we presume to suggest to her any alteration or modification of her institutions. But it is necessary, we must frankly say, and necessary as a preliminary to any intelligent dealings with her on our part, that we should know whom her spokesmen speak for when they speak to us, whether for the Reichstag majority or for the military party and the men whose creed is imperial domination.

We have spoken now, surely, in terms too concrete to admit of any further doubt or question. An evident principle runs through the whole program I have outlined. It is the principle of justice to all peoples and nationalities, and their right to live on equal terms of liberty and safety with one another, whether they be strong or weak.

Unless this principle be made its foundation no part of the structure of international justice can stand. The people of the United States could act upon no other principle; and to the vindication of this principle they are ready to devote their lives, their honor, and everything they possess. The moral climax of this the culminating and final war for human liberty has come, and they are ready to put their own strength, their own highest purpose, their own integrity and devotion to the test.
Mr. President:

The independence of the United States is not only more precious to ourselves but to the world than any single possession. Look at the United States today. We have made mistakes in the past. We have had shortcomings. We shall make mistakes in the future and fall short of our own best hopes. But none the less is there any country today on the face of the earth which can compare with this in ordered liberty, in peace, and in the largest freedom?

I feel that I can say this without being accused of undue boastfulness, for it is the simple fact, and in making this treaty and taking on these obligations[,] all that we do is in a spirit of unselfishness and in a desire for the good of mankind. But it is well to remember that we are dealing with nations[,] every one of which has a direct individual interest to serve, and there is grave danger in an unshared idealism.

Contrast the United States with any country on the face of the earth today and ask yourself whether the situation of the United States is not the best to be found. I will go as far as anyone in world service, but the first step to world service is the maintenance of the United States.

I have always loved one flag and I cannot share that devotion [with] a mongrel banner created for a League.

You may call me selfish if you will, conservative or reactionary, or use any other harsh adjective you see fit to apply, but an American I was born, an American I have remained all my life. I can never be anything else but an American, and I must think of the United States first, and when I think of the United States first in an arrangement like this I am thinking of what is best for the world, for if the United States fails, the best hopes of mankind fail with it.

I have never had but one allegiance - I cannot divide it now. I have loved but one flag and I cannot share that devotion and give affection to the mongrel banner invented for a
league. Internationalism, illustrated by the Bolshevik and by the men to whom all countries are alike provided they can make money out of them, is to me repulsive.

National I must remain, and in that way I like all other Americans can render the ampest service to the world. The United States is the world’s best hope, but if you fetter her in the interests and quarrels of other nations, if you tangle her in the intrigues of Europe, you will destroy her power for good and endanger her very existence. Leave her to march freely through the centuries to come as in the years that have gone.

Strong, generous, and confident, she has nobly served mankind. Beware how you trifle with your marvellous inheritance, this great land of ordered liberty, for if we stumble and fall freedom and civilization everywhere will go down in ruin.

We are told that we shall ‘break the heart of the world’ if we do not take this league just as it stands. I fear that the hearts of the vast majority of mankind would beat on strongly and steadily and without any quickening if the league were to perish altogether. If it should be effectively and beneficently changed the people who would lie awake in sorrow for a single night could be easily gathered in one not very large room but those who would draw a long breath of relief would reach to millions.

We hear much of visions and I trust we shall continue to have visions and dream dreams of a fairer future for the race. But visions are one thing and visionaries are another, and the mechanical appliances of the rhetorician designed to give a picture of a present which does not exist and of a future which no man can predict are as unreal and short-lived as the steam or canvas clouds, the angels suspended on wires[,] and the artificial lights of the stage.

They pass with the moment of effect and are shabby and tawdry in the daylight. Let us at least be real. Washington’s entire honesty of mind and his fearless look into the face of all facts are qualities which can never go out of fashion and which we should all do well to imitate.
Ideals have been thrust upon us as an argument for the league until the healthy mind which rejects cant revolts from them. Are ideals confined to this deformed experiment upon a noble purpose, tainted, as it is, with bargains and tied to a peace treaty which might have been disposed of long ago to the great benefit of the world if it had not been compelled to carry this rider on its back? ‘Post equitem sedet atra cura {Behind the rider sits a black care},’ Horace tells us, but no blacker care ever sat behind any rider than we shall find in this covenant of doubtful and disputed interpretation as it now perches upon the treaty of peace.

No doubt many excellent and patriotic people see a coming fulfillment of noble ideals in the words ‘league for peace.’ We all respect and share these aspirations and desires, but some of us see no hope, but rather defeat, for them in this murky covenant. For we, too, have our ideals, even if we differ from those who have tried to establish a monopoly of idealism.

Our first ideal is our country, and we see her in the future, as in the past, giving service to all her people and to the world. Our ideal of the future is that she should continue to render that service of her own free will. She has great problems of her own to solve, very grim and perilous problems, and a right solution, if we can attain to it, would largely benefit mankind.

We would have our country strong to resist a peril from the West, as she has flung back the German menace from the East. We would not have our politics distracted and embittered by the dissensions of other lands. We would not have our country’s vigour exhausted or her moral force abated, by everlasting meddling and muddling in every quarrel, great and small, which afflicts the world.

Our ideal is to make her ever stronger and better and finer, because in that way alone, as we believe, can she be of the greatest service to the world’s peace and to the welfare of mankind.
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Why Teach the Interwar Years and World War II

The “war to end all wars” did not live up to its name. Although during the 1920s the United States enjoyed a decade of economic prosperity, the rest of the world endured an uneasy peace marked by portents of future tumult and anxiety. Then Americans would suffer their own crash and a Great Depression that changed American government and economics in ways that broke sharply with the American founding. In retrospect, the Second World War seemed inevitable. The world was hurled into the greatest age of bloodshed known to man, a brutal rebuke to those who imagined that the world was reaching its zenith of enlightenment. But it is miraculous that America, despite the many great upheavals and pressures she faced, largely stood firm in the face of a totalitarian conquest of the world. Students need to grasp what was at
stake in this great conflict and why the key role played by the United States should be a point of enduring pride for all Americans. The totalitarian regimes sought to annihilate the very principles on which human freedom and dignity were founded. It was for these principles, and the way of life to which they gave rise, that Americans sacrificed, and died, and saved the world.

Enduring Ideas from This Unit

1. The 1920s were a decade not only of prosperity and of cultural change but also of a renewal of the principles and practice of limited government that had waned during the Progressive Era.
2. The stock market crash and the Great Depression were predictable economic consequences of normal economic forces exacerbated by government actions.
3. The Roosevelt administration and the New Deal brought much-needed encouragement to Americans living through hardship, while also transforming the size, scope, and power of government in unprecedented ways.
4. World War II was the bloodiest war in human history and demonstrated the potential of new philosophies and technologies to unleash untold horrors.
5. The United States took up the cause of the heroic British and saved civilization from a modern barbarism that trampled on the truth of each person’s inherent dignity.

What Teachers Should Consider

While the Progressive Era had critiqued some of America’s founding ideas—particularly about government, economics, and human nature—the underlying moral philosophy of the Progressives was largely the same as that held by the founders. The Harding and Coolidge administrations preserved that continuity while dialing back the expansion of government under the Progressives and reasserting principles of limited self-government and the free market. The Roaring Twenties witnessed exceptional prosperity for many, and with this affluence came novel cultural norms, at least for America’s well-to-do. For most of the rest, the cultural changes were far less dramatic, and the difficult conditions of farmers and others dependent upon the agricultural economy during the twenties should not be forgotten. Overall, however, life was comfortable, and the standard of living continued to rise.

The second quarter of the twentieth century, however, saw America torn between her founding principles and new ideas that argued those principles were largely outdated. With the Great Depression, a combination of economic forces and unfortunate government actions sank the American and world economies into a decade-long quagmire.

The response in the United States was the New Deal. American society was buoyed by Franklin D. Roosevelt’s personality and his unprecedented expansion of government, even though the actual economic effectiveness of these efforts would elicit questions over time. What is certain is this: expansion and its many programs would change American government and economics, marking a decisive contrast with America’s founding ideas.
Elsewhere in the world, ideologies arose that concentrated on dividing people into groups based on class or race. In trampling on the natural rights of millions of individuals, these totalitarian ideologues rejected America’s founding principles, especially the view of the dignity of the human person and the dangers of concentrated power. This assault on principle had its counterpart in the horrendous machines of war that swept through Europe, North Africa, and the Pacific. The world found itself on the cusp of global tyranny, with evil powers aligned against all that the American experiment in self-government had stood for. Americans rose to meet the challenge and to distinguish their country yet again by their commitment to enduring and timeless truths.

How Teachers Can Learn More

TEXTS

New World Coming, Nathan Miller
The Forgotten Man, Amity Shlaes
Freedom from Fear, David Kennedy
Three New Deals, Wolfgang Schivelbusch
From Isolation to War: 1931–1941, Justus Doenecke
The Second World War, Martin Gilbert
The Second World Wars, Victor Davis Hanson
To Hell and Back, Ian Kershaw
American Heritage: A Reader, ed. Hillsdale College History Faculty

ONLINE COURSES | Online.Hillsdale.edu

The Great American Story
American Heritage
Constitution 101
Constitution 201
The Second World Wars

Lesson Planning Resources

TEACHER RESOURCES

A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope, Wilfred McClay and John McBride
A Student Workbook for Land of Hope, Wilfred McClay and John McBride
A Short History of World War II, James Stokesbury

STUDENT RESOURCES

Land of Hope, Wilfred McClay
PRIMARY SOURCES

“The Inspiration of the Declaration of Independence,” Calvin Coolidge
Commonwealth Club address, Franklin Roosevelt
First inaugural address, Franklin Roosevelt
Democratic Convention address, 1936, Franklin Roosevelt
“The Conservative Manifesto,” Josiah Bailey
“The Dominant Dogma of the Age,” Walter Lippmann
Annual Message to Congress, 1944, Franklin Roosevelt
“Fifty Years Hence,” Winston Churchill
Fireside chat on National Security, Franklin Roosevelt
Annual Message to Congress, 1941, Franklin Roosevelt
Atlantic Charter, Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill
LESSON PLANS, ASSIGNMENTS, AND QUIZZES
Lesson 1 — The Roaring Twenties

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the prosperity that much of America produced and enjoyed during the 1920s, the presidency of Calvin Coolidge, and the cultural transformations that followed America’s victory in the Great War.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
- *Land of Hope* Pages 276–294
- Primary Sources See below.

Teacher Texts
- *A Student Workbook for Land of Hope* Pages 166–170

Online.Hillsdale.edu
- *The Great American Story* Lecture 17

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students read *Land of Hope*, pages 276–286, and either complete the reading questions handout in *A Student Workbook for Land of Hope* (pages 166–168) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 2: Students read *Land of Hope*, pages 286–294, and either complete the reading questions handout in *A Student Workbook for Land of Hope* (pages 168–170) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 3: Students read and annotate Calvin Coolidge’s “The Inspiration of the Declaration of Independence,” and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography and Places
- New York City
- Greenwich Village
- Detroit
- Harlem
- Tulsa
- Greenwood district
Persons
Woodrow Wilson  F. Scott Fitzgerald
Carrie Nation  Al Capone
Susan B. Anthony  William Jennings Bryan
Joseph Stalin  Norman Rockwell
Warren G. Harding  Andrew Wyeth
Andrew Mellon  Frank Lloyd Wright
Calvin Coolidge  Robert Frost
Henry Ford  Irving Berlin
Babe Ruth  Louis Armstrong
Charlie Chaplin  Duke Ellington
Walt Disney  James Weldon Johnson
George Gershwin  Langston Hughes
Charles Lindbergh  Zora Neale Hurston

Terms and Topics
inflation  highways
Spanish Flu  refrigerator
Red Summer  long-term mortgage
18th Amendment  radio
Prohibition  motion pictures
19th Amendment  Hollywood
Russian Civil War  celebrities
Red Terror  advertising
Red Scare  organized crime
Mexican Revolution  flappers
immigration quota laws  fundamentalism
free market  Scopes Trial
laissez-faire  art deco
Great Migration  Empire State Building
Tulsa Massacre  Rhapsody in Blue
Teapot Dome Scandal  jazz
electricity  Harlem Renaissance
automobile
General Motors

Primary Sources
“The Inspiration of the Declaration of Independence,” Calvin Coolidge

To Know by Heart
“Perhaps one of the most important characteristics of my administration has been minding my own business.” —Calvin Coolidge
Timeline

1918–1921 Russian Civil War
1923 Warren G. Harding dies; Calvin Coolidge becomes president
1928 Herbert Hoover elected

Images

Historical figures and events
Cities affected by the Spanish Flu
Women’s suffrage movement
Painting of Calvin Coolidge being sworn in by his father
New inventions
Automobiles
Professional sporting events
First motion pictures
Bootleggers
Flappers
Upper class society
Art deco architecture and art
Cityscapes
Map of the Great Migration
Factories and workers
Jazz halls and musicians
Pictures from before and after the Tulsa Race Massacre

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Biographies and the roles of Susan B. Anthony, Warren G. Harding, and Calvin Coolidge
- Edith Wilson effectively governing the country after Woodrow Wilson’s stroke
- The Topeka Daily Capital on Carrie Nation in 1900
- The trial of Sacco and Vanzetti
- The death of Warren G. Harding in San Francisco
- Calvin Coolidge being sworn in by his father
- The New York Times’ 1927 account of a television broadcast
- Edwin James’s account of Charles Lindbergh’s arriving in Paris
- Paul Morand’s account of speakeasies in New York City
- The New York Times’ 1931 description of the Empire State Building

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- How did the Great War change America?
- What challenges did America face domestically following the Great War? Why?
- What were the arguments for Prohibition?
- What was the Russian Civil War about? Who won? Why?
- In the wake of the Great War, what was the main argument for why Congress ended limitless immigration to America?
- What did Warren G. Harding mean by a “return to normalcy”? 
- How might Warren G. Harding’s presidency be characterized?
- What economic policies did Warren G. Harding enact with respect to the economy? What was the result?
- Why did the Great Migration begin during the Great War and accelerate during the 1920s?
- What was life like in the Greenwood neighborhood of Tulsa, Oklahoma? What happened to it?
- How might Calvin Coolidge’s presidency be characterized?
- In what ways did Warren G. Harding and Calvin Coolidge offer an answer to the Progressives?
- What technological innovations were most responsible for transforming the pace and busyness of life for Americans during the 1920s?
- How was the 18th Amendment ineffective, and how did it undermine the rule of law?
- To what extent and in what ways did American culture change during the 1920s? Why?
- How universal were changes to American culture?
- What did Charles Lindbergh’s celebrity status reveal about the power of new communication technology and journalism?
- To what was Christian fundamentalism responding in the interwar years?
- How did art and architecture change in America following the Great War? What inspirations and principles shaped the artists who introduced these styles?
- How did American music change?
- How did jazz develop, and what were its main characteristics?
- What was the Harlem Renaissance? What were its origins and main ideas?
- Questions from the US Civics Test:
  - Question 5: How are changes made to the US Constitution?
  - Question 13: What is the rule of law?
  - Question 48: What are two Cabinet-level positions?
  - Question 63: There are four amendments to the US Constitution about who can vote. Describe one of them.
  - Question 99: Name one leader of the women’s rights movement in the 1800s.
  - Question 102: When did all women get the right to vote?
  - Question 118: Name one example of an American innovation.

**Keys to the Lesson**

The 1920s were another period of great change in American life. First, the transition from wartime to peacetime involved many challenges, including an influenza pandemic, an economic downturn, and fears of anarchist and communist attacks on the American way of life. It was argued that the return to a policy of limited government under the Harding and Coolidge administrations brought a renewed confidence in American entrepreneurship and innovation. The 1920s thus saw tremendous gains in the standard of living and prosperity. New technologies, especially the mass production of the automobile and new forms of mass communication, led to a life for the middle class that has much in common with life in America today. A different kind of culture and lifestyle began to emerge, however, in America’s large cities and among its upper income earners, who enjoyed exceptional wealth and opulence. American cultural norms in these areas began to diverge from traditional morality, while the unenforceable ban on alcohol precipitated a general decline in respect for the rule of law, even outside of cities.
Teachers might best plan and teach The Roaring Twenties with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Discuss the two amendments to the Constitution that were ratified during and after the Great War. Teach about the work of Carrie Nation and Progressives to ratify the 18th Amendment (which prohibited the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages); the work of suffragists Susan B. Anthony, Alice Paul, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucy Stone, and Ida B. Wells; and the 19th Amendment (which secured women’s right to vote).

- Note the challenges that the end of the war brought to America: a recession coupled with inflation, housing and job shortages for returning soldiers, a summer of riots and violence against African Americans in dozens of cities, and the terrifying epidemic of Spanish Flu.

- Teach about the Russian Civil War, the involvement of Allied and American soldiers on the side of the Whites, and the Red Terror. Amid the chaos left in the wake of the Great War, communist groups attempted to seize power in European nations just as the Bolsheviks had done in Russia. With the upheavals that America was experiencing in the first year following the Armistice, communist and anarchist agitation was also present in the United States, a time that some have dubbed the “Red Scare.”

- Introduce Warren G. Harding as a president who generally moved against the Progressive rhetoric and views on government power, of which many Americans had grown weary under Woodrow Wilson. His promise of a “return to normalcy” in America represented a restoration of limited constitutional government after Progressivism. The cutting of taxes and streamlining of regulations in particular unleashed the productive capacity of the American economy. Harding’s administration was overshadowed, though, by a series of scandals among government officials, most notably the Teapot Dome scandal.

- Teach students about the condition of African Americans in various parts of the country, including the beginning of the Great Migration of African Americans from southern states to northern cities. Show the students why these cities became hotbeds of social tension. Highlight, for instance, the racial violence directed against African Americans in the city of Tulsa, Oklahoma. The Tulsa Massacre showed that the American principles of the rule of law and equal protection under the law could be fragile, and that it was the responsibility of the American constitutional order to prevent such events and to bring to justice those who committed such atrocities.

- Explore with students Warren G. Harding’s policies regarding African Americans serving in federal positions and his statements on lynching, the introduction of federal anti-lynching bills in 1922, and a comparison of party platforms, especially regarding lynching and civil rights.

- Teach about Warren G. Harding’s sudden death in 1923 and Calvin Coolidge’s assuming the presidency. Coolidge continued many of Harding’s limited government policies while openly defending the principles of the American founding against the Progressive view that they had been made obsolete by social changes. Read with students Coolidge’s “The Inspiration of the Declaration of Independence.”

- Present a canvas of America during the 1920s. Begin with the transforming effects of mass automobile ownership, thanks to Henry Ford’s assembly line system, and the proliferation of faster means of communication. The ability to watch motion pictures and to listen to recorded music and the radio complemented the changes to American life brought about by the car. Students should be asked to imagine life before these inventions and how these inventions changed the way Americans experienced life.
- Continue to teach about the efforts to circumvent Prohibition, the rise of organized crime, and the broader lifestyle of the well-to-do, particularly in America’s cities. The emergence of the flapper culture, opulence, and open flouting of Prohibition by America’s leading politicians and businessmen has come to characterize the America of the 1920s. But it is important for students to recognize that this view of America was based on a select elite on which the journalism of the day focused its writings. The vast majority of America underwent no such overwhelming cultural transformation, aside from what was wrought by the automobile, new forms of communication, larger markets, and mass advertisement. Moreover, most of America’s farmers saw little of the prosperity that industry brought and that those in cities were experiencing.

- Spend some time on the art, architecture, music, and literature of the interwar years. Include art deco; writers F. Scott Fitzgerald, Ernest Hemingway, and William Faulkner; the development of jazz, including the contributions of Louis Armstrong and Duke Ellington; and the literature of the Harlem Renaissance, including the work of Langston Hughes, James Weldon Johnson, Paul Lawrence Dunbar, Zora Neale Hurston, Jacob Lawrence, and Faith Ringgold. Students should recognize and understand the ideas informing these changes and developments in art.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment:** Explain the ways in which America changed during the 1920s, the reasons for these changes, and the extent to which these changes were universal (2–3 paragraphs).
Name______________________________ Date____________

Reading Quiz 6.1

The Interwar Years and World War II | Lesson 1
Land of Hope, Pages 276-286

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. Did John Maynard Keynes look hopefully or despondently upon the future after the Great War?

2. What illness killed over 600,000 Americans from 1918-1919?

3. Did Warren Harding eliminate Woodrow Wilson’s regulatory agencies or appoint business-friendly people to lead and work in them?

4. Who transformed American transportation with the mass production of the Model T automobile?

5. What new genre and style of music became a nationwide phenomenon during the 1920s?
Reading Quiz 6.2

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. What does the author say about advertising in the 1920s?

2. Does the author believe that the cultural changes of the 1920s were equally present in all economic classes?

3. What was outlawed during the 1920s due to a constitutional amendment?

4. Who became president upon the death of President Warren G. Harding?

5. What was one thing Herbert Hoover was known for prior to becoming president?
Lesson 2 — The Great Depression

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the stock market crash of 1929 and the subsequent Great Depression, including the actions of the federal government under President Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s New Deal.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts

Land of Hope
Pages 294–315
Primary Sources
See below.

Teacher Texts

A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope
Pages 273–274, 286–293
A Student Workbook for Land of Hope
Pages 170–171, 182–186

Online.Hillsdale.edu

The Great American Story
Lecture 18
Constitution 101
Lecture 9
Constitution 201
Lecture 5

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students read Land of Hope, pages 294–302, and either complete the reading questions handout in A Student Workbook for Land of Hope (pages 170–171 and 182–183) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 2: Students read Land of Hope, pages 302–315, and either complete the reading questions handout in A Student Workbook for Land of Hope (pages 183–186) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 3: Students read and annotate excerpts from Franklin Roosevelt’s Commonwealth Club address, first inaugural address, and 1936 Democratic Convention speech, and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).

CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography and Places
Hoover Dam
Tennessee Valley Authority
Mount Rushmore

Persons
Herbert Hoover
Franklin Delano Roosevelt
Jesse Owens
Ernest Hemingway
Aaron Copland

Terms and Topics
stock market
Federal Reserve System
Federal Reserve rate
speculation
marginal trading
overvaluation
bubble
Black Tuesday
bank run
fractional reserve banking
purchasing power
investment
recession
Smoot-Hawley Tariff
retaliatory tariffs
depression
Great Depression
Hoovervilles
Reconstruction Finance
Corporation
Emergency Relief Act
Bonus Army
21st Amendment
New Deal
brain trust
fireside chats
Banking Act
regulation
bureaucracy
public works programs
Civilian Conservation Corps
Works Progress
Administration
National Recovery
Administration
Agricultural Adjustment
Administration
Dust Bowl
Securities and Exchange
Commission
Social Security Act
welfare
Tuskegee Experiment
Wagner Act
income tax
Berlin Olympics
court packing
“Roosevelt recession”

Primary Sources
Commonwealth Club address, Franklin Roosevelt
First inaugural address, Franklin Roosevelt
Democratic Convention address, 1936, Franklin Roosevelt
“The Conservative Manifesto,” Josiah Bailey
“The Dominant Dogma of the Age,” Walter Lippmann
Annual Message to Congress, 1944, Franklin Roosevelt
To Know by Heart

“God Bless America” — Irving Berlin

Timeline

Oct. 29, 1929 Stock Market Crash (Black Tuesday)
1930 Smoot-Hawley Tariff
1932 Franklin Roosevelt elected
1937 “Roosevelt recession”

Images

Historical figures and events
Wall Street on Black Tuesday
Hoovervilles
Poverty in cities
The Bonus Army and its dispersion
Fireside chat
The buildings that housed the new federal bureaucracies
Workers in public works programs
Hoover Dam
Mount Rushmore
Tennessee Valley Authority projects
The National Recovery Administration’s “Blue Eagle”
The Dust Bowl
Jesse Owens on the podium at the Berlin Olympics

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Biography and presidential actions of Franklin Delano Roosevelt
- Elliott Bell’s account of the stock market crash of 1929
- Lee McCardell’s account of the US Army dispersing the Bonus Army
- Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes’s diary entries on the Roosevelt administration’s implementation of the New Deal
- Jesse Owens’s gold medal at the 1936 Berlin Olympics in Nazi Germany

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- How does the Federal Reserve System work? What is its purpose?
- What is the purpose of buying and selling stocks, both for corporations and investors?
- How does stock trading work? What ultimately determines a stock’s price?
- For what reasons was stock speculation less than careful by the late 1920s?
- For what reasons were many stocks grossly overvalued by the late 1920s?
- What role did the Federal Reserve System play in encouraging speculation and overvaluation? How so?
- What first caused a sell-off in stocks in October 1929?
- How did the sell-off influence other investors?
- What is a bank run? What is its connection to fractional reserve banking?
To what extent did Herbert Hoover depart from Calvin Coolidge’s policy of limited government and laissez-faire economics?

What actions by the Hoover administration and Congress may have caused a temporary recession to become the Great Depression? How so?

What was life like for many Americans during the Great Depression?

How might one describe Franklin Delano Roosevelt? Why did he appeal to so many Americans, and why did his foes dislike him?

What were the main ideas behind Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal? How did the New Deal compare to the American founding and the initial Progressive Era?

What were the main types of government action taken as part of the New Deal?

What language and images did Franklin Roosevelt use to gain public support for his actions?

How did the New Deal transform the role and functioning of the federal government?

How did Franklin Roosevelt conduct politics during his several terms as president?

How was the National Recovery Administration both unconstitutional, per the Supreme Court, and practically difficult to manage?

How did the Dust Bowl come about?

To what extent was the New Deal successful? How so?

In what ways were people critical of the New Deal, particularly of its public works programs, farming policies, and involvement in the flow of market information?

What were the similarities and differences between the New Deal and the economic programs of European countries in the 1930s?

What caused the recession of 1937, which some called the “Roosevelt recession”?

Why do some scholars claim that the New Deal may have unintentionally prolonged the Great Depression?

What was Franklin Roosevelt’s court-packing plan, and why did that plan backfire in public opinion?

How did the programs enacted through the New Deal change the approach the Democratic Party would take toward assembling democratic majorities?

Questions from the US Civics Test:
  - Question 53: How many seats are on the Supreme Court?
  - Question 103: What was the Great Depression?
  - Question 104: When did the Great Depression start?
  - Question 105: Who was president during the Great Depression and World War II?

**Keys to the Lesson**

Rarely in American history can two adjoining time periods be juxtaposed so sharply as the 1920s and the 1930s, as the boom of the Roaring Twenties gave way abruptly to the bust of the Great Depression. Fluctuations in the economic decisions of millions of people are natural, relatively brief, and often clarifying for producers and consumers alike, but the economic abyss into which Americans descended was unlike anything else. Likewise, the response of the federal government was unmatched to any other time in its history. In the presidencies of Herbert Hoover and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a second run of Progressivism rose in response to the laissez-faire approach of the previous decade. Roosevelt’s policies often went far beyond the traditional constitutional limits on government authority in order to win (as he framed it) the war against the Depression. Students should understand the debates over the causes, the
deepening, and the perpetuation of the Great Depression, as well as the types and effectiveness of various government actions in response.

Teachers might best plan and teach The Great Depression with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Review with students the role and functioning of the Federal Reserve System, which Progressives had created via constitutional amendment during the Wilson administration.

- While students should have encountered the workings of the stock market in previous units, spend some time at the outset of this lesson to help them understand how the stock market works. Of particular importance is that they understand the normal function of buying and selling stocks, both for corporations and for investors. Admittedly, many achievements in American life would have been nearly impossible without the raising of capital through the sale of stocks. But students should also learn how the price of a stock can become detached from the hard realities and purposes behind a corporation’s offering of stocks. In short, buying and selling stocks can easily become a form of straightforward gambling.

- With this backdrop, help students understand what makes a person less careful in the stock market. Students should be aware of the perception that the gains of the 1920s economy were unstoppable, but they should also learn about the practice of marginal trading and the effects of the rather novel Federal Reserve System’s practice of keeping interest rates exceptionally low. This meant an inordinately low cost of borrowing money. By 1929, almost every bet in the stock market seemed sure to gain in value, and the money to borrow to place such bets seemed unending. It was human nature to respond in this way—both for investors and government experts at the Federal Reserve. Nobody thought it would stop, and in the case of the Federal Reserve members, nobody wanted to slow it down.

- Clarify for students what this meant: In the broader economy, much of Americans’ savings had been loaned out, with complete confidence that they would be repaid with a sure profit. The capital raised from these savings was readily available and readily spent to expand the production of businesses. This production was responding more to the available capital rather than to the actual quantity of goods and services that Americans wanted. Almost everything was overvalued: the price a person saw a stock or company to be worth was far higher than its actual business success would yield. All it took was somebody to realize this, to attempt to sell their stocks at this higher price before they fell back to their real value, and then for others to notice what this person just did, recognize the underlying discrepancy, and do the same. Then the valuations would crash.

- While it is difficult to pinpoint what caused investors in late 1929 to look into the real value of the companies in which they had invested, a possible alarm might have been the sudden closing of a major investment firm in London that had been charged with fraud. While it did not have a direct impact on the American stock market, the sudden closure may have alerted enough American investors to take a closer look at the companies in which they had invested. What they found was that their stocks were indeed overvalued, and they began to sell.

- Be sure to note for students that a stock market crash and, in this case, the onset of a recession, is made up of the reactions of millions of individuals. In October 1929, that meant that a growing number of investors were frightened by the first sell-offs and began to presume that every stock—even those that were sound—were overvalued or would be affected by other overvalued stocks. It became a race to save something of their original investments.

- Next, begin to explain the various effects of this stock market crash in other areas of the economy, noting how the consequences were something like a trip wire that would then double back and
trigger itself again. As a company’s stocks were deflated, the business model and outlook of a company dimmed, production and services halted, and employees were furloughed and then laid off. Now in need of money, the unemployed went to withdraw some of their personal savings from their banks. Here, introduce students to fractional reserve banking. With only a fraction of deposits on hand and the rest loaned out—in many cases, in overvalued stocks and companies—the deposits for all who had savings at a bank were not readily available for everyone all at once, should a bank run occur. As events unfolded, these savings were dissipated with the collapse of each additional business, and news of a limited supply of savings led to further panicked bank runs. With their savings gone, the unemployed and employed alike further lost the means to spend money at businesses and repay loans when businesses and banks were already short on revenue. More businesses closed, more stocks lost value, more people were unemployed, and the pattern repeated, continuing its downward spiral.

- Consider with students how the initial stock market crash did not make the Great Depression inevitable. The crash was harder than most sell-offs and recessions owing to a combination of the Federal Reserve System’s monetary policy, overvaluation, and overproduction, but a relatively quick (albeit longer) correction was generally anticipated. Focus, then, on the important actions of the Hoover administration that arguably turned a bad recession into a depression. This series of events runs counter to the perception of Herbert Hoover as a dedicated champion of the free market and limited government. In contrast with Warren G. Harding and Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover believed the American government and large American businesses were capable of using their authority, often in concert, to solve economic problems. But the passage of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff and the consequent retaliatory tariffs by other nations raised prices for the unemployed and underemployed while stifling international trade when the economy was already faltering. The Federal Reserve’s belated raising of interest rates further restricted the flow of increasingly scarce dollars and dampened new investments and spending when that is just what businesses needed. Aid to key industries for mortgages and in the form of public works seemed to do little to help. Some argue that it was these events that actually caused the recession to turn into a historic depression.

- Take time to teach about the experiences of those who were suffering during the early days of the Great Depression, comparing it to the great prosperity they had experienced during the 1920s. Help students to see the desperation and disillusionment that so many families endured and the growing demand for some sort of radical solution. With the situation ripe for anarchist, socialist, and communist agitators to gain a sizeable following, things were volatile, to say the least.

- Explain the changes in party constituencies—particularly the Democratic alliance of southerners, western farmers, immigrants, workers in northern urban centers, and some African Americans—and the reasons for these shifts.

- Help students to understand the appeal of Franklin Delano Roosevelt in his ideas, his words, and his personality, particularly as they fit the situation America was in by 1932. The fact that he spoke well and affably—combined with his penchant to have the government take action as though it were fighting a war—made him highly successful in garnering support from a downtrodden populace. Consider reading with students Roosevelt’s Commonwealth Club address and his First inaugural address.

- Explain the ideas, nature, and products of Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal. The New Deal had many strands and, considered in its totality, can seem to be a collection of competing policies. But a common principle was that the federal government would not abide by the principles of limited government set forth in the American founding and asserted during the 1920s but rather would
adopt the Progressive belief in government action to solve problems, confident in the power of bureaucratic expertise. The chief difference between the original Progressives and the Progressives of the New Deal was the dramatic scope of and almost exclusive economic focus of the New Deal. Consider reading Roosevelt’s 1936 Democratic Convention address and his 1944 Annual Message to Congress to see his justifications for the New Deal and his efforts to expand the progressive view of rights and associated government powers.

- Lead students through a consideration of the New Deal’s various approaches and programs to address the economic struggles America faced. Key areas to focus on include efforts to make banking less volatile and restore investor confidence; the myriad of public works programs; the close cooperation of the federal government and large businesses to fix the prices, wages, and other standards within various industries; the creation of certain limited welfare programs such as Social Security; and the record increase in income tax rates. Be sure to consider with students whether these actions worked as intended, followed the Constitution, and helped or hurt the economy. Chapter 17 of *Land of Hope* may be of help in navigating these questions, as well as for tracking the ebb and flow of Franklin Roosevelt’s popularity. Reading Josiah Bailey’s “The Conservative Manifesto” and Walter Lippmann’s “The Dominant Dogma of the Day” are two sources that demonstrate contemporary critiques of Roosevelt and the New Deal.

- Discuss Franklin Roosevelt’s reelection campaigns and the eventual decline in Democratic electoral victories as the Depression dragged on. Roosevelt’s plan to pack the Supreme Court hurt him at the polls while many argued that his New Deal policies led to a recession in 1937. A debate has arisen, therefore, over whether Roosevelt’s New Deal, if not worsening the Depression, at least inhibited a recovery that was already in the making, as had usually been the case in past economic downturns.

- Be sure students understand and reflect on the tremendous transformations that Franklin Roosevelt and the New Deal wrought in the size, purpose, and functioning of the federal government and the place of the presidency. Never had the federal government been so large. The bureaucratic ideals first envisioned by the Progressives expanded greatly. Roosevelt’s use of the presidency’s bully pulpit surpassed perhaps even that of his cousin Theodore Roosevelt, while his use of government spending and power within political electoral matters marked a new era in national political operations. Students should explore what advantages and risks are inherent in such changes in government power, particularly in light of the principles of the American founding and traditional manner of governance that had formerly defined the United States. They should also consider the fact that Roosevelt and his New Deal provided a psychological boost to millions of suffering Americans.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Explain how the stock market came about and how the initial recession was turned into the Great Depression (2–3 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Explain the various ways the New Deal sought to improve the American economy and the effects of these actions, both on the economy and on the government itself (3–4 paragraphs).
Reading Quiz 6.3

The Interwar Years and World War II | Lesson 2
Land of Hope, Pages 294-302

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. What happened on “Black Tuesday”?

2. Where did the Great Depression start? Where did it spread?

3. Describe briefly one of the two main schools of thought about the causes of the Great Depression.

4. What did other countries do in response to the Smoot-Hawley Tariff?

5. What happened to the group of Great War veterans called the “Bonus Army”? 
Reading Quiz 6.4

The Interwar Years and World War II | Lesson 2
Land of Hope, Pages 302-315

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question.

1. Why was Franklin Roosevelt’s public personality and temperament helpful during the Great Depression?

2. What did Franklin Roosevelt promise to use to stop and reverse the Great Depression?

3. Name one of the actions Franklin Roosevelt took with his New Deal programs.

4. What did the U.S. Supreme Court rule about the National Recovery Administration (NRA)?

5. What caused the “Roosevelt recession”?
Unit 6 | Formative Quiz

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. What was the Russian Civil War about? Who won? Why?

2. What did Warren G. Harding mean by a “return to normalcy”?

3. What was life like in the Greenwood neighborhood of Tulsa, Oklahoma? What happened to it?

4. What did Charles Lindbergh’s celebrity status reveal about the power of new communication technology and journalism?

5. How does stock trading work? What ultimately determines a stock’s price?

6. To what extent did Herbert Hoover depart from Calvin Coolidge’s policy of limited government and laissez-faire economics?

7. How did the programs enacted through the New Deal change the approach the Democratic Party would take toward assembling democratic majorities?
Lesson 3 — World War II

1939–1945

6–7 classes

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the rise of totalitarianism during the interwar years, the outbreak of war in Europe and Asia, and the role of the United States in moving from a position of neutrality to its own entrance into the war and ultimate victory.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts
- Land of Hope
- Primary Sources

Teacher Texts
- A Teacher’s Guide to Land of Hope
- A Student Workbook for Land of Hope
- A Short History of World War II

Online.Hillsdale.edu
- The Great American Story
- The Second World Wars
- American Heritage

STUDENT PREPARATION

Assignment 1: Students read Land of Hope, pages 316–327, and either complete the reading questions handout in A Student Workbook for Land of Hope (198–201) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 2: Students read Land of Hope, pages 327–340, and either complete the reading questions handout in A Student Workbook for Land of Hope (202–205) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 3: Students read and annotate excerpts from Winston Churchill’s “Fifty Years Hence,” and answer guiding reading questions (provided in appendix).
CORE CONTENT IN THIS LESSON

Geography and Places
- Latin America
- Ukraine
- Imperial Japan
- China
- Ethiopia
- Rhineland
- Sudetenland
- Ardennes Forest
- Dunkirk
- Vichy France
- Free France
- English Channel
- Yugoslavia
- Caucasus
- Pacific Ocean
- Detroit
- Seattle
- Tunisia
- Sicily
- Normandy
- Bastogne
- Dresden
- Tokyo
- Hiroshima and Nagasaki

Persons
- Franklin D. Roosevelt
- Joseph Stalin
- Benito Mussolini
- Adolf Hitler
- Hirohito
- Hideki Tojo
- Francisco Franco
- Neville Chamberlain
- Winston Churchill
- Philippe Pétain
- Charles de Gaulle
- Heinrich Himmler
- Hermann Göring
- Reinhard Heydrich
- Adolf Eichmann
- Erwin Rommel
- Bernard Montgomery
- A. Philip Randolph
- George Patton
- Dwight Eisenhower
- Douglas MacArthur
- Chester Nimitz
- Harry Truman
- Albert Einstein
- J. Robert Oppenheimer

Terms and Topics
- Treaty of Versailles
- League of Nations
- totalitarianism
- communism
- nationalism
- Cheka
- gulag archipelago
- Great Purge
- Holodomor
- Meiji Restoration
- Weimar Republic
- fascism
- Nazi Party
- Brownshirts
- SS
- Reichstag fire
- Gestapo
- Nuremberg Laws
- Kristallnacht
- Neutrality Acts
- Spanish Civil War
- Japanese Invasion of China
- Rape of Nanking
- rearmament
- Luftwaffe
- Austrian Anschluss
- Munich Crisis
- appeasement
Nazi-Soviet Nonaggression Pact
Invasion of Poland
Allied Powers
Blitzkrieg
paratroopers
Katyn Forest
“sitzkrieg”
Scandinavian Campaigns
Maginot Line
Miracle of Dunkirk
Axis Powers
Royal Air Force (RAF)
Battle of Britain
The Blitz
Ultra decrypting
Cash and carry
Destroyers for Bases
Atlantic Charter
Lend-Lease
Hemispheric Defense Zone
Operation Barbarossa
Battle of Moscow
Siege of Leningrad
Attack on Pearl Harbor
Bataan Death March
Big Three
“Arsenal of Democracy”
code talkers
Bracero Program
Japanese Internment
Korematsu v. United States
Tuskegee Airmen
Battle of the Coral Sea
Battle of Midway
Battle of the Atlantic
Fanfare for the Common Man
Battle of Stalingrad

Primary Sources
“Fifty Years Hence,” Winston Churchill
Fireside chat on National Security, Franklin Roosevelt
Annual Message to Congress, 1941, Franklin Roosevelt
Atlantic Charter, Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill

Battle of Guadalcanal
Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam
resistance/partisan groups
Operation Torch
Operation Husky
Italian Campaign
Gustav Line
strategic bombing
thousand-bomber raids
US Marines
island hopping
amphibious assault
Atlantic Wall
Operation Overlord
D-Day
Battle of Normandy
Falaise pocket
Operation Market Garden
Battle of Leyte Gulf
Warsaw Uprising
Battle of the Bulge
Bombing of Dresden
Battle of Iwo Jima
Battle of Okinawa
concentration/death camps
Auschwitz
The Holocaust
genocide
Battle of Berlin
VE Day
Firebombing of Tokyo
Operation Downfall
Manhattan Project
atomic bomb
Enola Gay
VJ Day
To Know by Heart

“December 7, 1941, a date which will live in infamy.” —Franklin Roosevelt, War Message to Congress

“I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears and sweat.” —Winston Churchill to Parliament, May 13, 1940

“We shall go on to the end, we shall fight in France, we shall fight on the seas and oceans, we shall fight with growing confidence and growing strength in the air, we shall defend our Island, whatever the cost may be, we shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender, and even if, which I do not for a moment believe, this Island or a large part of it were subjugated and starving, then our Empire beyond the seas, armed and guarded by the British Fleet, would carry on the struggle, until, in God’s good time, the New World, with all its power and might, steps forth to the rescue and the liberation of the old.” —Winston Churchill to Parliament, June 4, 1940

“[T]he Battle of France is over. I expect that the Battle of Britain is about to begin. Upon this battle depends the survival of Christian civilization. Upon it depends our own British life, and the long continuity of our institutions and our Empire. The whole fury and might of the enemy must very soon be turned on us. Hitler knows that he will have to break us in this Island or lose the war. If we can stand up to him, all Europe may be free and the life of the world may move forward into broad, sunlit uplands. But if we fail, then the whole world, including the United States, including all that we have known and cared for, will sink into the abyss of a new Dark Age made more sinister, and perhaps more protracted, by the lights of perverted science. Let us therefore brace ourselves to our duties, and so bear ourselves that, if the British Empire and its Commonwealth last for a thousand years, men will still say, “This was their finest hour.”” —Winston Churchill to Parliament, June 18, 1940

“Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few.”
—Winston Churchill on the Royal Air Force pilots who fought in the Battle of Britain, August 20, 1940

Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Stock market crash; Great Depression begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Hitler appointed chancellor, named dictator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Austrian Anschluss and Munich Crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Germany seizes all of Czechoslovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939–1945</td>
<td>World War II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Sept. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Dec. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Battle of Stalingrad

1943
Battle of Guadalcanal
Invasions of North Africa and Italy

1944 June 6 Normandy Invasion (D-Day)
Battle of the Bulge

1945 May 8 VE Day
Aug. 15 VJ Day

Images
- Historical figures and events
- Photographs from the Soviet gulags
- Images and uniforms of Allied and Axis officers and soldiers
- Depictions and photographs of figures at various scenes and moments in battle
- Video footage of soldiers and fighting
- Maps: alliances, overall strategies, specific battles
- Military equipment and weaponry
- War propaganda
- Medical equipment
- Reenactment photos
- Facsimiles of documents and letters
- Home front and factory production
- Japanese internment notices
- Prisoner-of-war and death camps
- Destruction from the war
- Postwar maps

STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART

- Life in a Soviet gulag
- Nadezhda Mandelstam’s account of a Soviet arrest
- Life during the Holodomor
- Life in Weimar, Germany
- Sefton Delmer’s account of the Reichstag fire
- Noel Monks’s account of the bombing of Guernica
- The attack by German soldiers dressed as Poles on a German radio station, which Adolf Hitler used to justify invading Poland
- The bombing of Rotterdam
- Erwin Rommel’s account of blitzkrieg in France
- The evacuation of the British Army from Dunkirk, mainly using British civilian boats; John Austin’s account
- Winston Churchill and the Royal Air Force in the Battle of Britain; Richard Hillary’s account
- Frances Faviell’s account of the Blitz
- The Russian winter setting in as the Germans were on the outskirts of Moscow
- The mass murders committed by the Soviet Union, Imperial Japan, and Nazi Germany
- Resistance fighting
- Ultra deciphering of the German Enigma Code
- John Garcia’s and Daniel Inouye’s accounts of the attack on Pearl Harbor
- Bataan Death March
- Doolittle Raid
- Attempted assassinations of Adolf Hitler
- Mitsuo Fuchida’s account of the Battle of Midway
- Fighting in the various theaters of war, especially those involving American soldiers
- Stories of American soldiers in various major battles
- Forrest Vosler in a B-17
- John Basilone fighting in the Pacific
- Robert Sherrod’s account of the Marines landing at Tarawa
- James Rudder and the Army Rangers attacking Pointe du Hoc
- Robert Edlin’s account of fighting at Omaha Beach on D-Day
- Fighting of John Pruitt in Europe
- Dietrich von Choltitz’s refusal to destroy Paris
- First reports to the Allies of the “Final Solution,” by Gerhart Riegner
- Life in Nazi concentration camps and stories of resistance and survival
- Hermann Graebe’s account of a mass execution of Jews
- Sophia Litwinska’s account of the gas chambers
- Deaths of Maximilian Kolbe, Edith Stein, and Dietrich Bonhoeffer, among others
- Warsaw uprising
- Accounts by Eugene Sledge of fighting in the Pacific
- Jack Lucas fighting at Iwo Jima
- Deaths of Franklin Roosevelt, Benito Mussolini, and Adolf Hitler in April 1945
- The Enola Gay dropping the first atomic bomb
- Survivors of strategic bombing and atomic bombing campaigns

Questions for the American Mind

- To what extent did the Soviet Union fulfill its goals of material equality and democratic liberty?
- What forms of political persecution and extermination did the communist Soviet Union inflict on its people?
- What groups of people in Europe especially feared communism during the 1920s and 1930s?
- What is economic fascism?
- How did Imperial Japan become so powerful?
- How did Benito Mussolini come to power in Italy? What did he promise?
- What problems did Weimar, Germany, face? What caused these problems?
- Why were Germans attracted to the ideas of the Nazi Party in the 1930s?
- Why was Adolf Hitler obsessed with a person’s race?
- What were Adolf Hitler’s goals for those he considered “Aryans”?
- What was the Reichstag fire? How did it come about, and why was it important for Adolf Hitler’s dictatorship?
- What are the ways in which communism, socialism, and fascism are similar and different? What roles did nationalism and militarism play in each?
- What military actions did Japan, Italy, Germany, and Spain each take during the 1930s? Why?
- What were Adolf Hitler’s foreign policy goals, and how did he try to justify them to the other countries of Europe?
- How did World War II begin in September 1939?
What were the main components to blitzkrieg?
What was the situation the world faced at Dunkirk and in the Battle of Britain?
How significant were the persona and the actions of Winston Churchill, especially during the early years of World War II?
Why was the Battle of Britain fought?
What were the ways the United States indirectly but intentionally helped the British in their war with Germany and in their deterrence of Japan in the Pacific?
Why was Operation Barbarossa so significant?
Why did Japan attack the United States? What was the strategic goal of the attack on Pearl Harbor? Why was the attack not completely successful?
How did Nazi Germany, communist Soviet Union, and Imperial Japan treat their own people, the people they conquered, and soldiers they captured? Why?
How did resistance groups fight the tyrannies under which they lived?
After Pearl Harbor, what nation did the Allies agree to focus on defeating first? Why?
How did the Allies gradually win the Battle of the Atlantic? Why was this victory so vital?
What was strategic bombing? What were the problems with it, both practical and moral?
How were American industrial might and American generals important to the Allied cause?
What was fighting like in the Pacific, in North Africa, and in Italy? How were the Allies eventually successful in each theater?
How did Operation Overlord work?
What did Nazi Germany do in the Holocaust?
In addition to the Nazis’ primary target, the Jews, who else was targeted and killed in German executions and concentration camps?
To what extent did average Germans and the outside world know what was happening? Explain.
As the war drew to a close in Europe, why did territorial gains by each Allied power become an issue among the Allies?
What happened to Poland and all of Eastern Europe in the final year of the war? How can this development be said to be both tragic and ironic?
How was the atomic bomb developed?
What moral quandaries did the Allies face at numerous points in the war?
Question from the US Civics Test:
- Question 105: Who was president during the Great Depression and World War II?
- Question 106: Why did the United States enter World War II?
- Question 107: Dwight Eisenhower is famous for many things. Name one.

**Keys to the Lesson**

World War II was one of the monumental events in world history, an epic struggle between good and evil. This is not to say that the Allied war effort was morally perfect. But if there ever was a moment when we can say that an evil regime was set to conquer the world and heroes rose to meet it, World War II was such a moment. The efforts of Americans of the time—from business leaders and workers to generals and citizen soldiers—saved the world. In recognizing these facts, students should be able to acknowledge the gratitude and honor they owe to this “greatest generation” and should rise to conserve what those soldiers sacrificed and died to defend.
Teachers might best plan and teach World War II with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Begin the lesson with a retracing of events in Europe and Asia during the 1920s and 1930s. In addition to the tumult of the global Depression, Europe was slow to recover from the Great War, particularly with respect to the shakiness of its political and traditional institutions and beliefs.

- Spend time with Soviet Russia as the experiment in communism played out. Under both Vladimir Lenin and Joseph Stalin, the Soviet Union was the world’s first totalitarian state, combining an atheistic philosophy with modern scientific technology and thus controlling its people and seeking to spread its revolutionary power worldwide. Talk specifically about the gulag death camps, the Holodomor in the Ukraine, the secret police, and the torture of political and philosophical opponents.

- Pivot to discussing the other branch of totalitarianism: fascism. Imperial Japan, Benito Mussolini’s Italy, Nazi Germany, and Francisco Franco’s Spain were distinct from communism mainly in economic policy. Whereas communism in the Soviet Union owned all business and property, economic fascism sought more to direct or force private businesses and property toward certain state-sanctioned goals. Communism, socialism, and fascism thus are all distinct from the American economic principle of free markets that come with limited constitutional government and capitalism.

- Consider with students that, with the exception of economic policy, the communist and fascist regimes of the interwar years were similar to each other. Discuss with students how this was the case, for even though the specific goals were different, the means were the same. Students may consider, for example, how all three regimes:
  - opposed the free market
  - divided people into superior and inferior groups
  - sought conquest
  - involved enormous centralized government action without enforced constitutions
  - appealed to the common man even as their leaders sacrificed the common man to preserve themselves
  - harnessed both traditional culture and cultural change to mobilize and unite their people
  - held no objective moral principles besides the will to power
  - employed propaganda and restricted free speech
  - appealed to passion instead of reason
  - indoctrinated the youth by dividing them from their parents
  - used science and technology for mass control
  - worked in close concert with military leaders and industries
  - coalesced around a single individual leader
  - took advantage of economic and political crises to gain power
  - employed secret police
  - endorsed gang violence and thuggery
  - persecuted political opponents

- Students should understand the way of life in these regimes, contrasting it with such American principles as freedom of speech, freedom of religion, private property, protection against unreasonable search and seizure, limited government, representative democracy, and the dignity of the human person and natural rights. Exploring the relationship between these ideologies and the new technologies arrived at through science is an important part of this conversation, as captured in Winston Churchill’s “Fifty Years Hence,” which may be read with students.
Discuss how Adolf Hitler’s Nazi party gained power, at first legally, and the circumstances—for example, inflation from reparations, the humiliations from the Treaty of Versailles, the Great Depression, and fears of a communist revolution—that had made the Nazi platform initially appealing to Germans. Then walk through the various steps Hitler took to gain dictatorial power, including the Nazi-organized Reichstag fire that was used to justify this power grab, the suspension of the constitution, and the violation of rights. At this point in the lesson, students should learn about the Nazis’ treatment of Jews and others up through Kristallnacht, waiting to teach about the Holocaust itself until the final years of the war, when the ordinary people of the rest of the world first learned of it (see guidance below).

Begin the prelude to war with Italy’s invasion of Ethiopia, Italy and Germany’s involvement in the Spanish Civil War, and Japan’s complete invasion of China. Turn to Hitler’s violations of the Treaty of Versailles as he rearmed Germany and imposed territorial claims. Students should understand the sources of the European policy of appeasement, even while asking whether the policy was misguided, as Winston Churchill warned. Consider especially how each of Hitler’s moves was an admitted gamble in his eyes, as well as the clear actions European powers could have taken to rebut Germany successfully. Be sure to track Churchill’s warnings during these years, even as he was not yet prime minister. By the time Hitler invaded Poland, Germany had grown too powerful to be easily checked. Still, a French offensive in the west may have done some good instead of forces waiting behind the Maginot Line.

Amid the growing belligerence of these powers, note America’s general return to the foreign policy of George Washington and subsequent policies that had preceded its involvement in the Great War. A series of Neutrality Acts sought to keep America in this position, one of avoiding any war that was not in the national interest of America, here meaning the preservation of the constitutional government that preserved the natural rights of Americans.

Have students think through and compare the various advantages and disadvantages each side had at the outset of the war and how these shifted during the war. Have students take simple notes, as a “T-Chart” can be effective for this part of the lesson.

Build students’ familiarity with the style of warfare in 1939, and show them plenty of images to do so. Students need this foundation for their subsequent study of battles. This helps them to imagine and understand what happens in battle and to appreciate the bravery of soldiers fighting on both sides. Explain in particular the great changes in technology and tactics.

Present to students explanations of each side’s strategy at various stages of the war and the tactics and battle plans employed in specific battles. Have students track strategy changes on a map of Europe and the Pacific during World War II.

As with any conflict, dwell on the key contributions of both leaders and common soldiers in the war, especially Winston Churchill, Charles de Gaulle, Erwin Rommel, George Patton, Dwight Eisenhower, and Douglas MacArthur. The Second World War was an exceptionally well-documented conflict, and every battle has plenty of firsthand accounts and stories of individual soldiers that students deserve to learn.

Teach the war in some detail, especially the major battles and military campaigns. Students should understand how the battles came to be, the key stories, factors, and moments from the battle itself, and the significance of their various outcomes on subsequent events. Employ battle maps often and have students track battles and campaigns on maps of Europe, North Africa, and the Pacific. There are many well-documented and engaging battles to teach, so prudence and time will determine which to treat in depth and which to summarize in a lively and telling manner. A
Short History of World War II is a great aid for teaching these battles; students may enjoy reading select accounts of battles from this work.

- Teach the beginning of the war through 1941 with all the speed and drama that defined the time. Matters reached a crisis point at Dunkirk, where the British army was facing almost certain annihilation but executed a miracle evacuation. But the British had appeared merely to forestall the inevitable, as the German army prepared for the invasion of the British Isles and the end to free government on the frontier of Western civilization. Here teachers must help students imagine what they and the world would have been facing. It is not an overstatement to say this: the fate of the world lay in the hands of the British, particularly in their leader, Winston Churchill, their ordinary citizens, and the young men of the Royal Air Force. Their sacrifice in the Battle of Britain and then the Blitz staved off a German victory. Likewise, students should be aware of the crucial folly of Hitler’s invasion of Russia.

- Note for students how the rapid German conquest of Europe and the heroism of the British moved the American people, not to outright support for war, but to support material aid to the British. Discuss Roosevelt’s unprecedented third term and the various ways he and Congress aided the British and checked the Japanese in the Pacific. With this background and especially the American policy toward Japan, teach the attack on the US Pacific Fleet stationed at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. Students may read Roosevelt’s Fireside Chat on National Security, his 1941 Annual Message to Congress, and the Atlantic Charter to gain insights into U.S. policy prior to Pearl Harbor.

- Briefly walk through the main ways that America mobilized for war, which had the side effect of lifting America out of the Great Depression, with millions of soldiers leaving the workforce or unemployment rolls to fight, just as demand for workers for the war effort soared.

- Teachers will need to decide whether to teach the war from Pearl Harbor onward in one of two ways. The first way is to teach the European theater and then the Pacific. The other way is to teach the war year-by-year, oscillating between theaters and touching on the other ongoing war efforts, both domestically and in combat, in the process. This latter effort can be more challenging but also presents a fuller and more realistic experience of the course of events.

- Of special import, highlight for students the moments and factors that led to an Allied victory once America entered the war. These factors may include the sheer manpower and industrial might of America, the failure of the Japanese to destroy America’s aircraft carriers and oil reserves at Pearl Harbor, the ingenuity that closed the Atlantic Gap, the work of codebreakers, the enterprise and daring of American soldiers and generals in innumerable situations, the hubris of Axis leaders, and the key battles of Midway, Stalingrad, Guadalcanal, small islands in the vast Pacific, Leyte Gulf, D-Day, the Battle of the Bulge, and the resistance efforts of many brave people.

- As the lesson proceeds toward the end of the war, discuss the various conferences and conversations among the “Big Three” concerning the postwar world. As their common enemy was nearing defeat, the awkward alliance was sure to pit a totalitarian regime against those of representative self-government. Students should understand the ideas and maneuverings (or lack thereof) by the Americans and the British, especially Winston Churchill’s salient predictions about Joseph Stalin and the Soviet Union.

- Teach students about the Holocaust, beginning with the moment that the Allies began to enter Poland and Germany in 1944 and 1945 and discovered the concentration and death camps. Students should learn about the Nazis’ purposes for this genocide—the murder of Jews and others they considered inferior or who stood up to them. Students may be asked to make these reflections in consideration of the moral and political philosophy on which the American
founders established the United States. The Holocaust entailed the total annihilation of natural rights, of freedom, of the dignity of the human person, and of human life itself.

- Likewise, teach about the mass murders of other people by the Soviet Union and Japan.
- Outline the basic terms of the treaties ending the war and the state of affairs among the British and the Americans and the Soviets.
- Discuss with students the moral quandaries of waging a just war, such as the internment of Japanese American citizens, the general foreknowledge by the Roosevelt administration of the Holocaust, and arguments that some have made about strategic bombing and the use of atomic weapons. Students should appreciate the complexities of war, even of just war, and the great questions facing human beings, who—even amid the most just of causes—are nevertheless still fallible.
- Recap the war by considering major statistics, including the number of casualties and deaths on each side, and its effects on America and the world. Considering the civilian death toll and murder of so many noncombatant men, women, and children is also appropriate and sobering. In many ways, the jubilance that America experienced at the end of the war was a rarity in the world.

**Strengthening Understanding: Post-Lesson Assignments**

**Assignment 1**: Explain the rise of totalitarian regimes and the ways that communism and fascism were both similar and different (3–4 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2**: Retell the history of World War II, with particular focus on America’s involvement (4–5 paragraphs).
Reading Quiz 6.5

The Interwar Years and World War II | Lesson 3
Land of Hope, Pages 316-327

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. What was one way Germany struggled after the Great War?

2. What almost happened to the British Army in Europe in 1940?

3. Name one way in which Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s policies helped the British and hurt the Germans and Japanese prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor.

4. What from America did Japan rely on in order to project power militarily?

5. Name one failure of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.
Reading Quiz 6.6

The Interwar Years and World War II | Lesson 3
Land of Hope, Pages 327-340

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question.

1. List three things that happened domestically once America declared war.
   
   i.
   
   ii.
   
   iii.

2. Name two major battles or fields of combat in Europe and North Africa in which Americans fought during World War II.
   
   i.
   
   ii.

3. Name two major battles or fields of combat in the Pacific theater in which Americans fought during World War II.
   
   i.
   
   ii.
APPENDIX A

Study Guide

Test

Writing Assignment
Unit 6 Test — Study Guide

**TIMELINE**

*When given chronological dates, match events from a list to the years or dates that they happened.*

Oct. 29, 1929  Stock Market Crash (Black Tuesday)
1932        Franklin Roosevelt elected president
1933        Adolf Hitler appointed chancellor, named dictator
1939–1945  World War II
  1939  Sept. 1  Germany and the Soviet Union invade Poland
  1940        Fall of France
              Battle of Britain and the Blitz
  1941        Germany invades the Soviet Union
              Dec. 7        Japanese attack Pearl Harbor
  1942        Battle of Midway
              Battle of Stalingrad
  1943        Battle of Guadalcanal
              Invasions of North Africa and Italy
  1944        June 6        Normandy Invasion (D-Day)
              Battle of the Bulge
  1945        May 8        VE Day
              Aug. 15        VJ Day

**GEOGRAPHY AND PLACES**

*Identify the approximate location or field of battle for each on a map.*

Battle of Moscow  Operation Torch  Battle of Iwo Jima
Attack on Pearl Harbor  Operation Husky  Battle of Okinawa
Battle of Midway  Operation Overlord
Battle of Stalingrad  Operation Market Garden
Battle of Guadalcanal  Battle of the Bulge

**PERSONS**

*Identify each, provide biographical details, and explain what he or she thought or did in specific periods or events.*

Woodrow Wilson  Calvin Coolidge  William Jennings Bryan
Susan B. Anthony  Henry Ford  Robert Frost
Joseph Stalin  Walt Disney  Louis Armstrong
Warren G. Harding  Charles Lindbergh  Duke Ellington
Andrew Mellon  Al Capone  Langston Hughes
Herbert Hoover
Franklin Delano Roosevelt
Aaron Copland
Benito Mussolini
Adolf Hitler
Hirohito
Hideki Tojo
Neville Chamberlain

Winston Churchill
Charles de Gaulle
Heinrich Himmler
Erwin Rommel
Bernard Montgomery
A. Philip Randolph
George Patton
Dwight Eisenhower

Douglas MacArthur
Chester Nimitz
Harry Truman
Albert Einstein
J. Robert Oppenheimer

**TERMS AND TOPICS**

Identify each and explain its significance to the period of history studied.

Spanish Flu
18th Amendment
Prohibition
19th Amendment
Russian Civil War
Red Scare
Great Migration
Tulsa Massacre
Teapot Dome Scandal
long-term mortgage
organized crime
Scopes Trial
art deco
jazz
Harlem Renaissance
stock market
Federal Reserve System
Federal Reserve rate
speculation
marginal trading
overvaluation
bubble
Black Tuesday
fractional reserve banking
Smoot-Hawley Tariff
Great Depression
Bonus Army
21st Amendment
New Deal
brain trust
fireside chats
regulation
bureaucracy

public works programs
National Recovery
Administration
Dust Bowl
Social Security Act
Tuskegee Experiment
Wagner Act
court packing
“Roosevelt recession”
Treaty of Versailles
totalitarianism
communism
nationalism
gulag archipelago
Great Purge
Holodomor
Meiji Restoration
Weimar Republic
fascism
Nazi Party
Reichstag fire
Gestapo
Nuremberg Laws
Kristallnacht
Neutrality Acts
Rape of Nanking
Austrian Anschluss
Munich Crisis
Nazi-Soviet Nonaggression
Pact
Allied Powers
Blitzkrieg
“sitzkrieg”

Axis Powers
Royal Air Force (RAF)
Ultra decrypting
Cash and carry
Destroyers for Bases
Atlantic Charter
Lend-Lease
Hemispheric Defense Zone
Bataan Death March
“Arsenal of Democracy”
code talkers
Bracero Program
Japanese Internment
*Korematsu v. United States*
Tuskegee Airmen
Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam
Conferences
Gustav Line
thousand-bomber raids
US Marines
island hopping
Atlantic Wall
concentration/death camps
Auschwitz
The Holocaust
genocide
VE Day
Manhattan Project
atomic bomb
VJ Day
**MAJOR CONFLICTS**

*Explain how each battle began, narrate what happened in it and how, and explain the significance of the battle’s outcome.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Battle of Poland</th>
<th>Battle of Midway</th>
<th>D-Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miracle of Dunkirk</td>
<td>Battle of the Atlantic</td>
<td>Battle of Normandy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle of Britain</td>
<td>Battle of Stalingrad</td>
<td>Operation Market Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Blitz</td>
<td>Battle of Guadalcanal</td>
<td>Battle of the Bulge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation Barbarossa</td>
<td>Operation Torch</td>
<td>Battle of Iwo Jima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle of Moscow</td>
<td>Operation Husky</td>
<td>Battle of Okinawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attack on Pearl Harbor</td>
<td>Italian Campaign</td>
<td>Operation Downfall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle of the Coral Sea</td>
<td>Operation Overlord</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRIMARY SOURCES**

*Based on annotations and notes from seminar conversations, be able to answer questions on each primary source. While you will not necessarily be asked why each primary source was created, what it did or argued, and what its effects were, being able to answer these kinds of questions will make you well-prepared.*

“The Inspiration of the Declaration of Independence,” Calvin Coolidge  
Commonwealth Club address, Franklin Roosevelt  
Democratic Convention address, 1936, Franklin Roosevelt  
“The Dominant Dogma of the Age,” Walter Lippmann  
Annual Message to Congress, 1944, Franklin Roosevelt  
Annual Message to Congress, 1941, Franklin Roosevelt  
Atlantic Charter, Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill

**TO KNOW BY HEART**

*Be prepared to fill in missing words and/or identify the speaker and context.*

“Perhaps one of the most important characteristics of my administration has been minding my own business.” —Calvin Coolidge

“December 7, 1941, a date which will live in infamy.” —Franklin Roosevelt, War Message to Congress

“[T]he Battle of France is over. I expect that the Battle of Britain is about to begin. Upon this battle depends the survival of Christian civilization. Upon it depends our own British life, and the long continuity of our institutions and our Empire. The whole fury and might of the enemy must very soon be turned on us. Hitler knows that he will have to break us in this Island or lose the war. If we can stand up to him, all Europe may be free and the life of the world may move forward into broad, sunlit uplands. But if we fail, then the whole world, including the United States, including all that we have known and cared for, will sink into the abyss of a new Dark Age made more sinister, and perhaps more protracted, by the lights of perverted science. Let us therefore brace ourselves to our duties, and so bear ourselves that, if the
British Empire and its Commonwealth last for a thousand years, men will still say, 'This was their finest hour.'—Winston Churchill to Parliament, June 18, 1940

“Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few.” —Winston Churchill on the Royal Air Force pilots who fought in the Battle of Britain, August 20, 1940

**STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART**

In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be middle school students.

- Biographies and the roles of Susan B. Anthony, Calvin Coolidge, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt
- Life in a Soviet gulag
- Life during the Holodomor
- The evacuation of the British Army from Dunkirk, mainly using British civilian boats
- Winston Churchill and the Royal Air Force in the Battle of Britain
- The mass murders committed by the Soviet Union, Imperial Japan, and Nazi Germany
- Resistance fighting
- Bataan Death March
- Doolittle Raid
- The Army Rangers attacking Pointe du Hoc
- Life in Nazi concentration camps and stories of resistance and survival
- The *Enola Gay* dropping the first atomic bomb

**QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND**

Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.

**Lesson 1 | The Roaring Twenties**

☐ How did the Great War change America?
☐ What challenges did America face domestically following the Great War? Why?
☐ What were the arguments for Prohibition?
☐ What did Warren G. Harding mean by a “return to normalcy”?
☐ What economic policies did Warren G. Harding enact with respect to the economy? What was the result?
☐ Why did the Great Migration begin during the Great War and accelerate during the 1920s?
☐ What was life like in the Greenwood neighborhood of Tulsa, Oklahoma? What happened to it?
☐ How might Calvin Coolidge’s presidency be characterized?
☐ In what ways did Warren G. Harding and Calvin Coolidge offer an answer to the Progressives?
☐ What technological innovations were most responsible for transforming the pace and busyness of life for Americans during the 1920s?
☐ How was the 18th Amendment ineffective, and how did it undermine the rule of law?
☐ To what extent and in what ways did American culture change during the 1920s? Why?
☐ How did art and architecture change in America following the Great War? What inspirations and principles shaped the artists who introduced these styles?
☐ How did jazz develop, and what were its main characteristics?
Lesson 2 | The Great Depression

- What was the Harlem Renaissance? What were its origins and main ideas?

- How does the Federal Reserve System work? What is its purpose?
- How does stock trading work? What ultimately determines a stock’s price?
- For what reasons was stock speculation less than careful by the late 1920s?
- For what reasons were many stocks grossly overvalued by the late 1920s?
- What role did the Federal Reserve System play in encouraging speculation and overvaluation? How so?
- What is a bank run? What is its connection to fractional reserve banking?
- What actions by the Hoover administration and Congress may have caused a temporary recession to become the Great Depression? How so?
- What was life like for many Americans during the Great Depression?
- How might one describe Franklin Delano Roosevelt? Why did he appeal to so many Americans, and why did his foes dislike him?
- What were the main ideas behind Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal? How did the New Deal compare to the American founding and the initial Progressive Era?
- What were the main types of government action taken as part of the New Deal?
- How did the New Deal transform the role and functioning of the federal government?
- How was the National Recovery Administration both unconstitutional, per the Supreme Court, and practically difficult to manage?
- To what extent was the New Deal successful? How so?
- What was Franklin Roosevelt’s court-packing plan, and why did that plan backfire in public opinion?
- How did the programs enacted through the New Deal change the approach the Democratic Party would take toward assembling democratic majorities?

Lesson 3 | World War II

- What groups of people in Europe especially feared communism during the 1920s and 1930s?
- What is economic fascism?
- What problems did Weimar, Germany, face? What caused these problems?
- What was the Reichstag fire? How did it come about, and why was it important for Adolf Hitler’s dictatorship?
- What are the ways in which communism, socialism, and fascism are similar and different? What roles did nationalism and militarism play in each?
- How did World War II begin in September 1939?
- What was the situation the world faced at Dunkirk and in the Battle of Britain?
- How significant were the persona and the actions of Winston Churchill, especially during the early years of World War II?
- What were the ways the United States indirectly but intentionally helped the British in their war with Germany and in their deterrence of Japan in the Pacific?
- Why did Japan attack the United States? What was the strategic goal of the attack on Pearl Harbor? Why was the attack not completely successful?
- How did Nazi Germany, communist Soviet Union, and Imperial Japan treat their own people, the people they conquered, and soldiers they captured? Why?
☐ After Pearl Harbor, what nation did the Allies agree to focus on defeating first? Why?
☐ How did the Allies gradually win the Battle of the Atlantic? Why was this victory so vital?
☐ How were American industrial might and American generals important to the Allied cause?
☐ What was fighting like in the Pacific, in North Africa, and in Italy? How were the Allies eventually successful in each theater?
☐ How did Operation Overlord work?
☐ What did Nazi Germany do in the Holocaust?
☐ As the war drew to a close in Europe, why did territorial gains by each Allied power become an issue among the Allies?
☐ What happened to Poland and all of Eastern Europe in the final year of the war? How can this development be said to be both tragic and ironic?
☐ How was the atomic bomb developed?
Unit 6 | Test — The Interwar Years and World War II

**TIMELINE**

Write the letter of each event next to the date or years it took place.

Oct. 29, 1929 ______
1932 ______ A. Battle of Britain and the Blitz
1933 ______ B. Battle of Guadalcanal
1939–1945 ______ C. Battle of Midway
1939 Sept. 1 ______ D. Battle of Stalingrad
1940 ______ E. Battle of the Bulge
1941 ______ F. Fall of France
Dec. 7 ______ G. Franklin Roosevelt elected president
1942 ______ H. Germany and the Soviet Union invade Poland
1943 ______ I. Germany invades the Soviet Union
1944 June 6 ______ J. Hitler appointed chancellor, named dictator
1944 ______ K. Invasions of North Africa and Italy
1945 May 8 ______ L. Japanese attack Pearl Harbor
Aug. 15 ______ M. Normandy Invasion (D-Day)
1945 ______ N. Stock Market Crash (Black Tuesday)
1945 ______ O. VE Day
1945 ______ P. VJ Day
Q. World War II

**GEOGRAPHY AND PLACES**

1. Mark the approximate location or field of battle for each on the following maps using the corresponding letters.

   A. Battle of Moscow
   B. Attack on Pearl Harbor
   C. Battle of Midway
   D. Battle of Stalingrad
   E. Battle of Guadalcanal
   F. Operation Torch
   G. Operation Husky
   H. Operation Overlord
   I. Operation Market Garden
   J. Battle of the Bulge
   K. Battle of Iwo Jima
   L. Battle of Okinawa
PERSONS, TERMS, AND TOPICS

Fill in the blank.

2. While women had the right to vote in some states, it was not until the passage of the _________________ in 1920 that women’s right to vote was guaranteed in the US Constitution.

3. The cultural revival among African Americans known as the Harlem Renaissance also helped give rise to a new, distinctly American genre of music based on rhythm and improvisation known as ________.

4. Beginning in the 1920s, millions of African Americans began moving to northern cities, seeking new opportunities in burgeoning industrial centers in what is known as the _________________.

5. In addition to helping to pass the 21st Amendment ending Prohibition and arguing that Americans had “nothing to fear but fear itself,” _________________ gave further hope to Americans in exchange for greater trust with his weekly radio broadcasts known as _________________.

6. Having won a power battle after the death of Vladimir Lenin, _______________________ became Secretary General of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, where he eliminated political opponents with political purges carried out by his secret police, starved seven million Ukrainians to death when they revolted, and hid the truth of his actions behind endless propaganda.

7. By the time Japan invaded China in 1931, she had undergone the Meiji Restoration, which made her into an industrial and military powerhouse led by the military under the command of prime minister _________________.

Maps courtesy of A Student Workbook for Land of Hope.
8. In the 1920s and ’30s, Italy and Germany began a new political system which depended on a government-business partnership, a strong sense of race-based nationalism, a conviction that “right makes might,” and a tendency to see other people as scapegoats for their yet unachieved power. These are some of the characteristics of the ideology known as ________________.

9. Against the backdrop of the economic troubles of the Weimar Republic, the Treaty of Versailles, and the threat of a communist revolution, Adolf Hitler and the _______ Party gained power in the 1932 elections, with Adolf Hitler appointed chancellor in 1933.

10. Had it not been for the actions of a thousand British private boat-owners who ferried trapped British soldiers from France across the English Channel and to Great Britain during what became known as the ________________, the British Army would have been destroyed and the last hope in Europe for a free world left without an army.

11. In June 1941, in pursuance of his plans for Eastern Europe and his hatred of communism, Adolf Hitler launched Operation ________________, the largest land invasion in history, in which the German Army invaded the Soviet Union.

12. When America began antagonizing Imperial Japan by taking measures to protect British colonies in the Pacific Ocean, Japan sought to cripple America’s Pacific Fleet by attacking it at the Hawaiian naval base called _________________. While the attack killed 2,403 American sailors, sank eight battleships, and destroyed hundreds of warplanes, it did not sink any of America’s aircraft carriers—which had been out to sea. As one Japanese admiral hence feared, “All we have done is to awaken a sleeping giant and fill him with a terrible resolve.”

13. After attacking the US Pacific Fleet, Japan then sent its navy and air force to conquer British and American possessions throughout the Pacific Ocean. When American soldiers were overrun in the Philippines, their Japanese conquerors forced the prisoners to march one hundred miles for seven days without food or water in the scorching South Pacific sun. Those who fell were shot, and thousands of American soldiers died on the _________________.

14. Angered at Japan and fearing spies or sabotage, the American government forced thousands of Americans of Japanese descent from their homes and into internment camps, a policy which the Supreme Court ruled was constitutional in the case _________________.

15. The Battle of ________________ was the largest naval battle of the war. Although the United States lost the aircraft carrier USS Yorktown, American planes were able to sink four Japanese carriers and gain naval control of the Pacific Ocean.

16. In 1942, the US Marines conducted an amphibious invasion of the island of ________________ in the Solomon Islands. These soldiers’ jungle-fighting against the Japanese resulted in thousands of Marines killed, but also in victory, stopping the Japanese advance and placing the United States on a slow but steady offensive in the Pacific.
17. As the Soviets stopped Hitler’s advance into the USSR at the Battle of Stalingrad, by late 1943 the Allies had destroyed the German and Italian armies in North Africa, had invaded Sicily, and were now in bitter mountain warfare in the ____________ Campaign. Rome fell to the Allies on June 4, 1944.

18. Allied forces were steadily advancing on the Western Front until the failure of Operation Market Garden, the attempt to finish the war by Christmas 1944 by invading the Netherlands. Then, in December of 1944, Adolf Hitler launched a surprise attack through the Ardennes Forest, driving American soldiers into retreat, and surrounding the 101st Airborne in the city of Bastogne, Belgium, for a month in what was known as the Battle of the ____________. The German offensive’s eventual failure was the last chance for Hitler to force a peace favorable to Germany.

19. The Pacific theater was a series of deadly, brutal island battles, where invading American soldiers were met by an enemy determined to die rather than surrender. One of the deadliest battles was for the volcanic island of ____________, where Americans had to rout tens of thousands of Japanese soldiers from caves in hand-to-hand fighting and by using flamethrowers. Such warfare, in which only two hundred Japanese surrendered, led the new US president, Harry Truman, to consider alternative ways to force Japan to surrender.

**MAJOR CONFLICTS**

*Explain how each battle began, narrate what happened in it and how, and explain the significance of the battle’s outcome.*

20. Battle of Britain

21. Battle of Moscow

22. Operation Overlord
**KNOW BY HEART**

*Fill in missing words and identify the source.*

23. “Perhaps one of the most important characteristics of my administration has been _____________ _____________.”

   Speaker: ________________________________

24. “Never in the field of human _____________ was so much owed by so _________ to so __________.”

   Speaker: ________________________________

**STORIES FOR THE AMERICAN HEART**

*In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be middle school students.*

25. Life in a Soviet gulag

26. The Enola Gay dropping the first atomic bomb
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and good writing should be employed, and responses must fully answer each question.

27. What economic policies did Warren G. Harding enact with respect to the economy? What was the result?

28. In what ways did Warren G. Harding and Calvin Coolidge offer an answer to the Progressives?

29. How was the 18th Amendment ineffective, and how did it undermine the rule of law?

30. What was the Harlem Renaissance? What were its origins and main ideas?

31. For what reasons was stock speculation less than careful by the late 1920s?

32. What role did the Federal Reserve System play in encouraging speculation and overvaluation in the stock market? How so?

33. What actions by the Hoover administration and Congress may have caused a temporary recession to become the Great Depression? How so?

34. How might one describe Franklin Delano Roosevelt? Why did he appeal to so many Americans, and why did his foes dislike him?

35. What were the main ideas behind Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal? How did the New Deal compare to the American founding and the initial Progressive Era?
36. To what extent was the New Deal successful? How so?

37. What groups of people in Europe especially feared communism during the 1920s and 1930s?

38. What was the Reichstag fire? How did it come about, and why was it important for Adolf Hitler’s dictatorship?

39. What are the ways in which communism, socialism, and fascism are similar and different? What roles did nationalism and militarism play in each?

40. How significant were the persona and the actions of Winston Churchill, especially during the early years of World War II?

41. What were the ways the United States indirectly but intentionally helped the British in their war with Germany and in their deterrence of Japan in the Pacific?

42. What was fighting like in the Pacific, in North Africa, and in Italy? How were the Allies eventually successful in each theater?

43. What did Nazi Germany do in the Holocaust?
Unit 6 | Writing Assignment — The Interwar Years and World War II

DIRECTIONS

Citing events and primary sources in your argument, write a 500–800-word essay answering this question:

How did the events of the 1920s, 1930s, and World War II reshape America in terms of its economy, government, and power in the world?
APPENDIX B

Primary Sources

Calvin Coolidge

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

Josiah Bailey

Walter Lippmann

Winston Churchill
PRESIDENT CALVIN COOLIDGE (R)

The Inspiration of the Declaration of Independence

SPEECH

July 5, 1926
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

BACKGROUND

President Calvin Coolidge delivered this speech at Philadelphia to celebrate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence and the founding of the United States.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What theories and principles does Coolidge say need to be reaffirmed and reestablished?

2. What kind of people were the American revolutionaries, according to Coolidge?

3. Who was the great apostle of the sovereignty of the people in the colonial clergy?

4. What is the relationship between government and ideals according to Coolidge?

5. According to Coolidge, why are Progressives not truly proponents of progress when they reject the principles of the American founding?

We meet to celebrate the birthday of America. The coming of a new life always excites our interest. Although we know in the case of the individual that it has been an infinite repetition reaching back beyond our vision, that only makes it the more wonderful. But how our interest and wonder increase when we behold the miracle of the birth of a new nation. It is to pay our tribute of reverence and respect to those who participated in such a mighty event that we annually observe the fourth day of July. Whatever may have been the impression created by the news which went out from this city on that summer day in 1776, there can be no doubt as to the estimate which is now placed upon it. At the end of 150 years the four corners of the earth unite in coming to Philadelphia as to a holy shrine in grateful acknowledgement of a service so great, which a few inspired men here rendered to humanity, that it is still the preeminent support of free government throughout the world.

Although a century and a half measured in comparison with the length of human experience is but a short time, yet measured in the life of governments and nations it ranks as a very respectable period. Certainly enough time has elapsed to demonstrate with a great deal of thoroughness the value of our institutions and their dependability as rules for the regulation of human conduct and the advancement of civilization. They have been in existence long enough to become very well seasoned. They have met, and met successfully, the test of experience.

It is not so much then for the purpose of undertaking to proclaim new theories and principles that this annual celebration is maintained, but rather to reaffirm and reestablish those old theories and principles which time and the unerring logic of events have demonstrated to be sound. Amid all the clash of conflicting interests, amid all the welter of partisan politics, every American can turn for solace and consolation to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States with the assurance and confidence that those two great charters of freedom and justice remain firm and unshaken. Whatever perils appear, whatever dangers threaten, the Nation remains secure in the knowledge that the ultimate application of the law of the land will provide an adequate defense and protection.
It is little wonder that people at home and abroad consider Independence Hall as hallowed ground and revere the Liberty Bell as a sacred relic. That pile of bricks and mortar, that mass of metal, might appear to the uninstructed as only the outgrown meeting place and the shattered bell of a former time, useless now because of more modern conveniences, but to those who know they have become consecrated by the use which men have made of them. They have long been identified with a great cause. They are the framework of a spiritual event. The world looks upon them, because of their associations of one hundred and fifty years ago, as it looks upon the Holy Land because of what took place there nineteen hundred years ago. Through use for a righteous purpose they have become sanctified.

It is not here necessary to examine in detail the causes which led to the American Revolution. In their immediate occasion they were largely economic. The colonists objected to the navigation laws which interfered with their trade, they denied the power of Parliament to impose taxes which they were obliged to pay, and they therefore resisted the royal governors and the royal forces which were sent to secure obedience to these laws. But the conviction is inescapable that a new civilization had come, a new spirit had arisen on this side of the Atlantic more advanced and more developed in its regard for the rights of the individual than that which characterized the Old World. Life in a new and open country had aspirations which could not be realized in any subordinate position. A separate establishment was ultimately inevitable. It had been decreed by the very laws of human nature. Man everywhere has an unconquerable desire to be the master of his own destiny.

We are obliged to conclude that the Declaration of Independence represented the movement of a people. It was not, of course, a movement from the top. Revolutions do not come from that direction. It was not without the support of many of the most respectable people in the Colonies, who were entitled to all the consideration that is given to breeding, education, and possessions. It had the support of another element of great significance and importance to which I shall later refer. But the preponderance of all those who occupied a position which took on the aspect of aristocracy did not approve of the Revolution and held toward it an attitude either of neutrality or open hostility. It was in no sense a rising of the oppressed and downtrodden. It brought no scum to the surface, for the reason that colonial
society had developed no scum. The great body of the people were accustomed to priva-
tions, but they were free from depravity. If they had poverty, it was not of the hopeless kind
that afflicts great cities, but the inspiring kind that marks the spirit of the pioneer. The
American Revolution represented the informed and mature convictions of a great mass of
independent, liberty-loving, God-fearing people who knew their rights, and possessed the
courage to dare to maintain them.

The Continental Congress was not only composed of great men, but it represented a great
people. While its members did not fail to exercise a remarkable leadership, they were
equally observant of their representative capacity. They were industrious in encouraging
their constituents to instruct them to support independence. But until such instructions
were given they were inclined to withhold action.

While North Carolina has the honor of first authorizing its delegates to concur with other
Colonies in declaring independence, it was quickly followed by South Carolina and Geor-
gia, which also gave general instructions broad enough to include such action. But the first
instructions which unconditionally directed its delegates to declare for independence came
from the great Commonwealth of Virginia. These were immediately followed by Rhode
Island and Massachusetts, while the other Colonies, with the exception of New York, soon
adopted a like course.

This obedience of the delegates to the wishes of their constituents, which in some cases
caused them to modify their previous positions, is a matter of great significance. It reveals
an orderly process of government in the first place; but more than that, it demonstrates that
the Declaration of Independence was the result of the seasoned and deliberate thought of
the dominant portion of the people of the Colonies. Adopted after long discussion and as
the result of the duly authorized expression of the preponderance of public opinion, it did
not partake of dark intrigue or hidden conspiracy. It was well advised. It had about it noth-
ing of the lawless and disordered nature of a riotous insurrection. It was maintained on a
plane which rises above the ordinary conception of rebellion. It was in no sense a radical
movement but took on the dignity of a resistance to illegal usurpations. It was conservative
and represented the action of the colonists to maintain their constitutional rights which from time immemorial had been guaranteed to them under the law of the land.

When we come to examine the action of the Continental Congress in adopting the Declaration of Independence in the light of what was set out in that great document and in the light of succeeding events, we can not escape the conclusion that it had a much broader and deeper significance than a mere secession of territory and the establishment of a new nation. Events of that nature have been taking place since the dawn of history. One empire after another has arisen, only to crumble away as its constituent parts separated from each other and set up independent governments of their own. Such actions long ago became commonplace. They have occurred too often to hold the attention of the world and command the admiration and reverence of humanity. There is something beyond the establishment of a new nation, great as that event would be, in the Declaration of Independence which has ever since caused it to be regarded as one of the great charters that not only was to liberate America but was everywhere to ennoble humanity.

It was not because it was proposed to establish a new nation, but because it was proposed to establish a nation on new principles, that July 4, 1776, has come to be regarded as one of the greatest days in history. Great ideas do not burst upon the world unannounced. They are reached by a gradual development over a length of time usually proportionate to their importance. This is especially true of the principles laid down in the Declaration of Independence. Three very definite propositions were set out in its preamble regarding the nature of mankind and therefore of government. These were the doctrine that all men are created equal, that they are endowed with certain inalienable rights, and that therefore the source of the just powers of government must be derived from the consent of the governed.

If no one is to be accounted as born into a superior station, if there is to be no ruling class, and if all possess rights which can neither be bartered away nor taken from them by any earthly power, it follows as a matter of course that the practical authority of the Government has to rest on the consent of the governed. While these principles were not altogether new in political action, and were very far from new in political speculation, they had never
been assembled before and declared in such a combination. But remarkable as this may be, it is not the chief distinction of the Declaration of Independence. The importance of political speculation is not to be underestimated, as I shall presently disclose. Until the idea is developed and the plan made there can be no action.

It was the fact that our Declaration of Independence containing these immortal truths was the political action of a duly authorized and constituted representative public body in its sovereign capacity, supported by the force of general opinion and by the armies of Washington already in the field, which makes it the most important civil document in the world. It was not only the principles declared, but the fact that therewith a new nation was born which was to be founded upon those principles and which from that time forth in its development has actually maintained those principles, that makes this pronouncement an incomparable event in the history of government. It was an assertion that a people had arisen determined to make every necessary sacrifice for the support of these truths and by their practical application bring the War of Independence to a successful conclusion and adopt the Constitution of the United States with all that it has meant to civilization.

The idea that the people have a right to choose their own rulers was not new in political history. It was the foundation of every popular attempt to depose an undesirable king. This right was set out with a good deal of detail by the Dutch when as early as July 26, 1581, they declared their independence of Philip of Spain. In their long struggle with the Stuarts the British people asserted the same principles, which finally culminated in the Bill of Rights deposing the last of that house and placing William and Mary on the throne. In each of these cases sovereignty through divine right was displaced by sovereignty through the consent of the people. Running through the same documents, though expressed in different terms, is the clear inference of inalienable rights. But we should search these charters in vain for an assertion of the doctrine of equality. This principle had not before appeared as an official political declaration of any nation. It was profoundly revolutionary. It is one of the corner stones of American institutions.
But if these truths to which the declaration refers have not before been adopted in their combined entirety by national authority, it is a fact that they had been long pondered and often expressed in political speculation. It is generally assumed that French thought had some effect upon our public mind during Revolutionary days. This may have been true. But the principles of our declaration had been under discussion in the Colonies for nearly two generations before the advent of the French political philosophy that characterized the middle of the eighteenth century. In fact, they come from an earlier date. A very positive echo of what the Dutch had done in 1581, and what the English were preparing to do, appears in the assertion of the Reverend Thomas Hooker of Connecticut as early as 1638, when he said in a sermon before the General Court that—

“The foundation of authority is laid in the free consent of the people.

“The choice of public magistrates belongs unto the people by God’s own allowance.”

This doctrine found wide acceptance among the nonconformist clergy who later made up the Congregational Church. The great apostle of this movement was the Reverend John Wise, of Massachusetts. He was one of the leaders of the revolt against the royal governor Andros in 1687, for which he suffered imprisonment. He was a liberal in ecclesiastical controversies. He appears to have been familiar with the writings of the political scientist, Samuel Pufendorf, who was born in Saxony in 1632. Wise published a treatise, entitled “The Church’s Quarrel Espoused,” in 1710, which was amplified in another publication in 1717. In it he dealt with the principles of civil government. His works were reprinted in 1772 and have been declared to have been nothing less than a textbook of liberty for our Revolutionary fathers.

While the written word was the foundation, it is apparent that the spoken word was the vehicle for convincing the people. This came with great force and wide range from the successors of Hooker and Wise. It was carried on with a missionary spirit which did not fail to reach the Scotch-Irish of North Carolina, showing its influence by significantly making that
Colony the first to give instructions to its delegates looking to independence. This preaching reached the neighborhood of Thomas Jefferson, who acknowledged that his “best ideas of democracy” had been secured at church meetings.

That these ideas were prevalent in Virginia is further revealed by the Declaration of Rights, which was prepared by George Mason and presented to the general assembly on May 27, 1776. This document asserted popular sovereignty and inherent natural rights, but confined the doctrine of equality to the assertion that “All men are created equally free and independent.” It can scarcely be imagined that Jefferson was unacquainted with what had been done in his own Commonwealth of Virginia when he took up the task of drafting the Declaration of Independence. But these thoughts can very largely be traced back to what John Wise was writing in 1710. He said, “Every man must be acknowledged equal to every man.” Again, “The end of all good government is to cultivate humanity and promote the happiness of all and the good of every man in all his rights, his life, liberty, estate, honor, and so forth....”

And again, “For as they have a power every man in his natural state, so upon combination they can and do bequeath this power to others and settle it according as their united discretion shall determine.” And still again, “Democracy is Christ’s government in church and state.” Here was the doctrine of equality, popular sovereignty, and the substance of the theory of inalienable rights clearly asserted by Wise at the opening of the eighteenth century, just as we have the principle of the consent of the governed stated by Hooker as early as 1638.

When we take all these circumstances into consideration, it is but natural that the first paragraph of the Declaration of Independence should open with a reference to Nature’s God and should close in the final paragraphs with an appeal to the Supreme Judge of the world and an assertion of a firm reliance on Divine Providence. Coming from these sources, having as it did this background, it is no wonder that Samuel Adams could say “The people seem to recognize this resolution as though it were a decree promulgated from heaven.”
No one can examine this record and escape the conclusion that in the great outline of its principles the Declaration was the result of the religious teachings of the preceding period. The profound philosophy which Jonathan Edwards applied to theology, the popular preaching of George Whitefield, had aroused the thought and stirred the people of the Colonies in preparation for this great event. No doubt the speculations which had been going on in England, and especially on the Continent, lent their influence to the general sentiment of the times. Of course, the world is always influenced by all the experience and all the thought of the past. But when we come to a contemplation of the immediate conception of the principles of human relationship which went into the Declaration of Independence we are not required to extend our search beyond our own shores. They are found in the texts, the sermons, and the writings of the early colonial clergy who were earnestly undertaking to instruct their congregations in the great mystery of how to live. They preached equality because they believed in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. They justified freedom by the text that we are all created in the divine image, all partakers of the divine spirit.

Placing every man on a plane where he acknowledged no superiors, where no one possessed any right to rule over him, he must inevitably choose his own rulers through a system of self-government. This was their theory of democracy. In those days such doctrines would scarcely have been permitted to flourish and spread in any other country. This was the purpose which the fathers cherished. In order that they might have freedom to express these thoughts and opportunity to put them into action, whole congregations with their pastors had migrated to the colonies. These great truths were in the air that our people breathed. Whatever else we may say of it, the Declaration of Independence was profoundly American.

If this apprehension of the facts be correct, and the documentary evidence would appear to verify it, then certain conclusions are bound to follow. A spring will cease to flow if its source be dried up; a tree will wither if its roots be destroyed. In its main features the Declaration of Independence is a great spiritual document. It is a declaration not of material but of spiritual conceptions. Equality, liberty, popular sovereignty, the rights of man—these
are not elements which we can see and touch. They are ideals. They have their source and their roots in the religious convictions. They belong to the unseen world. Unless the faith of the American people in these religious convictions is to endure, the principles of our Declaration will perish. We can not continue to enjoy the result if we neglect and abandon the cause.

We are too prone to overlook another conclusion. Governments do not make ideals, but ideals make governments. This is both historically and logically true. Of course the government can help to sustain ideals and can create institutions through which they can be the better observed, but their source by their very nature is in the people. The people have to bear their own responsibilities. There is no method by which that burden can be shifted to the government. It is not the enactment, but the observance of laws, that creates the character of a nation.

About the Declaration there is a finality that is exceedingly restful. It is often asserted that the world has made a great deal of progress since 1776, that we have had new thoughts and new experiences which have given us a great advance over the people of that day, and that we may therefore very well discard their conclusions for something more modern. But that reasoning can not be applied to this great charter. If all men are created equal, that is final. If they are endowed with inalienable rights, that is final. If governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, that is final. No advance, no progress can be made beyond these propositions. If anyone wishes to deny their truth or their soundness, the only direction in which he can proceed historically is not forward, but backward toward the time when there was no equality, no rights of the individual, no rule of the people. Those who wish to proceed in that direction can not lay claim to progress. They are reactionary. Their ideas are not more modern, but more ancient, than those of the Revolutionary fathers.

In the development of its institutions America can fairly claim that it has remained true to the principles which were declared 150 years ago. In all the essentials we have achieved an equality which was never possessed by any other people. Even in the less important matter
of material possessions we have secured a wider and wider distribution of wealth. The rights of the individual are held sacred and protected by constitutional guarantees, which even the Government itself is bound not to violate. If there is any one thing among us that is established beyond question, it is self-government—the right of the people to rule. If there is any failure in respect to any of these principles, it is because there is a failure on the part of individuals to observe them. We hold that the duly authorized expression of the will of the people has a divine sanction. But even in that we come back to the theory of John Wise that “Democracy is Christ’s government....” The ultimate sanction of law rests on the righteous authority of the Almighty.

On an occasion like this a great temptation exists to present evidence of the practical success of our form of democratic republic at home and the ever-broadening acceptance it is securing abroad. Although these things are well known, their frequent consideration is an encouragement and an inspiration. But it is not results and effects so much as sources and causes that I believe it is even more necessary constantly to contemplate. Ours is a government of the people. It represents their will. Its officers may sometimes go astray, but that is not a reason for criticizing the principles of our institutions. The real heart of the American Government depends upon the heart of the people. It is from that source that we must look for all genuine reform. It is to that cause that we must ascribe all our results.

It was in the contemplation of these truths that the fathers made their declaration and adopted their Constitution. It was to establish a free government, which must not be permitted to degenerate into the unrestrained authority of a mere majority or the unbridled weight of a mere influential few. They undertook the balance these interests against each other and provide the three separate independent branches, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial departments of the Government, with checks against each other in order that neither one might encroach upon the other. These are our guarantees of liberty. As a result of these methods enterprise has been duly protected from confiscation, the people have been free from oppression, and there has been an ever-broadening and deepening of the humanities of life.
Under a system of popular government there will always be those who will seek for political preferment by clamoring for reform. While there is very little of this which is not sincere, there is a large portion that is not well informed. In my opinion very little of just criticism can attach to the theories and principles of our institutions. There is far more danger of harm than there is hope of good in any radical changes. We do need a better understanding and comprehension of them and a better knowledge of the foundations of government in general. Our forefathers came to certain conclusions and decided upon certain courses of action which have been a great blessing to the world. Before we can understand their conclusions we must go back and review the course which they followed. We must think the thoughts which they thought. Their intellectual life centered around the meeting-house. They were intent upon religious worship. While there were always among them men of deep learning, and later those who had comparatively large possessions, the mind of the people was not so much engrossed in how much they knew, or how much they had, as in how they were going to live. While scantily provided with other literature, there was a wide acquaintance with the Scriptures. Over a period as great as that which measures the existence of our independence they were subject to this discipline not only in their religious life and educational training, but also in their political thought. They were a people who came under the influence of a great spiritual development and acquired a great moral power.

No other theory is adequate to explain or comprehend the Declaration of Independence. It is the product of the spiritual insight of the people. We live in an age of science and of abounding accumulation of material things. These did not create our Declaration. Our Declaration created them. The things of the spirit come first. Unless we cling to that, all our material prosperity, overwhelming though it may appear, will turn to a barren scepter in our grasp. If we are to maintain the great heritage which has been bequeathed to us, we must be like-minded as the fathers who created it. We must not sink into a pagan materialism. We must cultivate the reverence which they had for the things that are holy. We must follow the spiritual and moral leadership which they showed. We must keep replenished, that they may glow with a more compelling flame, the altar fires before which they worshipped.
GOVERNOR FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT (D)
Commonwealth Club Address

SPEECH EXCERPTS

September 23, 1932
Commonwealth Club of California | San Francisco, California

BACKGROUND

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, then Governor of New York, won the Democratic nomination for President in 1932 and delivered this campaign speech a month and a half before the election.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What happened to the “equality of opportunity?”
2. What does the situation in America call for?
3. What is the “task of government,” according to Roosevelt?
4. What does Roosevelt say about America’s contract?
5. What does Roosevelt say about property?

A glance at the situation today only too clearly indicates that equality of opportunity as we have known it no longer exists. Our industrial plant is built; the problem just now is whether under existing conditions it is not overbuilt. Our last frontier has long since been reached, and there is practically no more free land. More than half of our people do not live on the farms or on lands and cannot derive a living by cultivating their own property. There is no safety valve in the form of a Western prairie to which those thrown out of work by the Eastern economic machines can go for a new start. We are not able to invite the immigration from Europe to share our endless plenty. We are now providing a drab living for our own people.

Our system of constantly rising tariffs has at last reacted against us to the point of closing our Canadian frontier on the north, our European markets on the east, many of our Latin-American markets to the south, and a goodly proportion of our Pacific markets on the west, through the retaliatory tariffs of those countries. It has forced many of our great industrial institutions which exported their surplus production to such countries, to establish plants in such countries, within the tariff walls. This has resulted in the reduction of the operation of their American plants, and opportunity for employment.

Just as freedom to farm has ceased, so also the opportunity in business has narrowed. It still is true that men can start small enterprises, trusting to native shrewdness and ability to keep abreast of competitors; but area after area has been pre-empted altogether by the great corporations, and even in the fields which still have no great concerns, the small man starts under a handicap. The unfeeling statistics of the past three decades show that the independent business man is running a losing race.

Clearly, all this calls for a re-appraisal of values. A mere builder of more industrial plants, a creator of more railroad systems, an organizer of more corporations, is as likely to be a danger as a help. The day of the great promoter or the financial Titan, to whom we granted anything if only he would build, or develop, is over. Our task now is
not discovery or exploitation of natural resources, or necessarily producing more goods. It is the soberer, less dramatic business of administering resources and plants already in hand, of seeking to reestablish foreign markets for our surplus production, of meeting the problem of underconsumption, of adjusting production to consumption, of distributing wealth and products more equitably, of adapting existing economic organizations to the service of the people. The day of enlightened administration has come. . . . can we fix this hanging line?

As I see it, the task of Government in its relation to business is to assist the development of an economic declaration of rights, an economic constitutional order. This is the common task of statesman and business man. It is the minimum requirement of a more permanently safe order of things. . . .

The Declaration of Independence discusses the problem of Government in terms of a contract. Government is a relation of give and take, a contract, perforce, if we would follow the thinking out of which it grew. Under such a contract, rulers were accorded power, and the people consented to that power on consideration that they be accorded certain rights. The task of statesmanship has always been the re-definition of these rights in terms of a changing and growing social order. New conditions impose new requirements upon Government and those who conduct Government. . . .

The terms of that contract are as old as the Republic, and as new as the new economic order.

Every man has a right to life; and this means that he has also a right to make a comfortable living. He may by sloth or crime decline to exercise that right; but it may not be denied him. We have no actual famine or dearth; our industrial and agricultural mechanism can produce enough and to spare. Our Government formal and informal, political and economic, owes to everyone an avenue to possess himself of a portion of that plenty sufficient for his needs, through his own work.
Every man has a right to his own property; which means a right to be assured, to the fullest extent attainable, in the safety of his savings. By no other means can men carry the burdens of those parts of life which, in the nature of things, afford no chance of labor: childhood, sickness, old age. In all thought of property, this right is paramount; all other property rights must yield to it. If, in accord with this principle, we must restrict the operations of the speculator, the manipulator, even the financier, I believe we must accept the restriction as needful, not to hamper individualism but to protect it.

. . . The Government should assume the function of economic regulation only as a last resort, to be tried only when private initiative, inspired by high responsibility, with such assistance and balance as Government can give, has finally failed. As yet there has been no final failure, because there has been no attempt; and I decline to assume that this Nation is unable to meet the situation. . . .

Faith in America, faith in our tradition of personal responsibility, faith in our institutions, faith in ourselves demand that we recognize the new terms of the old social contract. We shall fulfill them, as we fulfilled the obligation of the apparent Utopia which Jefferson imagined for us in 1776, and which Jefferson, Roosevelt and Wilson sought to bring to realization. We must do so, lest a rising tide of misery, engendered by our common failure, engulf us all. But failure is not an American habit; and in the strength of great hope we must all shoulder our common load.
PRESIDENT FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT (D)
First Inaugural Address

SPEECH

March 4, 1933
U.S. Capitol | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

Franklin Delano Roosevelt delivered this address upon his inauguration in 1933.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What ought to be feared, according to Roosevelt?
2. How does Roosevelt describe American's situation?
3. How can America be restored?
4. What is happiness?
5. What is the “greatest primary task”?
6. Can the Constitution be changed?
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I am certain that my fellow Americans expect that on my induction into the Presidency I will address them with a candor and a decision which the present situation of our Nation impels. This is preeminently the time to speak the truth, the whole truth, frankly and boldly. Nor need we shrink from honestly facing conditions in our country today. This great Nation will endure as it has endured, will revive and will prosper. So, first of all, let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself – nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance. In every dark hour of our national life a leadership of frankness and vigor has met with that understanding and support of the people themselves which is essential to victory. I am convinced that you will again give that support to leadership in these critical days.

In such a spirit on my part and on yours we face our common difficulties. They concern, thank God, only material things. Values have shrunken to fantastic levels; taxes have risen; our ability to pay has fallen; government of all kinds is faced by serious curtailment of income; the means of exchange are frozen in the currents of trade; the withered leaves of industrial enterprise lie on every side; farmers find no markets for their produce; the savings of many years in thousands of families are gone.

More important, a host of unemployed citizens face the grim problem of existence, and an equally great number toil with little return. Only a foolish optimist can deny the dark realities of the moment.

Yet our distress comes from no failure of substance. We are stricken by no plague of locusts. Compared with the perils which our forefathers conquered because they believed and were not afraid, we have still much to be thankful for. Nature still offers her bounty and human efforts have multiplied it. Plenty is at our doorstep, but a generous use of it languishes in the very sight of the supply. Primarily this is because the rulers of the exchange of mankind’s goods have failed, through their own stubbornness and their own incompetence, have admitted their failure, and abdicated.
Practices of the unscrupulous money changers stand indicted in the court of public opinion, rejected by the hearts and minds of men.

True they have tried, but their efforts have been cast in the pattern of an outworn tradition. Faced by failure of credit they have proposed only the lending of more money. Stripped of the lure of profit by which to induce our people to follow their false leadership, they have resorted to exhortations, pleading tearfully for restored confidence. They know only the rules of a generation of self-seekers. They have no vision, and when there is no vision the people perish.

The money changers have fled from their high seats in the temple of our civilization. We may now restore that temple to the ancient truths. The measure of the restoration lies in the extent to which we apply social values more noble than mere monetary profit.

Happiness lies not in the mere possession of money; it lies in the joy of achievement, in the thrill of creative effort. The joy and moral stimulation of work no longer must be forgotten in the mad chase of evanescent profits. These dark days will be worth all they cost us if they teach us that our true destiny is not to be ministered unto but to minister to ourselves and to our fellow men.

Recognition of the falsity of material wealth as the standard of success goes hand in hand with the abandonment of the false belief that public office and high political position are to be valued only by the standards of pride of place and personal profit; and there must be an end to a conduct in banking and in business which too often has given to a sacred trust the likeness of callous and selfish wrongdoing. Small wonder that confidence languishes, for it thrives only on honesty, on honor, on the sacredness of obligations, on faithful protection, on unselfish performance; without them it cannot live.
Restoration calls, however, not for changes in ethics alone. This Nation asks for action, and action now.

Our greatest primary task is to put people to work. This is no unsolvable problem if we face it wisely and courageously. It can be accomplished in part by direct recruiting by the Government itself, treating the task as we would treat the emergency of a war, but at the same time, through this employment, accomplishing greatly needed projects to stimulate and reorganize the use of our natural resources.

Hand in hand with this we must frankly recognize the overbalance of population in our industrial centers and, by engaging on a national scale in a redistribution, endeavor to provide a better use of the land for those best fitted for the land. The task can be helped by definite efforts to raise the values of agricultural products and with this the power to purchase the output of our cities. It can be helped by preventing realistically the tragedy of the growing loss through foreclosure of our small homes and our farms. It can be helped by insistence that the Federal, State, and local governments act forthwith on the demand that their cost be drastically reduced. It can be helped by the unifying of relief activities which today are often scattered, uneconomical, and unequal. It can be helped by national planning for and supervision of all forms of transportation and of communications and other utilities which have a definitely public character. There are many ways in which it can be helped, but it can never be helped merely by talking about it. We must act and act quickly.

Finally, in our progress toward a resumption of work we require two safeguards against a return of the evils of the old order; there must be a strict supervision of all banking and credits and investments; there must be an end to speculation with other people’s money, and there must be provision for an adequate but sound currency.
There are the lines of attack. I shall presently urge upon a new Congress in special session detailed measures for their fulfillment, and I shall seek the immediate assistance of the several States.

Through this program of action we address ourselves to putting our own national house in order and making income balance outgo. Our international trade relations, though vastly important, are in point of time and necessity secondary to the establishment of a sound national economy. I favor as a practical policy the putting of first things first. I shall spare no effort to restore world trade by international economic readjustment, but the emergency at home cannot wait on that accomplishment.

The basic thought that guides these specific means of national recovery is not narrowly nationalistic. It is the insistence, as a first consideration, upon the interdependence of the various elements in all parts of the United States – a recognition of the old and permanently important manifestation of the American spirit of the pioneer. It is the way to recovery. It is the immediate way. It is the strongest assurance that the recovery will endure.

In the field of world policy I would dedicate this Nation to the policy of the good neighbor – the neighbor who resolutely respects himself and, because he does so, respects the rights of others – the neighbor who respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors.

If I read the temper of our people correctly, we now realize as we have never realized before our interdependence on each other; that we can not merely take but we must give as well; that if we are to go forward, we must move as a trained and loyal army willing to sacrifice for the good of a common discipline, because without such discipline no progress is made, no leadership becomes effective. We are, I know, ready and willing to submit our lives and property to such discipline, because it makes possible a leadership which aims at a larger good. This I propose to offer, pledging that
the larger purposes will bind upon us all as a sacred obligation with a unity of duty hitherto evoked only in time of armed strife.

With this pledge taken, I assume unhesitatingly the leadership of this great army of our people dedicated to a disciplined attack upon our common problems.

Action in this image and to this end is feasible under the form of government which we have inherited from our ancestors. Our Constitution is so simple and practical that it is possible always to meet extraordinary needs by changes in emphasis and arrangement without loss of essential form. That is why our constitutional system has proved itself the most superbly enduring political mechanism the modern world has produced. It has met every stress of vast expansion of territory, of foreign wars, of bitter internal strife, of world relations.

It is to be hoped that the normal balance of executive and legislative authority may be wholly adequate to meet the unprecedented task before us. But it may be that an unprecedented demand and need for undelayed action may call for temporary departure from that normal balance of public procedure.

I am prepared under my constitutional duty to recommend the measures that a stricken nation in the midst of a stricken world may require. These measures, or such other measures as the Congress may build out of its experience and wisdom, I shall seek, within my constitutional authority, to bring to speedy adoption.

But in the event that the Congress shall fail to take one of these two courses, and in the event that the national emergency is still critical, I shall not evade the clear course of duty that will then confront me. I shall ask the Congress for the one remaining instrument to meet the crisis – broad Executive power to wage a war against the emergency, as great as the power that would be given to me if we were in fact invaded by a foreign foe.
For the trust reposed in me I will return the courage and the devotion that befit the time. I can do no less.

We face the arduous days that lie before us in the warm courage of the national unity; with the clear consciousness of seeking old and precious moral values; with the clean satisfaction that comes from the stern performance of duty by old and young alike. We aim at the assurance of a rounded and permanent national life.

We do not distrust the future of essential democracy. The people of the United States have not failed. In their need they have registered a mandate that they want direct, vigorous action. They have asked for discipline and direction under leadership. They have made me the present instrument of their wishes. In the spirit of the gift I take it.

In this dedication of a Nation we humbly ask the blessing of God. May He protect each and every one of us. May He guide me in the days to come.
PRESIDENT FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT (D)
On Accepting the Presidential Nomination

SPEECH EXCERPTS

June 27, 1936
Democratic National Convention
Franklin Field | Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

BACKGROUND

Franklin D. Roosevelt delivered this address to commence his reelection campaign following his selection as the 1936 Democratic candidate for the presidency.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. To what struggle in American history does Roosevelt compare his struggle against big businesses and the wealthy?

2. Why does Roosevelt argue that most Americans are not really free?

3. What kind of language does Roosevelt adopt in explaining this struggle?

4. Which Christian virtues does Roosevelt redefine for his argument?

5. Is Roosevelt worried about the government making mistakes? Why or why not?

---

. . . [F]reedom, in itself and of necessity, suggests freedom from some restraining power. In 1776 we sought freedom from the tyranny of a political autocracy—from the eighteenth century royalists who held special privileges from the crown. It was to perpetuate their privilege that they governed without the consent of the governed; that they denied the right of free assembly and free speech; that they restricted the worship of God; that they put the average man’s property and the average man’s life in pawn to the mercenaries of dynastic power; that they regimented the people.

And so it was to win freedom from the tyranny of political autocracy that the American Revolution was fought. That victory gave the business of governing into the hands of the average man, who won the right with his neighbors to make and order his own destiny through his own Government. Political tyranny was wiped out at Philadelphia on July 4, 1776.

Since that struggle, however, man’s inventive genius released new forces in our land which reordered the lives of our people. The age of machinery, of railroads; of steam and electricity; the telegraph and the radio; mass production, mass distribution—all of these combined to bring forward a new civilization and with it a new problem for those who sought to remain free.

For out of this modern civilization economic royalists carved new dynasties. New kingdoms were built upon concentration of control over material things. Through new uses of corporations, banks and securities, new machinery of industry and agriculture, of labor and capital—all undreamed of by the fathers—the whole structure of modern life was impressed into this royal service.

There was no place among this royalty for our many thousands of small business men and merchants who sought to make a worthy use of the American system of initiative and profit. They were no more free than the worker or the farmer. Even honest and
progressive-minded men of wealth, aware of their obligation to their generation, could never know just where they fitted into this dynastic scheme of things.

It was natural and perhaps human that the privileged princes of these new economic dynasties, thirsting for power, reached out for control over Government itself. They created a new despotism and wrapped it in the robes of legal sanction. In its service new mercenaries sought to regiment the people, their labor, and their property. And as a result the average man once more confronts the problem that faced the Minute Man.

The hours men and women worked, the wages they received, the conditions of their labor—these had passed beyond the control of the people, and were imposed by this new industrial dictatorship. The savings of the average family, the capital of the small business man, the investments set aside for old age—other people’s money—these were tools which the new economic royalty used to dig itself in.

Those who tilled the soil no longer reaped the rewards which were their right. The small measure of their gains was decreed by men in distant cities.

Throughout the Nation, opportunity was limited by monopoly. Individual initiative was crushed in the cogs of a great machine. The field open for free business was more and more restricted. Private enterprise, indeed, became too private. It became privileged enterprise, not free enterprise.

An old English judge once said: “Necessitous men are not free men.” Liberty requires opportunity to make a living—a living decent according to the standard of the time, a living which gives man not only enough to live by, but something to live for.

For too many of us the political equality we once had won was meaningless in the face of economic inequality. A small group had concentrated into their own hands an almost complete control over other people’s property, other people’s money, other
people’s labor – other people’s lives. For too many of us life was no longer free; liberty no longer real; men could no longer follow the pursuit of happiness.

Against economic tyranny such as this, the American citizen could appeal only to the organized power of Government. The collapse of 1929 showed up the despotism for what it was. The election of 1932 was the people’s mandate to end it. Under that mandate it is being ended.

The royalists of the economic order have conceded that political freedom was the business of the Government, but they have maintained that economic slavery was nobody’s business. They granted that the Government could protect the citizen in his right to vote, but they denied that the Government could do anything to protect the citizen in his right to work and his right to live.

Today we stand committed to the proposition that freedom is no half-and-half affair. If the average citizen is guaranteed equal opportunity in the polling place, he must have equal opportunity in the market place.

These economic royalists complain that we seek to overthrow the institutions of America. What they really complain of is that we seek to take away their power. Our allegiance to American institutions requires the overthrow of this kind of power. In vain they seek to hide behind the Flag and the Constitution. In their blindness they forget what the Flag and the Constitution stand for. Now, as always, they stand for democracy, not tyranny; for freedom, not subjection; and against a dictatorship by mob rule and the over-privileged alike.

The brave and clear platform adopted by this Convention, to which I heartily subscribe, sets forth that Government in a modern civilization has certain inescapable obligations to its citizens, among which are protection of the family and the home, the establishment of a democracy of opportunity, and aid to those overtaken by disaster.
But the resolute enemy within our gates is ever ready to beat down our words unless in greater courage we will fight for them.

For more than three years we have fought for them. This Convention, in every word and deed, has pledged that that fight will go on.

The defeats and victories of these years have given to us as a people a new understanding of our Government and of ourselves. Never since the early days of the New England town meeting have the affairs of Government been so widely discussed and so clearly appreciated. It has been brought home to us that the only effective guide for the safety of this most worldly of worlds, the greatest guide of all, is moral principle.

We do not see faith, hope and charity as unattainable ideals, but we use them as stout supports of a Nation fighting the fight for freedom in a modern civilization.

Faith—in the soundness of democracy in the midst of dictatorships.

Hope—renewed because we know so well the progress we have made.

Charity—in the true spirit of that grand old word. For charity literally translated from the original means love, the love that understands, that does not merely share the wealth of the giver, but in true sympathy and wisdom helps men to help themselves.

We seek not merely to make Government a mechanical implement, but to give it the vibrant personal character that is the very embodiment of human charity.

In the place of the palace of privilege we seek to build a temple out of faith and hope and charity.
Governments can err, Presidents do make mistakes, but the immortal Dante tells us that divine justice weighs the sins of the cold-blooded and the sins of the warm-hearted in different scales.

Better the occasional faults of a Government that lives in a spirit of charity than the consistent omissions of a Government frozen in the ice of its own indifference.

There is a mysterious cycle in human events. To some generations much is given. Of other generations much is expected. This generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny.

In this world of ours in other lands, there are some people, who, in times past, have lived and fought for freedom, and seem to have grown too weary to carry on the fight. They have sold their heritage of freedom for the illusion of a living. They have yielded their democracy.

I believe in my heart that only our success can stir their ancient hope. They begin to know that here in America we are waging a great and successful war. It is not alone a war against want and destitution and economic demoralization. It is more than that; it is a war for the survival of democracy. We are fighting to save a great and precious form of government for ourselves and for the world.

I accept the commission you have tendered me. I join with you. I am enlisted for the duration of the war.


**REP. JOSIAH BAILEY (R-NC)**

An Address to the People of the United States

NEWSPAPER TRANSCRIPT ON AN UNDELIVERED SPEECH

December 16, 1937

*The New York Times*

**BACKGROUND**

More conservative members of both the Republican and Democratic parties, including former allies of Franklin Roosevelt, were represented by Representative Josiah Bailey in this undelivered speech drafted by Bailey and leaked to *The New York Times* before it was delivered.

**GUIDING QUESTIONS**

1. What does Bailey fear is happening to the American economy?

2. What are the “paramount principles” that ought to govern public policy?

3. What is the proper function of government as it relates to economic activity?

4. What is the “tradition” that Bailey hopes to protect?

---
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A sudden and extensive recession in business, industry, employment, prices and values demands instant attention of all in positions of responsibility. To arrest it, to reverse it and to avert its consequences is the common task. In this as Senators we have a duty, and in partial discharge of it we have determined upon this statement.

We have now not only the problem of caring for the unemployed pending opportunity for their employment, but also the task of preventing many now employed from losing their jobs.

We believe that a policy of cooperation by all concerned upon sound lines will suffice to set the country as a whole on its accustomed way toward higher ground. This cooperation is the objective of this address to the American people. This is no time for alarm or pessimism. We have come to the inevitable period of transition, and fortunately the underlying conditions are favorable.

We are concerned now only with our duty in view of the conditions that confront us, in order that full activity of employment and commerce may be had. To avoid controversy and make for unity, we may dispense with appraisals of policies or arguments. The past is experience, and is of value only for its lessons. We propose no criticism, no politics.

**Private Investment the Key**

We consider that the time has come when liberal investment of private savings in enterprise as a means of employment must be depended upon and, without delay, heartily encouraged by the public policy and all Americans.

Public spending, invoked in the recent emergency, was recognized as a cushion rather than as a substitute for the investment of savings by the people. To this latter all have looked at length. We believe that an encouraging public policy will ensue quickly in expanding enterprise, in active business, in widespread employment and in abundant demand for farm products.
Without criticism of the public spending policy attendant upon the former emergency, we recognize that a repetition of that policy would not serve again and moreover is out of the question. It ought to be borne in mind that private enterprise, properly fostered, carries the indispensable element of vigor.

The present unemployed and employed, and the young men and women about to enter upon careers, rightly desire and must have the opportunity which is afforded only by private enterprise. The President recently informed the Congress of the instant and obvious task of inducing the investment of private funds. We perceive, as does he, the necessity for the transition, gradual, to be sure, but distinct. And we propose to do our part to accomplish this objective in full cooperation.

Submits List of Essentials

In order to do this, we recognize that the public policy must conform to certain paramount principles, and without undertaking to specify all, we submit the following as essential at this time:

1. The capital gains tax and undistributed profits tax ought thoroughly to be revised at once without reducing revenue so as to free funds for investment and promote the normal flow of savings into profitable and productive use, not for the sake of capital, but for the consequences in expanding business, larger employment and a more active consumer demand for goods.

2. Steady approach must be made toward a balance of the public revenue with the public expenditure, a balanced national budget, and an end of those fears which deter investment.

The public credit must be preserved or nothing else matters. To undermine it is to defeat recovery; to destroy the people upon inflationary high living costs, and particularly to ruin those of our people who are on relief. There is nothing but a sound public credit between them and disaster, because they have no other reliance for their subsistence.
This means reduced public expenditure at every point practicable. We must have certainty of taxation and stability of the currency and credit. Before increasing taxes or broadening the base, we would exhaust the resources of an intelligent application of economy. We intend that a consistent progress toward a balanced budget shall be made—so consistent that none may question the consummation in due season. It must be a paramount objective, since it underlies certainty, stability and confidence.

As to Labor Relations

3. We propose just relations between capital and labor, and we seek an end at once of a friction engendered by more favorable conditions, that now serves none but injures all. We advise that government take a hand only as a last resort, and if it must, that it shall be impartial. We insist upon the constitutional guarantees of the rights of person and of property—the right of the worker to work, of the owner to possession, and of every man to enjoy in peace the fruits of his labor.

The maintenance of law and order is fundamental. It does labor no good to obtain new benefits if an orderly society in which to enjoy them is destroyed. Coercion and violence in labor relationships must stop, no matter by whom employed. Enlightened capital must deal with labor in the light of a new conception of legitimate collective bargaining and the right to organize. Enlightened labor must deal with capital in a due appreciation of mutual responsibilities for the success of enterprise indispensable to both.

Against Government Competition

4. Relying upon the profitable investment of private savings in enterprise, we oppose every government policy tending unnecessarily to compete with and so to discourage such investment. If the government proposes to compete in any field, due notice ought to be given in order that private investment may avoid it. For the government and private investment cannot occupy the same field.
We favor the principle recently suggested for the White House to the end that private funds on the basis of fair return upon prudent investment may be made available without delay.

We urge that the railroads shall enjoy an income appropriate to prudent investment value.

We favor also a constructive and encouraging attitude toward all legitimate institutions operating to assist the flow of funds into investment—with the view to a broad credit at low rates.

We favor the encouragement of housing construction, recognizing that this is also one of the larger fields for investment of private funds in durable goods—precisely the instant need.

**Reasonable Profit Essential**

5. We recognize that the value of investment, and the circulation of money, depends upon reasonable profit, not only to protect the investment and assure confidence, but also to provide increasing employment, and consumption of goods from farm to factory. We favor the competitive system as against either private or government monopoly, as preventing unreasonable profit and demanding vigor of enterprise. Our American competitive system is superior to any form of the collectivist program. We intend to preserve and foster it as the means of employment, of livelihood, and of maintaining our standard of living.

6. The sources of credit are abundant, but credit depends upon security—the soundness and stability of values; and these are governed by the profitable operation of the concerns in which stocks are certificates of interest or in which bonds are evidences of debt. If, therefore, the reservoirs of credit are to be tapped, we must assure a policy making for the sense of the safety of the collateral which is the basis of credit.
Taxes Blamed for Farm Plight

7. The spread between the prices of paid farmers and the prices paid by consumers for their products is notorious. One explanation of the difference is the fact that the amount of annual taxes, Federal, State and local, comes to at least one-fourth of the national income. It is the price to the consumer, with the burden of taxes therein, which accounts for consumer resistance, depresses demand for goods, and tends to pile up unmarketable surpluses. There ought to be reduction in the tax burden, and if this is impossible at the moment, firm assurance of no further increase ought to be given.

8. In a country so large and so complex as ours it is always difficult to fix uniform national standards for universal application in respect to the lives and livelihoods of our people. Except where State and local control are proven definitely inadequate, we favor the vigorous maintenance of States rights, home rule and local self-government. Otherwise we shall create more problems than we solve.

Would Give Work to Needy

9. We propose that there shall be no suffering for food, fuel, clothing and shelter; and that pending the contemplated revival of industry useful work shall be provided to an extent consistent with the principles of this address. The deserving must be provided for when and if their resources of energy, skill, or funds cease to avail. To be done well, this must be done economically with the view to encouraging individual self-reliance, the return to self-dependence at the first opportunity, the natural impulses of kinship and benevolence, local responsibility in county, city and State, and without the slightest catering to political favor. The administration of relief ought to be non-political and non-partisan, and temporary.
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We hold to the conviction that private investment and personal initiative properly encouraged will provide opportunity for all who are capable, and we propose employment for all who are capable as the goal of our efforts to justify the investment of savings in productive enterprise.
Rely on the American System

10. We propose to preserve and rely upon the American system of private enterprise and initiative, and our American form of government. It is not necessary to claim perfection for them. On the record they are far superior to and infinitely to be preferred to any other so far devised. They carry the priceless content of liberty and the dignity of man. They carry spiritual values of infinite import, and which constitute the source of the American spirit. We call upon all Americans to renew their faith in them and press an invincible demand in their behalf.

We can and will erect appropriate safeguards under the common law principles of free men without surrendering in any degree the vital principles and self-reliant spirit on which we must depend.

Our economic system must be such as to stimulate ambition, afford opportunity, and excite in each boy and girl a sense of responsibility to produce to his capacity.

Through individual self-reliance and service only can abundance, security, and happiness be attained.

Pledging ourselves to uphold these principles, we summon our fellow citizens, without regard to party, to join with us in advancing them as the only hope of permanent recovery and further progress. They will serve to take us safely through the period of transition now suddenly thrust upon us as they have taken us through every emergency. They will not fail us, if we adhere to them. But if we shall abandon them, the consequences will are outweigh in penalty the sacrifices we may make to our faith in them.

The heart of the American people is sound. They have met every emergency and demand. We will meet those of today and so hand down to our children our most precious heritage enhanced by a new and major trophy of free institutions. Let us not be dismayed but press on in the great liberal tradition and in its spirit of courageous self-reliance which has won through all the vicissitudes of a great
period, and has made our country the strongest, the most progressive and the best of nations.
WALTER LIPPMANN

“The Dominant Dogma of the Age”

CHAPTER 1 FROM THE GOOD SOCIETY

September 1937

Little, Brown and Company | Boston, Massachusetts

BACKGROUND

American writer and reporter Walter Lippmann publish his book The Good Society in 1937 amidst the Great Depression, Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal, and the rise of and military actions by totalitarian regimes in Europe and the Pacific.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Does Lippmann think people and countries will only fight over important and significant differences?

2. What is the “dogma” that other dogmas presuppose?

3. According to Lippmann, who do totalitarians and progressives alike presume must have an increase in power in order to improve the condition of men?

4. Lippmann argues that western man has sought for two thousand years to find a law superior to arbitrary power. What does he say this law is?

“There will be some fundamental assumptions which adherents of all the various systems within the epoch unconsciously presuppose. With these assumptions a certain limited number of types of philosophic systems are possible, and this group of systems constitutes the philosophy of the epoch.”

— Alfred North Whitehead, Science and the Modern World, page 69

In the violent conflicts which now trouble the earth the active contenders believe that since the struggle is so deadly it must be that the issues which divide them are deep. I think they are mistaken. Because parties are bitterly opposed, it does not necessarily follow that they have radically different purposes. The intensity of their antagonism is no measure of the divergence of their views. There has been many a ferocious quarrel among sectarians who worship the same god.

Although the partisans who are now fighting for the mastery of the modern world wear shirts of different colors, their weapons are drawn from the same armory, their doctrines are variations of the same theme, and they go forth to battle singing the same tune with slightly different words. Their weapons are the coercive direction of the life and labor of mankind. Their doctrine is that disorder and misery can be overcome only by more and more compulsory organization. Their promise is that through the power of the state men can be made happy.

Throughout the world, in the name of progress, men who call themselves communists, socialists, fascists, nationalists, progressives, and even liberals, are unanimous in holding that government with its instruments of coercion must, by commanding the people how they shall live, direct the course of civilization and fix the shape of things to come. They believe in what Mr. Stuart Chase accurately describes as “the overhead planning and control of economic activity.” This is the dogma which all the prevailing dogmas presuppose. This is the mold in which are cast the thought and action of the epoch. No other approach to the regulation of human affairs is seriously considered, or is even conceived as possible. The recently enfranchised masses and the leaders of thought who supply their ideas are almost completely under the spell of this dogma. Only a handful here and there, groups
without influence, isolated and disregarded thinkers, continue to challenge it. For the premises of authoritarian collectivism have become the working beliefs, the self-evident assumptions, the unquestioned axioms, not only of all the revolutionary regimes, but of nearly every effort which lays claim to being enlightened, humane, and progressive.

So universal is the dominion of this dogma over the minds of contemporary men that no one is taken seriously as a statesman or a theorist who does not come forward with proposals to magnify the power of public officials and to extend and multiply their intervention in human affairs. Unless he is authoritarian and collectivist, he is a mossback, a reactionary, at best an amiable eccentric swimming hopelessly against the tide. It is a strong tide. Though despotism is no novelty in human affairs, it is probably true that at no time in twenty-five hundred years has any western government claimed for itself a jurisdiction over men's lives comparable with that which is officially attempted in the totalitarian states. No doubt there have been despotic regimes which were more cruel than those of Russia, Italy, and Germany. There has been none which was more inclusive. In these ancient centres of civilization, several hundred millions of persons live under what is theoretically the absolute dominion of the dogma that public officials are their masters and that only under official orders may they live, work, and seek their salvation.

But it is even more significant that in other lands where men shrink from the ruthless policy of these regimes, it is commonly assumed that the movement of events must be in the same general direction. Nearly everywhere the mark of a progressive is that he relies at last upon the increased power of officials to improve the condition of men. Though the progressives prefer to move gradually and with consideration, by persuading majorities to consent, the only instrument of progress in which they have faith is the coercive agency of government. They can, it would seem, imagine no alternative, nor can they remember how much of what they cherish as progressive has come by emancipation from political dominion, by the limitation of power, by the release of personal energy from authority and collective coercion. For virtually all that now passes for progressivism in countries like England and the United States calls for the increasing ascendancy of the state: always the cry is for more officials with more power over more and more of the activities of men.
Yet the assumptions of this whole movement are not so self-evident as they seem. They are, in fact, contrary to the assumptions bred in men by the whole long struggle to extricate conscience, intellect, labor, and personality from the bondage of prerogative, privilege, monopoly, authority. For more than two thousand years, since western men first began to think about the social order, the main preoccupation of political thinking has been to find a law which would be superior to arbitrary power. Men have sought it in custom, in the dictates of reason, in religious revelation, endeavoring always to set up some check upon the exercise of force. This is the meaning of the long debate about Natural Law. This is the meaning of a thousand years of struggle to bring the sovereign under a constitution, to establish for the individual and for voluntary associations of men rights which they can enforce against kings, barons, magnates, majorities, and mobs. This is the meaning of the struggle to separate the church from the state, to emancipate conscience, learning, the arts, education, and commerce from the inquisitor, the censor, the monopolist, the policeman, and the hangman.

Conceivably the lessons of this history no longer have a meaning for us. Conceivably there has come into the world during this generation some new element which makes it necessary for us to undo the work of emancipation, to retrace the steps men have taken to limit the power of rulers, which compels us to believe that the way of enlightenment in affairs is now to be found by intensifying authority and enlarging its scope. But the burden of proof is upon those who reject the ecumenical tradition of the western world. It is for them to show that their cult of the Providential State is in truth the new revelation they think it is, and that it is not, as a few still believe, the gigantic heresy of an apostate generation.
PRESIDENT FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT (D)

Annual Message to Congress

SPEECH

January 11, 1944

U.S. Congress | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

President Franklin Roosevelt outlined his second or “economic Bill of Rights” while delivering his state of the union address to Congress looking forward to post-war policies.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What does Roosevelt consider our “political rights”?

2. Why are those political rights no longer adequate, according to Roosevelt?

3. How would the government go about securing things such as a right to a decent living or recreation?

4. What or who in America does Roosevelt label as Fascistic?

5. Who is the source for all these rights?

It is our duty now to begin to lay the plans and determine the strategy for the winning of a lasting peace and the establishment of an American standard of living higher than ever before known. We cannot be content, no matter how high that general standard of living may be, if some fraction of our people—whether it be one-third or one-fifth or one-tenth—is ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed, and insecure.

This Republic had its beginning, and grew to its present strength, under the protection of certain inalienable political rights—among them the right of free speech, free press, free worship, trial by jury, freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures. They were our rights to life and liberty.

As our Nation has grown in size and stature, however—as our industrial economy expanded—these political rights proved inadequate to assure us equality in the pursuit of happiness.

We have come to a clear realization of the fact that true individual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence. "Necissitous men are not free men." People who are hungry and out of a job are the stuff of which dictatorships are made.

In our day these economic truths have become accepted as self-evident. We have accepted, so to speak, a second Bill of Rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all—regardless of station, race, or creed.

Among these are:

The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the Nation;

The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation;

The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living;
The right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad;

The right of every family to a decent home;

The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;

The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment;

The right to a good education.

All of these rights spell security. And after this war is won we must be prepared to move forward, in the implementation of these rights, to new goals of human happiness and well-being.

America’s own rightful place in the world depends in large part upon how fully these and similar rights have been carried into practice for our citizens. For unless there is security here at home there cannot be lasting peace in the world.

One of the great American industrialists of our day—a man who has rendered yeoman service to his country in this crisis—recently emphasized the grave dangers of "rightist reaction" in this Nation. All clear-thinking businessmen share his concern. Indeed, if such reaction should develop—if history were to repeat itself and we were to return to the so-called "normalcy" of the 1920’s—then it is certain that even though we shall have conquered our enemies on the battlefields abroad, we shall have yielded to the spirit of Fascism here at home.

I ask the Congress to explore the means for implementing this economic bill of rights—for it is definitely the responsibility of the Congress so to do. Many of these problems are already before committees of the Congress in the form of proposed legislation. I shall from time to time communicate with the Congress with respect to these and further proposals.
In the event that no adequate program of progress is evolved, I am certain that the Nation
will be conscious of the fact.

Our fighting men abroad—and their families at home—expect such a program and have the right to insist upon it. It is to their demands that this Government should pay heed rather than the whining demands of selfish pressure groups who seek to feather their nests while young Americans are dying.

The foreign policy that we have been following—the policy that guided us at Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran—is based on the common sense principle which was best expressed by Benjamin Franklin on July 4, 1776: "We must all hang together, or assuredly we shall all hang separately."

I have often said that there are no two fronts for America in this war. There is only one front. There is one line of unity which extends from the hearts of the people at home to the men of our attacking forces in our farthest outposts. When we speak of our total effort, we speak of the factory and the field, and the mine as well as of the battleground—we speak of the soldier and the civilian, the citizen and his Government.

Each and every one of us has a solemn obligation under God to serve this Nation in its most critical hour—to keep this Nation great—to make this Nation greater in a better world.
Winston Churchill, Member of Parliament (Conservative Party)

Fifty Years Hence

ARTICLE

Mclean's | November 15, 1931

BACKGROUND

Winston Churchill, after leaving leadership positions in Parliament, wrote this article in 1931, first published in a Canadian magazine of current affairs.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Does Churchill believe human nature progresses?

2. What is the cause of the last century’s progress? Does Churchill think such progress is a good thing?

3. In what ways does Churchill think science could be dangerous to free government?

4. What questions are beyond science’s reach, according to Churchill? What is needed to go beyond science?

5. What are difficulties with democracy that Churchill sees when faced with the problem of managing science and progress?

The great mass of human beings, absorbed in the toils, cares and activities of life, are only dimly conscious of the pace at which mankind has begun to travel. We look back a hundred years and see that great changes have taken place. We look back fifty years and see that the speed is constantly quickening. This present century has witnessed an enormous revolution in material things, in scientific appliances, in political institutions, in manners and customs. The greatest change of all is the least perceptible by individuals: it is the far greater numbers which in every civilized country participate in the fuller life of man. 'In those days,' said Disraeli, writing at the beginning of the nineteenth century, 'England was for the few and for the very few.' 'The twice two thousand for whom,’ wrote Byron, 'the world is made’ have given place to many millions for whom existence has become larger, safer, more varied, more full of hope and choice. In the United States scores of millions have lifted themselves above primary necessities and comforts, and aspire to culture – at least for their children. Europe, though stunned and lacerated by Armageddon, presents a similar if less general advance. We all take the modern conveniences and facilities as they are offered to us without being grateful or consciously happier. But we simply could not live if they were taken away. We assume that progress will be constant. 'This 'ere progress,' Mr Wells makes one of his characters remark, 'keeps going on. It's wonderful 'ow it keeps going on.' It is also very fortunate, for if it stopped or were reversed, there would be the catastrophe of unimaginable horror. Mankind has gone too far to go back, and is moving too fast to stop. There are too many people maintained, not merely in comfort but in existence, by processes unknown a century ago, for us to afford even a temporary check, still less a general setback, without experiencing calamity in its most frightful form.

When we look back beyond a hundred years over the long trails of history, we see immediately why the age we live in differs from all other ages in human annals. Mankind has sometimes travelled forwards and sometimes backwards, or has stood still even for hundreds of years. It remained stationary in India and in China for thousands of years. What is it that has produced this new prodigious speed of man? Science is the
cause. Her once feeble vanguards, often trampled down, often perishing in isolation, have now become a vast organized united class-conscious army marching forward upon all the fronts towards objectives none may measure or define. It is a proud, ambitious army which cares nothing for all the laws that men have made; nothing for their most time-honoured customs, or most dearly cherished beliefs, or deepest instincts. It is this power called Science which has laid hold of us, conscripted us into its regiments and batteries, set us to work upon its highways and in its arsenals; rewarded us for our services, healed us when we were wounded, trained us when we were young, pensioned us when we were worn out. None of the generations of men before the last two or three were ever gripped for good or ill and handled like this.

Man in the earliest stages lived alone and avoided his neighbours with as much anxiety and probably as much reason as he avoided the fierce flesh-eating beasts that shared his forests. With the introduction of domestic animals the advantages of co-operation and the division of labour became manifest. In the neolithic times when cereals were produced and agriculture developed, the bleak hungry period whilst the seeds were germinating beneath the soil involved some form of capitalism and the recognition of those special rights of landed proprietors the traces of which are still visible in our legislation. Each stage involved new problems legal, sociological and moral. But progress only crawled, and often rested for a thousand years or so.

The two ribbon States in the valley of the Nile and the Euphrates produced civilizations as full of pomp and circumstance and more stable than any the world has ever known. Their autocracies and hierarchies were founded upon the control and distribution of water and corn. The rulers held the people in an efficiency of despotism never equalled till Soviet Russia was born. They had only to cut off or stint the water in the canals to starve or subjugate rebellious provinces. This, apart from their granaries, gave them powers at once as irresistible and as capable of intimate regulation as the control of all food supplies gives to the Bolshevik commissars. Safe from internal trouble, they were vulnerable only to external attack. But in these states man had not learnt to catalyse the
forces of nature. The maximum power available was the sum of the muscular efforts of all the inhabitants. Later empires, scarcely less imposing but far less stable, rose and fell. In the methods of production and communication, in the modes of getting food and exchanging goods, there was less change between the time of Sargon and the time of Louis XIV than there has been between the accession of Queen Victoria and the present day. Darius could probably send a message from Susa to Sardis faster than Philip II could transmit an order from Madrid to Brussels. Sir Robert Peel, summoned in 1841 from Rome to form a government in London, took the same time as the Emperor Vespasian when he had to hasten to his province of Britain. The bathrooms of the palaces of Minos were superior to those of Versailles. A priest from Thebes would probably have felt more at home at the Council of Trent two thousand years after Thebes had vanished than Sir Isaac Newton at a modern undergraduate physical society, or George Stephenson in the Institute of Electrical Engineers. The changes have been so sudden and so gigantic that no period in history can be compared with the last century. The past no longer enables us even dimly to measure the future.

The most wonderful of all modern prophecies is found in Tennyson’s ‘Locksley Hall’: For I dipt into the future, far as human eye could see, Saw the Vision of the world, and all the wonder that would be; Saw the heavens fill with commerce, argosies of magic sails, Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales; Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there rain’d a ghastly dew From the nations’ airy navies grappling in the central blue; Far along the world-wide whisper of the south-wind rushing warm With the standards of the peoples plunging thro’ the thunderstorm; Till the war-drum throbb’d no longer, and the battle-flags were furl’d In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world. Slowly comes a hungry people, as a lion creeping nigher, Glares at one that nods and winks behind a slowly-dying fire.

These six couplets of prediction, written eighty years ago, have already been fulfilled. The conquest of the air for commerce and war, the League of Nations, the Communist movement—all divined in their true sequence by the great Victorian—all now already
in the history books and stirring the world around us today! We may search the Scriptures in vain for such precise and swiftly vindicated forecasts of the future. Jeremiah and Isaiah dealt in dark and cryptic parables pointing to remote events and capable of many varied interpretations from time to time. A Judge, a Prophet, a Redeemer would arise to save His Chosen People; and from age to age the Jews asked, disputing, 'Art thou he that should come or do we look for another?’ But 'Locksley Hall' contains an exact foretelling of stupendous events, which many of those who knew the writer lived to see and endure! The dawn of the Victorian era opened the new period of man; and the genius of the poet pierced the veil of the future.

There are two processes which we adopt consciously or unconsciously when we try to prophesy. We can seek a period in the past whose conditions resemble as closely as possible those of our day, and presume that the sequel to that period will, save for some minor alterations, be repeated. Secondly, we can survey the general course of development in our immediate past, and endeavour to prolong it into the near future. The first is the method of the historian; the second that of the scientist. Only the second is open to us now, and this only in a partial sphere. By observing all that Science has achieved in modern times, and the knowledge and power now in her possession, we can predict with some assurance the inventions and discoveries which will govern our future. We can but guess, peering through a glass darkly, what reactions these discoveries and their applications will produce upon the habits, the outlook and the spirit of men.

Whereas formerly the utmost power that man could guide and control was a team of horses or a galleyful of slaves, or possibly, if they could be sufficiently drilled and harnessed, a gang of labourers like the Israelites in Egypt; it is today already possible to control accurately from the bridge of a battle cruiser all the power of hundreds of thousands of men, or to set off with one finger a mine capable in an instant of destroying the work of thousands of man-years. These changes are due to the substitution of molecular energy for muscular energy, and its direction and control by
an elaborate, beautifully perfected apparatus. These immense new sources of power, and the fact that they can be wielded by a single individual, have made possible novel methods of mining and metallurgy, new modes of transport and undreamed-of machinery. These in their turn enable the molecular sources of power to be extended and used more efficiently. They facilitate also the improvement of ancient methods. They substitute the hundred-thousand kilowatt turbo-generators at Niagara for the mill-wheel of our forefathers. Each invention acted and reacted on other inventions, and with ever-growing rapidity that vast structure of technical achievement was raised which separates the civilization of today from all that the past has known.

There is no doubt that this evolution will continue at an increasing rate. We know enough to be sure that the scientific achievements of the next fifty years will be far greater, more rapid and more surprising, than those we have already experienced. The slide-lathe enabled machines of precision to be made, and the power of steam rushed out upon the world. And through the steam-clouds flashed the dazzling lightning of electricity. But this is only a beginning. High authorities tell us that new sources of power, vastly more important than any we yet know, will surely be discovered. Nuclear energy is incomparably greater than the molecular energy which we use today. The coal a man can get in a day can easily do five hundred times as much work as the man himself. Nuclear energy is at least one million times more powerful still. If the hydrogen atoms in a pound of water could be prevailed upon to combine together and form helium, they would suffice to drive a thousand horsepower engine for a whole year. If the electrons, those tiny planets of the atomic systems, were induced to combine with the nuclei in the hydrogen the horsepower liberated would be 120 times greater still. There is no question among scientists that this gigantic source of energy exists. What is lacking is the match to set the bonfire alight, or it may be the detonator to cause the dynamite to explode. The Scientists are looking for this.

The discovery and control of such sources of power would cause changes in human affairs incomparably greater than those produced by the steam-engine four generations
ago. Schemes of cosmic magnitude would become feasible. Geography and climate
would obey our orders. Fifty thousand tons of water, the amount displaced by the
Berengaria, would, if exploited as described, suffice to shift Ireland to the middle of the
Atlantic. The amount of rain falling yearly upon the Epsom racecourse would be
equal to thaw all the ice at the Arctic and Antarctic poles. The changing of one
element into another by means of temperatures and pressures would be far beyond our
present reach, would transform beyond all description our standards of values.
Materials thirty times stronger than the best steel would create engines fit to bridle the
new forms of power. Communications and transport by land, water and air would take
unimaginable forms, if, as is in principle possible, we could make an engine of 600
horsepower, weighing 20 lb and carrying fuel for a thousand hours in a tank the size of
a fountain-pen. Wireless telephones and television, following naturally upon their
present path of development, would enable their owner to connect up with any room
similarly installed, and hear and take part in the conversation as well as if he put his
head in through the window. The congregation of men in cities would become
superfluous. It would rarely be necessary to call in person on any but the most intimate
friends, but if so, excessively rapid means of communication would be at hand. There
would be no more object in living in the same city with one’s neighbour than there is
today in living with him in the same house. The cities and the countryside would
become indistinguishable. Every home would have its garden and its glade.

Up till recent times the production of food has been the prime struggle of man. That
war is won. There is no doubt that the civilized races can produce or procure all the
food they require. Indeed some of the problems which vex us today are due to the
production of wheat by white men having exceeded their own needs, before yellow
men, brown men and black men have learnt to demand and become able to purchase a
diet superior to rice. But food is at present obtained almost entirely from the energy of
the sunlight. The radiation from the sun produces from the carbonic acid in the air
more or less complicated carbon compounds which give us our plants and vegetables.
We use the latent chemical energy of these to keep our bodies warm; we convert it into
muscular effort. We employ it in the complicated processes of digestion to repair and replace the wasted cells of our bodies. Many people, of course, prefer food in what the vegetarians call 'the secondhand form', i.e. after it has been digested and converted into meat for us by domestic animals kept for this purpose. In all these processes, however, ninety-nine parts of the solar energy are wasted for every part used.

Even without the new sources of power great improvements are probable here. Microbes, which at present convert the nitrogen of the air into the proteins by which animals live, will be fostered and made to work under controlled conditions, just as yeast is now. New strains of microbes will be developed and made to do a great deal of our chemistry for us. With a greater knowledge of what are called hormones, i.e. the chemical messengers in our blood, it will be possible to control growth. We shall escape the absurdity of growing a whole chicken in order to eat the breast or wing, by growing these parts separately under a suitable medium. Synthetic food will, of course, also be used in the future. Nor need the pleasures of the table be banished. That gloomy Utopia of tabloid meals need never be invaded. The new foods will from the outset be practically indistinguishable from the natural products, and any changes will be so gradual as to escape observation.

If the gigantic new sources of power become available, food will be produced without recourse to sunlight. Vast cellars in which artificial radiation is generated may replace the cornfields or potato-patches of the world. Parks and gardens will cover our pastures and ploughed fields. When the time comes there will be plenty of room for the cities to spread themselves again.

But equally startling developments lie already just beyond our finger-tips in the breeding of human beings and the shaping of human nature. It used to be said, 'Though you have taught the dog more tricks, you cannot alter the breed of the dog.' But that is no longer true. A few years ago London was surprised by a play called Rossum's Universal Robots. The production of such beings may well be possible within fifty
years. They will not be made, but grown under glass. There seems little doubt that it will be possible to carry out in artificial surroundings the entire cycle which now leads to the birth of a child. Interference with the mental development of such beings, expert suggestion and treatment in the earlier years, would produce beings specialized to thought or toil. The production of creatures, for instance, which have admirable physical development, with their mental endowment stunted in particular directions, is almost within the range of human power. A being might be produced capable of tending a machine but without other ambitions. Our minds recoil from such fearful eventualities, and the laws of a Christian civilization will prevent them. But might not lop-sided creatures of this type fit in well with the Communist doctrines of Russia? Might not the Union of Soviet Republics armed with all the power of science find it in harmony with all their aims to produce a race adapted to mechanical tasks and with no other ideas but to obey the Communist State? The present nature of man is tough and resilient. It casts up its sparks of genius in the darkest and most unexpected places. But Robots could be made to fit the grisly theories of Communism. There is nothing in the philosophy of Communists to prevent their creation.

I have touched upon this sphere only lightly, but with the purpose of pointing out that, in a future which our children may live to see, powers will be in the hands of men altogether different from any by which human nature has been moulded. Explosive forces, energy, materials, machinery will be available upon a scale which can annihilate whole nations. Despotisms and tyrannies will be able to prescribe the lives and even the wishes of their subjects in a manner never known since time began. If to these tremendous and awful powers is added the pitiless sub-human wickedness which we now see embodied in one of the most powerful reigning governments, who shall say that the world itself will not be wrecked, or indeed that it ought not to be wrecked? There are nightmares of the future from which a fortunate collision with some wandering star, reducing the earth to incandescent gas, might be a merciful deliverance.
It is indeed a descent almost to the ridiculous to contemplate the impact of the tremendous and terrifying discoveries which are approaching upon the structure of Parliamentary institutions. How can we imagine the whole mass of the people being capable of deciding by votes at the Report of the Committee With Studies of Administrative Management in the Federal Government lections upon the right course to adopt amid these cataclysmic changes? Even now the Parliaments of every country have shown themselves quite inadequate to deal with the economic problems which dominate the affairs of every nation and of the world. Before these problems the claptrap of the hustings and the stunts of the newspapers wither and vanish away.

Democracy as a guide or motive to progress has long been known to be incompetent. None of the legislative assemblies of the great modern states represents in universal suffrage even a fraction of the strength or wisdom of the community. Great nations are no longer led by their ablest men, or by those who know most about their immediate affairs, or even by those who have a coherent doctrine. Democratic governments drift along the line of least resistance, taking short views, paying their way with sops and doles, and smoothing their path with pleasant-sounding platitudes. Never was there less continuity or design in their affairs, and yet towards them are coming swiftly changes which will revolutionize for good or ill not only the whole economic structure of the world but the social habits and moral outlook of every family. Only the Communists have a plan and a gospel. It is a plan fatal to personal freedom and a gospel founded upon Hate.

Certain it is that while men are gathering knowledge and power with ever-increasing and measureless speed, their virtues and their wisdom have not shown any notable improvement as the centuries have rolled. The brain of a modern man does not differ in essentials from that of the human beings who fought and loved here millions of years ago. The nature of man has remained hitherto practically unchanged. Under sufficient stress—starvation, terror, warlike passion, or even cold intellectual frenzy—the modern man we know so well will do the most terrible deeds, and his modern woman will back him up. At the present moment the civilizations of many different ages co-exist.
together in the world, and their representatives meet and converse. Englishmen, Frenchmen, or Americans with ideas abreast of the twentieth century do business with Indians or Chinese whose civilizations were crystallized several thousands of years ago. We have the spectacle of the powers and weapons of man far outstripping the march of his intelligence; we have the march of his intelligence proceeding far more rapidly than the development of his nobility. We may well find ourselves in the presence of 'the strength of civilization without its mercy'.

It is therefore above all things important that the moral philosophy and spiritual conceptions of men and nations should hold their own amid these formidable scientific evolutions. It would be much better to call a halt in material progress and discovery rather than to be mastered by our own apparatus and the forces which it directs. There are secrets too mysterious for man in his present state to know, secrets which, once penetrated, may be fatal to human happiness and glory. But the busy hands of the scientists are already fumbling with the keys of all the chambers hitherto forbidden to mankind. Without an equal growth of Mercy, Pity, Peace and Love, Science herself may destroy all that makes human life majestic and tolerable. There never was a time when the inherent virtue of human beings required more strong and confident expression in daily life; there never was a time when the hope of immortality and the disdain of earthly power and achievement were more necessary for the safety of the children of men.

After all, this material progress, in itself so splendid, does not meet any of the real needs of the human race. I read a book the other day which traced the history of mankind from the birth of the solar system to its extinction. There were fifteen or sixteen races of men which in succession rose and fell over periods measured by tens of millions of years. In the end a race of beings was evolved which had mastered nature. A state was created whose citizens lived as long as they chose, enjoyed pleasures and sympathies incomparably wider than our own, navigated the interplanetary spaces, could recall the panorama of the past and foresee the future. But what was the good of all that to them?
What did they know more than we know about the answers to the simple questions which man has asked since the earliest dawn of reason—’Why are we here? What is the purpose of life? Whither are we going?’ No material progress, even though it takes shapes we cannot now conceive, or however it may expand the faculties of man, can bring comfort to his soul. It is this fact, more wonderful than any that Science can reveal, which gives the best hope that all will be well. Projects undreamed-of by past generations will absorb our immediate descendants; forces terrific and devastating will be in their hands; comforts, activities, amenities, pleasures will crowd upon them, but their hearts will ache, their lives will be barren, if they have not a vision above material things. And with the hopes and powers will come dangers out of all proportion to the growth of man’s intellect, to the strength of his character or to the efficacy of his institutions. Once more the choice is offered between Blessing and Cursing. Never was the answer that will be given harder to foretell.
PRESIDENT FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT (D)
Fireside Chat on National Security
RADIO BROADCAST EXCERPTS

December 29, 1940
The White House | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

President Franklin Roosevelt addressed the nation during one of his “fireside chats” radio broadcasts six months after Nazi Germany conquered France and amidst the Battle of Britain.

ANNOTATIONS

This is not a fireside chat on war. It is a talk on national security; because the nub of the whole purpose of your President is to keep you now; and your children later, and your grandchildren much later, out of a last-ditch war for the preservation of American independence and all of the things that American independence means to you and to me and to ours.

Tonight, in the presence of a world crisis, my mind goes back eight years ago to a night in the midst of a domestic crisis. It was a time when the wheels of American industry were grinding to a full stop, when the whole banking system of our country had ceased to function.

I well remember that while I sat in my study in the White House, preparing to talk with the people of the United States, I had before my eyes the picture of all those Americans with whom I was talking. I saw the workmen in the mills, the mines, the factories; the girl behind the counter; the small shopkeeper; the farmer doing his spring plowing; the widows and the old men wondering about their life's savings.

I tried to convey to the great mass of American people what the banking crisis meant to

__________________
them in their daily lives.

Tonight, I want to do the same thing, with the same people, in this new crisis which faces America.

We met the issue of 1933 with courage and realism.

5 We face this new crisis—this new threat to the security of our Nation—with the same courage and realism.

Never before since Jamestown and Plymouth Rock has our American civilization been in such danger as now.

For, on September 27, 1940, by an agreement signed in Berlin, three powerful nations, two in Europe and one in Asia, joined themselves together in the threat that if the United States interfered with or blocked the expansion program of these three nations—a program aimed at world control—they would unite in ultimate action against the United States.

The Nazi masters of Germany have made it clear that they intend not only to dominate all life and thought in their own country, but also to enslave the whole of Europe, and then to use the resources of Europe to dominate the rest of the world.

Three weeks ago their leader stated, "There are two worlds that stand opposed to each other." Then in defiant reply to his opponents, he said this: "Others are correct when they say: 'With this world we cannot ever reconcile ourselves.' . . . I can beat any other power in the world." So said the leader of the Nazis.

In other words, the Axis not merely admits but proclaims that there can be no ultimate peace between their philosophy of government and our philosophy of government.

In view of the nature of this undeniable threat, it can be asserted, properly and categorically, that the United States has no right or reason to encourage talk of peace until
the day shall come when there is a clear intention on the part of the aggressor nations to abandon all thought of dominating or conquering the world.

At this moment, the forces of the states that are leagued against all peoples who live in freedom are being held away from our shores. The Germans and Italians are being blocked on the other side of the Atlantic by the British, and by the Greeks, and by thousands of soldiers and sailors who were able to escape from subjugated countries. The Japanese are being engaged in Asia by the Chinese in another great defense.

In the Pacific is our fleet.

Some of our people like to believe that wars in Europe and in Asia are of no concern to us. But it is a matter of most vital concern to us that European and Asiatic war-makers should not gain control of the oceans which lead to this hemisphere.

One hundred and seventeen years ago the Monroe Doctrine was conceived by our Government as a measure of defense in the face of a threat against this hemisphere by an alliance in continental Europe. Thereafter, we stood on guard in the Atlantic, with the British as neighbors. There was no treaty. There was no "unwritten agreement".

Yet, there was the feeling, proven correct by history, that we as neighbors could settle any disputes in peaceful fashion. The fact is that during the whole of this time the Western Hemisphere has remained free from aggression from Europe or from Asia.

Does anyone seriously believe that we need to fear attack while a free Britain remains our most powerful naval neighbor in the Atlantic? Does any one seriously believe, on the other hand, that we could rest easy if the Axis powers were our neighbor there?

If Great Britain goes down, the Axis powers will control the continents of Europe, Asia, Africa, Australasia, and the high seas—and they will be in a position to bring enormous military and naval resources against this hemisphere. It is no exaggeration to say that all
of us in the Americas would be living at the point of a gun—a gun loaded with explosive bullets, economic as well as military.

We should enter upon a new and terrible era in which the whole world, our hemisphere included, would be run by threats of brute force. To survive in such a world, we would have to convert ourselves permanently into a militaristic power on the basis of war economy.

Some of us like to believe that, even if Great Britain falls, we are still safe, because of the broad expanse of the Atlantic and of the Pacific.

But the width of these oceans is not what it was in the days of clipper ships. At one point between Africa and Brazil the distance is less than from Washington to Denver—five hours for the latest type of bomber. And at the, north of the Pacific Ocean, America and Asia almost touch each other. Even today we have planes which could fly from the British Isles to New England and back without refueling. And the range of the modern bomber is ever being increased….

Any South American country, in Nazi hands, would always constitute a jumping-off place for German attack on any one of the other republics of this hemisphere….

There are those who say that the Axis powers would never have any desire to attack the Western Hemisphere. This is the same dangerous form of wishful thinking which has destroyed the powers of resistance of so many conquered peoples. The plain facts are that the Nazis have proclaimed, time and again, that all other races are their inferiors and therefore subject to their orders. And most important of all, the vast resources and wealth of this hemisphere constitute the most tempting loot in all the world….

The British people are conducting an active war against this unholy alliance. Our own future security is greatly dependent on the outcome of that fight. Our ability to "keep out of war" is going to be affected by that outcome.
Thinking in terms of today and tomorrow, I make the direct statement to the American people that there is far less chance of the United States getting into war if we do all we can now to support the nations defending themselves against attack by the Axis than if we acquiesce in their defeat, submit tamely to an Axis victory, and wait our turn to be the object of attack in another war later on.

If we are to be completely honest with ourselves, we must admit there is risk in any course we may take. But I deeply believe that the great majority of our people agree that the course that I advocate involves the least risk now and the greatest hope for world peace in the future.

The people of Europe who are defending themselves do not ask us to do their fighting. They ask us for the implements of war, the planes, the tanks, the guns, the freighters, which will enable them to fight for their liberty and our security. Emphatically we must get these weapons to them in sufficient volume and quickly enough, so that we and our children will be saved the agony and suffering of war which others have had to endure.

Let not defeatists tell us that it is too late. It will never be earlier. Tomorrow will be later than today.

Certain facts are self-evident.

In a military sense Great Britain and the British Empire are today the spearhead of resistance to world conquest. They are putting up a fight which will live forever in the story of human gallantry.

There is no demand for sending an American Expeditionary Force outside our own borders. There is no intention by any member of your Government to send such a force. You can, therefore, nail any talk about sending armies to Europe as deliberate untruth.

Our national policy is not directed toward war. Its sole purpose is to keep war away from our country and our people.
Arsenal of Democracy Speech  
Franklin Roosevelt

Democracy's fight against world conquest is being greatly aided, and must be more greatly aided, by the rearmament of the United States and by sending every ounce and every ton of munitions and supplies that we can possibly spare to help the defenders who are in the front lines. It is no more unneutral for us to do that than it is for Sweden, Russia, and other nations near Germany to send steel and ore and oil and other war materials into Germany every day.

We are planning our own defense with the utmost urgency; and in its vast scale we must integrate the war needs of Britain and the other free nations resisting aggression.

This is not a matter of sentiment or of controversial personal opinion. It is a matter of realistic military policy, based on the advice of our military experts who are in close touch with existing warfare. These military and naval experts and the members of the Congress and the administration have a single-minded purpose—the defense of the United States.

This Nation is making a great effort to produce everything that is necessary in this emergency—and with all possible speed. This great effort requires great sacrifice.…

American industrial genius, unmatched throughout the world in the solution of production problems, has been called upon to bring its resources and talents into action. Manufacturers of watches, of farm implements, linotypes, cash registers, automobiles, sewing machines, lawn mowers, and locomotives are now making fuses, bomb-packing crates, telescope mounts, shells, pistols, and tanks.

But all our present efforts are not enough. We must have more ships, more guns, more planes—more of everything. This can only be accomplished if we discard the notion of "business as usual". This job cannot be done merely by superimposing on the existing productive facilities the added requirements for defense.

Our defense efforts must not be blocked by those who fear the future consequences of surplus plant capacity. The possible consequence of failure of our defense efforts now are much more to be feared.
After the present needs of our defense are past, a proper handling of the country's peacetime needs will require all of the new productive capacity—if not more.

No pessimistic policy about the future of America shall delay the immediate expansion of those industries essential to defense.

I want to make it clear that it is the purpose of the Nation to build now with all possible speed every machine and arsenal and factory that we need to manufacture our defense material. We have the men the skill, the wealth, and above all, the will.

I am confident that if and when production of consumer or luxury goods in certain industries requires the use of machines and raw materials essential for defense purposes, then such production must yield to our primary and compelling purpose.

I appeal to the owners of plants, to the managers, to the workers, to our own Government employees, to put every ounce of effort into producing these munitions swiftly and without stint. And with this appeal I give you the pledge that all of us who are officers of you Government will devote ourselves to the same whole-hearted extent to the great task which lies ahead.

As planes and ships and guns and shells are produced, your Government, with its defense experts, can then determine how best to use them to defend this hemisphere. The decision as to how much shall be sent abroad and how much shall remain at home must be made on the basis of our overall military necessities.

We must be the great arsenal of democracy. For us this is an emergency as serious as war itself. We must apply ourselves to our task with the same resolution, the same sense of urgency, the same spirit of patriotism and sacrifice, as we would show were we at war.

We have furnished the British great material support and we will furnish far more in the future.
There will be no "bottlenecks" in our determination to aid Great Britain. No dictator, no combination of dictators, will weaken that determination by threats of how they will construe that determination.

The British have received invaluable military support from the heroic Greek Army and from the forces of all the governments in exile. Their strength is growing. It is the strength of men and women who value their freedom more highly than they value their lives.

I believe that the Axis powers are not going to win this war. I base that belief on the latest and best information.

We have no excuse for defeatism. We have every good reason for hope—hope for peace, hope for the defense of our civilization and for the building of a better civilization in the future.

I have the profound conviction that the American people are now determined to put forth a mightier effort than they have ever yet made to increase our production of all the implements of defense, to meet the threat to our democratic faith.

As President of the United States I call for that national effort. I call for it in the name of this Nation which we love and honor and which we are privileged and proud to serve. I call upon our people with absolute confidence that our common cause will greatly succeed.
PRESIDENT FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT (D)
Annual Message to Congress

ADDRESS

January 6, 1941
U.S. Congress | Washington, D.C.

Four Freedoms Speech

BACKGROUND

As Great Britain’s Royal Air Force fended off the German Luftwaffe during the Battle of Britain, President Franklin D. Roosevelt delivered this message to Congress, as required annually by the Constitution.

ANNOTATIONS

…We must always be wary of those who with sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal preach the “ism” of appeasement.

5 We must especially beware of that small group of selfish men who would clip the wings of the American eagle in order to feather their own nests.

I have recently pointed out how quickly the tempo of modern warfare could bring into our very midst the physical attack which we must eventually expect if the dictator nations win this war….

10 As long as the aggressor nations maintain the offensive, they—not we—will choose the time and the place and the method of their attack.

That is why the future of all the American Republics is today in serious danger.

That is why this Annual Message to the Congress is unique in our history.

That is why every member of the Executive Branch of the Government and every member of the Congress faces great responsibility and great accountability.

The need of the moment is that our actions and our policy should be devoted primarily—almost exclusively—to meeting this foreign peril. For all our domestic problems are now a part of the great emergency.

Just as our national policy in internal affairs has been based upon a decent respect for the rights and the dignity of all our fellow men within our gates, so our national policy in foreign affairs has been based on a decent respect for the rights and dignity of all nations, large and small. And the justice of morality must and will win in the end.

Our national policy is this:

First, by an impressive expression of the public will and without regard to partisanship, we are committed to all-inclusive national defense.

Second, by an impressive expression of the public will and without regard to partisanship, we are committed to full support of all those resolute peoples, everywhere, who are resisting aggression and are thereby keeping war away from our Hemisphere. By this support, we express our determination that the democratic cause shall prevail; and we strengthen the defense and the security of our own nation.

Third, by an impressive expression of the public will and without regard to partisanship, we are committed to the proposition that principles of morality and considerations for our own security will never permit us to acquiesce in a peace dictated by aggressors and sponsored by appeasers. We know that enduring peace cannot be bought at the cost of other people’s freedom.
In the recent national election there was no substantial difference between the two great parties in respect to that national policy. No issue was fought out on this line before the American electorate. Today it is abundantly evident that American citizens everywhere are demanding and supporting speedy and complete action in recognition of obvious danger.

Therefore, the immediate need is a swift and driving increase in our armament production.…

New circumstances are constantly begetting new needs for our safety. I shall ask this Congress for greatly increased new appropriations and authorizations to carry on what we have begun.

I also ask this Congress for authority and for funds sufficient to manufacture additional munitions and war supplies of many kinds, to be turned over to those nations which are now in actual war with aggressor nations.…

As men do not live by bread alone, they do not fight by armaments alone. Those who man our defenses, and those behind them who build our defenses, must have the stamina and the courage which come from unshakable belief in the manner of life which they are defending. The mighty action that we are calling for cannot be based on a disregard of all things worth fighting for.

The Nation takes great satisfaction and much strength from the things which have been done to make its people conscious of their individual stake in the preservation of democratic life in America. Those things have toughened the fibre of our people, have renewed their faith and strengthened their devotion to the institutions we make ready to protect.
Certainly this is no time for any of us to stop thinking about the social and economic problems which are the root cause of the social revolution which is today a supreme factor in the world.

For there is nothing mysterious about the foundations of a healthy and strong democracy. The basic things expected by our people of their political and economic systems are simple. They are:

- Equality of opportunity for youth and for others.
- Jobs for those who can work.
- Security for those who need it.
- The ending of special privilege for the few.
- The preservation of civil liberties for all.
- The enjoyment of the fruits of scientific progress in a wider and constantly rising standard of living.

These are the simple, basic things that must never be lost sight of in the turmoil and unbelievable complexity of our modern world. The inner and abiding strength of our economic and political systems is dependent upon the degree to which they fulfill these expectations.

Many subjects connected with our social economy call for immediate improvement.

As examples:
We should bring more citizens under the coverage of old-age pensions and unemployment insurance.

We should widen the opportunities for adequate medical care.

We should plan a better system by which persons deserving or needing gainful employment may obtain it.

I have called for personal sacrifice. I am assured of the willingness of almost all Americans to respond to that call.

A part of the sacrifice means the payment of more money in taxes. In my Budget Message I shall recommend that a greater portion of this great defense program be paid for from taxation than we are paying today. No person should try, or be allowed, to get rich out of this program; and the principle of tax payments in accordance with ability to pay should be constantly before our eyes to guide our legislation.

If the Congress maintains these principles, the voters, putting patriotism ahead of pocketbooks, will give you their applause.

In the future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms.

The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world.

The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world.

The third is freedom from want—which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants—everywhere in the world.
The fourth is freedom from fear—which, translated into world terms, means a world-wide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor—anywhere in the world.

That is no vision of a distant millennium. It is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our own time and generation. That kind of world is the very antithesis of the so-called new order of tyranny which the dictators seek to create with the crash of a bomb.

To that new order we oppose the greater conception—the moral order. A good society is able to face schemes of world domination and foreign revolutions alike without fear.

Since the beginning of our American history, we have been engaged in change—in a perpetual peaceful revolution—a revolution which goes on steadily, quietly adjusting itself to changing conditions—without the concentration camp or the quick-lime in the ditch. The world order which we seek is the cooperation of free countries, working together in a friendly, civilized society.

This nation has placed its destiny in the hands and heads and hearts of its millions of free men and women; and its faith in freedom under the guidance of God. Freedom means the supremacy of human rights everywhere. Our support goes to those who struggle to gain those rights or keep them. Our strength is our unity of purpose. To that high concept there can be no end save victory.
President Franklin Roosevelt & Prime Minister Winston Churchill

Joint Declaration by the President and the Prime Minister

International Joint Statement

August 14, 1941
Atlantic Conference
Naval Station Argentia | Dominion of Newfoundland, British Empire

Atlantic Charter

BACKGROUND

While the United States remained officially out of World War II, American President Franklin D. Roosevelt and British Prime Minister Winston Churchill articulated a joint policy plan for the post-war world.

ANNOTATIONS

The President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty’s Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

5 First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;

Fourth, they will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity;

Fifth, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement and social security;

Sixth, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want;

Seventh, such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance;

Eighth, they believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

Franklin D. Roosevelt

Winston S. Churchill
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## American Government and Politics

8 units | 45-50-minute classes

### COURSE OVERVIEW

#### Unit 1 | The Principles of America

| LESSON 1 | Liberty, Equality, Rights, and Self-Government |
| LESSON 2 | The Necessities for Freedom and Self-Government |
| LESSON 3 | Public Policy and Partisanship |

#### Unit 2 | A Constitution of Principles

| LESSON 1 | The Case for the Constitution |
| LESSON 2 | The Case for Union |
| LESSON 3 | Federalism |
| LESSON 4 | Separation of Powers and Checks & Balances |
Unit 3 | Governing in the Constitution  
LESSON 1  The Congress in the Constitution  
LESSON 2  The Presidency in the Constitution  
LESSON 3  The Judiciary in the Constitution  
LESSON 4  The Bill of Rights  

Unit 4 | Equality in America  
LESSON 1  Self-Government vs. Slavery  
LESSON 2  Slavery and Moral Relativism  
LESSON 3  Lincoln’s Statesmanship and the End of Slavery  
LESSON 4  Civil Rights and Reconstruction  

Unit 5 | Progressivism and the State  
LESSON 1  Criticism of the Declaration of Independence  
LESSON 2  Politics, Leadership, and the Administrative State  
LESSON 3  The New Deal and the Great Society  
LESSON 4  Constitutionalist Responses to Progressivism
Unit 6 | Institutions and Policy

LESSON 1 Congress
LESSON 2 The Presidency
LESSON 3 The Bureaucracy and the Administrative State
LESSON 4 Placeholder: State and Local Government
LESSON 5 Domestic Policy
LESSON 6 National Security and Foreign Policy

Unit 7 | Politics in Practice

LESSON 1 Parties, Elections, and Campaigns
LESSON 2 Civic Participation and Public Opinion
LESSON 3 Civic Associations and Interest Groups
LESSON 4 The First Amendment and the Media

Unit 8 | Late 20th Century Government and Politics

LESSON 1 The Civil Rights Movement
LESSON 2 Recent Political Philosophy
LESSON 3 Major Supreme Court Decisions

Optional Civics Activities | Fostering Civic Responsibility

ACTIVITIES BY UNIT
CIVICS CLUB IDEAS
VOLUNTEERISM AND VIRTUE FORMATION IDEAS
UNIT 1
The Principles of America

45-50-minute classes | 13-16 classes

UNIT PREVIEW

Structure

LESSON 1 Liberty, Equality, Rights, and Self-Government 6-7 classes p. 7
LESSON 2 The Necessities for Freedom and Self-Government 3-4 classes p. 14
LESSON 3 Public Policy and Partisanship 2-3 classes p. 18
APPENDIX A Study Guide, Test, and Writing Assignment p. 21
APPENDIX B Primary Sources p. 31

Why Teach the Principles of America

Young Americans on the verge of assuming all the responsibilities and rights of citizenship as adults must be more than merely familiar with the political body of which they are a part; they must hold a strong and deep understanding of its nature, its structure, its means, and, perhaps most importantly, its ends. No society, no government, no self-governing republic can long endure if even one generation should fail to possess such an understanding. Moreover, citizens cannot love their country, cannot preserve its goodness while correcting its failures, unless they know its history first. And knowledge of the United States for young Americans begins with a knowledge of its origins. In order to judge prudently in matters of public interest in the present day, students must learn about the philosophical principles upon which the American Founders created the United States of America, including the assertion of self-evident, objective truths about natural rights, morality, and self-government.
What Teachers Should Consider

Americans in general—but especially American students—take a lot for granted about their way of life in this country. This is not surprising, given human nature and the wide achievements of American society. But it does indicate one of the primary roles of the teacher of American civics and history: to help students to understand the arguments and the actions, the sacrifices and accomplishments, that led to the way of life they enjoy today.

To that end, teachers themselves must not take life in America for granted and teach history backwards. That means recognizing what America shares with other countries, especially today, but then also looking back at history and comparing the development of United States to life and government in contemporary civilizations. This is a great feat of the imagination that takes great effort on the part of the teacher.

The key starting point for putting America in perspective is its very unique founding. As reflected in its government and institutions, the country was founded as a republic. The people themselves determine what their government will do by choosing from among their fellow citizens those who will represent their interest in government decisions. Compared to monarchical and tyrannical governments, aristocracies and oligarchies, establishing a republic was an extraordinary exception in the 1700s, especially given its poor historical record of success dating back to the ancient world.

But what was truly unprecedented about America is that it was founded based not merely on borders and not on ethnicity, but on an idea, namely that “all men are created equal,” a truth for all peoples at all times. To found a political community and government on an explicit idea about human beings was truly unheard of in history.

The sources of this truth were as old as the ancients, but their particular articulation in the Declaration of Independence and their assertion as the foundation of just government were altogether novel attempts in political history. “[T]he Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God” served as the foundation for America, where nature indicated the truth of reality and of human nature. These truths stood outside of the will of any human being.

And so within the specific circumstances of the colonists’ struggle with the British government in the 18th century the founders posited in the Declaration of Independence the “abstract truth, applicable to all men and all times,” as Abraham Lincoln put it, that “all men are created equal” and that the purpose of government is to “secure these rights.”

These principles are what made the founding of America truly exceptional, and an exception in human history.
How Teachers Can Learn More

TEXTS

The U.S. Constitution: A Reader, ed. Hillsdale College Politics Faculty Chapters 1–3
The Political Theory of the American Founding, Thomas West Books I-III
On Duties, Marcus Tullius Cicero
Second Treatise of Government, John Locke Chapters 1 and 4
American Government and Politics, Joseph Bessette and John Pitney

ONLINE COURSES | Online.Hillsdale.edu

Introduction to the Constitution
Constitution 101

Primary Sources Studied in This Unit

On the Laws, Book I, Marcus Tullius Cicero
Second Treatise of Government, Chapter 9, John Locke
The Mayflower Compact
The Declaration of Independence
The Massachusetts Constitution of 1780, Preamble and Part the First
Virginia Declaration of Rights
Fragment on the Constitution and Union, Abraham Lincoln
Inaugural Address, George Washington
Farewell Address, George Washington
The Northwest Ordinance, Article III
Report of the Commissioners for the University of Virginia, Thomas Jefferson & James Madison
Letter to the Massachusetts Militia, John Adams
Fast Day Proclamation of the Continental Congress
First Annual Address to Congress, George Washington
Thanksgiving Proclamation, George Washington
Letter to the Hebrew Congregation, George Washington
To the Society of Quakers, George Washington
The Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom
"Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments," James Madison
Letter to the Danbury Baptist Association, Thomas Jefferson
Fragment on the French Revolution, Alexander Hamilton
"Property," James Madison
Bill for the Support of the Poor, Thomas Jefferson
The Examination No. 7, Alexander Hamilton
Notes on the State of Virginia, Query 8, Thomas Jefferson
LESSON PLANS, ASSIGNMENTS, AND QUIZZES
Lesson 1 — Liberty, Equality, Rights, and Self-Government

**LESSON OBJECTIVE**

Students learn how the thought and practice of republicanism and liberalism, as expressed especially in the Declaration of Independence and through the practice of self-government, formed the philosophical and practical underpinnings of the United States.

**ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu**

| Introduction to the Constitution | Lectures 1, 2, 3, and 4 |
| Constitution 101 | Lectures 1 and 2 |

**PRIMARY SOURCES**

Students are to read or, if they have previously read, review the following primary source(s). While reading, students should annotate these sources. For particularly challenging texts or if the class is offered earlier in high school, the teacher may wish to provide students with guided reading questions (included in appendix) to assist with comprehension, clarity, and direction. Using their annotations and any guided reading questions, students should come to class prepared to participate in a seminar conversation on each text.

- *On the Laws*, Book I, Marcus Tullius Cicero
- *Second Treatise of Government*, Chapter 9, John Locke
- The Mayflower Compact
- The Declaration of Independence
- The Massachusetts Constitution of 1780, Preamble and Part the First
- Virginia Declaration of Rights
- Fragment on the Constitution and Union, Abraham Lincoln

**TERMS AND TOPICS**

| polis | state of nature |
| politics | Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God |
| political philosophy | natural rights |
| public policy | social contract |
| natural law | consent of the governed |
| principles | limited government |
| morality | tyranny |
| virtue | revolution |
| liberalism | equality |
| democratic republicanism | natural rights |
| rule of law | unalienable |
| self-evident | liberty |
| objectivity | pursuit of happiness |
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What are natural rights and why do human beings have them? Where do they come from?
- What does human equality mean in the statement, “all men are created equal”? Equal in what respects? In which ways are people not equal according to the Founders?
- What view of human nature does this presuppose?
- What does “unalienable” mean? Who or what, precisely, can alienate our rights?
- What are the overall ideas that we collectively call “liberalism”?
- What is the relationship between the state of nature, the social contract, representative government, and consent of the governed?
- Why did the founding generation consider government’s powers to be “just” only when government is instituted by the consent of the governed?
- Was the Founders’ idea of justice based on nothing more than consent? What considerations might be more important to consider than consent?
- What is the purpose of government?
- How do natural rights both empower and limit the government?
- What is meant by “limited government”?
- What are “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God”?
- What is a “self-evident” truth?
- What is the importance of individual freedom within liberalism?
- What is tyranny?
- What is the right to revolution, why do people have this right, and when may it be exercised?
- How does natural-rights liberalism help overcome the problems of religious and class-based factionalism and the great political evils they can produce, namely, civil war and tyranny?
- What is meant by a “natural aristocracy”?
- How is life in democracy different from life in aristocracy, especially in considering the idea of “the equality of conditions” compared to a nobility and established social classes?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 8: Why is the Declaration of Independence important?
  - Question 10: Name two important ideas from the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution.
  - Question 11: The words “Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness” are in what founding document?
  - Question 12: What is the economic system of the United States?
  - Question 13: What is the rule of law?

KEYS TO THE LESSON

America is like other nations in that it has a people, a geographic location, and laws that govern it. But America is also very different. It was founded at a particular time on the basis of particular ideas. In the end, America is not bound by an ethnic character, a common religion, or even a shared history as much as by a set of principles held to true and universal and established as the basis for this particular nation. These principles bind America’s extraordinarily diverse people into one nation through a shared belief and commitment to these principles. Students must understand this unique quality about their country and know what these principles are: there are self-evident truths, that all are equal and equally possess rights by
nature, and that chief among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The reason people join together to form a government is to secure their rights and preserve their safety and happiness.

Teachers might best plan and teach Liberty, Equality, Rights, and Self-Government with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Begin the year considering what politics is. Briefly sketch its origins in the ancient world and what virtues it demands of those who would practice it well, particularly that cardinal virtue of prudence.
- While scheduling may limit the study of other thinkers related to political order and the American founding, it would be best for teachers to familiarize themselves with those thinkers who, while disagreeing in many ways, were at least united in conversation around what human nature is and what it means for the civic body. These would include those who contributed to the western philosophical tradition and experience in government up to and during the American founding, such as Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Niccolò Machiavelli, Thomas Hobbes, and Adam Smith; those who more directly informed the Founders, such as Algernon Sidney, William Blackstone, and Montesquieu; and the relevant political histories of ancient civilizations (e.g., Babylonians, Hebrews, Greeks, Romans), medieval society, the Enlightenment, England, and the British North American colonies. Spending some time to review these figures, ideas, and histories with students or at least to refer to them where appropriate may be helpful in teaching the first three units of this course.
- Outline with students (or if they have already studied early American history, review) the key historical circumstances in which the Founding occurred, especially the following:
  - The colonists who settled in British North America came from many nations (chiefly but not exclusively those of Europe) for many different reasons, but one thing they did not bring with them were the class distinctions that defined the aristocratic and monarchical nations they left behind. These individuals (except for their British governors) were common people who immigrated to America seeking their freedom and to better their station in life.
  - Religious faith strongly defined colonial culture, largely because so many came to America to escape the religious persecutions of the old world. From the pilgrims and the Puritans to Roman Catholics and Jews, a wide variety of denominations found throughout colonial settlements. This diversity fostered religious liberty and toleration at the same time that it strengthened a common morality rooted in religious faith and practice, which was widespread and imbued colonial society.
  - Colonial America was highly literate and the leading members of colonial society and government were educated in classical thought, ancient and contemporary history, and philosophy and politics (including thinkers of the moderate Enlightenment).
  - Consider the year 1619 at Jamestown as an insight into colonial America:
    - On one hand, it was in 1619 that the first Africans, having been taken from a Portuguese slave ship en route to Mexico by an English privateer, landed at Jamestown.
    - On the other hand, it was also in 1619 at Jamestown that the Virginia House of Burgesses first convened, marking the beginning of representative self-government in the colonies. This self-government would flourish for over a hundred and fifty years as the British colonists of North America largely
governed themselves and developed the thought, practice, and habits of a self-governing people (a phenomenon that Edmund Burke described as “salutary neglect”).

- Have students read and annotate excerpts from John Locke’s *Second Treatise of Government*. Locke was the political theorist most quoted by the Founders during the 1770s, and his articulation of the principles of equality and consent shaped the principles on which America was founded. Students should pay special attention to the state of nature, the existence of natural rights, the equal possession thereof, the source of these rights, and how and why governments are created with respect to these rights. Guide students through the form a government should have based on the types of powers it needs to enforce the law of nature and protect natural rights. Students should be able to draw connections between Locke’s ideas and the subsequent ideas and institutions of the American Founders.

- Have students read and annotate the Declaration of Independence. Much of the lesson should involve connecting ideas in the Declaration to the primary sources in this lesson. Utilize these sources to provide further elaboration on what Thomas Jefferson meant by certain statements in the Declaration. Students should understand how other colonial documents, certain ancient and British thinkers, and British legal customs informed the Declaration, but also how the Declaration was a new articulation and combination of such ideas, particularly as principles that were universal and thus formed the basis of a new country.

- Help students to consider that the Founders were making assertions about the existence of objective truth by referencing “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God” and by describing the truths as self-evident. This line of thinking adheres to the first law of logic, that of contradiction, which is the basis of all reasoning and of our capacity to make sense of reality: i.e., that something cannot both be and not be at the same time in the same way. The use of the words “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God” ties truth to an external reality (nature) with fixed and reliable features (laws). “Self-evident” ties truth to fixed definitions—a “self-evident” claim is one that is true by definition of the idea in question, like the claim that a triangle has three sides. A “self-evident” truth is not merely a matter of perspective; it can be known and understood by anyone at any time.

- Note that for the Founders, the “Laws...of Nature’s God” implied that this understanding of nature was consistent with the Christian tradition within which the American founding occurred. Other references to divine sources of truth in the Declaration include that men are “endowed by their Creator” and its appeals to “the Supreme Judge of the world” and to “the protection of divine Providence.”

- Emphasize with students the importance of an understanding of “nature,” particularly human nature. “Nature” here means not the physical world but the purpose of things, that toward which a thing’s very existence aims: why something exists. The feature of human nature that distinguishes people from animals is man’s ability to think, communicate, and live together. This means that humans can speak, debate, and agree on certain things. Since man has the ability to deliberate and choose, he is responsible morally for his actions and is also capable of liberty. When we consider human beings living with other human beings, the ends of politics are determined by human nature. That is, the justness of one’s actions or the actions of a people depend on what it means to be human, and should comport with truth.

- Ask students what the Declaration means by “all men are created equal.” The meaning of equality in the Declaration refers to universal human dignity and to the equal possession by each person of natural rights, freedoms that are simply part of being human. Individuals are obviously different
by almost any measure. Yet, by nature, human beings are all the same in that they are human and have a human nature. The Declaration does not suggest there is in nature equality of talent, property, or other accidental aspects of one’s humanity.

- Have students consider whether women and slaves were included in this understanding of equality. For one thing, in traditional usage, man, or in this case men, used without an article itself refers to the species or to humanity (mankind) as a whole, not male as opposed to female. Based on the totality of their writings available, the Founders meant that men and women share equally in human dignity and in possession of natural rights or freedoms that are simply part of being human. A consistent application of equality would make slavery, for instance, impossible.

- Consider with students that, according to the Declaration, rights do not come from government. Rights are inherent in nature, that is, they come with being a human person. Likewise, individuals do not give up their rights by forming government. People may give to government their individual power to secure those rights in certain circumstances in order that the government might use that power to protect the rights of all. But the natural rights possessed by each individual cannot be given up, or taken away unless one has violated the rights of another. This is what is meant by “unalienable.”

- Ask students what the Declaration states to be the purpose of government. Students should be able to see in the Declaration that the purpose of government is to secure the natural rights of each person.

- Ask students about the source of a government’s legitimate power. The basis of rule in the American regime is the sovereignty of the people: since all are equal by nature, no one is born to rule or to be ruled. Legitimate government can only arise out of the consent of those governed. The powers of government are defined when they are delegated by agreement of those who possess rights. Thus, the principle of natural rights both empowers government at the same time that it limits it to these specific purposes.

- Ask students how the establishment and recognition of equal natural rights guards against discrimination based on class, religion, or race, and against the factions and civil divisions that often result from such unjust distinctions. Upholding equal natural rights preserves the humanity of each person, encourages all to recognize that humanity in others despite differences, and reminds all to be mindful that one’s own dignity is protected insofar as others also hold to the belief in natural rights.

- Help students to understand what is meant by self-government in the political body, i.e., that government derives its “just powers from the consent of the governed,” that is, from the people themselves. Consent requires the people, directly or indirectly, to be involved in making the laws. It also implies participation in the activities of governing (office holding, voting, serving as jurors, etc.).

- Consider with students the colonists’ “appeal to heaven.” King George III was neither securing the rights of the colonists nor providing for the protection. In fact, he and the British Parliament were doing many things that denied the colonists’ rights. When a government fails to protect fundamental rights, the people may alter or abolish the current government and form a new one at assure their safety and happiness. This is called the right of revolution.

- Read with students aloud in class Abraham Lincoln’s commentary on the relationship between the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. Students should be able to think within this analogy throughout the study of the founding.
STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT

Assignment: Explain the principles that make America—namely, the law of nature, natural rights, equality, self-government, the purpose of government, and the objectivity of truth (4–5 paragraphs).
Unit 1 | Formative Quiz

Covering Lesson 1
10-15 minutes

**Directions:** Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. What are natural rights and why do human beings have them? Where do they come from?

2. What is the purpose of government?

3. What is meant by “limited government”?

4. What are “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God”?

5. How are “all men created equal”? In what ways are people not equal according to the Founders?
Lesson 2 — Necessities for Freedom and Self-Government

3-4 classes

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the conditions necessary for the flourishing and perpetuation of freedom and self-government, particularly in a constitutional republic.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

Introduction to the Constitution Lecture 9
Constitution 101 Lecture 5

PRIMARY SOURCES

Students are to read or, if they have previously read, review the following primary source(s). While reading, students should annotate these sources. For particularly challenging texts or if the class is offered earlier in high school, the teacher may wish to provide students with guided reading questions to assist with comprehension, clarity, and direction. Using their annotations and any guided reading questions, students should come to class prepared to participate in a seminar conversation on each text.

Inaugural Address, George Washington
Farewell Address, George Washington
The Northwest Ordinance, Article III
Report of the Commissioners for the University of Virginia, Thomas Jefferson
Letter to the Massachusetts Militia, John Adams
Fast Day Proclamation of the Continental Congress
First Annual Address to Congress, George Washington
Thanksgiving Proclamation, George Washington
Letter to the Hebrew Congregation, George Washington
To the Society of Quakers, George Washington
The Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom
“Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments,” James Madison
Letter to the Danbury Baptist Association, Thomas Jefferson
Fragment on the French Revolution, Alexander Hamilton
“Property,” James Madison

TERMS AND TOPICS

self-government commercial republic
morality religion
virtue free exercise of religion
liberal education freedom of speech
property
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What are the virtues and character necessary for freedom and self-government?
- How did the Founders promote morality?
- Why are self-reliance and martial virtue important for a free people?
- How are liberal and civic education necessary for freedom and self-government?
- How did the Land Ordinance of 1785 promote public vs. private ownership of land and public education?
- How did the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 promote public education and prevent the expansion of slavery?
- How did the Founders promote education?
- How does religion help promote morality and freedom?
- What is the free exercise of religion and why is it important?
- What is freedom of speech and why is it so crucial to freedom and self-government?
- What is the significance of property rights, commerce, and work?
- What economic conditions make American democracy possible? Could American democracy under the forthcoming Constitution be reconciled with any and every economic system?
- Why do critics of American democracy such as Karl Marx believe that private property is the root of injustice? How would Madison and Hamilton have responded to Marx and his followers’ criticism?
- Why are social mobility and a large, functioning middle class important?
- What is the commercial republic and how does it shape character?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 6: What does the Bill of Rights protect?
  - Question 12: What is the economic system of the United States?
  - Question 13: What is the rule of law?
  - Question 65: What are three rights of everyone living in the United States?
  - Question 67: Name two promises that new citizens make in the Oath of Allegiance.
  - Question 69: What are two examples of civic participation in the United States?
  - Question 70: What is one way Americans can serve their country?

KEYS TO THE LESSON

Benjamin Franklin, on departing the Constitutional Convention, was asked what the convention’s delegates had proposed. Franklin responded, “A republic, if you can keep it.” The American system of self-government rests ultimately on the capacity of Americans to govern themselves in political terms and to exercise personal self-government (good character) in their own lives. Students preparing for the full responsibilities of citizenship ought to understand thoroughly this necessity to life in the American republic. The key facets to preserving free government involve citizens being knowledgeable, morally upright, spirited, and free to use their minds, voices, and possessions to maintain liberty and the rule of law. Schools, religion, civic organizations, and the family are the key institutions by which citizens are formed to be able to govern themselves. The public and private contributions of the vast majority of citizens who govern their own lives as such is the determining factor in the health of the American republic and in the experiment in free self-government. Should these falter or fail in the individual lives of citizens, the preservation of liberty and equal human dignity will not long last.
Teachers might best plan and teach Necessities for Freedom and Self-Government with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Teach students about the two major achievements of Congress under the Articles of Confederation: the Land Ordinance of 1785 and the Northwest Ordinance of 1787. Students should understand the historic emphasis many Founders placed on public education, private land ownership, and preventing the spread of slavery as evident in these laws. The Northwest Ordinance in particular articulates principles that would later be reflected in the Constitution, namely, consent of the governed, private property, and the liberty of individuals. Each of these, the Founders argued, would be indispensable if freedom and self-government were to succeed in the United States.

- Consider with students George Washington’s observation in his First Inaugural that “the foundations of our national policy will be laid in the pure and immutable principles of private morality” and in his Farewell Address that “Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports” and that “let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion.”

- Emphasize with students the most famous line from Article III of the Northwest Ordinance: “Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.” Make clear for students the significance of knowledge and character as fostered by education. Public (meaning taxpayer-funded) support for education, both secular and religious, was present in colonial Massachusetts for decades prior to the founding and would continue through the Land Ordinance of 1785 and the Northwest Ordinance. The township system portioned out land reserved for education explicitly. America was a trailblazer in allocating so many resources exclusively for education. In addition to instruction in knowledge, character-building and the development of patriotic and dutiful citizens were chief purposes of these public schools.

- Have students consider the Founders’ arguments for the necessity of religion in fostering morality, virtue, and character. While opinions varied on religious belief and the extent to which government should endorse a single church, specifically at the state-level, there was general consensus that the instruction in moral conduct, duty, and charity in religion warranted at least the encouragement of religious practice by governments. Read and discuss with students the writings of Washington, Jefferson, and Madison on the topic of religion, both to see the degrees to which the Founders agreed and disagreed regarding religion. They should see, at the very least, that the free exercise of religion was of paramount importance. Hamilton’s commentary on the French Revolution shows the dangers inherent in a society that disregards or outright oppresses religion.

- Review with students James Madison’s “Property” from the previous lesson. Rights to hold and preserve property are intimately tied to one’s right to defend oneself and to better one’s condition. The “pursuit of happiness” aims at and recognizes goods higher than mere material prosperity. The right to property, if not sufficient to human happiness, is most certainly necessary to the individual liberty to pursue such happiness. Moreover, the free allocation of scarce resources through commerce ensures that all can have what they most need at the times in which they most need it while contributing to ideas and positive activity conducive to the general improvement of human life.
Assignment: Explain why the American Founders argued that education, religion, private property, and freedom of speech were necessary in a citizenry in order for freedom and self-government to exist (3–4 paragraphs).
Lesson 3 — Public Policy and Partisanship

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the Founders’ thoughts in various public policy areas and their concern about and attempts to avoid the rise of partisanship in American politics.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

- Introduction to the Constitution, Lecture 7
- Constitution 101, Lectures 3 and 5

PRIMARY SOURCES

Students are to read or, if they have previously read, review the following primary source(s). While reading, students should annotate these sources. For particularly challenging texts or if the class is offered earlier in high school, the teacher may wish to provide students with guided reading questions to assist with comprehension, clarity, and direction. Using their annotations and any guided reading questions, students should come to class prepared to participate in a seminar conversation on each text.

- Bill for the Support of the Poor, Thomas Jefferson
- Farewell Address, George Washington
- The Examination No. 7, Alexander Hamilton
- Notes on the State of Virginia, Query 8, Thomas Jefferson

TERMS AND TOPICS

- public policy
- economics
- taxation
- regulation
- property rights
- diplomacy
- immigration
- criminal law
- marriage and family law
- factionalism
- partisanship
- civil war
- tyranny
- revolution

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- How did the Founders think about public policy, especially in the following areas:
  - economics
  - taxation
  - regulation
  - the protection of property
  - war and diplomacy
  - immigration
  - criminal law
  - laws affecting morality
  - obscenity laws
  - marriage and family law
- Why were the Founders worried about partisanship? How did they attempt to overcome it?
How did partisanship nonetheless arise?

Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
- Question 12: What is the economic system of the United States?
- Question 70: What is one way Americans can serve their country?
- Question 71: Why is it important to pay federal taxes?

**Keys to the Lesson**

Often we think of and look to the American Founders only in terms of the principles and institutions they set down as the American foundation. This is their primary benefit to us, but we ought not lose sight of the real public policy issues and positions that the Founders had to address in their own time. They approached these issues with the principles of the founding fresh in mind and cognizant of the importance that beginnings have in all affairs, especially that of a country. Students should understand the Founders’ policy positions, why they held them, and how they might guide us today while navigating the challenges of partisanship.

Teachers might best plan and teach Public Policy and Partisanship with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Talk with students about how the Founders saw the economic role of government as being to uphold the rule of law, enforce contracts, protect property, and permit economic activity that did not violate natural rights. This ensured broad latitude to the liberty of private individuals to trade with one another freely with only minimal regulation. Taxation at the federal level was limited largely to matters of national defense.
- While opinions varied, help students to see how George Washington’s actions and advice regarding foreign policy sought to abstain as much as possible from permanent alliances and passionate foreign attachments in order to establish and maintain an independent national character.
- Read aloud with students in class Alexander Hamilton’s Examination No. 7 on the need for a citizenry that holds certain principles and habits of conduct conducive to respecting the rights of fellow citizens. In a nation as diverse as the United States and that is not bound by blood, understanding of, adherence to, and practice in these principles of self-government become all the more important. Immigration policy for Hamilton, therefore, sought to encourage as much immigration as was possible while still achieving these prerequisites to maintaining free government. In brief, an immigrant had to understand and be willing and able to practice the responsibilities of self-government.
- Consider with students the Founders’ positions on the preservation of morality and the role of the family. While freedom of speech was given broad interpretation, the public utterance and promotion of obscenity was understood to undermine the moral habits of the citizenry, especially the young, and government thus had an interest in restricting such speech to private quarters. The primacy of the family was also significant, as the security, material support, education, sense of duty, and work ethic cultivated first in the family were all equally important to a self-governing citizenry.
- Explain to students how strongly the Founders sought to resist the rise of factions and partisanship. It should be made clear, however, that the Founders’ resistance to partisanship was not in some general idea of bipartisanship for bipartisanship’s sake. Instead, the Founders
believed that if all Americans held to the ideas of the American founding, then there were few disagreements so fundamental as to justify separate and permanent parties. The Founders had no qualms, however, with resisting movements and ideas that rejected the principles of the founding, mainly because such a rejection was, in their view, a rejection of objective truth and justice themselves. Such a rejection of these founding principles was thought irrational and almost certainly to lead to tyranny.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

**Assignment:** Explain the Founders’ arguments on the government’s role in economic activity, foreign policy, immigration, and family life (2–3 paragraphs).
APPENDIX A

Study Guide

Test

Writing Assignment
Unit 1 Test — Study Guide

TERMS AND TOPICS

Explain each of the following and the context in which it was discussed during this unit’s lessons.

polis
politics
political philosophy
natural law
principles
morality
virtue
liberalism
rule of law
self-evident
objectivity
state of nature
Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God
natural rights
social contract
consent of the governed
limited government
tyranny
revolution
equality
unalienable
liberty
pursuit of happiness
natural aristocracy
self-government
liberal education
property
commercial republic
religion

free exercise of religion
freedom of speech
public policy
economics
taxation
regulation
property rights
diplomacy
immigration
criminal law
marriage and family law
factionalism
partisanship
civil war

PRIMARY SOURCES

Explain the main arguments in each of the following sources and their significance to our understanding of America’s founding principles.

On the Laws, Book I, Marcus Tullius Cicero
Second Treatise of Government, Chapter 9, John Locke
The Mayflower Compact
The Declaration of Independence
Fragment on the Constitution and Union, Abraham Lincoln
“Property,” James Madison
Farewell Address, George Washington
Report of the Commissioners of the University of Virginia, Thomas Jefferson
First Inaugural Address, George Washington
The Northwest Ordinance, Article III
First Annual Address to Congress, George Washington
Thanksgiving Proclamation, George Washington
Letter to the Hebrew Congregation, George Washington
Letter to the Danbury Baptist Association, Thomas Jefferson
Bill for the Support of the Poor, Thomas Jefferson
Notes on the State of Virginia, Query 8, Thomas Jefferson
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.

Lesson 1 | Liberty, Equality, Rights, and Self-Government

☐ What are natural rights and why do human beings have them? Where do they come from?
☐ What does human equality mean in the statement that “all men are created equal”? Equal in what respects? In what ways are people not equal according to the Founders?
☐ What view of human nature does this presuppose?
☐ What does “unalienable” mean? Who or what, precisely, can alienate our rights?
☐ What are the overall ideas that we collectively call “liberalism”?
☐ What is the relationship between the state of nature, the social contract, representative government, and consent of the governed?
☐ Why did the founding generation consider government’s powers to be “just” only when government is instituted by the consent of the governed?
☐ Was the Founders’ idea of justice based on nothing more than consent? What considerations might be more important than consent?
☐ What is the purpose of government?
☐ How do natural rights both empower and limit the government?
☐ What is the importance of individual freedom with liberalism?
☐ What is the right to revolution, why do people have this right, and when may it be exercised?
☐ How does natural-rights liberalism help overcome the problems of religious and class-based factionalism and the great political evils they can produce, namely, civil war and tyranny?
☐ What is meant by a “natural aristocracy”?
☐ How is life in democracy different from life in aristocracy, especially in considering the idea of “the equality of conditions” compared to a nobility and established social classes?

Lesson 2 | The Necessities for Freedom and Self-Government

☐ What are the virtues and character necessary for freedom and self-government?
☐ How did the Founders promote morality?
☐ Why are self-reliance and martial virtue important for a free people?
☐ How are liberal and civic education necessary for freedom and self-government?
☐ How did the Land Ordinance of 1785 promote public vs. private ownership of land and public education?
☐ How did the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 promote public education and prevent the expansion of slavery?
☐ How did the Founders promote education?
☐ How does religion help promote morality and freedom?
☐ What is the free exercise of religion, and why is it important?
☐ What is freedom of speech and why is it so crucial to freedom and self-government?
☐ What is the significance of property rights, commerce, and work?
☐ Why are social mobility and a large, functioning middle class important?
☐ What is the commercial republic and how does it shape character?
Lesson 3 | Public Policy and Partisanship

☐ How did the Founders think about public policy, especially in the following areas:
  - economics
  - taxation
  - regulation
  - the protection of property
  - war and diplomacy
  - immigration
  - criminal law
  - laws affecting morality
  - obscenity laws
  - marriage and family law

☐ Why were the Founders worried about partisanship? How did they attempt to overcome it?

☐ How did partisanship nonetheless arise?
Unit 1 | Test — The Principles of America

**TERMS AND TOPICS**

*Explain each of the following and the context in which it was discussed during this unit's lessons.*

1. politics
2. principles
3. morality
4. virtue
5. liberalism
6. rule of law
7. self-evident
9. social contract
10. limited government
11. tyranny
12. liberty
13. self-government

14. liberal education

15. partisanship

**PRIMARY SOURCES**

*Explain the main arguments in each of the following sources and their significance to our understanding of America’s founding principles.*


17. Farewell Address, George Washington

18. The Northwest Ordinance, Article III

19. Letter to the Hebrew Congregation, George Washington
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and writing should be employed, and responses must fully answer each question.

20. What are natural rights and why do human beings have them? Where do they come from?

21. What is the relationship between the state of nature, the social contract, representative government, and consent of the governed?

22. What is the purpose of government?

23. What is the right to revolution, why do people have this right, and when may it be exercised?

24. How are “all men created equal”? In what ways are people not equal according to the Founders?

25. What are the virtues and character necessary for freedom and self-government?

26. How did the Founders promote morality?

27. How are liberal and civic education necessary for freedom and self-government?

28. How does religion help promote morality and freedom?

29. What is freedom of speech and why is it so crucial to freedom and self-government?
30. What is the significance of property rights, commerce, and work?

31. How did the Founders think about taxation?

32. How did the Founders think about regulation?

33. How did the Founders think about war and diplomacy?

34. How did the Founders think about immigration?

35. How did the Founders think about marriage and family law?
Unit 1 | Writing Assignment — The Principles of America

DIRECTIONS

Due on _____________

Citing primary sources and conversations from class in your argument, write a 500–800-word essay answering the question:

What are the principles on which America was founded, and what qualities must American citizens and society exhibit in order to sustain such principles of civic life?
APPENDIX B

Primary Sources

Marcus Tullius Cicero

John Locke

The Pilgrims

The Second Continental Congress

The People of Massachusetts

The Fifth Virginia Convention

Abraham Lincoln

James Madison

George Washington

Thomas Jefferson

John Adams

Alexander Hamilton

The United States Congress

The Virginia General Assembly
MARCUS TULLIUS CICERO

De Legibus, Book I

BOOK EXCERPTS

51 BC

On the Laws

BACKGROUND

The Roman lawyer and statesman Marcus Tullius Cicero wrote this treatise, modeled after Plato’s dialogue *The Laws*, amidst his efforts to resist the rise of dictatorship in the Roman Republic.

ANNOTATIONS

…It is therefore an absurd extravagance in some philosophers to assert that all things are necessarily just, which are established by the civil laws and the institutions of the people. Are then the laws of tyrants just, simply because they are laws? If the thirty tyrants of Athens imposed certain laws on the Athenians, and if these Athenians were delighted with these tyrannical laws, are we therefore bound to consider these laws as just? For my own part, I do not think such laws deserve any greater estimation than that past during our own interregnum, which ordained, that the dictator should be empowered to put to death with impunity, whatever citizens he pleased, without hearing them in their own defence.

There can be but one essential justice, which cements society, and one law which establishes this justice. This law is right reason, which is the true rule of all commandments and prohibitions. Whoever neglects this law, whether written or unwritten, is necessarily unjust and wicked.

But if justice consists in submission to written laws and national customs, and if, as the Epicureans persist in affirming, every thing must be measured by utility alone, he who

---

wishes to find an occasion of breaking such laws and customs, will be sure to discover it. So that real justice remains powerless if not supported by nature, and this pretended justice is overturned by that very utility which they call its foundation.

But this is not all. If nature does not ratify law, all the virtues lose their sway. What becomes of generosity, patriotism, or friendship? Where should we find the desire of benefiting our neighbours, or the gratitude that acknowledges kindness? For all these virtues proceed from our natural inclination to love and cherish our associates. This is the true basis of justice, and without this, not only the mutual charities of men, but the religious services of the gods, would become obsolete; for these are preserved, as I imagine, rather by the natural sympathy which subsists between divine and human beings, than by mere fear and timidity.

If the will of the people, the decrees of the senate, the adjudications of magistrates, were sufficient to establish justice, the only question would be how to gain suffrages, and to win over the votes of the majority, in order that corruption and spoliation, and the falsification of wills, should become lawful. But if the opinions and suffrages of foolish men had sufficient weight to outbalance the nature of things, might they not determine among them, that what is essentially bad and pernicious should henceforth pass for good and beneficial? Or why should not a law able to enforce injustice, take the place of equity? Would not this same law be able to change evil into good, and good into evil?

As far as we are concerned, we have no other rule capable of distinguishing between a good or a bad law, than our natural conscience and reason. These, however, enable us to separate justice from injustice, and to discriminate between the honest and the scandalous. For common sense has impressed in our minds the first principles of things, and has given us a general acquaintance with them, by which we connect with Virtue every honourable and excellent quality, and with Vice all that is abominable and disgraceful.

Now we must entirely take leave of our senses, ere we can suppose that law and justice have no foundation in nature, and rely merely on the transient opinions of men. We should not
venture to praise the virtue of a tree or a horse, in which expression there is an abuse of terms, were we not convinced that this virtue was in their nature, rather than in our opinion. For a stronger reason, it is mainly with respect to the moral nature of things, that we ought to speak of honour and shame among men.

5

If opinion could determine respecting the character of universal virtue, it might also decide respecting particular or partial virtues. But who will dare to determine that a man is prudent and cautious in his moral disposition, from any external appearances. For virtue evidently lies in perfect rationality, and this resides in the inmost depths of our nature. The same remark applies to all honour and honesty, for we judge of true and false, creditable and discreditable, rather by their essential qualities, than their external relations. Thus we judge according to their intrinsic nature, that rationality of life, which is virtue, must be ever constant and perpetual, and that inconstancy must necessarily be vicious....
ANONYMOUS (JOHN LOCKE)

Two Treatises of Government

BOOK EXCERPTS

December 1689

England

BACKGROUND

English doctor and political thinker John Locke published this work on government during the time of Glorious Revolution in England, which was read and influential among colonial leaders in the British North American colonies during the following century.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Why do men form political societies according to Locke?

2. What are the two powers man possesses in the state of nature?

123. If man in the state of nature be so free, as has been said; if he be absolute lord of his own person and possessions, equal to the greatest, and subject to nobody, why will he part with his freedom? Why will he give up his empire, and subject himself to the dominion and control of any other power? To which it is obvious to answer, that though in the state of nature he hath such a right, yet the enjoyment of it is very uncertain, and constantly exposed to the invasion of others; for all being kings as much as he, every man his equal, and the greater part no strict observers of equity and justice, the enjoyment of the property he has in this state is very unsafe, very unsecure. This makes him willing to quit a condition, which, however free, is full of fears and continual dangers: and it is not without reason, that he seeks out, and is willing to join in society with others, who are already united, or have a mind to unite, for the mutual preservation of their lives, liberties, and estates, which I call by the general name, property.

124. The great and chief end, therefore, of men’s uniting into commonwealths, and putting themselves under government, is the preservation of their property. To which in the state of nature there are many things wanting. First, There wants an established, settled, known law, received and allowed by common consent to be the standard of right and wrong, and the common measure to decide all controversies between them: for though the law of nature be plain and intelligible to all rational creatures; yet men being biased by their interest, as well as ignorant for want of studying it, are not apt to allow of it as a law binding to them in the application of it to their particular cases.

125. Secondly, In the state of nature there wants a known and indifferent judge, with authority to determine all differences according to the established law: for every one in that state being both judge and executioner of the law of nature, men being partial to themselves, passion and revenge is very apt to carry them too far, and with too much heat, in their own cases; as well as negligence, and unconcernedness, to make them too remiss in other men’s.
126. Thirdly, In the state of nature there often wants power to back and support the sentence when right, and to give it due execution. They who by any injustice offend, will seldom fail, where they are able, by force to make good their injustice; such resistance many times makes the punishment dangerous, and frequently destructive, to those who attempt it.

127. Thus mankind, notwithstanding all the privileges of the state of nature, being but in an ill condition, while they remain in it, are quickly driven into society. Hence it comes to pass that we seldom find any number of men live any time together in this state. The inconveniencies that they are therein exposed to, by the irregular and uncertain exercise of the power every man has of punishing the transgressions of others, make them take sanctuary under the established laws of government, and therein seek the preservation of their property. It is this makes them so willingly give up every one his single power of punishing, to be exercised by such alone, as shall be appointed to it amongst them; and by such rules as the community, or those authorized by them to that purpose, shall agree on. And in this we have the original right of both the legislative and executive power, as well as of the governments and societies themselves.

128. For in the state of nature, to omit the liberty he has of innocent delights, a man has two powers. The first is to do whatsoever he thinks fit for the preservation of himself and others within the permission of the law of nature: by which law, common to them all, he and all the rest of mankind are one community, make up one society, distinct from all other creatures. And, were it not for the corruption and viciousness of degenerate men, there would be no need of any other; no necessity that men should separate from this great and natural community, and by positive agreements combine into smaller and divided associations. The other power a man has in the state of nature, is the power to punish the crimes committed against that law. Both these he gives up, when he joins in a private, if I may so call it, or particular politic society, and incorporates into any commonwealth, separate from the rest of mankind.
129. The first power, viz. “of doing whatsoever he thought fit for the preservation of himself, and the rest of mankind, he gives up to be regulated by laws made by the society, so far forth as the preservation of himself and the rest of that society shall require; which laws of the society in many things confine the liberty he had by the law of nature.

130. Secondly, The power of punishing he wholly gives up, and engages his natural force, (which he might before employ in the execution of the law of nature, by his own single authority, as he thought fit) to assist the executive power of the society, as the law thereof shall require: for being now in a new state, wherein he is to enjoy many conveniencies, from the labor, assistance, and society of others in the same community, as well as protection from its whole strength; he is to part also, with as much of his natural liberty, in providing for himself, as the good, prosperity, and safety of the society shall require; which is not only necessary, but just, since the other members of the society do the like....
The Undersigned Subjects of King James

Agreement Between
the Settlers of New Plymouth

LAW

November 11, 1620

Mayflower | Off the Coast of Cape Cod

The Mayflower Compact

BACKGROUND

The settlers who traveled to the British possession of Virginia on the Mayflower drafted and signed this agreement pertaining to their governance before disembarking in the New World.

ANNOTATIONS

IN THE NAME OF GOD, AMEN. We, whose names are underwritten, the Loyal Subjects of our dread Sovereign Lord King James, by the Grace of God, of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, King, Defender of the Faith, &c. Having undertaken for the Glory of God, and Advancement of the Christian Faith, and the Honour of our King and Country, a Voyage to plant the first Colony in the northern Parts of Virginia; Do by these Presents, solemnly and mutually, in the Presence of God and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil Body Politick, for our better Ordering and Preservation, and Furtherance of the Ends aforesaid: And by Virtue hereof do enact, constitute, and frame, such just and equal Laws, Ordinances, Acts, Constitutions, and Officers, from time to time, as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the general Good of the Colony; unto which we promise all due Submission and Obedience.

IN WITNESS whereof we have hereunto subscribed our names at Cape-Cod the eleventh of November, in the Reign of our Sovereign Lord King James, of England, France, and Ireland, the eighteenth, and of Scotland the fifty-fourth, Anno Domini; 1620.

THE THIRTEEN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Unanimous Declaration

A Declaration

July 4, 1776

Pennsylvania State House | Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

BACKGROUND

The delegates from each colony at the Second Continental Congress announced their votes to form a new country separate from Great Britain in this statement to mankind that expounds both the principles on which this new country would be founded and the reasons they judged themselves justified to separate.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Why do the United States believe they need to release a statement about their decision to form a country separate from Great Britain?

2. What do they consider about the truths they posit?

3. How are all men equal?

4. From where comes their rights?

5. What is the reason why people create governments?

6. From where comes a government’s powers?

7. What may a people do if a government does not fulfill its ends?

8. Although governments should not be changed for small reasons, when should the people change them?

9. Against which person does the Declaration of Independence level its charges?

10. What actions involving the military has this person carried out against the colonists?

11. What legal practices has this person violated?

12. What efforts have the colonists made to seek redress and reconciliation with Great Britain?

13. To whom do the representatives appeal for the justness of their intentions?

14. By whose authority do the representatives declare independence?

15. What do each of the representatives pledge to one another?
When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.—That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,—That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security.—Such has been the patient sufferance of these Colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former Systems of Government. The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. To prove this, let Facts be submitted to a candid world.

He has refused his Assent to Laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

He has forbidden his Governors to pass Laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his Assent should be obtained; and when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.
He has refused to pass other Laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of Representation in the Legislature, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only.

5 He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their public Records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures.

He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly, for opposing with manly firmness his invasions on the rights of the people.

10 He has refused for a long time, after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected; whereby the Legislative powers, incapable of Annihilation, have returned to the People at large for their exercise; the State remaining in the mean time exposed to all the dangers of invasion from without, and convulsions within.

15 He has endeavored to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the Laws for Naturalization of Foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migrations hither, and raising the conditions of new Appropriations of Lands.

20 He has obstructed the Administration of Justice, by refusing his Assent to Laws for establishing Judiciary powers.

25 He has made Judges dependent on his Will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.

He has erected a multitude of New Offices, and sent hither swarms of Officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance.

30 He has kept among us, in times of peace, Standing Armies without the Consent of our legislatures.
He has affected to render the Military independent of and superior to the Civil power.

He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his Assent to their Acts of pretended Legislation:

For Quartering large bodies of armed troops among us:

For protecting them, by a mock Trial, from punishment for any Murders which they should commit on the Inhabitants of these States:

For cutting off our Trade with all parts of the world:

For imposing Taxes on us without our Consent:

For depriving us in many cases, of the benefits of Trial by Jury:

For transporting us beyond Seas to be tried for pretended offenses:

For abolishing the free System of English Laws in a neighboring Province, establishing therein an Arbitary government, and enlarging its Boundaries so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these Colonies:

For taking away our Charters, abolishing our most valuable Laws, and altering fundamentally the Forms of our Governments:

For suspending our own Legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

He has abdicated Government here, by declaring us out of his Protection and waging War against us.
He has plundered our seas, ravaged our Coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of
our people.

He is at this time transporting large Armies of foreign Mercenaries to complete the works
of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of Cruelty and perfidy
scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the Head of a civilized
nation.

He has constrained our fellow Citizens taken Captive on the high Seas to bear Arms against
their Country, to become the executioners of their friends and Brethren, or to fall them-
selves by their Hands.

He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavored to bring on the
inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian Savages, whose known rule of warfare, is
an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes and conditions.

In every stage of these Oppressions We have Petitioned for Redress in the most humble
terms: Our repeated Petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A Prince whose
character is thus marked by every act which may define a Tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of
a free people.

Nor have We been wanting in attentions to our British brethren. We have warned them
from time to time of attempts by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction
over us. We have reminded them of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement
here. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured
them by the ties of our common kindred to disavow these usurpations, which, would inev-
itably interrupt our connections and correspondence. They too have been deaf to the voice
of justice and of consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity, which de-
nounces our Separation, and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind, Enemies in War,
in Peace Friends.
We, therefore, the Representatives of the united States of America, in General Congress, Assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the Name, and by Authority of the good People of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, That these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be Free and Independent States; that they are Absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as Free and Independent States, they have full Power to levy War, conclude Peace, contract Alliances, establish Commerce, and to do all other Acts and Things which Independent States may of right do. And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor.

Georgia
Button Gwinnett, Lyman Hall, George Walton

North Carolina
William Hooper, Joseph Hewes, John Penn

South Carolina
Edward Rutledge, Thomas Heyward, Jr., Thomas Lynch, Jr., Arthur Middleton

Maryland
Samuel Chase, William Paca, Thomas Stone, Charles Carroll of Carrollton

Virginia
George Wythe, Richard Henry Lee, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Harrison, Thomas Nelson, Jr., Francis Lightfoot Lee, Carter Braxton

Pennsylvania
Robert Morris, Benjamin Rush, Benjamin Franklin, John Morton, George Clymer, James Smith, George Taylor, James Wilson, George Ross
Delaware
Caesar Rodney, George Read, Thomas McKean

New York
5 William Floyd, Philip Livingston, Francis Lewis, Lewis Morris

New Jersey
Richard Stockton, John Witherspoon, Francis Hopkinson, John Hart, Abraham Clark

10 New Hampshire
Josiah Bartlett, William Whipple, Matthew Thornton

Massachusetts
John Hancock, Samuel Adams, John Adams, Robert Treat Paine, Elbridge Gerry

15 Rhode Island
Stephen Hopkins, William Ellery

Connecticut
20 Roger Sherman, Samuel Huntington, William Williams, Oliver Wolcot
THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

A Constitution or Frame of Government

BACKGROUND

Massachusetts adopted this new constitution in the midst of the Revolutionary War.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. How is a political community or body-politic formed?
2. What are some of the rights with which men are born?
3. Upon what does the happiness, order, and preservation of a people and government depend?
4. What duties are required of citizens of Massachusetts?

Preamble

The end of the institution, maintenance and administration of government, is to secure the existence of the body-politic; to protect it, and to furnish the individuals who compose it, with the power of enjoying, in safety and tranquillity, their natural rights, and the blessings of life: And whenever these great objects are not obtained, the people have a right to alter the government, and to take measures necessary for their safety, prosperity and happiness.

The body-politic is formed by a voluntary association of individuals: It is a social compact, by which the whole people covenants with each citizen, and each citizen with the whole people, that all shall be governed by certain laws for the common good. It is the duty of the people, therefore, in framing a Constitution of Government, to provide for an equitable mode of making laws, as well as for an impartial interpretation, and a faithful execution of them; that every man may, at all times, find his security in them.

We, therefore, the people of Massachusetts, acknowledging, with grateful hearts, the goodness of the Great Legislator of the Universe, in affording us, in the course of His providence, an opportunity, deliberately and peaceably, without fraud, violence or surprise, of entering into an original, explicit, and solemn compact with each other; and of forming a new Constitution of Civil Government, for ourselves and posterity; and devoutly imploring His direction in so interesting a design, DO agree upon, ordain and establish, the following Declaration of Rights, and Frame of Government, as the CONSTITUTION of the COMMON-WEALTH of MASSACHUSETTS.

Part the First. A Declaration of the Rights of the Inhabitants of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Art. I.--All men are born free and equal, and have certain natural, essential, and unalienable rights; among which may be reckoned the right of enjoying and defending their lives and liberties; that of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property; in fine, that of seeking and obtaining their safety and happiness.
II.--It is the right as well as the duty of all men in society, publicly, and at stated seasons, to worship the SUPREME BEING, the great creator and preserver of the universe. And no subject shall be hurt, molested, or restrained, in his person, liberty, or estate, for worshipping GOD in the manner and season most agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience; or for his religious profession or sentiments; provided he doth not disturb the public peace, or obstruct others in their religious worship.

III.--As the happiness of a people, and the good order and preservation of civil government, essentially depend upon piety, religion and morality; and as these cannot be generally diffused through a community, but by the institution of the public worship of GOD, and of public instructions in piety, religion and morality: Therefore, to promote their happiness and to secure the good order and preservation of their government, the people of this Commonwealth have a right to invest their legislature with power to authorize and require, and the legislature shall, from time to time, authorize and require, the several towns, parishes, precincts, and other bodies-politic, or religious societies, to make suitable provision, at their own expense, for the institution of the public worship of GOD, and for the support and maintenance of public protestant teachers of piety, religion and morality, in all cases where such provision shall not be made voluntarily.

And the people of this Commonwealth have also a right to, and do, invest their legislature with authority to enjoin upon all the subjects an attendance upon the instructions of the public teachers aforesaid, at stated times and seasons, if there be any on whose instructions they can conscientiously and conveniently attend.

Provided notwithstanding, that the several towns, parishes, precincts, and other bodies-politic, or religious societies, shall, at all times, have the exclusive right of electing their public teachers, and of contracting with them for their support and maintenance.

And all monies paid by the subject to the support of public worship, and of the public teachers aforesaid, shall, if he require it, be uniformly applied to the support of the public teacher or teachers of his own religious sect or denomination, provided there be any on
whose instructions he attends: otherwise it may be paid towards the support of the teacher or teachers of the parish or precinct in which the said monies are raised.

And every denomination of christians, demeaning themselves peaceably, and as good subjects of the Commonwealth, shall be equally under the protection of the law: And no subordination of any one sect or denomination to another shall ever be established by law.

IV.--The people of this Commonwealth have the sole and exclusive right of governing themselves as a free, sovereign, and independent state; and do, and forever hereafter shall, exercise and enjoy every power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not, or may not hereafter, be by them expressly delegated to the United States of America, in Congress assembled.

V.--All power residing originally in the people, and being derived from them, the several magistrates and officers of government, vested with authority, whether legislative, executive, or judicial, are their substitutes and agents, and are at all times accountable to them.

VI.--No man, nor corporation, or association of men, have any other title to obtain advantages, or particular and exclusive privileges, distinct from those of the community, than what arises from the consideration of services rendered to the public; and this title being in nature neither hereditary, nor transmissible to children, or descendants, or relations by blood, the idea of a man born a magistrate, lawgiver, or judge, is absurd and unnatural.

VII.--Government is instituted for the common good; for the protection, safety, prosperity and happiness of the people; and not for the profit, honor, or private interest of any one man, family, or class of men; Therefore the people alone have an incontestible, unalienable, and indefeasible right to institute government; and to reform, alter, or totally change the same, when their protection, safety, prosperity and happiness require it.

VIII.--In order to prevent those, who are vested with authority, from becoming oppressors, the people have a right, at such periods and in such manner as they shall establish by their frame of government, to cause their public officers to return to private life; and to fill up vacant places by certain and regular elections and appointments.
IX.--All elections ought to be free; and all the inhabitants of this Commonwealth, having such qualifications as they shall establish by their frame of government, have an equal right to elect officers, and to be elected, for public employments.

X.--Each individual of the society has a right to be protected by it in the enjoyment of his life, liberty and property, according to standing laws. He is obliged, consequently, to contribute his share to the expense of this protection; to give his personal service, or an equivalent, when necessary: But no part of the property of any individual, can, with justice, be taken from him, or applied to public uses without his own consent, or that of the representative body of the people: In fine, the people of this Commonwealth are not controllable by any other laws, than those to which their constitutional representative body have given their consent. And whenever the public exigencies require, that the property of any individual should be appropriated to public uses, he shall receive a reasonable compensation therefor.

XI.--Every subject of the Commonwealth ought to find a certain remedy, by having recourse to the laws, for all injuries or wrongs which he may receive in his person, property, or character. He ought to obtain right and justice freely, and without being obliged to purchase it; completely, and without any denial; promptly, and without delay; conformably to the laws.

XII.--No subject shall be held to answer for any crime or offence, until the same is fully and plainly, substantially and formally, described to him; or be compelled to accuse, or furnish evidence against himself. And every subject shall have a right to produce all proofs, that may be favorable to him; to meet the witnesses against him face to face, and to be fully heard in his defence by himself, or his council, at his election. And no subject shall be arrested, imprisoned, despoiled, or deprived of his property, immunities, or privileges, put out of the protection of the law, exiled, or deprived of his life, liberty, or estate; but by the judgment of his peers, or the law of the land.
And the legislature shall not make any law, that shall subject any person to a capital or infamous punishment, excepting for the government of the army and navy, without trial by jury.

XIII.--In criminal prosecutions, the verification of facts in the vicinity where they happen, is one of the greatest securities of the life, liberty, and property of the citizen.

XIV.--Every subject has a right to be secure from all unreasonable searches, and seizures of his person, his houses, his papers, and all his possessions. All warrants, therefore, are contrary to this right, if the cause or foundation of them be not previously supported by oath or affirmation; and if the order in the warrant to a civil officer, to make search in suspected places, or to arrest one or more suspected persons, or to seize their property, be not accompanied with a special designation of the persons or objects of search, arrest, or seizure: and no warrant ought to be issued but in cases, and with the formalities, prescribed by the laws.

XV.--In all controversies concerning property, and in all suits between two or more persons, except in cases in which it has heretofore been otherways used and practised, the parties have a right to a trial by jury; and this method of procedure shall be held sacred, unless, in causes arising on the high-seas, and such as relate to mariners wages, the legislature shall hereafter find it necessary to alter it.

XVI.--The liberty of the press is essential to the security of freedom in a state: it ought not, therefore, to be restrained in this Commonwealth.

XVII.--The people have a right to keep and to bear arms for the common defence. And as in time of peace armies are dangerous to liberty, they ought not to be maintained without the consent of the legislature; and the military power shall always be held in an exact subordination to the civil authority, and be governed by it.

XVIII.--A frequent recurrence to the fundamental principles of the constitution, and a constant adherence to those of piety, justice, moderation, temperance, industry, and frugality, are absolutely necessary to preserve the advantages of liberty, and to maintain a free gov-
ernment: The people ought, consequently, to have a particular attention to all those principles, in the choice of their officers and representatives: And they have a right to require of their law-givers and magistrates, an exact and constant observance of them, in the formation and execution of the laws necessary for the good administration of the Commonwealth.

XIX.--The people have a right, in an orderly and peaceable manner, to assemble to consult upon the common good; give instructions to their representatives; and to request of the legislative body, by the way of addresses, petitions, or remonstrances, redress of the wrongs done them, and of the grievances they suffer.

XX.--The power of suspending the laws, or the execution of the laws, ought never to be exercised but by the legislature, or by authority derived from it, to be exercised in such particular cases only as the legislature shall expressly provide for.

XXI.--The freedom of deliberation, speech and debate, in either house of the legislature, is so essential to the rights of the people, that it cannot be the foundation of any accusation or prosecution, action or complaint, in any other court or place whatsoever.

XXII.--The legislature ought frequently to assemble for the redress of grievances, for correcting, strengthening, and confirming the laws, and for making new laws, as the common good may require.

XXIII.--No subsidy, charge, tax, impost, or duties, ought to be established, fixed, laid, or levied, under any pretext whatsoever, without the consent of the people, or their representatives in the legislature.

XXIV.--Laws made to punish for actions done before the existence of such laws, and which have not been declared crimes by preceding laws, are unjust, oppressive, and inconsistent with the fundamental principles of a free government.

XXV.--No subject ought, in any case, or in any time, to be declared guilty of treason or felony by the legislature.
XXVI.--No magistrate or court of law shall demand excessive bail or sureties, impose excessive fines, or inflict cruel or unusual punishments.

XXVII.--In time of peace no soldier ought to be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner; and in time of war such quarters ought not to be made but by the civil magistrate, in a manner ordained by the legislature.

XXVIII.--No person can in any case be subjected to law-martial, or to any penalties or pains, by virtue of that law, except those employed in the army or navy, and except the militia in actual service, but by authority of the legislature.

XXIX.--It is essential to the preservation of the rights of every individual, his life, liberty, property and character, that there be an impartial interpretation of the laws, and administration of justice. It is the right of every citizen to be tried by judges as free, impartial and independent as the lot of humanity will admit. It is therefore not only the best policy, but for the security of the rights of the people, and of every citizen, that the judges of the supreme judicial court should hold their offices as long as they behave themselves well; and that they should have honorable salaries ascertained and established by standing laws.

XXX.--In the government of this Commonwealth, the legislative department shall never exercise the executive and judicial powers, or either of them: The executive shall never exercise the legislative and judicial powers, or either of them: The judicial shall never exercise the legislative and executive powers, or either of them: to the end it may be a government of laws and not of men.
FIFTH VIRGINIA CONVENTION

A Declaration of Rights

DECLARATION

June 12, 1776

The Capitol | Williamsburg, Virginia

BACKGROUND

As the delegates to the Second Continental Congress were recessed and considering a vote for independence, Virginia adopted the following declaration.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What is the basis of Virginians' rights?

2. Which rights refer specifically to government?

A DECLARATION OF RIGHTS made by the representatives of the good people of Virginia, assembled in full and free Convention; which rights do pertain to them and their posterity, as the basis and foundation of government.

1. THAT all men are by nature equally free and independent, and have certain inherent rights, of which, when they enter into a state of society, they cannot, by any compact, deprive or divest their posterity; namely, the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety.

2. That all power is vested in, and consequently derived from, the people; that magistrates are their trustees and servants, and at all times amenable to them.

3. That government is, or ought to be, instituted for the common benefit, protection, and security of the people, nation, or community; of all the various modes and forms of government, that is best, which is capable of producing the greatest degree of happiness and safety, and is most effectually secured against the danger of maladministration; and that whenever any government shall be found inadequate or contrary to these purposes, a majority of the community hath an indubitable, unalienable, and indefeasible right, to reform, alter, or abolish it, in such manner as shall be judged most conducive to the public weal.

4. That no man, or set of men, are entitled to exclusive or separate emoluments and privileges from the community, but in consideration of public services; which, not being descendible, neither ought the offices of magistrate, legislator, or judge to be hereditary.

5. That the legislative and executive powers of the State should be separate and distinct from the judiciary; and that the members of the two first may be restrained from oppression, by feeling and participating the burthens of the people, they should, at fixed periods, be reduced to a private station, return into that body from
which they were originally taken, and the vacancies be supplied by frequent, cer-
tain, and regular elections, in which all, or any part of the former members, to be
again eligible, or ineligible, as the laws shall direct.

6. That elections of members to serve as representatives of the people, in assembly,
ought to be free; and that all men, having sufficient evidence of permanent com-
mon interest with, and attachment to, the community, have the right of suffrage,
and cannot be taxed or deprived of their property for public uses without their own
consent, or that of their representative so elected, nor bound by any law to which
they have not, in like manner, assented, for the public good.

7. That all power of suspending laws, or the execution of laws, by any authority, with-
out consent of the representatives of the people, is injurious to their rights, and
ought not to be exercised.

8. That in all capital or criminal prosecutions a man hath a right to demand the cause
and nature of his accusation, to be confronted with the accusers and witnesses, to
call for evidence in his favor, and to a speedy trial by an impartial jury of twelve
men of his vicinage, without whose unanimous consent he cannot be found
guilty, nor can he be compelled to give evidence against himself; that no man be
deprived of his liberty, except by the law of the land or the judgment of his peers.

9. That excessive bail ought not to be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel
and unusual punishments inflicted.

10. That general warrants, whereby any officer or messenger may be commanded to
search suspected places without evidence of a fact committed, or to seize any per-
son or persons not named, or whose offence is not particularly described and sup-
ported by evidence, are grievous and oppressive, and ought not to be granted.

11. That in controversies respecting property, and in suits between man and man, the
ancient trial by jury is preferable to any other, and ought to be held sacred.
12. That the freedom of the press is one of the great bulwarks of liberty, and can never be restrained but by despotic governments.

13. That a well regulated militia, composed of the body of the people, trained to arms, is the proper, natural, and safe defense of a free state; that standing armies, in time of peace, should be avoided, as dangerous to liberty; and that, in all cases, the military should be under strict subordination to, and governed by, the civil power.

14. That the people have a right to uniform government; and therefore, that no government separate from, or independent of, the government of Virginia, ought to be erected or established within the limits thereof.

15. That no free government, or the blessing of liberty, can be preserved to any people, but by a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, frugality, and virtue, and by frequent recurrence to fundamental principles.

16. That religion, or the duty which we owe to our CREATOR, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence, and therefore all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience; and that it is the mutual duty of all to practice Christian forbearance, love, and charity, towards each other.
BACKGROUND

Abraham Lincoln scrawled these words on the relationship between the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, potentially as part of his drafts for his First Inaugural Address, though they were not used in the final speech nor in any other public comments.

ANNOTATIONS

All this is not the result of accident. It has a philosophical cause. Without the Constitution and the Union, we could not have attained the result; but even these, are not the primary cause of our great prosperity. There is something back of these, entwining itself more closely about the human heart. That something, is the principle of "Liberty to all"—the principle that clears the path for all—gives hope to all—and, by consequence, enterprise, and industry to all.

The expression of that principle, in our Declaration of Independence, was most happy, and fortunate. Without this, as well as with it, we could have declared our independence of Great Britain; but without it, we could not, I think, have secured our free government, and consequent prosperity. No oppressed, people will fight, and endure, as our fathers did, without the promise of something better, than a mere change of masters.

The assertion of that principle, at that time, was the word, "fitly spoken" which has proved an "apple of gold" to us. The Union, and the Constitution, are the picture of silver, subsequently framed around it. The picture was made, not to conceal, or destroy the apple; but

_____________________
to adorn, and preserve it. The picture was made for the apple—not the apple for the picture.

So let us act, that neither picture, or apple shall ever be blurred, or bruised or broken.

That we may so act, we must study, and understand the points of danger.
President George Washington

First Inaugural Address

Speech

April 30, 1789

Federal Hall | New York City, New York

BACKGROUND

George Washington gave this address to Congress on the occasion of his inauguration.

ANNOTATIONS

Fellow Citizens of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Among the vicissitudes incident to life, no event could have filled me with greater anxieties than that of which the notification was transmitted by your order, and received on the fourteenth day of the present month. On the one hand, I was summoned by my Country, whose voice I can never hear but with veneration and love, from a retreat which I had chosen with the fondest predilection, and, in my flattering hopes, with an immutable decision, as the asylum of my declining years: a retreat which was rendered every day more necessary as well as more dear to me, by the addition of habit to inclination, and of frequent interruptions in my health to the gradual waste committed on it by time. On the other hand, the magnitude and difficulty of the trust to which the voice of my Country called me, being sufficient to awaken in the wisest and most experienced of her citizens, a distrustful scrutiny into his qualifications, could not but overwhelm with despondence, one, who, inheriting inferior endowments from nature and unpractised in the duties of civil administration, ought to be peculiarly conscious of his own deficiencies. In this conflict of emotions, all I dare aver, is, that it has been my faithful study to collect my duty from a just appreciation of every circumstance, by which it might be affected. All I dare hope, is, that, if in executing

this task I have been too much swayed by a grateful remembrance of former instances, or by an affectionate sensibility to this transcendent proof, of the confidence of my fellow-citizens; and have thence too little consulted my incapacity as well as disinclination for the weighty and untried cares before me; my error will be palliated by the motives which misled me, and its consequences be judged by my Country, with some share of the partiality in which they originated.

Such being the impressions under which I have, in obedience to the public summons, repaired to the present station; it would be peculiarly improper to omit in this first official Act, my fervent supplications to that Almighty Being who rules over the Universe, who presides in the Councils of Nations, and whose providential aids can supply every human defect, that his benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the People of the United States, a Government instituted by themselves for these essential purposes: and may enable every instrument employed in its administration to execute with success, the functions allotted to his charge. In tendering this homage to the Great Author of every public and private good I assure myself that it expresses your sentiments not less than my own; nor those of my fellow-citizens at large, less than either. No People can be bound to acknowledge and adore the invisible hand, which conducts the Affairs of men more than the People of the United States. Every step, by which they have advanced to the character of an independent nation, seems to have been distinguished by some token of providential agency. And in the important revolution just accomplished in the system of their United Government, the tranquil deliberations and voluntary consent of so many distinct communities, from which the event has resulted, cannot be compared with the means by which most Governments have been established, without some return of pious gratitude along with an humble anticipation of the future blessings which the past seem to presage. These reflections, arising out of the present crisis, have forced themselves too strongly on my mind to be suppressed. You will join with me I trust in thinking, that there are none under the influence of which, the proceedings of a new and free Government can more auspiciously commence.
By the article establishing the Executive Department, it is made the duty of the President "to recommend to your consideration, such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient." The circumstances under which I now meet you, will acquit me from entering into that subject, farther than to refer to the Great Constitutional Charter under which you are assembled; and which, in defining your powers, designates the objects to which your attention is to be given. It will be more consistent with those circumstances, and far more congenial with the feelings which actuate me, to substitute, in place of a recommendation of particular measures, the tribute that is due to the talents, the rectitude, and the patriotism which adorn the characters selected to devise and adopt them. In these honorable qualifications, I behold the surest pledges, that as on one side, no local prejudices, or attachments; no separate views, nor party animosities, will misdirect the comprehensive and equal eye which ought to watch over this great assemblage of communities and interests: so, on another, that the foundations of our National policy will be laid in the pure and immutable principles of private morality; and the pre-eminence of a free Government, be exemplified by all the attributes which can win the affections of its Citizens, and command the respect of the world.

I dwell on this prospect with every satisfaction which an ardent love for my Country can inspire: since there is no truth more thoroughly established, than that there exists in the economy and course of nature, an indissoluble union between virtue and happiness, between duty and advantage, between the genuine maxims of an honest and magnificent policy, and the solid rewards of public prosperity and felicity: Since we ought to be no less persuaded that the propitious smiles of Heaven, can never be expected on a nation that disregards the eternal rules of order and right, which Heaven itself has ordained: And since the preservation of the sacred fire of liberty, and the destiny of the Republican model of Government, are justly considered as deeply, perhaps as finally staked, on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people.

Besides the ordinary objects submitted to your care, it will remain with your judgment to decide, how far an exercise of the occasional power delegated by the Fifth article of the Constitution is rendered expedient at the present juncture by the nature of objections
which have been urged against the System, or by the degree of inquietude which has given birth to them. Instead of undertaking particular recommendations on this subject, in which I could be guided by no lights derived from official opportunities, I shall again give way to my entire confidence in your discernment and pursuit of the public good: For I assure myself that whilst you carefully avoid every alteration which might endanger the benefits of an United and effective Government, or which ought to await the future lessons of experience; a reverence for the characteristic rights of freemen, and a regard for the public harmony, will sufficiently influence your deliberations on the question how far the former can be more impregnably fortified, or the latter be safely and advantageously promoted.

To the preceeding observations I have one to add, which will be most properly addressed to the House of Representatives. It concerns myself, and will therefore be as brief as possible. When I was first honoured with a call into the Service of my Country, then on the eve of an arduous struggle for its liberties, the light in which I contemplated my duty required that I should renounce every pecuniary compensation. From this resolution I have in no instance departed. And being still under the impressions which produced it, I must decline as inapplicable to myself, any share in the personal emoluments, which may be indispensably included in a permanent provision for the Executive Department; and must accordingly pray that the pecuniary estimates for the Station in which I am placed, may, during my continuance in it, be limited to such actual expenditures as the public good may be thought to require.

Having thus imparted to you my sentiments, as they have been awakened by the occasion which brings us together, I shall take my present leave; but not without resorting once more to the benign parent of the human race, in humble supplication that since he has been pleased to favour the American people, with opportunities for deliberating in perfect tranquility, and dispositions for deciding with unparelled unanimity on a form of Government, for the security of their Union, and the advancement of their happiness; so his divine blessing may be equally conspicuous in the enlarged views, the temperate consultations, and the wise measures on which the success of this Government must depend.
PRESIDENT GEORGE WASHINGTON

To the People of America

LETTER

September 19, 1796

American Daily Advertiser | Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Farewell Address

BACKGROUND

George Washington wrote this letter to the American people announcing his retirement from the Presidency after his second term. At the time, there were no term limits on the presidency.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What is one of the main pillars supporting American independence, according to Washington?

2. How are the various geographical parts of the country connected to one another?

3. What are Washington’s main criticisms of partisanship?

4. Which habits are necessary for political prosperity and popular government?

5. Why is Washington opposed to permanent alliances with other nations?

6. What should be the foreign policy of the United States in relation to other nations?

Friends, and Fellow Citizens:

The period for a new election of a Citizen, to Administer the Executive government of the United States, being not far distant, and the time actually arrived, when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person, who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation, which binds a dutiful citizen to his country, and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest, no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in, the office to which your Suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire.

I constantly hoped, that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives, which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement, from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last Election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our Affairs with foreign Nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice, that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty, or propriety; and am persuaded whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.
The impressions, with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say, that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the Organization and Administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious, in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and every day the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services, they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe, that while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment, which is intended to terminate the career of my public life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that, under circumstances in which the Passions agitated in every direction were liable to mislead, amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging, in situations in which not unfrequently want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism, the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that Heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence; that your Union and brotherly affection may be perpetual; that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained; that its Administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and Virtue; that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these States, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete, by so careful a
preservation and so prudent a use of this blessing as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection, and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments; which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a People. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The Unity of Government which constitutes you one people is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main Pillar in the Edifice of your real independence, the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very Liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee, that from different causes and from different quarters, much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed, it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national Union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immoveable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the Palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned, and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our
Country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to You, in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of Patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same Religion, Manners, Habits and political Principles. You have in a common cause fought and triumphed together. The independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint councils, and joint efforts; of common dangers, sufferings and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they address themselves to your sensibility are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your Interest. Here every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the Union of the whole.

The North, in an unrestrained intercourse with the South, protected by the equal Laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of Maritime and commercial enterprise and precious materials of manufacturing industry. The South in the same Intercourse, benefitting by the Agency of the North, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the North, it finds its particular navigation envigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the National navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a Maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The East, in a like intercourse with the West, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications, by land and water, will more and more find, a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The West derives from the East supplies requisite to its growth and comfort, and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyment of indispensable outlets for its own productions to the weight, influence, and the future Maritime strength of the
Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as one Nation. Any other tenure by which the West can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength, or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign Power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular Interest in Union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts greater strength, greater resource, proportionally greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their Peace by foreign Nations; and, what is of inestimable value! they must derive from Union an exemption from those broils and Wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries, not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalships alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown Military establishments, which under any form of Government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to Republican Liberty: In this sense it is, that your Union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind, and exhibit the continuance of the Union as a primary object of Patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? Let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective Subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. ’Tis well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to Union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason, to distrust the patriotism of those, who in any quarter may endeavor to weaken its bands.
In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by Geographical discriminations: Northern and Southern—Atlantic and Western; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of Party to acquire influence, within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other Districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations. They tend to render Alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our Western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head. They have seen, in the Negotiation by the Executive; and in the unanimous ratification by the Senate, of the Treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at that event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the General Government and in the Atlantic States unfriendly to their interests [in] regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two Treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them every thing they could desire, in respect to our Foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the Union by which they were procured? Will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such there are, who would sever them from their Brethren and connect them with Aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a Government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances however strict between the parts can be an adequate substitute. They must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all Alliances in all times have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a Constitution of Government, better calculated than your former for an intimate Union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its
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own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its Laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true Liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their Constitutions of Government. But the Constitution which at any time exists, 'til changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole People, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the People to establish Government presupposes the duty of every Individual to obey the established Government.

All obstructions to the execution of the Laws, all combinations and Associations, under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberation and action of the Constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle and of fatal tendency. They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force; to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation, the will of a party; often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the Community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the Mirror of the ill-concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils and modified by mutual interests. However combinations or Associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the Power of the People, and to usurp for themselves the reins of Government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your Government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular oppositions to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles however specious the pretexts. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the Constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system, and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of
Governments, as of other human institutions; that experience is the surest standard, by which to test the real tendency of the existing Constitution of a country; that facility in changes upon the credit of mere hypotheses and opinion exposes to perpetual change, from the endless variety of hypotheses and opinion, and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests, in a country so extensive as ours, a Government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of Liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a Government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest Guardian. It is indeed little else than a name, where the Government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the Society within the limits prescribed by the Laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of Parties in the State, with particular reference to the founding of them on Geographical discriminations. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the Spirit of Party, generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human Mind. It exists under different shapes in all Governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but, in those of the popular form, it is seen in its greatest rankness and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissention, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries, which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an Individual; and sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation, on the ruins of Public Liberty.
Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of Party are sufficient to make it the interest and the duty of a wise People to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the Public Councils and enfeeble the Public administration. It agitates the Community with ill-founded jealousies and false alarms, kindles the animosity of one part against another, foments occasionally riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which find a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country, are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the Administration of the government and serve to keep alive the spirit of Liberty. This within certain limits is probably true, and in Governments of a Monarchical cast Patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in Governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched; it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent its bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free Country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective Constitutional spheres; avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power, and proneness to abuse it, which predominates in the human heart is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power; by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the Guardian of the Public Weal against invasions by the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern, some of them in our
country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute
them. If in the opinion of the People, the distribution or modification of the Constitutional
powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which
the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in
one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free
governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent
evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, Religion and morality
are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of Patriotism, who
should labor to subvert these great Pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the
duties of Men and citizens. The mere Politician, equally with the pious man ought to re-
spect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and
public felicity. Let it simply be asked where is the security for property, for reputation, for
life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths, which are the instruments of inves-
tigation in Courts of Justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality
can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined
education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect
that National morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

'Tis substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government.
The rule indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free Government. Who
that is a sincere friend to it, can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the founda-
tion of the fabric.

Promote then as an object of primary importance, Institutions for the general diffusion of
knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it
is essential that public opinion should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of
preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible: avoiding occasions of expense by cultivat-
ing peace, but remembering also that timely disbursements to prepare for danger frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of Peace to discharge the Debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your Representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be Revenue; that to have Revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper objects (which is always a choice of difficulties) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the Conduct of the Government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining Revenue which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all Nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct; and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great Nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a People always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt that in the course of time and things the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it? Can it be, that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human Nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular Nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded; and that in place of them just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The Nation, which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one Nation against
another, disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable, when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The Nation, prompted by ill will and resentment sometimes impels to War the Government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The Government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the Nation subservient to projects of hostility instigated by pride, ambition and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the Liberty, of Nations has been the victim.

So, likewise, a passionate attachment of one Nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and Wars of the latter, without adequate inducement or justification: It leads also to concessions to the favorite Nation of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the Nation making the concession; by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate, in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld: And it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens (who devote themselves to the favorite Nation) facility to betray, or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition[,] corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent Patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public Councils! Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful Nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.
Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens), the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of Republican Government. But that jealousy to be useful must be impartial; else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike of another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real Patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The Great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign Nations is in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connections as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements let them be fulfilled, with perfect good faith. Here let us stop. Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence therefore it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships, or enmities:

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one People, under an efficient government, the period is not far off, when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interest guided by justice shall Counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle
our peace and prosperity in the toils of European Ambition, Rivalship, Interest, Humor or Caprice?

"Tis our true policy to steer clear of permanent Alliances, with any portion of the foreign world. So far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it, for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements (I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than to private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy). I repeat it therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves, by suitable establishments, on a respectably defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, liberal intercourse with all Nations, are recommended by policy, humanity and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand: neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of Commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with Powers so disposed; in order to give to trade a stable course, to define the rights of our Merchants, and to enable the Government to support them; conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied, as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that "tis folly in one Nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its Independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors and yet, of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from Nation to Nation. "Tis an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my Countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression, I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our Nation from running the course which
has hitherto marked the Destiny of Nations. But if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the Impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare, by which they have been dictated.

How far in the discharge of my Official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public Records and other evidences of my conduct must Witness to You and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have at least believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting War in Europe, my Proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793 is the index to my Plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice and by that of Your Representatives in both Houses of Congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me; uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination with the aid of the best lights I could obtain I was well satisfied that our Country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a Neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it, with moderation, perseverance, and firmness.

The considerations, which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe, that according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the Belligerent powers has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a Neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every Nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of Peace and amity towards other Nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me, a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress without
interruption, to that degree of strength and consistency, which is necessary to give it, hu-
manly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my Administration, I am unconscious of intentional
error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have
committed many errors. Whatever they may be I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert
or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my
Country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that after forty-five years of
my life dedicated to its Service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will
be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the Mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards
it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors
for several Generations, I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat, in which I prom-
ise myself to realize, without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my
fellow Citizens, the benign influence of good Laws under a free Government, the ever fa-
vorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and
dangers.
THE U.S. CONGRESS OF THE CONFEDERATION

An Ordinance for the Government of the Territory of the United States Northwest of the River Ohio

LAW EXCERPT

July 13, 1787

Federal Hall | New York City, New York

BACKGROUND

Congress passed the Northwest Ordinance to provide the governing structure for all of the territories of the young United States, lands that would later become the states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin.

ANNOTATIONS

Article III

Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged. The utmost good faith shall always be observed towards the Indians; their lands and property shall never be taken from them without their consent; and in their property, rights, and liberty they never shall be invaded or disturbed unless in just and lawful wars authorized by Congress; but laws founded in justice and humanity shall, from time to time, be made, for preventing wrongs being done to them, and for preserving peace and friendship with them....

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

Report of the Board of Commissioners

REPORT EXCERPTS

August 4, 1818

Rockfish Gap, Virginia

BACKGROUND

Thomas Jefferson and James Madison had a role in forming these ideas on education and the public support thereof as members of the Board of Commissioners for the University of Virginia.

ANNOTATIONS

…In proceeding to the third and fourth duties prescribed by the Legislature, of reporting "the branches of learning, which should be taught in the University, and the number and description of the professorships they will require," the Commissioners were first to consider at what point it was understood that university education should commence? Certainly not with the alphabet, for reasons of expediency and impracticability, as well from the obvious sense of the Legislature, who, in the same act, make other provision for the primary instruction of the poor children, expecting, doubtless, that in other cases it would be provided by the parent, or become, perhaps, subject of future and further attention of the Legislature. The objects of this primary education determine its character and limits.

These objects would be,

To give to every citizen the information he needs for the transaction of his own business;

To enable him to calculate for himself, and to express and preserve his ideas, his contracts and accounts, in writing;

NOTES & QUESTIONS

To improve, by reading, his morals and faculties;

To understand his duties to his neighbors and country, and to discharge with competence the functions confided to him by either;

To know his rights; to exercise with order and justice those he retains; to choose with discretion the fiduciary of those he delegates; and to notice their conduct with diligence, with candor, and judgment;

And, in general, to observe with intelligence and faithfulness all the social relations under which he shall be placed.

To instruct the mass of our citizens in these, their rights, interests and duties, as men and citizens, being then the objects of education in the primary schools, whether private or public, in them should be taught reading, writing and numerical arithmetic, the elements of mensuration, (useful in so many callings,) and the outlines of geography and history.

And this brings us to the point at which are to commence the higher branches of education, of which the Legislature require the development; those, for example, which are,

To form the statesmen, legislators and judges, on whom public prosperity and individual happiness are so much to depend;

To expound the principles and structure of government, the laws which regulate the intercourse of nations, those formed municipally for our own government, and a sound spirit of legislation, which, banishing all arbitrary and unnecessary restraint on individual action, shall leave us free to do whatever does not violate the equal rights of another;

To harmonize and promote the interests of agriculture, manufactures and commerce, and by well informed views of political economy to give a free scope to the public industry;
To develop the reasoning faculties of our youth, enlarge their minds, cultivate their morals, and instill into them the precepts of virtue and order;

To enlighten them with mathematical and physical sciences, which advance the arts, and administer to the health, the subsistence, and comforts of human life;

And, generally, to form them to habits of reflection and correct action, rendering them examples of virtue to others, and of happiness within themselves.

These are the objects of that higher grade of education, the benefits and blessings of which the Legislature now propose to provide for the good and ornament of their country, the gratification and happiness of their fellow-citizens, of the parent especially, and his progeny, on which all his affections are concentrated.
President John Adams (Federalist)

To the Officers of the Militia of Massachusetts

Letter

October 11, 1798
Quincy, Massachusetts

BACKGROUND

President John Adams responds to a message sent to him from the militia of his home state of Massachusetts.

ANNOTATIONS

To the Officers of the first Brigade of the third Division of the Militia of Massachusetts

Quincy October 11, 1798

Gentlemen

I have received from Major General Hull and Brigadier General Walker your unanimous Address from Lexington, animated with a martial Spirit and expressed with a military Dignity, becoming your Characters and the memorable Plains, in which it was adopted.

While our Country remains untainted with the Principles and manners, which are now producing desolation in so many Parts of the World: while she continues Sincere and incapable of insidious and impious Policy: We shall have the Strongest Reason to rejoice in the local destination assigned Us by Providence. But should the People of America, once become capable of that deep simulation towards one another and towards foreign nations, which assumes the Language of Justice and moderation while it is practicing Iniquity and Extravagance; and displays in the most captivating manner the charming Pictures of Candour frankness & sincerity while it is rioting in rapine and Insolence: this Country will be

To the Officers of the Militia of Massachusetts  
John Adams

the most miserable Habitation in the World. Because We have no Government armed with  
Power capable of contending with human Passions unbridled by morality and Religion.  
Avarice, Ambition Revenge or Galantry, would break the strongest Cords of our Constitu-  
tion as a Whale goes through a Net. Our Constitution was made only for a moral and reli-
gious People. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other  

An Address so unanimous and firm from the officers commanding two thousand Eight  
hundred Men, consisting of such substantial Citizens as are able and willing at their own  
Expence, compleatly to arm, And cloath themselves in handsome Uniforms does honor to  
that Division of the Militia which has done so much honor to their Country. Oaths, in this  
Country, are as yet universally considered as Sacred Obligations. That which you have  
taken and so solemnly repeated on that venerable Spot is an ample Pledge of your sincerity,  
and devotion to your Country and its Government.

John Adams
SECOND CONTINENTAL CONGRESS

Fast Day Proclamation

PROCLAMATION

December 11, 1776
United States of America

BACKGROUND

The Continental Congress called Americans to prayer and fasting in the first winter of the Revolutionary War.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Why is the Continental Congress asking Americans to fast?

2. What conduct is expected of all members and officers of the United States?

Whereas, the war in which the United States are engaged with Great Britain, has not only been prolonged, but is likely to be carried to the greatest extremity; and whereas, it becomes all public bodies, as well as private persons, to reverence the Providence of God, and look up to him as the supreme disposer of all events, and the arbiter of the fate of nations; therefore,

Resolved, That it be recommended to all the United States, as soon as possible, to appoint a day of solemn fasting and humiliation; to implore of Almighty God the forgiveness of the many sins prevailing among all ranks, and to beg the countenance and assistance of his Providence in the prosecution of the present just and necessary war.

The Congress do also, in the most earnest manner, recommend to all the members of the United States, and particularly the officers civil and military under them, the exercise of repentance and reformation; and further, require of them the strict observation of the articles of war, and particularly, that part of the said articles, which forbids profane swearing, and all immorality, of which all such officers are desired to take notice.

It is left to each state to issue out proclamations fixing the days that appear most proper within their several bounds....
PRESIDENT GEORGE WASHINGTON

Annual Message to Congress

SPEECH EXCERPTS

January 8, 1790

Senate Chamber, Federal Hall | New York City, New York

BACKGROUND

President George Washington gave this address as the first annual message to Congress on the state of the Union, as required per the Constitution.

ANNOTATIONS

Fellow Citizens of the Senate, and House of Representatives…

Among the many interesting objects which will engage your attention, that of providing for the common defence will merit particular regard. To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace….  

Nor am I less persuaded, that you will agree with me in opinion, that there is nothing which can better deserve your patronage, than the promotion of Science and Literature. Knowledge is in every country the surest basis of publick happiness. In one, in which the measures of government receive their impression so immediately from the sense of the community, as in our's, it is proportionately essential. To the security of a free Constitution it contributes in various ways: By convincing those who are entrusted with the publick administration, that every valuable end of government is best answered by the enlightened confidence of the people: And by teaching the people themselves to know, and to value their own rights; to discern and provide against invasions of them; to distinguish between oppression and the necessary exercise of lawful authority; between burthens proceeding

---
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from a disregard to their convenience, and those resulting from the inevitable exigencies of society; to discriminate the spirit of liberty from that of licentiousness, cherishing the first, avoiding the last, and uniting a speedy, but temperate vigilance against encroachments, with an inviolable respect to the laws.

Whether this desirable object will be best promoted by affording aids to seminaries of learning already established, by the institution of a national university, or by any other expedients, will be well worthy of a place in the deliberations of the Legislature…. 
PRESIDENT GEORGE WASHINGTON

Thanksgiving Proclamation

PROCLAMATION

October 3, 1789

Federal Hall | New York City, New York

BACKGROUND

President George Washington established a day of thanksgiving to God for peaceably establishing a new form of government, to be observed around the one-year anniversary of the new Constitution.

ANNOTATIONS

By the President of the United States of America, a Proclamation.

Whereas it is the duty of all Nations to acknowledge the providence of Almighty God, to obey his will, to be grateful for his benefits, and humbly to implore his protection and favor—and whereas both Houses of Congress have by their joint Committee requested me “to recommend to the People of the United States a day of public thanksgiving and prayer to be observed by acknowledging with grateful hearts the many signal favors of Almighty God especially by affording them an opportunity peaceably to establish a form of government for their safety and happiness.”

Now therefore I do recommend and assign Thursday the 26th day of November next to be devoted by the People of these States to the service of that great and glorious Being, who is the beneficent Author of all the good that was, that is, or that will be—That we may then all unite in rendering unto him our sincere and humble thanks—for his kind care and protection of the People of this Country previous to their becoming a Nation—for the signal and manifold mercies, and the favorable interpositions of his Providence which we experienced in the course and conclusion of the late war—for the great degree of tranquillity,

united, and plenty, which we have since enjoyed—for the peaceable and rational manner, in which we have been enabled to establish constitutions of government for our safety and happiness, and particularly the national one now lately instituted—for the civil and religious liberty with which we are blessed; and the means we have of acquiring and diffusing useful knowledge; and in general for all the great and various favors which he hath been pleased to confer upon us.

And also that we may then unite in most humbly offering our prayers and supplications to the great Lord and Ruler of Nations and beseech him to pardon our national and other transgressions—to enable us all, whether in public or private stations, to perform our several and relative duties properly and punctually—to render our national government a blessing to all the people, by constantly being a Government of wise, just, and constitutional laws, discreetly and faithfully executed and obeyed—to protect and guide all Sovereigns and Nations (especially such as have shewn kindness unto us) and to bless them with good government, peace, and concord—to promote the knowledge and practice of true religion and virtue, and the encrease of science among them and us—and generally to grant unto all Mankind such a degree of temporal prosperity as he alone knows to be best.

Given under my hand at the City of New-York the third day of October in the year of our Lord 1789.

George Washington
President George Washington

To the Hebrew Congregation in Newport

LETTER

August 18, 1790
Newport, Rhode Island

BACKGROUND

In his response to a congratulatory note sent by the congregation on the occasion of his election, George Washington expresses his gratitude and discusses religious liberty.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What has "toleration" been replaced with? What is the distinction Washington makes?

2. What natural rights does Washington refer to, and how are they to be protected?

Gentlemen:

While I receive, with much satisfaction, your Address replete with expressions of esteem; I rejoice in the opportunity of assuring you, that I shall always retain grateful remembrance of the cordial welcome I experienced in my visit to Newport, from all classes of Citizens.

The reflection on the days of difficulty and danger which are past is rendered the more sweet, from a consciousness that they are succeeded by days of uncommon prosperity and security. If we have wisdom to make the best use of the advantages with which we are now favored, we cannot fail, under the just administration of a good Government, to become a great and happy people.

The Citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy: a policy worthy of imitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that toleration is spoken of, as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people, that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural rights. For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support.

It would be inconsistent with the frankness of my character not to avow that I am pleased with your favorable opinion of my Administration and fervent wishes for my felicity. May the Children of the Stock of Abraham, who dwell in this land, continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other Inhabitants; while every one shall sit in safety under his own vine and figtree, and there shall be none to make him afraid. May the father of all mercies scatter light and not darkness in our paths, and make us all in our several vocations useful here, and in his own due time and way everlastingly happy.
President George Washington

To the Society of Quakers

Letter

October 13, 1789

Background

President George Washington responds to a note of congratulations from the Society of Quakers on the occasion of his election.

Annotations

Gentlemen,

I receive with pleasure your affectionate address, and thank you for the friendly Sentiments & good wishes which you express for the Success of my administration, and for my personal Happiness.

We have Reason to rejoice in the prospect that the present National Government, which by the favor of Divine Providence, was formed by the common Counsels, and peaceably established with the common consent of the People, will prove a blessing to every denomination of them. To render it such, my best endeavours shall not be wanting.

Government being, among other purposes, instituted to protect the Persons and Consciences of men from oppression, it certainly is the duty of Rulers, not only to abstain from it themselves, but according to their Stations, to prevent it in others.

The liberty enjoyed by the People of these States, of worshipping Almighty God agreeable to their Consciences, is not only among the choicest of their Blessings, but also of their Rights—While men perform their social Duties faithfully, they do all that Society or

the State can with propriety demand or expect; and remain responsible only to their Maker for the Religion or modes of faith which they may prefer or profess.

Your principles & conduct are well known to me—and it is doing the People called Quakers no more than Justice to say, that (except their declining to share with others the burthen of the common defence) there is no Denomination among us who are more exemplary and useful Citizens.

I assure you very explicitly that in my opinion the Consciencious scruples of all men should be treated with great delicacy & tenderness, and it is my wish and desire that the Laws may always be as extensively accomodated to them, as a due regard to the Protection and essential Interests of the Nation may Justify, and permit.

George Washington
THOMAS JEFFERSON

Statute for Religious Freedom

DRAFT BILL

1777
Virginia

BACKGROUND

This 1777 draft bill was the blueprint for one eventually passed in Virginia in 1786, and was one of three actions for which Thomas Jefferson wanted credited mentioned on his tombstone, in addition to being author of the Declaration of Independence and founder of the University of Virginia.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What has Almighty God given man with respect to his mind?

2. What does this statute say are the problems with compelled contributions of money to religion?

3. What particular right of man does this statute protect?

---

I. Well aware that the opinions and belief of men depend not on their own will but follow involuntarily the evidence proposed to their minds; that Almighty God hath created the mind free; and manifested his supreme will that free it shall remain by making it altogether insusceptible of restraint; that all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments, or burdens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the plan of the holy author of our religion, who being lord both of body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercions on either, as was in his Almighty power to do but to extend it by its influence on reason alone; that the impious presumption of legislators and rulers, civil as well as ecclesiastical, who, being themselves but fallible and uninspired men, have assumed dominion over the faith of others, setting up their own opinions and modes of thinking as the only true and infallible, and as such endeavoring to impose them on others, hath established and maintained false religions over the greatest part of the world and through all time: That to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves and abhors, is sinful and tyrannical; that even the forcing him to support this or that teacher of his own religious persuasion, is depriving him of the comfortable liberty of giving his contributions to the particular pastor whose morals he would make his pattern, and whose powers he feels most persuasive to righteousness and is withdrawing from the ministry those temporary rewards, which proceeding from an approbation of their personal conduct, are an additional incitement to earnest and unremitting labors for the instruction of mankind; that our civil rights have no dependence on our religious opinions, any more than our opinions in physics or geometry; that therefore the proscribing any citizen as unworthy the public confidence by laying upon him an incapacity of being called to offices of trust and emolument, unless he profess or renounce this or that religious opinion, is depriving him injuriously of those privileges and advantages to which, in common with his fellow citizens, he has a natural right; that it tends also to corrupt the principles of that religion it is meant to encourage, by bribing, with a monopoly of worldly honors and emoluments, those who will externally profess and conform to it; that though indeed these are criminal who do not withstand
such temptation, yet neither are those innocent who lay the bait in their way *that the opinions of men are not the object of civil government, nor under its jurisdiction*; that to suffer the civil magistrate to intrude his powers into the field of opinion and to restrain the profession or propagation of principles on supposition of their ill tendency is a dangerous fallacy, which at once destroys all religious liberty, because he being of course judge of that tendency will make his opinions the rule of judgement, and approve or condemn the sentiments of others only as they shall square with or differ from his own; that it is time enough for the rightful purposes of civil government for its officers to interfere when principles break out into overt acts against peace and good order; and finally, that truth is great and will prevail if left to herself; that she is the proper and sufficient antagonist to error, and has nothing to fear from the conflict unless by human interposition disarmed of her natural weapons, free argument and debate; errors ceasing to be dangerous when it is permitted freely to contradict them.

II. *We the General Assembly of Virginia do enact*, that no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burdened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer, on account of his religious opinions or belief; but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities.

And though we well know that this Assembly, elected by the people for the ordinary purposes of legislation only, have no power to restrain the acts of succeeding Assemblies, constituted with powers equal to our own, and that therefore to declare this act to be irrevocable would be of no effect in law; yet we are free to declare, and do declare, that the rights hereby asserted are of the natural rights of mankind, and that if any act shall be hereafter passed to repeal the present or to narrow its operation, such act will be an infringement of natural right.
ANONYMOUS (VIRGINIA HOUSE DELEGATE JAMES MADISON)

A Memorial and Remonstrance

ESSAY

June 20, 1785

General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia | Richmond, Virginia

BACKGROUND

Madison circulated this anonymous essay in order to support the passage of the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Why must each man's religion be left to his individual conscience?

2. What is the extent of the legislature's power over religion, according to Madison?

3. How does Madison link the founding principle of equality to religious freedom?

4. According to Madison's interpretation, what does the Christian religion itself say about religious freedom?

5. What does Madison think imposing religious assessments will do for the public harmony?

6. In what way would religious assessments impede the "victorious progress of Truth," according to Madison?

7. Among the rights of citizens, what rank does religious freedom have, in Madison's view?

To the Honorable the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia: A Memo-
rial and Remonstrance

We the subscribers, citizens of the said Commonwealth, having taken into serious consid-
eration, a Bill printed by order of the last Session of General Assembly, entitled "A Bill
establishing a provision for Teachers of the Christian Religion," and conceiving that the
same if finally armed with the sanctions of a law, will be a dangerous abuse of power, are
bound as faithful members of a free State to remonstrate against it, and to declare the rea-
sons by which we are determined. We remonstrate against the said Bill,

1. Because we hold it for a fundamental and undeniable truth, "that Religion or the duty
which we owe to our Creator and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by
reason and conviction, not by force or violence." The Religion then of every man must be
left to the conviction and conscience of every man; and it is the right of every man to exer-
cise it as these may dictate. This right is in its nature an unalienable right. It is unalienable,
because the opinions of men, depending only on the evidence contemplated by their own
minds cannot follow the dictates of other men: It is unalienable also, because what is here
a right towards men, is a duty towards the Creator. It is the duty of every man to render to
the Creator such homage and such only as he believes to be acceptable to him. This duty is
precedent, both in order of time and in degree of obligation, to the claims of Civil Society.
Before any man can be considered as a member of Civil Society, he must be considered as
a subject of the Governor of the Universe: And if a member of Civil Society, who enters
into any subordinate Association, must always do it with a reservation of his duty to the
General Authority; much more must every man who becomes a member of any particular
Civil Society, do it with a saving of his allegiance to the Universal Sovereign. We maintain
therefore that in matters of Religion, no mans right is abridged by the institution of Civil
Society and that Religion is wholly exempt from its cognizance. True it is, that no other
rule exists, by which any question which may divide a Society, can be ultimately deter-
mined, but the will of the majority; but it is also true that the majority may trespass on the
rights of the minority.
2. Because if Religion be exempt from the authority of the Society at large, still less can it be subject to that of the Legislative Body. The latter are but the creatures and vicegerents of the former. Their jurisdiction is both derivative and limited: it is limited with regard to the coordinate departments, more necessarily is it limited with regard to the constituents. The preservation of a free Government requires not merely, that the metes and bounds which separate each department of power be invariably maintained; but more especially that neither of them be suffered to overleap the great Barrier which defines the rights of the people. The Rulers who are guilty of such an encroachment, exceed the commission from which they derive their authority, and are Tyrants. The People who submit to it are governed by laws made neither by themselves nor by an authority derived from them, and are slaves.

3. Because it is proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties. We hold this prudent jealousy to be the first duty of Citizens, and one of the noblest characteristics of the late Revolution. The free men of America did not wait till usurped power had strengthened itself by exercise, and entangled the question in precedents. They saw all the consequences in the principle, and they avoided the consequences by denying the principle. We revere this lesson too much soon to forget it. Who does not see that the same authority which can establish Christianity, in exclusion of all other Religions, may establish with the same ease any particular sect of Christians, in exclusion of all other Sects? that the same authority which can force a citizen to contribute three pence only of his property for the support of any one establishment, may force him to conform to any other establishment in all cases whatsoever?

4. Because the Bill violates that equality which ought to be the basis of every law, and which is more indispensible, in proportion as the validity or expediency of any law is more liable to be impeached. If “all men are by nature equally free and independent,” all men are to be considered as entering into Society on equal conditions; as relinquishing no more, and therefore retaining no less, one than another, of their natural rights. Above all are they to be considered as retaining an “equal title to the free exercise of Religion according to the dictates of Conscience.” Whilst we assert for ourselves a freedom to embrace, to profess
and to observe the Religion which we believe to be of divine origin, we cannot deny an equal freedom to those whose minds have not yet yielded to the evidence which has convinced us. If this freedom be abused, it is an offense against God, not against man: To God, therefore, not to man, must an account of it be rendered. As the Bill violates equality by subjecting some to peculiar burdens, so it violates the same principle, by granting to others peculiar exemptions. Are the Quakers and Menonists the only sects who think a compulsive support of their Religions unnecessary and unwarrantable? Can their piety alone be entrusted with the care of public worship? Ought their Religions to be endowed above all others with extraordinary privileges by which proselytes may be enticed from all others? We think too favorably of the justice and good sense of these denominations to believe that they either covet pre-eminences over their fellow citizens or that they will be seduced by them from the common opposition to the measure.

5. Because the Bill implies either that the Civil Magistrate is a competent Judge of Religious Truth; or that he may employ Religion as an engine of Civil policy. The first is an arrogant pretension falsified by the contradictory opinions of Rulers in all ages, and throughout the world: the second an unhallowed perversion of the means of salvation.

6. Because the establishment proposed by the Bill is not requisite for the support of the Christian Religion. To say that it is, is a contradiction to the Christian Religion itself, for every page of it disavows a dependence on the powers of this world: it is a contradiction to fact; for it is known that this Religion both existed and flourished, not only without the support of human laws, but in spite of every opposition from them, and not only during the period of miraculous aid, but long after it had been left to its own evidence and the ordinary care of Providence. Nay, it is a contradiction in terms; for a Religion not invented by human policy, must have pre-existed and been supported, before it was established by human policy. It is moreover to weaken in those who profess this Religion a pious confidence in its innate excellence and the patronage of its Author; and to foster in those who still reject it, a suspicion that its friends are too conscious of its fallacies to trust it to its own merits.
7. Because experience witnesseth that ecclesiastical establishments, instead of maintaining the purity and efficacy of Religion, have had a contrary operation. During almost fifteen centuries has the legal establishment of Christianity been on trial. What have been its fruits? More or less in all places, pride and indolence in the Clergy, ignorance and servility in the laity, in both, superstition, bigotry and persecution. Inquire of the Teachers of Christianity for the ages in which it appeared in its greatest luster; those of every sect, point to the ages prior to its incorporation with Civil policy. Propose a restoration of this primitive State in which its Teachers depended on the voluntary rewards of their flocks, many of them predict its downfall. On which Side ought their testimony to have greatest weight, when for or when against their interest?

8. Because the establishment in question is not necessary for the support of Civil Government. If it be urged as necessary for the support of Civil Government only as it is a means of supporting Religion, and it be not necessary for the latter purpose, it cannot be necessary for the former. If Religion be not within the cognizance of Civil Government how can its legal establishment be necessary to Civil Government? What influence in fact have ecclesiastical establishments had on Civil Society? In some instances they have been seen to erect a spiritual tyranny on the ruins of the Civil authority; in many instances they have been seen upholding the thrones of political tyranny: in no instance have they been seen the guardians of the liberties of the people. Rulers who wished to subvert the public liberty, may have found an established Clergy convenient auxiliaries. A just Government instituted to secure and perpetuate it needs them not. Such a Government will be best supported by protecting every Citizen in the enjoyment of his Religion with the same equal hand which protects his person and his property; by neither invading the equal rights of any Sect, nor suffering any Sect to invade those of another.

9. Because the proposed establishment is a departure from that generous policy, which, offering an Asylum to the persecuted and oppressed of every Nation and Religion, promised a luster to our country, and an accession to the number of its citizens. What a melancholy mark is the Bill of sudden degeneracy? Instead of holding forth an Asylum to the persecuted, it is itself a signal of persecution. It degrades from the equal rank of Citizens all
those whose opinions in Religion do not bend to those of the Legislative authority. Distant as it may be in its present form from the Inquisition, it differs from it only in degree. The one is the first step, the other the last in the career of intolerance. The magnanimous sufferer under this cruel scourge in foreign Regions, must view the Bill as a Beacon on our Coast, warning him to seek some other haven, where liberty and philanthropy in their due extent, may offer a more certain repose from his Troubles.

10. Because it will have a like tendency to banish our Citizens. The allurements presented by other situations are every day thinning their number. To superadd a fresh motive to emigration by revoking the liberty which they now enjoy, would be the same species of folly which has dishonored and depopulated flourishing kingdoms.

11. Because it will destroy that moderation and harmony which the forbearance of our laws to intermeddle with Religion has produced among its several sects. Torrents of blood have been spilt in the old world, by vain attempts of the secular arm, to extinguish Religious discord, by proscribing all difference in Religious opinion. Time has at length revealed the true remedy. Every relaxation of narrow and rigorous policy, wherever it has been tried, has been found to assuage the disease. The American Theater has exhibited proofs that equal and complete liberty, if it does not wholly eradicate it, sufficiently destroys its malignant influence on the health and prosperity of the State. If with the salutary effects of this system under our own eyes, we begin to contract the bounds of Religious freedom, we know no name that will too severely reproach our folly. At least let warning be taken at the first fruits of the threatened innovation. The very appearance of the Bill has transformed "that Christian forbearance, love and charity," which of late mutually prevailed, into animosities and jealousies, which may not soon be appeased. What mischiefs may not be dreaded, should this enemy to the public quiet be armed with the force of a law?

12. Because the policy of the Bill is adverse to the diffusion of the light of Christianity. The first wish of those who enjoy this precious gift ought to be that it may be imparted to the whole race of mankind. Compare the number of those who have as yet received it with the number still remaining under the dominion of false Religions; and how small is the former!
Does the policy of the Bill tend to lessen the disproportion? No; it at once discourages those who are strangers to the light of revelation from coming into the Region of it; andcountenances by example the nations who continue in darkness, in shutting out those who might convey it to them. Instead of Levelling as far as possible, every obstacle to the victorious progress of Truth, the Bill with an ignoble and unchristian timidity would circumscribe it with a wall of defense against the encroachments of error.

13. Because attempts to enforce by legal sanctions, acts obnoxious to so great a proportion of Citizens, tend to enervate the laws in general, and to slacken the bands of Society. If it be difficult to execute any law which is not generally deemed necessary or salutary, what must be the case, where it is deemed invalid and dangerous? And what may be the effect of so striking an example of impotency in the Government, on its general authority?

14. Because a measure of such singular magnitude and delicacy ought not to be imposed, without the clearest evidence that it is called for by a majority of citizens, and no satisfactory method is yet proposed by which the voice of the majority in this case may be determined, or its influence secured. "The people of the respective counties are indeed requested to signify their opinion respecting the adoption of the Bill to the next Session of Assembly." But the representation must be made equal, before the voice either of the Representatives or of the Counties will be that of the people. Our hope is that neither of the former will, after due consideration, espouse the dangerous principle of the Bill. Should the event disappoint us, it will still leave us in full confidence, that a fair appeal to the latter will reverse the sentence against our liberties.

15. Because finally, "the equal right of every citizen to the free exercise of his Religion according to the dictates of conscience" is held by the same tenure with all our other rights. If we recur to its origin, it is equally the gift of nature; if we weigh its importance, it cannot be less dear to us; if we consult the "Declaration of those rights which pertain to the good people of Virginia, as the basis and foundation of Government," it is enumerated with equal solemnity, or rather studied emphasis. Either then, we must say, that the Will of the Legislature is the only measure of their authority; and that in the plenitude of this authority, they
may sweep away all our fundamental rights; or, that they are bound to leave this particular right untouched and sacred: Either we must say, that they may control the freedom of the press, may abolish the Trial by Jury, may swallow up the Executive and Judiciary Powers of the State; nay that they may despoil us of our very right of suffrage, and erect themselves into an independent and hereditary Assembly or, we must say, that they have no authority to enact into law the Bill under consideration. We the Subscribers say, that the General Assembly of this Commonwealth have no such authority: And that no effort may be omitted on our part against so dangerous an usurpation, we oppose to it, this remonstrance; earnestly praying, as we are in duty bound, that the Supreme Lawgiver of the Universe, by illuminating those to whom it is addressed, may on the one hand, turn their Councils from every act which would affront his holy prerogative, or violate the trust committed to them: and on the other, guide them into every measure which may be worthy of his blessing, may redound to their own praise, and may establish more firmly the liberties, the prosperity and the happiness of the Commonwealth.
PRESIDENT THOMAS JEFFERSON (DEMOCRATIC-REPUBLICAN)

To the Danbury Baptist Association

LETTER

January 1, 1802
Danbury, Connecticut

BACKGROUND

President Thomas Jefferson responds to the Danbury Baptist Association's request that as president, he aid them in overcoming laws inhibiting religious liberty in Connecticut.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. How does Jefferson interpret the First Amendment's Establishment and Free Exercise clauses?

2. Given the principle of federalism, what, as president, is Jefferson able to do for the Association?

Gentlemen:

The affectionate sentiments of esteem and approbation which you are so good as to express towards me, on behalf of the Danbury Baptist Association, give me the highest satisfaction. My duties dictate a faithful and zealous pursuit of the interests of my constituents, and in proportion as they are persuaded of my fidelity to those duties, the discharge of them becomes more and more pleasing. Believing with you that religion is a matter which lies solely between man and his God, that he owes account to none other for his faith or his worship, that the legislative powers of government reach actions only, and not opinions, I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should "make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," thus building a wall of separation between Church and State. Adhering to this expression of the supreme will of the nation in behalf of the rights of conscience, I shall see with sincere satisfaction the progress of those sentiments which tend to restore to man all his natural rights, convinced he has no natural right in opposition to his social duties.

I reciprocate your kind prayers for the protection and blessing of the common Father and Creator of man, and tender you for yourselves and your religious association, assurances of my high respect and esteem.
TREASURY SECRETARY ALEXANDER HAMILTON

On the French Revolution

UNPUBLISHED WRITING FRAGMENT

BACKGROUND

In an unpublished and unfinished piece, Alexander Hamilton expresses serious concerns over the irreligiosity of the French Revolution.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What are the opinions that threaten the foundations of religion, morality, and society?

2. Which two groups are the enemies of religion and government?

3. How is the French Revolution the practical development of these irreligious and anarchic opinions?

On the French Revolution
Alexander Hamilton

Facts, numerous and unequivocal, demonstrate that the present aera is among the most extraordinary, which have occurred in the history of human affairs. Opinions, for a long time, have been gradually gaining ground, which threaten the foundations of Religion, Morality and Society. An attack was first made upon the Christian Revelation; for which natural Religion was offered as the substitute. The Gospel was to be discarded as a gross imposture; but the being and attributes of a God, the obligations of piety, even the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments were to be retained and cherished.

In proportion as success has appeared to attend the plan, a bolder project has been unfolded. The very existence of a Deity has been questioned, and in some instances denied. The duty of piety has been ridiculed, the perishable nature of man asserted and his hopes bounded to the short span of his earthly state. Death has been proclaimed an Eternal Sleep—“the dogma of the immortality of the soul a cheat invented to torment the living for the benefit of the dead.” Irreligion, no longer confined to the closets of concealed sophists, nor to the haunts of wealthy riot, has more or less displayed its hideous front among all classes.

Wise and good men took a lead in delineating the odious character of Despotism; in exhibiting the advantages of a moderate and well-balanced government, in inviting nations to contend for the enjoyment of rational liberty. Fanatics in political science have since exaggerated and perverted their doctrines. Theories of Government unsuited to the nature of man, miscalculating the force of his passions, disregarding the lessons of experimental wisdom, have been projected and recommended. These have everywhere attracted sectaries and everywhere the fabric of Government has been in different degrees undermined.

A league has at length been cemented between the apostles and disciples of irreligion and of anarchy. Religion and Government have both been stigmatised as abuses; as unwarrantable restraints upon the freedom of man; as causes of the corruption of his nature, intrinsically good; as sources of an artificial and false morality, which tyrannically robs him of the enjoyments for which his passions fit him; and as cloggs upon his progress to the perfection for which he was destined.
As a corollary from these premisses, it is a favourite tenet of the sect that religious opinion of any sort is unnecessary to Society; that the maxims of a genuine morality and the authority of the Magistracy and the laws are a sufficient and ought to be the only security for civil rights and private happiness.

As another corollary, it is occasionally maintained by the same sect, that but a small portion of power is requisite to Government; that even this portion is only temporarily necessary, in consequence of the bad habits which have been produced by the errors of ancient systems; and that as human nature shall refine and ameliorate by the operation of a more enlightened plan, government itself will become useless, and Society will subsist and flourish free from its shackles.

If all the votaries of this new philosophy do not go the whole length of its frantic creed; they all go far enough to endanger the full extent of the mischiefs which are inherent in so wild and fatal a scheme; every modification of which aims a mortal blow at the vitals of human happiness.

The practical development of this pernicious system has been seen in France. It has served as an engine to subvert all her antient institutions civil and religious, with all the checks that served to mitigate the rigour of authority; it has hurried her headlong through a rapid succession of dreadful revolutions, which have laid waste property, made havoc among the arts, overthrow cities, desolated provinces, unpeopled regions, crimsonned her soil with blood and deluged it in crime poverty and wretchedness; and all this as yet for no better purpose than to erect on the ruins of former things a despotism unlimited and unconstrained; leaving to a deluded, an abused, a plundered, a scourged and an oppressed people not even the shadow of liberty, to console them for a long train of substantial misfortunes, of bitter sufferings.

This horrid system seemed awhile to threaten the subversion of civilized Society and the introduction of general disorder among mankind. And though the frightful evils, which have been its first and only fruits, have given a check to its progress, it is to be feared that the poison has spread too widely and penetrated too deeply, to be as yet eradicated. Its
activity has indeed been suspended, but the elements remain concocting for new eruptions as occasion shall permit. It is greatly to be apprehended, that mankind is not near the end of the misfortunes, which it is calculated to produce, and that it still portends a long train of convulsion, Revolution, carnage, devastation, and misery.

Symptoms of the too great prevalence of this system in the United States are alarmingly visible. It was by its influence, that efforts were made to embark this country in a common cause with France in the early period of the present war; to induce our government to sanction and promote her odious principles and views with the blood and treasure of our citizens. It is by its influence, that every succeeding revolution has been approved or excused—all the horrors that have been committed justified or extenuated—that even the last usurpation, which contradicts all the ostensible principles of the Revolution, has been regarded with complacency; and the despotic constitution engendered by it slyly held up as a model not unworthy of our Imitation.

In the progress of this system, impiety and infidelity have advanced with gigantic strides. Prodigious crimes heretofore unknown among us are seen. The chief and idol of...[ENDS]
REP. JAMES MADISON (VA)

“Property”

ESSAY

March 27, 1792

The National Gazette | Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

BACKGROUND

James Madison included this essay as part of a series of articles he wrote for The National Gazette in the early years of American government under the Constitution.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What are the two senses of the word “property” according to Madison?

2. In what way can man’s rights, opinions, and the use of his faculties be his property?

3. According to Madison, what must a government do to secure the various senses of property?

This term in its particular application means “that dominion which one man claims and exercises over the external things of the world, in exclusion of every other individual.”

In its larger and juster meaning, it embraces every thing to which a man may attach a value and have a right; and which leaves to every one else the like advantage.

In the former sense, a man’s land, or merchandise, or money is called his property.

In the latter sense, a man has a property in his opinions and the free communication of them.

He has a property of peculiar value in his religious opinions, and in the profession and practice dictated by them.

He has a property very dear to him in the safety and liberty of his person.

He has an equal property in the free use of his faculties and free choice of the objects on which to employ them.

In a word, as a man is said to have a right to his property, he may be equally said to have a property in his rights.

Where an excess of power prevails, property of no sort is duly respected. No man is safe in his opinions, his person, his faculties, or his possessions.

Where there is an excess of liberty, the effect is the same, though from an opposite cause.

Government is instituted to protect property of every sort; as well that which lies in the various rights of individuals, as that which the term particularly expresses. This being the end of government, that alone is a just government, which impartially secures to every man, whatever is his own.

According to this standard of merit, the praise of affording a just securing to property, should be sparingly bestowed on a government which, however scrupulously guarding the possessions of individuals, does not protect them in the enjoyment and communication of
their opinions, in which they have an equal, and in the estimation of some, a more valuable property.

More sparingly should this praise be allowed to a government, where a man’s religious rights are violated by penalties, or fettered by tests, or taxed by a hierarchy. Conscience is the most sacred of all property; other property depending in part on positive law, the exercise of that, being a natural and unalienable right. To guard a man’s house as his castle, to pay public and enforce private debts with the most exact faith, can give no title to invade a man’s conscience which is more sacred than his castle, or to withhold from it that debt of protection, for which the public faith is pledged, by the very nature and original conditions of the social pact.

That is not a just government, nor is property secure under it, where the property which a man has in his personal safety and personal liberty, is violated by arbitrary seizures of one class of citizens for the service of the rest. A magistrate issuing his warrants to a press gang, would be in his proper functions in Turkey or Indostan, under appellations proverbial of the most complete despotism.

That is not a just government, nor is property secure under it, where arbitrary restrictions, exemptions, and monopolies deny to part of its citizens that free use of their faculties, and free choice of their occupations, which not only constitute their property in the general sense of the word; but are the means of acquiring property strictly so called. What must be the spirit of legislation where a manufacturer of linen cloth is forbidden to bury his own child in a linen shroud, in order to favor his neighbour who manufactures woolen cloth; where the manufacturer and wearer of woolen cloth are again forbidden the economical use of buttons of that material, in favor of the manufacturer of buttons of other materials!

A just security to property is not afforded by that government, under which unequal taxes oppress one species of property and reward another species: where arbitrary taxes invade the domestic sanctuaries of the rich, and excessive taxes grind the faces of the poor; where the keenness and competitions of want are deemed an insufficient spur to labor, and taxes
are again applied, by an unfeeling policy, as another spur; in violation of that sacred property, which Heaven, in decreeing man to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow, kindly reserved to him, in the small repose that could be spared from the supply of his necessities.

If there be a government then which prides itself in maintaining the inviolability of property; which provides that none shall be taken directly even for public use without indemnification to the owner, and yet directly violates the property which individuals have in their opinions, their religion, their persons, and their faculties; nay more, which indirectly violates their property, in their actual possessions, in the labor that acquires their daily subsistence, and in the hallowed remnant of time which ought to relieve their fatigues and soothe their cares, the influence will have been anticipated, that such a government is not a pattern for the United States.

If the United States mean to obtain or deserve the full praise due to wise and just governments, they will equally respect the rights of property, and the property in rights: they will rival the government that most sacredly guards the former; and by repelling its example in violating the latter, will make themselves a pattern to that and all other governments.
COMMITTEE OF THE VIRGINIA ASSEMBLY

A Bill for the Support of the Poor

DRAFT BILL

June 18, 1779

Williamsburg, Virginia

BACKGROUND

As a representative in the Virginia Assembly, Thomas Jefferson drafted this bill that would provide some government support for poor Virginians.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. How will the government support the poor?

2. What is required of recipients in exchange for this support?

A Bill for the Support of the Poor

Thomas Jefferson

Be it enacted by the General Assembly, that the Aldermen of every county wherein such provision, as is herein after required for setting the poor of the county to work, shall not have been made, shall, so soon as conveniently may be, purchase the inheritance, or procure a lease, of one hundred acres of land, or any less quantity that is sufficient for the purpose intended, in the county, and thereon cause a house to be built, if a proper one be not there already, and kept in repair, and shall cause all persons in their county, who are maintained thereby, or who seek relief therefrom, to be put into such house, to be there maintained and employed in such work as they shall be able to perform; and may also, by their warrant, apprehend and send to the same place all persons found wandering and begg-}
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ging alms, in the county, other than seamen, who having been shipwrecked or discharged from vessels they had belonged to, and returning to their habitations, or going to some port to seek employment, and not loitering on the way thither, or abiding in port and offering to be employed, shall ask subsistance on their journey, or until any be willing to employ them, and shall put such beggar to work for any time not exceeding twenty days. And the said Aldermen shall hire some discreet man to oversee those who shall come or be put into such work-house, and shall, from time to time, ordain rules for his conduct, and for the government, employment, and correction of the persons subject to him, restraining him from correcting any of them with more stripes than ten, at one time, or for one offence. And in order to keep them at work shall provide wool, cotton, flax, hemp and other mate-

rials, with the tools and implements necessary for the manufacture thereof. And the said Aldermen shall meet together, at the court-house of their county, at some time between the second Tuesday in July and the first day of August in every year, and by taxation of the persons and property, in their county, according to the mode of assessment prescribed by the law which shall be then in force, for raising money for the public exigencies, shall raise competent sums of money for the necessary relief of such poor, lame, impotent, blind, and other inhabitants of the county as are not able to maintain themselves. And also for the putting out the poor children apprentices, as well as for defraying the expences of putting so much of this act in execution as relates to setting the poor to work and keeping them so employed; they shall moreover on or before the first day of August annually, make up in
their minutes an exact account of the persons to, and for whom, such monies are to be paid, the purposes for which and the particular sums; a copy of which they shall, on or before the same day, deliver to the collector of the public tax, together with a list of the persons chargeable with the poor rates, and the sums to be paid by each for his poor rate, and also a list of the debts due to them on behalf of their county: which collector shall give bond with responsible security for the discharge of his duty herein; and shall collect the said debts and poor rates in the same time, with the same powers, for the same commission, and subject to the same fines, forfeitures, and prosecutions as in the case of public taxes. The said collector shall proceed, so soon as his collection shall have enabled him, to pay the several sums as shall be specially directed in the account rendered him: and if he shall fail so to do, and also to settle his account with the Aldermen, on or before the first day of November following, it shall be lawful for the court of the county, on the motion of the said Aldermen, or of the person to whom any sum of money is directed to be paid, ten days previous notice of such motion having been given, to render judgment against such collector for the sum and costs; or if it be for failure to account, then to render such judgment or judgments as are usual in actions on writs of account, and thereon to award execution, unless the sum shall not exceed twenty five shillings, in which case it shall be determinable before a Justice of the Peace, in like manner. And at such annual meeting, and at other times when they shall think proper, the said Aldermen shall cause the overseer of the poor to render account of the persons under his care, the produce of their labor, and the disposition of such produce, and of all other things committed to his care, or belonging to his office, and apply the profits arising from their work towards defraying the expences of their maintenance. The Aldermen shall register in a book, to be provided at the expense of the county, and transmitted to their successors, the names of all persons who receive relief from the county, entering the times they were admitted, and stating the reasons of their admissions. When a person shall have resided twelve months in a county, without any intermediate change of habitation, such residence shall be deemed a settlement in that county, of such person, and those of his children who remain a part of his family. A bastard child shall be deemed a settled inhabitant of that county in which, at the birth, the mother was settled. Any person acknowledged by the Aldermen of a county to be a settled inhabitant thereof, producing a
certificate of such acknowledgement, signed by the said Aldermen, and delivering the cer-
tificate to the Aldermen of another county, wherein he shall not have such leasehold, or
greater estate as is herein after mentioned, shall be adjudged to continue a settled inhabitant
of the former county, which shall reimburse all expences incurred by the latter, for his
maintenance, or curing, or attempting to cure him of any disease he may labor under, to
be recovered, in case of refusal to repay them, in an action on the case, brought by the
Aldermen of one county against those of the other. A widow shall be adjudged a settled
inhabitant of that county in which her husband shall have gained a settlement, although
his death happen before she shall have resided there twelve months: But if he had no set-
tlement any where, she shall be considered with respect to her settlement as if she were an
unmarried woman. A person holding any estate of freehold, in lands or possessing an es-
tate, for one or more years, in lands, and coming to dwell in the county wherein such lands
lie, shall have the same right to remain there as if he had been a settled inhabitant thereof.
When a settled inhabitant of any county, or one who according to this act is deemed such,
shall leave it, and the Aldermen, or any two of them, in any other county, in which he shall
come to dwell, or abide, if he have not therein such estate as aforesaid, or do not give secu-
ritv to indemnify the county, and shall be apprehensive he will become chargeable to their
county, they may, by their warrant, cause such emigrant to be removed to the county
whereof he was a settled inhabitant, and delivered to one of the Aldermen thereof; and if
he be unable to travel immediately, the Alderman who signed the warrant, shall, at the
charge of their county, provide for his maintenance and cure, until he shall recover strength
and health sufficient for the journey, the expence of which removal shall be reimbursed,
and may be recovered in the same manner as those of the maintenance and cure are before
directed to be. Any Alderman refusing to receive a settled parishioner, so removed, shall
be himself answerable for his maintenance and cure, in like manner as his county is de-
clared to be. All able bodied persons not having wherewithal to maintain themselves, who
shall waste their time in idle and dissolute courses, or shall loiter or wander abroad, refusing
to work for reasonable wages, or to betake themselves to some honest and lawful calling, or
who shall desert wives or children, without so providing for them as that they shall not
become chargeable to a county, shall be deemed vagabonds, and shall be sent, by order of
A Bill for the Support of the Poor
Thomas Jefferson

an Alderman, to the poor house, there to be kept to labor during such time as shall be limited by the order, not exceeding thirty days; or if he be a settled inhabitant of another county, shall, by warrant of the said Alderman, be conveyed, by constable to constable, to some Alderman of such other county, who shall, by his order, send him to the proper poor house, to be there kept to labor as aforesaid; unless, in either of the cases, the vagabond shall give surety for his good behavior, and that he shall betake himself to some honest and lawful calling for twelve months; from which order the party thereby condemned may appeal to the county court, who, if the order be affirmed, shall award him to pay the costs.

The assessors of the several hundreds, in every county, shall be aiding and assisting to their Aldermen, in the execution of this act, by giving information of such persons, within their respective hundreds, as ought to be supported by the county; and of these who shall come from any other county, where they had a settled residence, to dwell within their hundred, and be likely to become chargeable, by apprehending, and carrying before the said Aldermen, any person found wandering or begging within their hundred, or coming within the description of a vagabond before given; and by dispensing, according to the instructions of the said Aldermen, any reliefs which may, by them, be deposited with such assessors for the use of the poor of their hundred. The Aldermen of every county and their successors shall have power to call upon the former vestrymen of any parish which, or any part of which, is within their county, to render account of the expenditure of all money, or tobacco, by them received, and to pay into their hands any balance, or their due proportion of any balance, which may remain, to be applied to the lessening of the poor rates, and on failure may maintain proper actions in law, or equity, against them for enforcing the same.
LUCIUS CRASSUS (ALEXANDER HAMILTON)
The Examination Number VII

BACKGROUND

Alexander Hamilton wrote this article examining President Thomas Jefferson's message to Congress at the beginning of his presidency.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. According to Hamilton, what are the several principles that ought to govern immigration?

The next exceptionable feature in the Message, is the proposal to abolish all restriction on naturalization, arising from a previous residence. In this the President is not more at variance with the concurrent maxims of all commentators on popular governments, than he is with himself. The Notes on Virginia are in direct contradiction to the Message, and furnish us with strong reasons against the policy now recommended. The passage alluded to is here presented: Speaking of the population of America, Mr. Jefferson there says, “Here I will beg leave to propose a doubt. The present desire of America, is to produce rapid population, by as great importations of foreigners as possible. But is this founded in good policy?” “Are there no inconveniences to be thrown into the scale, against the advantage expected from a multiplication of numbers, by the importation of foreigners? It is for the happiness of those united in society, to harmonize as much as possible, in matters which they must of necessity transact together. Civil government being the sole object of forming societies, its administration must be conducted by common consent. Every species of government has its specific principles: Ours, perhaps, are more peculiar than those of any other in the universe. It is a composition of the freest principles of the English Constitution, with others, derived from natural right and reason. To these, nothing can be more opposed than the maxims of absolute monarchies. Yet from such, we are to expect the greatest number of emigrants. They will bring with them the principles of the governments they leave, imbibed in their early youth; or if able to throw them off, it will be in exchange for an unbounded licentiousness, passing as is usual, from one extreme to another. It would be a miracle were they to stop precisely at the point of temperate liberty. Their principles with their language, they will transmit to their children. In proportion to their numbers, they will share with us in the legislation. They will infuse into it their spirit, warp and bias its direction, and render it a heterogeneous, incoherent, distracted mass. I may appeal to experience, during the present contest, for a verification of these conjectures: but if they be not certain in event, are they not possible, are they not probable? Is it not safer to wait with patience for the attainment of any degree of population desired or expected? May not our government be more homogeneous, more peaceable, more durable? Suppose 20 millions of republican Americans, thrown all of a sudden into France, what would be the condition of that kingdom? If it would be more turbulent, less happy, less strong, we may believe that the addition of half a
million of foreigners, to our present numbers, would produce a similar effect here.” Thus wrote Mr. Jefferson in 1781….

…The impolicy of admitting foreigners to an immediate and unreserved participation in the right of suffrage, or in the sovereignty of a Republic, is as much a received axiom as any thing in the science of politics, and is verified by the experience of all ages. Among other instances, it is known, that hardly any thing contributed more to the downfall of Rome, than her precipitate communication of the privileges of citizenship to the inhabitants of Italy at large. And how terribly was Syracuse scourged by perpetual seditions, when, after the overthrow of the tyrants, a great number of foreigners were suddenly admitted to the rights of citizenship? Not only does ancient but modern, and even domestic history furnish evidence of what may be expected from the dispositions of foreigners, when they get too early footing in a country. Who wields the sceptre of France, and has erected a Despotism on the ruins of a Republic? A foreigner. Who rules the councils of our own ill-fated, unhappy country? And who stimulates persecution on the heads of its citizens, for daring to maintain an opinion, and for exercising the rights of suffrage? A foreigner! Where is the virtuous pride that once distinguished Americans? Where the indignant spirit which in defence of principle, hazarded a revolution to attain that independence now insidiously attacked?

LUCIUS CRASSUS
**Anonymous (Thomas Jefferson)**

**Notes on the State of Virginia**

**Book Excerpt**

May 1785

Paris, France

**BACKGROUND**

Thomas Jefferson wrote *Notes on the State of Virginia* in response to questions posed to him by the Secretary of the French delegation to the United States.

**ANNOTATIONS**

…but are there no inconveniences to be thrown into the scale against the advantage expected from a multiplication of numbers by the importation of foreigners? It is for the happiness of those united in society to harmonize as much as possible in matters which they must of necessity transact together. Civil government being the sole object of forming societies, its administration must be conducted by common consent. Every species of government has its specific principles. Ours perhaps are more peculiar than those of any other in the universe. It is a composition of the freest principles of the English constitution, with others derived from natural right and natural reason. To these nothing can be more opposed than the maxims of absolute monarchies. Yet, from such, we are to expect the greatest number of emigrants. They will bring with them the principles of the governments they leave, imbibed in their early youth; or, if able to throw them off, it will be in exchange for an unbounded licentiousness, passing, as is usual, from one extreme to another. It would be a miracle were they to stop precisely at the point of temperate liberty. These principles, with their language, they will transmit to their children. In proportion to their numbers, they will share with us the legislation. They will infuse into it their spirit, warp and bias its direction, and render it a heterogeneous, incoherent, distracted mass. I may appeal to ex-

---

perience, during the present contest, for a verification of these conjectures. But, if they be not certain in event, are they not possible, are they not probable? Is it not safer to wait with patience 27 years and three months longer, for the attainment of any degree of population desired, or expected? May not our government be more homogeneous, more peaceable, more durable? Suppose 20 millions of republican Americans thrown all of a sudden into France, what would be the condition of that kingdom? If it would be more turbulent, less happy, less strong, we may believe that the addition of half a million of foreigners to our present numbers would produce a similar effect here. If they come of themselves, they are entitled to all the rights of citizenship: but I doubt the expediency of inviting them by extraordinary encouragements....
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A Constitution of Principles
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Why Teach a Constitution of Principles

“[I]t seems to have been reserved to the people of this country, by their conduct and example, to decide the important question, whether societies of men are really capable or not of establishing good government from reflection and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend for their political constitutions on accident and force.” Thus wrote Alexander Hamilton in the opening paragraph of Federalist 1 in support of the newly proposed United States Constitution. Indeed, it is the Constitution that gives institutional form to the principles of the Declaration of Independence. The Constitution is the vehicle for the American experiment in self-government. Study of the Constitution therefore shows students how and that human beings are able to govern themselves in freedom, securing the equal protection of rights and the dignity of each person through reflection, deliberation, and choice. This is a significant thing for students to grasp, for if the Constitution cannot achieve these ends, then force and violence are the only alternatives left to humankind.
What Teachers Should Consider

The idea and presence of a constitution is so ubiquitous to Americans that we forget how it was really the U.S. Constitution that made constitutions so common and expected. With this familiarity comes a lack of consideration of the uniqueness of the U.S. Constitution not only for being the first and oldest written constitution, but especially of the carefully discerned principles on which it rests.

The first of these is the rule of law, a principle that was not new but that was restored from antiquity through the Magna Carta and the English law tradition. The American colonists inherited this legal tradition and practiced it in the colonies for a century and a half in the colonies. Violations of the rule of law were at the heart of the colonists’ complaints against the British.

After the Revolution, it was of great significance to construct a government that would preserve the rule of law and create structures and processes that would ward against its violations.

How Teachers Can Learn More

TEXTS

- *The U.S. Constitution: A Reader*, Ed. Hillsdale College Politics Faculty
  Chapters 4–6
- *The Anti-Federalist*
- *American Government and Politics*, Joseph Bessette and John Pitney
  Chapters 2–3

ONLINE COURSES | Online.Hillsdale.edu

- *Introduction to the Constitution*
- *Constitution 101*
- *The Federalist Papers*
- *Civil Rights in American History*

Primary Sources Studied in This Unit

- The Articles of Confederation
- The U.S. Constitution
  *The Federalist*, Nos. 1, 2, 6, 9, 10, 23, 37, 39, 45, 47, 48, 49, and 51
LESSON PLANS, ASSIGNMENTS, AND FORMATIVE QUIZ
Lesson 1 — The Case for the Constitution

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the Articles of Confederation, the need for a new constitution, the debate for and against the proposed Constitution, and the basic structure and powers of the government that the United States Constitution establishes.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

- Introduction to the Constitution Lectures 4, 5, 6, 7
- Constitution 101 Lectures 1 and 3
- The Federalist Papers Lecture 1

PRIMARY SOURCES

Students are to read or, if they have previously read, review the following primary sources. While reading, students should annotate these sources. For particularly challenging texts or if the class is offered earlier in high school, the teacher may wish to provide students with guided reading questions to assist with comprehension, clarity, and direction. Using their annotations and any guided reading questions, students should come to class prepared to participate in a seminar conversation on each text.

- The Articles of Confederation
- The U.S. Constitution
- The Federalist, Nos. 1, 2, 37

TERMS AND TOPICS

- Articles of Confederation
- republic
- Federalists
- Anti-Federalists
- power
- vesting clauses
- constitutional veneration

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- How did the Articles of Confederation structure the government? Why did its framers structure it in these ways?
- What were the weaknesses and failures of the Articles of Confederation?
- What was the Anti-Federalists’ case against the Constitution?
- Why did the Anti-Federalists prefer smaller, simpler, more local, and more democratic government?
- What was the Federalists’ case for the Constitution?
What was the Federalists’ case for a written, fixed Constitution? Why did they consider it important to make the Constitution difficult to change? What did they mean by “constitutional veneration”?

What is the relationship between the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution?

The first stated purpose of the Constitution is “to form a more perfect union.” What two realities are suggested by this language of “more perfect”?

How did the Constitution structure and arrange the powers of the government?

What was involved in the act of founding?

What must every government official take an oath to do?

To whom are elected officials and the Constitution itself ultimately subject?

Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
- Question 1: What is the form of government of the United States?
- Question 3: Name one thing the U.S. Constitution does.
- Question 4: The U.S. Constitution starts with the words “We the People.” What does “We the People” mean?
- Question 10: Name two important ideas from the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution.
- Question 13: What is the rule of law?
- Question 14: Many documents influenced the U.S. Constitution. Name one.
- Question 82: What founding document was written in 1787?
- Question 83: The Federalist Papers supported the passage of the U.S. Constitution. Name one of the writers.
- Question 84: Why were the Federalist Papers important?
- Question 88: James Madison is famous for many things. Name one.
- Question 89: Alexander Hamilton is famous for many things. Name one.

**Keys to the Lesson**

Students ought to learn the principal reasons the delegates to the Constitutional Convention opted to replace the Articles of Confederation with a new Constitution. The reasons were not the result of high-sounding ideas and flights of fancy but were instead tied to the delegates’ knowledge of history, the problems they had faced under British rule and under the Articles of Confederation, and careful deliberation about how to produce the best government for a free people. This lesson should help students to understand what the Federalists considered to be the virtues of adopting the Constitution and the basic principles around which it was framed.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Case for the Constitution with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Survey with students the various main forms of government from which America is distinct, including pure democracy, monarchy, aristocracy, oligarchy, theocracy, autocracy, socialist, communist, fascist, etc. Drawing on their study of history, students should be asked often
throughout this unit and the course to draw specific distinctions between the American system of a self-governing republic and these other kinds of regimes.

- Review with students the structure of the Articles of Confederation and the issues that emerged under such a structure. The Articles were drafted by Americans wary of a strong central government in light of their experience with the British. They wanted to keep the states as independent as possible. To prevent the national government from becoming too powerful, the second Article asserted the sovereignty of each state except in case when a power is explicitly delegated to the United States Congress. While united on some matters of foreign policy, the Articles would prove to be ineffective as a federal government charter, because they did not provide a strong and unified executive, and they had no power to enforce laws or levy taxes to pay for the expenses of government.

- Proceed to considering the issues that dominated the 1780s, especially the debt cancellation laws by states (a clear example of majority tyranny) and the event that impressed upon George Washington and James Madison the importance of reforming the Articles: Shays’ Rebellion.

- Review with students their history knowledge concerning past experiments with democratic government. Democracies and republics had historically been short-lived because of two primary faults. The first was the tyranny of the majority, when the rights of the minority are trampled by the majority. Second was the ineptitude of democratic governments. Such a government was usually inefficient, weak, divided, and susceptible to the passions of the mob. Factions divided the institutions of such a regime. The result was civil war or conquest by an outside nation. The Constitution intended to form a government that would preserve the benefits of republicanism while guarding against its defects.

- Note for students the senses in which the Framers believed they were in the best position to achieve a free, self-governing republic in 1787, as opposed to previous times. The Framers argued that certain experiences and intelligent thinkers had helped mankind learn from past failures and improve the science of politics. This improved science of politics included the principles of the separation of powers, the office of an independent judiciary serving lifetime appointments, representatives selected by the people, and the extended sphere of a nation’s geographic size. This did not mean that they believed human nature changed or improved or that people and governments naturally evolve to become better over time. Human nature, as with all natures, was and is unchanging and therefore would always be prone to certain faults in character and intellect. So, too, would governments, as people are those who govern.

- Help students to appreciate the difficulty of what the delegates to the Constitutional Convention were attempting to do. They had to account, above all, for human nature, mitigating its negative tendencies while channeling its neutral and good tendencies toward constructive governance. Simultaneously, the delegates had to account for the myriad interests and situations of the various states. The issue of how the people and the states would be represented was a chief contention, one that resulted in a bicameral legislature with different means of representation. Other results were strong debates and compromises over the question of slavery.

- Introduce students briefly to the origins and purpose of The Federalist, including the backgrounds and roles of their principal authors, James Madison and Alexander Hamilton. It is worth noting that each would disagree strongly with one another on future issues, but on the Constitution, they found common ground, a good model for civil dialogue today.

- Ask students about the source and purpose of a government’s power. Review how the Declaration of Independence makes it clear that a legitimate government’s power—and, in the case of the
United States Constitution, each branch’s delegation of powers—comes from the free consent of the sovereign people, and ask students to identify and explain the ways in which the Constitution reflects this understanding. Federalist 1 and 2 underscore how regime change in America is based on reflection and choice rather than on force or fraud. It is worth noting that for Publius, Americans are already united by their common experience and the War of Independence. The question of the adoption of the Constitution is whether this people is capable of self-government based on the principles of asserted in the Declaration of Independence.

- Make sure students are mindful of the overall goals toward which the Founders directed every decision: freedom and self-government. In other words, they needed to arrange the government and distribute powers so as to enable representatives chosen by the people to protect the rights of the people while avoiding tyranny, either by the one, the few, or the many. To help them so craft the government, they relied on their deep knowledge of history and human nature that they gained from both history and what Jefferson called “the elementary books of public right.”

- Spend some time considering the Preamble to the Constitution. It is remarkable in stating two things: first, what the purposes of the government established by the Constitution are to be, and second, that it is the people who are establishing it for these purposes. Students should be able to relate everything mentioned in the Constitution to both of these elements of the Preamble: how does each arrangement achieve these stated purposes of government; and how does it reflect the consent of the governed?

- Pay close attention to the way the Framers carefully chose the words of the Constitution. The government has powers, not rights, that are granted by the consent of those being governed. The people do not give up their rights. Rather, they delegate or vest some of their power to protect their rights to establish a government. Thus do they vest those powers to protect their rights in a government that they control. The natural rights mentioned in the Declaration of Independence are not themselves given to the government by the Constitution. Instead, the people enact the Constitution to vest power in the core branches of the government to secure the natural rights and fundamental purposes outlined in the Declaration. The people are ultimately sovereign, and only the people, not the federal government (or the state governments, for that matter). Make clear that the various powers are not vested in the federal government as a whole, but rather specifically vested in specific branches separate from one another.

- Emphasize that the Constitution, moreover, is specific about what parts of the government receive which powers and how. The Constitution gives enumerated powers not to the federal government itself but rather to each of its branches. Emphasize the meaning of the word “enumerated.” These enumerated powers are limited to the ones explicitly listed in the Constitution. Close attention to this wording will keep students from misinterpreting each branch to have more powers than it has been specifically granted.

- The separation of powers (along with checks and balances between the branches) is the key “mechanism” of the Constitution. Remind students that the separation of powers is not an arbitrary design, but serves two purposes: 1) it upholds the rule of law (and good government) by focusing government on its core functions of making law, enforcing law, and adjudicating law; and 2) it preserves liberty (and limited government) by preventing the accumulation of power in the hands of any one branch, which Madison defines as the very definition of tyranny.

- Have students converse about the importance of the rule of law. With deep historical roots (especially British constitutional history and particular events such as the Magna Carta), the rule of law is a general concept of government that is straightforward but extremely important and
historically rare. First, it states that all of the governed abide by the law and are equally protected by the law; and second, that even those who govern must abide by the same law. It means that everyone—citizens and government officials alike—should be governed by agreed-upon rules that apply equally to everyone, rather than by the arbitrary judgment of government officials applying one set of rules to the governed and a separate set to themselves. The law is above any one person or group of people and their interests, and everyone is equally accountable to the law. John Adams put it simply when he described the purpose of a constitution government as “a government of laws, not of men.”

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment:** Explain the reasons why a new Constitution was necessary and the main qualities the Constitution brought to bear on American government, according to *The Federalist* (2–3 paragraphs).
Lesson 2 — The Case for Union

**Lesson Objective**

Students learn about the Federalists’ argument for union, particularly the unexpected benefits of a large republic with a diversity of opinions and interests.

**Online Courses for Teachers** | Online.Hillsdale.edu

- Constitution 101
- The Federalist Papers

**Primary Sources**

Students are to read or, if they have previously read, review the following primary sources. While reading, students should annotate these sources. For particularly challenging texts or if the class is offered earlier in high school, the teacher may wish to provide students with guided reading questions to assist with comprehension, clarity, and direction. Using their annotations and any guided reading questions, students should come to class prepared to participate in a seminar conversation on each text.

- The U.S. Constitution
- *The Federalist*, Nos. 6, 9, 10, 23

**Terms and Topics**

- Constitution
- Federalists
- Anti-Federalists
- union
- republic
- representative democracy
- direct democracy
- representation
- extended sphere
- interest
- faction
- parties
- property
- material inequality
- majority tyranny
- human nature
- national security
- commercial republic
- taxation
- regulation
- commerce

**Questions for the American Mind**

- What was the Federalists’ case for union?
- How is representative democracy distinct from direct democracy? Why did the Founders opt for representative democracy over the “pure” version of democracy practiced in ancient Athens?
- What did the Founders assert was the inadequacy of ancient democracy?
- What are the benefits of representation? What role do elections serve?
- What are the merits and challenges of a large republic?
- Why does *The Federalist* argue for the size of the republic to be larger than commonly thought possible? What are the advantages of this “extended sphere”?
- What are the positive and negative potentials of interests?
- What is the problem with factions?
- What concerns did the Founders have with parties?
- How are property and inequality sources of faction? How are these issues addressed in the Constitution?
- How does the Constitution seek to reconcile democracy (which means “rule by the majority”) with the rights of minorities? Stated differently, how does the Constitution do justice both to the equality of all and to the liberty of each?
- How did the Constitution balance freedom (majority rule) and justice (preserving minority rights)?
- According to *The Federalist*, what are the virtues and limitations of human nature?
- In what ways does the Constitution have the virtues of energy, stability, and responsibility?
- How does the Constitution address national security threats?
- Why is energetic government necessary for national security?
- What is the relationship between the government’s ends and its powers (means)?
- Why had there historically been doubts about the peacefulness of commercial republics?
- How does the Constitution address taxation, regulation, commerce, and protections for private property?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 2: What is the supreme law of the land?
  - Question 3: Name one thing the U.S. Constitution does.
  - Question 4: The U.S. Constitution starts with the words “We the People.” What does “We the People” mean?
  - Question 58: Name one power that is only for the federal government.
  - Question 59: Name one power that is only for the states.

**Keys to the Lesson**

The framers worked a careful balancing act in regard to the relationship between the union and the individual states. Keeping the country united was necessary for its survival, let alone its flourishing. The Constitution reflected a compact among the people but acknowledged their self-organization into different states, through which the Constitution was ratified. The republican nature of the federal government reflected and guaranteed the existence of republican governments in the states. One special innovation that the Constitution introduced was the idea of a large republic that would multiply the diversity of interests and result in a majority around only the most universally held views. This further justification for the unity of the country broke with most historical opinions and practices in republicanism and was one of the chief ingenuities of the framers.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Case for Union with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Emphasize for students the reality of majority tyranny. There is a straightforward though mistaken belief nowadays that justice is the rule of the majority and that 51 percent of the people have a moral right to impose whatever they wish on the 49 percent. The Founders rejected this...
idea of democracy and morality as “might makes right.” They asserted objective standards of right and wrong by which government must abide in protecting rights if it is to be a just government. One of the keys to the Constitution was the attempt to make sure the majority would rule but that they would rule justly with respect to the rights of the minority.

- **Highlight for students how Federalist 6, 9, and 10 all argue for improvements in mankind’s understanding of politics.** This, however, was not and is not inevitable. While human knowledge may expand, judgments on that knowledge and the prudence to apply it properly do not automatically evolve in a positive manner. In fact, *The Federalist* emphasizes in these sections that human nature itself does not change, that human beings are as they always have been and would continue to be. The Federalists’ case for union, indeed, for the entire Constitution, depends on holding both of these positions: that we have learned much with respect to governing but that those who govern are human beings, and human beings will always have the capacity to be tyrants.

- **Explain to students how the extended territory under American rule was thought to prevent majority tyranny by taking in a wider array of opinions and interests, many of which depended on geography, with the ties of occupation, culture, and religious beliefs that are connected to a certain location.** To achieve a majority in government the representatives would have to achieve a broad consensus on the issues, meaning that only the most universally held positions would be possible to enact.

- **Consider with students a second benefit of an extended sphere, namely that the pool of potential representatives would be larger, resulting in a greater number of quality persons who might represent the people.** The larger population would also make it more likely that ideologues would be known and identified as such, thus making it harder for such persons to harness the support of such a diverse and large populace.

- **Help students to see in the Federalist how national security for the fledgling country was of utmost importance in establishing union.** *Federalist* 23 underscores this point while also entrusting the civilian army to the legislative representatives of the people.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

**Assignment:** Explain the reasons and benefits of union as expressed by *The Federalist* (2–3 paragraphs).
DIRECTIONS: Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. What was the Federalists’ case for a written, fixed Constitution? Why did they consider it important to make the Constitution difficult to change? What did they mean by “constitutional veneration”?

2. The first stated purpose of the Constitution is “to form a more perfect union.” What two realities are suggested by this language of “more perfect”?

3. What are the merits and challenges of a large republic?

4. What is the problem with factions?

5. According to *The Federalist*, what are the virtues and limitations of human nature?
Lesson 3 — Federalism

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn the Federalists’ case for union with a federated republic, including the benefits, challenges, purposes, and powers of its various governments.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

Constitution 101 Lecture 4
The Federalist Papers Lecture 4

PRIMARY SOURCES

Students are to read or, if they have previously read, review the following primary sources. While reading, students should annotate these sources. For particularly challenging texts or if the class is offered earlier in high school, the teacher may wish to provide students with guided reading questions to assist with comprehension, clarity, and direction. Using their annotations and any guided reading questions, students should come to class prepared to participate in a seminar conversation on each text.

The U.S. Constitution
The Federalist, Nos. 39 and 45

TERMS AND TOPICS

- Constitution
- Federalists
- Anti-Federalists
- union
- federalism
- local government
- state government
- federal government
- township
- republic
- commerce
- expressed powers
- implied powers
- concurrent powers
- reserved powers

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What is federalism? Why is it important?
- What are the distinctions among the local, state, and federal governments? What purposes does each serve, and what powers does each have to carry out its purposes?
- What are the ways the states can control the federal government?
- How does the Constitution control all the other governments?
- How was the New England township structured and why was it planned this way? What is the significance of the township model?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
Question 2: What is the supreme law of the land?

Question 4: The U.S. Constitution starts with the words “We the People.” What does “We the People” mean?

Question 58: Name one power that is only for the federal government.

Question 59: Name one power that is only for the states.

**Keys to the Lesson**

The framers were very intentional about which level of government would have which powers based on a careful review of what each government’s purposes would be by nature. The result was a federal government that was limited to providing for the national defense and ensuring free trade among states, and little else. The vast majority of power remained with the people while most government power was at the state and local levels. The mixture of so many different governments at the state level of government all competing with each other and with the federal government would provide an additional safeguard against majority tyranny as individual actors vied for power while warding off infringements on their powers from other governments.

Teachers might best plan and teach Federalism with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Clarify for students the purposes of the federal government per the Preamble to the Constitution and the second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence. In particular, students should be able to articulate the purposes of government that a federal government might more effectively achieve, without compromising liberty, than a state government could. Students should see that these things are relatively few in number and pertain to fostering domestic tranquility and trade among the states while also defending against foreign threats.

- Explain how the division of power between the national government and the states (like the separation of powers within government) is another key way to protect liberty. Moreover, by recognizing that the powers not delegated to the federal government are reserved to the states or to the people, the Constitution prevents the federal government from becoming administratively centralized and too powerful.

- Read and discuss with students the arguments in Federalist 39 and 45 regarding sovereignty and representation in the Constitution. Publius rejects the notion that the states are sovereign, asserting that it is the entire American people who are sovereign but who have organized themselves by states. The necessary condition for republican government is indeed that all of the power comes in one way or another from the people. Federalist 39 also outlines the ways in which the national government is both national and federal based on the origins of members in each branch of government. Federalist 45 reinforces the point that the purpose of the Constitution is the happiness of the people and is not ultimately concerned with whether the national or state governments are sovereign. After all, the people are sovereign.

**Strengthening Understanding: Post-Lesson Assignment**

**Assignment 1:** Explain the principle, structure, and benefits of federalism as expressed by The Federalist (2–3 paragraphs).
Lesson 4 — Separation of Powers and Checks and Balances

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn why the Constitution separates the powers in the federal government among three branches, how these powers are distributed, and the means by which each branch may check the authority of the others and so maintain a balance in power.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

- Introduction to the Constitution
- Constitution 101
- The Federalist Papers

PRIMARY SOURCES

Students are to read or, if they have previously read, review the following primary source(s). While reading, students should annotate these sources. For particularly challenging texts or if the class is offered earlier in high school, the teacher may wish to provide students with guided reading questions to assist with comprehension, clarity, and direction. Using their annotations and any guided reading questions, students should come to class prepared to participate in a seminar conversation on each text.

- The U.S. Constitution
- The Federalist, Nos. 47, 48, 49, 51

TERMS AND TOPICS

- separation of powers
- implied powers
- branch
- concurrent powers
- checks and balances
- reserved powers
- expressed powers

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What is meant by the powers of the federal government being separately divided?
- What is the case for structuring the federal government so that its powers are separated from one another?
- How does the Constitution divide and allocate the various powers of the federal government?
- What are checks and balances? What is their purpose?
- To what in human nature do checks and balances appeal, and what do they channel?
- How can each branch check the power of the others?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 15: There are three branches of government. Why?
  - Question 16: Name the three branches of government.
The interference of the British Crown in the representative forms of government in the colonies highlighted for the framers the importance of dividing and separating government power even within a level of government. Inspired by the ideas of Montesquieu and reinforced by their experience, the framers organized power based on the nature of the power with respect to law: law-making, law-enforcing, and law-judging. These had long been recognized as the natural tasks of governance, but it was in assigning the tasks to separate and competing entities that was new in the Constitution, especially the establishment of a judiciary separate from the executive. Additionally, the framers assigned certain processes to each branch to both check the power and work with the other branches while still encouraging and channeling the virtues of each kind of governmental power and statecraft to achieve good government and eschew tyranny.

Teachers might best plan and teach Separation of Powers and Checks and Balances with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Help students understand the importance of the principles of separation of powers and federalism, and why these ideas are central to the Constitution’s safeguards against the exponential and corrupting tendencies of power.
- Emphasize that a chief concern of the Framers of the Constitution was to allow the will of the majority to rule, thus guaranteeing the consent of the governed, while still preserving the rights of the minority, thus securing justice. Separation of powers is perhaps the best and most significant example of how the Founders sought to achieve this consent and justice.
- Show students how the Constitution does not deny, demonize, or elevate human nature, but rather recognizes and seeks to channel the proclivities of human nature into constructive governing while mitigating against man’s baser tendencies. In brief, the Constitution is constructed in light of a fundamental understanding of man’s unchanging human nature, born of the Founders’ knowledge of history and political thought as well as their own experience and the lessons of prudence.
- Help students understand how the separation of powers is rooted in the Founders’ argument that human nature is fixed and unchanging, good but also flawed and tending toward corruptive power. The dangers of tyranny and lawlessness are always present and must be guarded against. Therefore, a good government would account for the realities of human nature and reject utopias as impossible. Separation of powers accounts for this.
- Read with students this passage from Federalist 51, harnessing the ambitions of human nature for the sake of constitutional government:

  “Ambition must be made to counteract ambition. The interest of the man must be connected with the constitutional rights of the place. It may be a reflection on human nature, that such devices should be necessary to control the abuses of government. But what is government itself, but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary. In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself.”
Walk students through how the separation of powers guards against the ability of one (in the presidency) or a faction (in Congress) to dominate and control the other, while an independent judiciary provides an impartial application of law. Note that the people (by elections and constitutional amendment) have the ultimate authority the check any and all of the branches of government. Each branch is delegated specific powers to fulfill the core functions of government (legislative, executive, and judicial). The system of checks and balances encourages each branch to protect its own powers and to do its assigned duty. The separation of powers coupled with checks and balances was intended to prevent the defects of republican government (namely, the tyrannical rule of a majority faction) while retaining what was good: the consent of the governed under the constitutional rule of law.

Read with students from the corresponding Federalist essays. In Federalist 47, note with students how Publius takes up Thomas Jefferson and James Madison’s understanding of tyranny as the accumulation of power in the same set of hands, where the same person or group is lawmaker, law-enforcer, and judge. In brief, tyranny comes from the absence of a separation of powers. Federalist 48 demonstrates that the tendency of those who have power is to ignore barriers and expand their power if others do not have the means to check and counter-balance those tendencies.

Moreover, Publius highlights how in the Constitution it is not only the legislature that represents the people, but every branch of government. As such, each must have the ability to defend both the Constitution and encroachments on its own power by the other branches. Federalist 49 argues for the coequality of the branches with respect to the meaning of the Constitution: each branch has a duty to uphold and interpret the Constitution. And Federalist 51 makes the case for checks and balances, along with stating the end of government is justice, especially meaning that the weaker (or the minority) is defended against the stronger (or the tyranny of the majority). This is a fundamentally different understanding of justice than that which gripped the twentieth century through totalitarianism: that the might of the majority and the powerful makes right.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

Assignment: Explain why the Constitution separates power into distinct branches and how it does so (2–3 paragraphs).
APPENDIX A

Study Guide

Test

Writing Assignment
Study Guide — A Constitution of Principles Test

TERMS AND TOPICS

Explain each of the following and the context in which it was discussed during this unit’s lessons.

- Articles of Confederation
- republic
- Federalists
- Anti-Federalists
- power
- constitutional veneration
- Constitution
- union
- representative democracy
- direct democracy
- representation
- extended sphere
- interest
- faction
- parties
- property
- material inequality
- majority tyranny
- human nature
- national security
- commercial republic
- taxation
- regulation
- commerce
- federalism
- local government
- state government
- federal government
- township
- separation of powers
- branch
- checks and balances

PRIMARY SOURCES

Explain the main arguments in each of the following sources and their significance to understanding the principles of the Constitution.

- The Articles of Confederation
- The U.S. Constitution
- Federalist 10
- Federalist 39
- Federalist 47
- Federalist 51

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.

Lesson 1 | The Case for the Constitution

☐ How did the Articles of Confederation structure the government? Why did its framers structure it in these ways?
☐ What were the weaknesses and failures of the Articles of Confederation?
☐ What was the Anti-Federalists’ case against the Constitution?
☐ Why did the Anti-Federalists prefer smaller, simpler, more local, and more democratic government?
☐ What was the Federalists’ case for the Constitution?
What was the Federalists’ case for a written, fixed Constitution? Why did they consider it important to make the Constitution difficult to change? What did they mean by “constitutional veneration”?

What is the relationship between the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution?

The first stated purpose of the Constitution is “to form a more perfect union.” What two realities are suggested by this language of “more perfect”?

How did the Constitution structure and arrange the powers of the government?

What was involved in the act of founding?

What must every government official take an oath to do?

To whom are elected officials and the Constitution itself ultimately subject?

Lesson 2 | The Case for Union

What was the Federalists’ case for union?

How is representative democracy distinct from direct democracy? Why did the Founders opt for representative democracy over the “pure” version of democracy practiced in ancient Athens? What did the Founders assert was the inadequacy of ancient democracy?

What are the benefits of representation? What role do elections serve?

What are the merits and challenges of a large republic?

Why does The Federalist argue for the size of the republic to be larger than commonly thought possible? What are the advantages of this “extended sphere”?

What are the positive and negative potentials of interests?

What is the problem with factions?

What concerns did the Founders have with parties?

How are property and inequality sources of faction? How are these issues addressed in the Constitution?

How does the Constitution seek to reconcile democracy (which means “rule by the majority”) with the rights of minorities? Stated differently, how does the Constitution do justice both to the equality of all and to the liberty of each?

How did the Constitution balance freedom (majority rule) and justice (preserving minority rights)?

According to The Federalist, what are the virtues and limitations of human nature?

In what ways does the Constitution have the virtues of energy, stability, and responsibility?

How does the Constitution address national security threats?

Why is energetic government necessary for national security?

What is the relationship between the government’s ends and its powers (means)?

Why had there historically been doubts about the peacefulness of commercial republics?

How does the Constitution address taxation, regulation, commerce, and protections for private property?

Lesson 3 | Federalism

What is federalism? Why is it important?

What are the distinctions between the local, state, and federal governments? What purposes does each serve, and what powers does each have to carry out its purposes?

What are the ways the states can control the federal government?

How does the Constitution control all the other governments?
How was the New England township structured and why was it planned this way? What is the significance of the township model?

Lesson 4 | Separation of Powers and Checks and Balances

- What is meant by the powers of the federal government being separately divided?
- What is the case for structuring the federal government so that its powers are separated from one another?
- How does the Constitution divide and allocate the various powers of the federal government?
- What are checks and balances? What are their purposes?
- To what in human nature do checks and balances appeal, and what do they channel?
- How can each branch check the powers of the others?
Test — A Constitution of Principles

TERMS AND TOPICS

Explain each of the following and the context in which it was discussed during this unit’s lessons.

1. republic

2. constitutional veneration

3. representative democracy

4. direct democracy

5. representation

6. extended sphere

7. faction

8. majority tyranny

9. human nature

10. federalism

11. local government

12. federal government
13. township

14. separation of powers

15. checks and balances

**PRIMARY SOURCES**

*Explain the main arguments in each of the following sources and their significance to understanding America’s founding principles.*

16. Federalist 10

17. Federalist 47

18. Federalist 51
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and writing should be employed, and responses must fully answer each question.

19. Why did the Anti-Federalists prefer smaller, simpler, more local, and more democratic government?

20. What was the Federalists’ case for the Constitution?

21. What was the Federalists’ case for a written, fixed Constitution? Why did they consider it important to make the Constitution difficult to change?

22. What is the relationship between the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution?

23. What was the Federalists’ case for union?

24. What are the benefits of representation? What role do elections serve?

25. Why does The Federalist argue for the size of the republic to be larger than commonly thought possible? What are the advantages of this “extended sphere”?

26. What is the problem with factions?

27. How are property and inequality sources of faction? How are these issues addressed in the Constitution?
28. According to *The Federalist*, what are the virtues and limitations of human nature?

29. What is the relationship between the government’s ends and its powers (means)?

30. Why is federalism important?

31. What are the ways the states can control the federal government?

32. How was the New England township structured and why was it planned this way? What is the significance of the township model?

33. What is the case for structuring the federal government so that its powers are separated from one another?

34. To what in human nature do checks and balances appeal, and what do they channel?

35. How can each branch check the powers of the others?
Writing Assignment — A Constitution of Principles

DIRECTIONS

Citing primary sources and conversations from class in your argument, write a 500–800-word essay answering the question:

What are the most significant principles to which the United States Constitution adheres?
APPENDIX B

Primary Sources

The American People

James Madison

Alexander Hamilton

John Jay
THE DELEGATES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN CONGRESS

Articles of Confederation

LAW

March 1, 1781

United States of America

BACKGROUND

After forming their own country with the Declaration of Independence, the Congress created the Articles of Confederation during the Revolutionary War as the first national government for the United States.

ANNOTATIONS

To all to whom these Presents shall come, we the undersigned Delegates of the States affixed to our Names, send greeting:

Whereas the Delegates of the United States of America in Congress assembled did on the fifteenth day of November in the Year of our Lord One Thousand Seven Hundred and Seventy-Seven, and in the Second Year of the Independence of America agree to certain articles of Confederation and perpetual Union between the States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia in the words following, viz.

Articles of Confederation and perpetual Union between the states of New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia.

Article I

The stile of this confederacy shall be "The United States of America."

Article II

Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom and independence, and every power, jurisdiction and right, which is not by this confederation expressly delegated to the United States, in Congress assembled.

Article III

The said States hereby severally enter into a firm league of friendship with each other, for their common defense, the security of their liberties, and their mutual and general welfare, binding themselves to assist each other, against all force offered to, or attacks made upon them, or any of them, on account of religion, sovereignty, trade, or any other pretense whatever.

Article IV

The better to secure and perpetuate mutual friendship and intercourse among the people of the different States in this Union, the free inhabitants of each of these States, paupers, vagabonds and fugitives from justice excepted, shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of free citizens in the several States; and the people of each State shall have free ingress and regress to and from any other State and shall enjoy therein all the privileges of trade and commerce, subject to the same duties, impositions and restrictions as the inhabitants thereof respectively, provided that such restriction shall not extend so far as to prevent the removal of property imported into any State, to any other State of which the owner is an inhabitant; provided also that no imposition, duties or restriction shall be laid by any State, on the property of the United States, or either of them.
If any person guilty of, or charged with treason, felony, or other high misdemeanor in any State, shall flee from justice, and be found in any of the United States, he shall, upon demand of the Governor or Executive power, of the State from which he fled, be delivered up and removed to the State having jurisdiction of his offense.

Full faith and credit shall be given in each of these States to the records, acts and judicial proceedings of the courts and magistrates of every other State.

Article V

For the more convenient management of the general interests of the United States, delegates shall be annually appointed in such manner as the legislature of each State shall direct, to meet in Congress on the first Monday in November, in every year, with a power reserved to each State to recall its delegates, or any of them, at any time within the year, and to send others in their stead, for the remainder of the year.

No State shall be represented in Congress by less than two, nor by more than seven members; and no person shall be capable of being a delegate for more than three years in any term of six years; nor shall any person, being a delegate, be capable of holding any office under the United States, for which he, or another for his benefit receives any salary, fees or emolument of any kind.

Each State shall maintain its own delegates in a meeting of the States, and while they act as members of the committee of the States.

In determining questions in the United States, in Congress assembled, each State shall have one vote.

Freedom of speech and debate in Congress shall not be impeached or questioned in any court, or place out of Congress, and the members of Congress shall be protected in their persons from arrests and imprisonments, during the time of their going to and from, and attendance on Congress, except for treason, felony, or breach of the peace.
Article VI

No State without the consent of the United States in Congress assembled, shall send any embassy to, or receive any embassy from, or enter into any conference, agreement, alliance or treaty with any king, prince or state; nor shall any person holding any office of profit or trust under the United States, or any of them, accept of any present, emolument, office or title of any kind whatever from any king, prince or foreign state; nor shall the United States in Congress assembled, or any of them, grant any title of nobility.

No two or more States shall enter into any treaty, confederation or alliance whatever between them, without the consent of the United States in Congress assembled, specifying accurately the purposes for which the same is to be entered into, and how long it shall continue.

No State shall lay any imposts or duties, which may interfere with any stipulations in treaties, entered into by the United States in Congress assembled, with any king, prince or state, in pursuance of any treaties already proposed by Congress, to the courts of France and Spain.

No vessels of war shall be kept up in time of peace by any State, except such number only, as shall be deemed necessary by the United States in Congress assembled, for the defense of such State, or its trade; nor shall any body of forces be kept up by any State, in time of peace, except such number only, as in the judgment of the United States, in Congress assembled, shall be deemed requisite to garrison the forts necessary for the defense of such State; but every State shall always keep up a well regulated and disciplined militia, sufficiently armed and accoutred, and shall provide and constantly have ready for use, in public stores, a due number of field pieces and tents, and a proper quantity of arms, ammunition and camp equipage.

No State shall engage in any war without the consent of the United States in Congress assembled, unless such State be actually invaded by enemies, or shall have received certain advice of a resolution being formed by some nation of Indians to invade such State, and the
danger is so imminent as not to admit of a delay, till the United States in Congress assem-
bled can be consulted: nor shall any State grant commissions to any ships or vessels of war,
nor letters of marque or reprisal, except it be after a declaration of war by the United States
in Congress assembled, and then only against the kingdom or state and the subjects thereof,
against which war has been so declared, and under such regulations as shall be established
by the United States in Congress assembled, unless such State be infested by pirates, in
which case vessels of war may be fitted out for that occasion, and kept so long as the danger
shall continue or until the United States in Congress assembled shall determine otherwise.

Article VII

When land-forces are raised by any State for the common defense, all officers of or under
the rank of colonel, shall be appointed by the Legislature of each State respectively, by
whom such forces shall be raised, or in such manner as such State shall direct, and all va-
cancies shall be filled up by the State which first made the appointment.

Article VIII

All charges of war, and all other expenses that shall be incurred for the common defense or
general welfare, and allowed by the United States in Congress assembled, shall be defrayed
out of a common treasury, which shall be supplied by the several States, in proportion to
the value of all land within each State, granted to or surveyed for any person, as such land
and the buildings and improvements thereon shall be estimated according to such mode as
the United States in Congress assembled, shall from time to time direct and appoint.

The taxes for paying that proportion shall be laid and levied by the authority and direction
of the Legislatures of the several States within the time agreed upon by the United States in
Congress assembled.

Article IX

The United States in Congress assembled, shall have the sole and exclusive right and power
of determining on peace and war, except in the cases mentioned in the sixth article—of
sending and receiving ambassadors—entering into treaties and alliances, provided that no
treaty of commerce shall be made whereby the legislative power of the respective States shall be restrained from imposing such imposts and duties on foreigners, as their own people are subjected to, or from prohibiting the exportation or importation of any species of goods or commodities, whatsoever—of establishing rules for deciding in all cases, what captures on land or water shall be legal, and in what manner prizes taken by land or naval forces in the service of the United States shall be divided or appropriated—of granting letters of marque and reprisal in times of peace—appointing courts for the trial of piracies and felonies committed on the high seas and establishing courts for receiving and determining finally appeals in all cases of captures, provided that no member of Congress shall be appointed a judge of any of the said courts.

The United States in Congress assembled shall also be the last resort on appeal in all disputes and differences now subsisting or that hereafter may arise between two or more States concerning boundary, jurisdiction or any other cause whatever; which authority shall always be exercised in the manner following. Whenever the legislative or executive authority or lawful agent of any State in controversy with another shall present a petition to Congress, stating the matter in question and praying for a hearing, notice thereof shall be given by order of Congress to the legislative or executive authority of the other State in controversy, and a day assigned for the appearance of the parties by their lawful agents, who shall then be directed to appoint by joint consent, commissioners or judges to constitute a court for hearing and determining the matter in question: but if they cannot agree, Congress shall name three persons out of each of the United States, and from the list of such persons each party shall alternately strike out one, the petitioners beginning, until the number shall be reduced to thirteen; and from that number not less than seven, nor more than nine names as Congress shall direct, shall in the presence of Congress be drawn out by lot, and the persons whose names shall be so drawn or any five of them, shall be commissioners or judges, to hear and finally determine the controversy, so always as a major part of the judges who shall hear the cause shall agree in the determination: and if either party shall neglect to attend at the day appointed, without showing reasons, which Congress shall judge sufficient, or being present shall refuse to strike, the Congress shall proceed to nominate three persons out of each State, and the Secretary of Congress shall strike in behalf of such party
absent or refusing; and the judgment and sentence of the court to be appointed, in the
manner before prescribed, shall be final and conclusive; and if any of the parties shall refuse
to submit to the authority of such court, or to appear or defend their claim or cause, the
court shall nevertheless proceed to pronounce sentence, or judgment, which shall in like
manner be final and decisive, the judgment or sentence and other proceedings being in
either case transmitted to Congress, and lodged among the acts of Congress for the security
of the parties concerned: provided that every commissioner, before he sits in judgment,
shall take an oath to be administered by one of the judges of the supreme or superior court
of the State where the cause shall be tried, "well and truly to hear and determine the matter
in question, according to the best of his judgment, without favor, affection or hope of re-
ward:" provided also that no State shall be deprived of territory for the benefit of the United
States.

All controversies concerning the private right of soil claimed under different grants of two
or more States, whose jurisdictions as they may respect such lands, and the States which
passed such grants are adjusted, the said grants or either of them being at the same time
claimed to have originated antecedent to such settlement of jurisdiction, shall on the peti-
tion of either party to the Congress of the United States, be finally determined as near as
may be in the same manner as is before prescribed for deciding disputes respecting territo-
rial jurisdiction between different States.

The United States in Congress assembled shall also have the sole and exclusive right and
power of regulating the alloy and value of coin struck by their own authority, or by that of
the respective States.—fixing the standard of weights and measures throughout the United
States.—regulating the trade and managing all affairs with the Indians, not members of any
of the States, provided that the legislative right of any State within its own limits be not
infringed or violated—establishing and regulating post-offices from one State to another,
throughout all the United States, and exacting such postage on the papers passing thro' the
same as may be requisite to defray the expenses of the said office—appointing all officers
of the land forces, in the service of the United States, excepting regimental officers—ap-
pointing all the officers of the naval forces, and commissioning all officers whatever in the
service of the United States—making rules for the government and regulation of the said
land and naval forces, and directing their operations.

The United States in Congress assembled shall have authority to appoint a committee, to
sit in the recess of Congress, to be denominated "a Committee of the States", and to consist
of one delegate from each State; and to appoint such other committees and civil officers as
may be necessary for managing the general affairs of the United States under their direc-
tion—to appoint one of their number to preside, provided that no person be allowed to
serve in the office of president more than one year in any term of three years; to ascertain
the necessary sums of money to be raised for the service of the United States, and to appro-
priate and apply the same for defraying the public expenses—to borrow money, or emit
bills on the credit of the United States, transmitting every half year to the respective States
an account of the sums of money so borrowed or emitted,—to build and equip a navy—to
agree upon the number of land forces, and to make requisitions from each State for its
quota, in proportion to the number of white inhabitants in such State; which requisition
shall be binding, and thereupon the Legislature of each State shall appoint the regimental
officers, raise the men and clothe, arm and equip them in a soldier-like manner, at the
expense of the United States; and the officers and men so clothed, armed and equipped
shall march to the place appointed, and within the time agreed on by the United States in
Congress assembled: but if the United States in Congress assembled shall, on consideration
of circumstances judge proper that any State should not raise men, or should raise a smaller
number than its quota, and that any other State should raise a greater number of men than
the quota thereof, such extra number shall be raised, officered, clothed, armed and
equipped in the same manner as the quota of such State, unless the legislature of such State
shall judge that such extra number cannot be safely spared out of the same, in which case
they shall raise, officer, cloth, arm and equip as many of such extra number as they judge
can be safely spared. And the officers and men so clothed, armed and equipped, shall march
to the place appointed, and within the time agreed on by the United States in Congress
assembled.
The United States in Congress assembled shall never engage in a war, nor grant letters of marque and reprisal in time of peace, nor enter into any treaties or alliances, nor coin money, nor regulate the value thereof, nor ascertain the sums and expenses necessary for the defense and welfare of the United States, or any of them, nor emit bills, nor borrow money on the credit of the United States, nor appropriate money, nor agree upon the number of vessels of war, to be built or purchased, or the number of land or sea forces to be raised, nor appoint a commander in chief of the army or navy, unless nine States assent to the same; nor shall a question on any other point, except for adjourning from day to day be determined, unless by the votes of a majority of the United States in Congress assembled.

The Congress of the United States shall have power to adjourn to any time within the year, and to any place within the United States, so that no period of adjournment be for a longer duration than the space of six months, and shall publish the journal of their proceedings monthly, except such parts thereof relating to treaties, alliances or military operations, as in their judgment require secrecy; and the yeas and nays of the delegates of each State on any question shall be entered on the journal, when it is desired by any delegate; and the delegates of a State, or any of them, at his or their request shall be furnished with a transcript of the said journal, except such parts as are above excepted, to lay before the legislatures of the several States.

Article X

The committee of the States, or any nine of them, shall be authorized to execute, in the recess of Congress, such of the powers of Congress as the United States in Congress assembled, by the consent of nine States, shall from time to time think expedient to vest them with; provided that no power be delegated to the said committee, for the exercise of which, by the articles of confederation, the voice of nine states in the Congress of the United States assembled is requisite.
Article XI

Canada acceding to this confederation, and joining in the measures of the United States, shall be admitted into, and entitled to all the advantages of this Union: but no other colony shall be admitted into the same, unless such admission be agreed to by nine States.

Article XII

All bills of credit emitted, monies borrowed and debts contracted by, or under the authority of Congress, before the assembling of the United States, in pursuance of the present confederation, shall be deemed and considered as a charge against the United States, for payment and satisfaction whereof the said United States, and the public faith are hereby solemnly pledged.

Article XIII

Every State shall abide by the determinations of the United States in Congress assembled, on all questions which by this confederation, are submitted to them. And the articles of this confederation shall be inviolably observed by every State, and the Union shall be perpetual; nor shall any alteration at any time hereafter be made in any of them; unless such alteration be agreed to in a Congress of the United States, and be afterwards confirmed by the Legislatures of every State.

And whereas it hath pleased the Great Governor of the world to incline the hearts of the Legislatures we respectively represent in Congress, to approve of, and to authorize us to ratify the said articles of confederation and perpetual Union. Know Ye that we, the undersigned delegates, by virtue of the power and authority to us given for that purpose, do by these presents, in the name and in behalf of our respective constituents, fully and entirely ratify and confirm each and every of the said articles of confederation and perpetual Union, and all and singular the matters and things therein contained: and we do further solemnly plight and engage the faith of our respective constituents, that they shall abide by the determinations of the United States in Congress assembled, on all questions, which by the
said confederation are submitted to them. And that the Articles thereof shall be inviolably observed by the States we respectively represent, and that the Union shall be perpetual.

In witness whereof we have hereunto set our hands in Congress. Done at Philadelphia in the State of Pennsylvania the ninth day of July, in the year of our Lord, one thousand seven hundred and seventy-eight, and in the third year of the independence of America.

On the part and behalf of the State of New Hampshire:

Josiah Bartlett, John Wentworth, Jr.

On the part and behalf of the State of Massachusetts Bay:

John Hancock, Samuel Adams, Elbridge Gerry, Francis Dana, James Lovell, Samuel Holten

On the part and behalf of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations:

William Ellery, Henry Marchant, John Collins

On the part and behalf of the State of Connecticut:

Roger Sherman, Samuel Huntington, Oliver Wolcott, Titus Hosmer, Andrew Adams

On the part and behalf of the State of New York:

James Duane, Francis Lewis, William Duer, Gouverneur Morris
On the part and behalf of the State of New Jersey:

John Witherspoon, Nathaniel Scudder

On the part and behalf of the State of Pennsylvania:

Robert Morris, Daniel Roberdeau, Jonathan Bayard Smith, William Clingan, Joseph Reed

On the part and behalf of the State of Delaware:
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LAW

March 4, 1789

United States of America

BACKGROUND

Delegates to the Constitutional Convention drafted and the states ratified this Constitution, forming the second national government for the United States of America.

ANNOTATIONS

Preamble

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

Article I

Section 1. All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Section 2. The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States, and the Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature.

No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the Age of twenty five Years, and been seven Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, __________

be an Inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons, including those bound to Service for a Term of Years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three fifths of all other Persons. The actual Enumeration shall be made within three Years after the first Meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent Term of ten Years, in such Manner as they shall by Law direct. The Number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every thirty Thousand, but each State shall have at Least one Representative; and until such enumeration shall be made, the State of New Hampshire shall be entitled to choose three, Massachusetts eight, Rhode-Island and Providence Plantations one, Connecticut five, New-York six, New Jersey four, Pennsylvania eight, Delaware one, Maryland six, Virginia ten, North Carolina five, South Carolina five, and Georgia three.

When vacancies happen in the Representation from any State, the Executive Authority thereof shall issue Writs of Election to fill such Vacancies.

The House of Representatives shall choose their Speaker and other Officers; and shall have the sole Power of Impeachment.

Section 3. The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the Legislature thereof, for six Years; and each Senator shall have one Vote.

Immediately after they shall be assembled in Consequence of the first Election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three Classes. The Seats of the Senators of the first Class shall be vacated at the Expiration of the second Year, of the second Class at the Expiration of the fourth Year, and of the third Class at the Expiration of the sixth Year, so that one third may be chosen every second Year; and if Vacancies happen by Resignation, or otherwise, during the Recess of the Legislature of any State, the Executive thereof may make temporary Appointments until the next Meeting of the Legislature, which shall then fill such Vacancies.
No Person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty Years, and been nine Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen.

The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no Vote, unless they be equally divided.

The Senate shall choose their other Officers, and also a President pro tempore, in the Absence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the Office of President of the United States.

The Senate shall have the sole Power to try all Impeachments. When sitting for that Purpose, they shall be on Oath or Affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside: And no Person shall be convicted without the Concurrence of two thirds of the Members present.

Judgment in Cases of Impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from Office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any Office of honor, Trust or Profit under the United States: but the Party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to Indictment, Trial, Judgment and Punishment, according to Law.

Section 4. The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of choosing Senators.

The Congress shall assemble at least once in every Year, and such Meeting shall be on the first Monday in December, unless they shall by Law appoint a different Day.

Section 5. Each House shall be the Judge of the Elections, Returns and Qualifications of its own Members, and a Majority of each shall constitute a Quorum to do Business; but a smaller Number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the Attendance of absent Members, in such Manner, and under such Penalties as each House may provide.
Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behavior, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.

Each House shall keep a Journal of its Proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such Parts as may in their Judgment require Secrecy; and the Yeas and Nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the Desire of one fifth of those Present, be entered on the Journal.

Neither House, during the Session of Congress, shall, without the Consent of the other, adjourn for more than three days, nor to any other Place than that in which the two Houses shall be sitting.

Section 6. The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States. They shall in all Cases, except Treason, Felony and Breach of the Peace, be privileged from Arrest during their Attendance at the Session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any Speech or Debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other Place.

No Senator or Representative shall, during the Time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil Office under the Authority of the United States, which shall have been created, or the Emoluments whereof shall have been encreased during such time; and no Person holding any Office under the United States, shall be a Member of either House during his Continuance in Office.

Section 7. All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills.

Every Bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a Law, be presented to the President of the United States; If he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his Objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the Objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If after such Reconsideration two thirds of that House shall agree to pass the Bill, it shall be sent, together with the Objections, to the other House, by which it shall
likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two thirds of that House, it shall become a Law. But in all such Cases the Votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and Nays, and the Names of the Persons voting for and against the Bill shall be entered on the Journal of each House respectively. If any Bill shall not be returned by the President within ten days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the Same shall be a Law, in like Manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress by their Adjournment prevent its Return in which Case it shall not be a Law.

Every Order, Resolution, or Vote to which the Concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of Adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the Same shall take Effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the Rules and Limitations prescribed in the Case of a Bill.

Section 8. The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow Money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and post Roads;
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To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;—And

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.
Section 9. The Migration or Importation of such Persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the Year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a Tax or duty may be imposed on such Importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each Person.

5 The Privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it.

No Bill of Attainder or ex post facto Law shall be passed.

No Capitation, or other direct, Tax shall be laid, unless in Proportion to the Census or Enumeration herein before directed to be taken.

10 No Tax or Duty shall be laid on Articles exported from any State.

No Preference shall be given by any Regulation of Commerce or Revenue to the Ports of one State over those of another: nor shall Vessels bound to, or from, one State, be obliged to enter, clear, or pay Duties in another.

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.

20 Section 10. No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts; pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, or Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts, or grant any Title of Nobility.

25 No State shall, without the Consent of the Congress, lay any Imposts or Duties on Imports or Exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection Laws: and
the net Produce of all Duties and Imposts, laid by any State on Imports or Exports, shall be for the Use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such Laws shall be subject to the Revision and Control of the Congress.

No State shall, without the Consent of Congress, lay any duty of Tonnage, keep Troops, or Ships of War in time of Peace, enter into any Agreement or Compact with another State, or with a foreign Power, or engage in War, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent Danger as will not admit of delay.

Article II

Section 1. The executive Power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his Office during the Term of four Years, and, together with the Vice-President chosen for the same Term, be elected as follows:

Each State shall appoint, in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors, equal to the whole Number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress: but no Senator or Representative, or Person holding an Office of Trust or Profit under the United States, shall be appointed an Elector. The Electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by Ballot for two Persons, of whom one at least shall not be an Inhabitant of the same State with themselves. And they shall make a List of all the Persons voted for, and of the Number of Votes for each; which List they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the Seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall, in the Presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the Certificates, and the Votes shall then be counted. The Person having the greatest Number of Votes shall be the President, if such Number be a Majority of the whole Number of Electors appointed; and if there be more than one who have such Majority, and have an equal Number of Votes, then the House of Representatives shall immediately choose by Ballot one of them for President; and if no Person have a Majority, then from the five highest on the List the said House shall in like Manner choose the President. But in choosing the President, the Votes shall be taken by States, the Representation from each State having one Vote; a quorum for
this Purpose shall consist of a Member or Members from two thirds of the States, and a Majority of all the States shall be necessary to a Choice. In every Case, after the Choice of the President, the Person having the greatest Number of Votes of the Electors shall be the Vice President. But if there should remain two or more who have equal Votes, the Senate shall choose from them by Ballot the Vice President.

The Congress may determine the Time of choosing the Electors, and the Day on which they shall give their Votes; which Day shall be the same throughout the United States.

No Person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President; neither shall any Person be eligible to that Office who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty-five Years, and been fourteen Years a Resident within the United States.

In Case of the Removal of the President from Office, or of his Death, Resignation, or Inability to discharge the Powers and Duties of the said Office, the Same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by Law provide for the Case of Removal, Death, Resignation or Inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what Officer shall then act as President, and such Officer shall act accordingly, until the Disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

The President shall, at stated Times, receive for his Services, a Compensation, which shall neither be increased nor diminished during the Period for which he shall have been elected, and he shall not receive within that Period any other Emolument from the United States, or any of them.

Before he enter on the Execution of his Office, he shall take the following Oath or Affirmation:—"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States."

Section 2. The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States; he may require the Opinion, in writing, of the principal Officer in each of
the executive Departments, upon any subject relating to the Duties of their respective Offices, and he shall have Power to grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offenses against the United States, except in Cases of Impeachment.

He shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law: but the Congress may by Law vest the Appointment of such inferior Officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the Courts of Law, or in the Heads of Departments.

The President shall have Power to fill up all Vacancies that may happen during the Recess of the Senate, by granting Commissions which shall expire at the End of their next Session.

Section 3. He shall from time to time give to the Congress Information of the State of the Union, and recommend to their Consideration such Measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient; he may, on extraordinary Occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them, and in Case of Disagreement between them, with Respect to the Time of Adjournment, he may adjourn them to such Time as he shall think proper; he shall receive Ambassadors and other public Ministers; he shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed, and shall Commission all the Officers of the United States.

Section 4. The President, Vice President and all civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.

Article III

Section 1. The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good
Behavior, and shall, at stated Times, receive for their Services a Compensation, which shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office.

Section 2. The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority;—to all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls;—to all Cases of admiralty and maritime Jurisdiction; —to Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party;—to Controversies between two or more States;—between a State and Citizens of another State;—between Citizens of different States;—between Citizens of the same State claiming Lands under Grants of different States, and between a State, or the Citizens thereof, and foreign States, Citizens or Subjects.

In all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, and those in which a State shall be Party, the supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction. In all the other Cases before mentioned, the supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make.

The Trial of all Crimes, except in Cases of Impeachment, shall be by Jury; and such Trial shall be held in the State where the said Crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State, the Trial shall be at such Place or Places as the Congress may by Law have directed.

Section 3. Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying War against them, or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort. No Person shall be convicted of Treason unless on the Testimony of two Witnesses to the same overt Act, or on Confession in open Court.

The Congress shall have Power to declare the Punishment of Treason, but no Attainder of Treason shall work Corruption of Blood, or Forfeiture except during the Life of the Person attainted.
Article IV

Section 1. Full Faith and Credit shall be given in each State to the public Acts, Records, and judicial Proceedings of every other State. And the Congress may by general Laws prescribe the Manner in which such Acts, Records and Proceedings shall be proved, and the Effect thereof.

Section 2. The Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of Citizens in the several States.

A Person charged in any State with Treason, Felony, or other Crime, who shall flee from Justice, and be found in another State, shall on Demand of the executive Authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having Jurisdiction of the Crime.

No Person held to Service or Labor in one State, under the Laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in Consequence of any Law or Regulation therein, be discharged from such Service or Labor, but shall be delivered up on Claim of the Party to whom such Service or Labor may be due.

Section 3. New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the Junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the Consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

Section 4. The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic Violence.
Article V

The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

Article VI

All Debts contracted and Engagements entered into, before the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation.

This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States.
Article VII

The Ratification of the Conventions of nine States, shall be sufficient for the Establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the Same.

Done in Convention by the Unanimous Consent of the States present the Seventeenth Day of September in the Year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and Eighty seven and of the Independence of the United States of America the Twelfth In witness whereof We have hereunto subscribed our Names.

George Washington—
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George Read, Gunning Bedford, Jr., John Dickinson, Richard Bassett, Jacob Broom
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Attest William Jackson Secretary
Amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America

Amendment I

Ratified December 15, 1791

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Amendment II

Ratified December 15, 1791

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

Amendment III

Ratified December 15, 1791

No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

Amendment IV

Ratified December 15, 1791

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.
Amendment V

Ratified December 15, 1791

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Amendment VI

Ratified December 15, 1791

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defense.

Amendment VII

Ratified December 15, 1791

In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.
Amendment VIII

Ratified December 15, 1791

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

Amendment IX

Ratified December 15, 1791

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Amendment X

Ratified December 15, 1791

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Amendment XI

Ratified February 7, 1795

The Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State.

Amendment XII

Ratified June 15, 1804

The Electors shall meet in their respective states and vote by ballot for President and Vice-President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same state with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice-President, and they shall make distinct lists of all per-
sons voted for as President, and of all persons voted for as Vice-President, and of the num-
ber of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat
of the government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate;—the Pres-
ident of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open
all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted;—The person having the greatest
number of votes for President, shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the
whole number of Electors appointed; and if no person have such majority, then from the
persons having the highest numbers not exceeding three on the list of those voted for as
President, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President.
But in choosing the President, the votes shall be taken by states, the representation from
each state having one vote; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or mem-
bers from two-thirds of the states, and a majority of all the states shall be necessary to a
choice. And if the House of Representatives shall not choose a President whenever the right
of choice shall devolve upon them, before the fourth day of March next following, then the
Vice-President shall act as President, as in the case of the death or other constitutional dis-
ability of the President.—The person having the greatest number of votes as Vice-Presi-
dent, shall be the Vice-President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of
Electors appointed, and if no person have a majority, then from the two highest numbers
on the list, the Senate shall choose the Vice-President; a quorum for the purpose shall con-
sist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number
shall be necessary to a choice. But no person constitutionally ineligible to the office of Pres-
ident shall be eligible to that of Vice-President of the United States.

Amendment XIII

Ratified December 6, 1865

Section 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime
whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or
any place subject to their jurisdiction.

Section 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.
Amendment XIV

Ratified July 9, 1868

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

Section 3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice-President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.
Section 4. The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.

Section 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

Amendment XV

Ratified February 3, 1870

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment XVI

Ratified February 3, 1913

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

Amendment XVII

Ratified April 8, 1913

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.
When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: Provided, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.

This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.

Amendment XVIII

Ratified January 16, 1919

Section 1. After one year from the ratification of this article the manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof for beverage purposes is hereby prohibited.

Section 2. The Congress and the several States shall have concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Section 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress.

Amendment XIX

Ratified August 18, 1920

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.
Amendment XX

Ratified January 23, 1933

Section 1. The terms of the President and the Vice President shall end at noon on the 20th
day of January, and the terms of Senators and Representatives at noon on the 3rd day of
January, of the years in which such terms would have ended if this article had not been
ratified; and the terms of their successors shall then begin.

Section 2. The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall
begin at noon on the 3rd day of January, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.

Section 3. If, at the time fixed for the beginning of the term of the President, the President
elect shall have died, the Vice President elect shall become President. If a President shall
not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or if the President
elect shall have failed to qualify, then the Vice President elect shall act as President until a
President shall have qualified; and the Congress may by law provide for the case wherein
neither a President elect nor a Vice President shall have qualified, declaring who shall then
act as President, or the manner in which one who is to act shall be selected, and such person
shall act accordingly until a President or Vice President shall have qualified.

Section 4. The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons
from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of
choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons
from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have
devolved upon them.

Section 5. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect on the 15th day of October following the ratifi-
cation of this article.

Section 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amend-
ment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within
seven years from the date of its submission.
Amendment XXI

Ratified December 5, 1933

Section 1. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

Section 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited.

Section 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress.

Amendment XXII

Ratified February 27, 1951

Section 1. No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than two years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of President more than once. But this Article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President when this Article was proposed by the Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this Article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term.

Section 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.
Amendment XXIII

Ratified March 29, 1961

Section 1. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct:

A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the twelfth article of amendment.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment XXIV

Ratified January 23, 1964

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment XXV

Ratified February 10, 1967

Section 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

Section 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.
Section 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

Section 4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session.

If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office.
Amendment XXVI

Ratified July 1, 1971

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States, who are eighteen years of age or older, to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment XXVII

Ratified May 7, 1992

No law varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives shall take effect, until an election of Representatives shall have intervened.
Publius (Alexander Hamilton) advocates for the proposed Constitution by introducing the forthcoming series of articles in its support and arguing for the necessity of union.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What are the two choices Hamilton gives for people to establish a new government?

2. How will the Union be favorable to political prosperity?

3. How is the confederacy insufficient at present?

4. Why is there a need for an energetic government?

5. What is the preferred form of government?

After full experience of the insufficiency of the existing federal government, you are invited to deliberate upon a New Constitution for the United States of America. The subject speaks its own importance; comprehending in its consequences, nothing less than the existence of the UNION, the safety and welfare of the parts of which it is composed, the fate of an empire, in many respects, the most interesting in the world. It has been frequently remarked, that it seems to have been reserved to the people of this country to decide, by their conduct and example, the important question, whether societies of men are really capable or not, of establishing good government from reflection and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend, for their political constitutions, on accident and force. If there be any truth in the remark, the crisis at which we are arrived may, with propriety, be regarded as the period when that decision is to be made; and a wrong election of the part we shall act, may, in this view, deserve to be considered as the general misfortune of mankind.

This idea, by adding the inducements of philanthropy to those of patriotism, will heighten the solicitude which all considerate and good men must feel for the event. Happy will it be if our choice should be directed by a judicious estimate of our true interests, uninfluenced by considerations foreign to the public good. But this is more ardently to be wished for, than seriously to be expected. The plan offered to our deliberations, affects too many particular interests, innovates upon too many local institutions, not to involve in its discussion a variety of objects extraneous to its merits, and of views, passions and prejudices little favourable to the discovery of truth.

Among the most formidable of the obstacles which the new constitution will have to encounter, may readily be distinguished the obvious interest of a certain class of men in every state to resist all changes which may hazard a diminution of the power, emolument and consequence of the offices they hold under the state establishments . . . and the perverted ambition of another class of men, who will either hope to aggrandize themselves by the confusions of their country, or will flatter themselves with fairer prospects of elevation from
the subdivision of the empire into several partial confederacies, than from its union under one government.

It is not, however, my design to dwell upon observations of this nature. I am aware that it would be disingenuous to resolve indiscriminately the opposition of any set of men into interested or ambitious views, merely because their situations might subject them to suspicion. Candour will oblige us to admit, that even such men may be actuated by upright intentions; and it cannot be doubted, that much of the opposition, which has already shown itself, or that may hereafter make its appearance, will spring from sources blameless at least, if not respectable . . . the honest errors of minds led astray by preconceived jealousies and fears. So numerous indeed and so powerful are the causes which serve to give a false bias to the judgement, that we, upon many occasions, see wise and good men on the wrong as well as on the right side of questions, of the first magnitude to society. This circumstance, if duly attended to, would always furnish a lesson of moderation to those, who are engaged in any controversy, however well persuaded of being in the right. And a further reason for caution, in this respect, might be drawn from the reflection, that we are not always sure, that those who advocate the truth are actuated by purer principles than their antagonists. Ambition, avarice, personal animosity, party opposition, and many other motives, not more laudable than these, are apt to operate as well upon those who support, as upon those who oppose, the right side of a question. Were there not even these inducements to moderation, nothing could be more ill judged than that intolerant spirit, which has, at all times, characterized political parties. For, in politics as in religion, it is equally absurd to aim at making proselytes by fire and sword. Heresies in either can rarely be cured by persecution.

And yet, just as these sentiments must appear to candid men, we have already sufficient indications, that it will happen in this, as in all former cases of great national discussion. A torrent of angry and malignant passions will be let loose. To judge from the conduct of the opposite parties, we shall be led to conclude, that they will mutually hope to evince the justness of their opinions, and to increase the number of their converts, by the loudness of their declamations, and by the bitterness of their invectives. An enlightened zeal for the energy and efficiency of government, will be stigmatized as the offspring of a temper fond
of power, and hostile to the principles of liberty. An over scrupulous jealousy of danger to the rights of the people, which is more commonly the fault of the head than of the heart, will be represented as mere pretence and artifice . . . the stale bait for popularity at the expense of public good. It will be forgotten, on the one hand, that jealousy is the usual concomitant of violent love, and that the noble enthusiasm of liberty is too apt to be infected with a spirit of narrow and illiberal distrust. On the other hand, it will be equally forgotten, that the vigour of government is essential to the security of liberty; that, in the contemplation of a sound and well informed judgment, their interests can never be separated; and that a dangerous ambition more often lurks behind the specious mask of zeal for the rights of the people, than under the forbidding appearances of zeal for the firmness and efficiency of government. History will teach us, that the former has been found a much more certain road to the introduction of despotism, than the latter, and that of those men who have overturned the liberties of republics, the greatest number have begun their career, by paying an obsequious court to the people . . . commencing demagogues, and ending tyrants.

In the course of the preceding observations it has been my aim, fellow citizens, to put you upon your guard against all attempts, from whatever quarter, to influence your decision in a matter of the utmost moment to your welfare, by any impressions, other than those which may result from the evidence of truth. You will, no doubt, at the same time, have collected from the general scope of them, that they proceed from a source not unfriendly to the new constitution. Yes, my countrymen, I own to you, that, after having given it an attentive consideration, I am clearly of opinion, it is your interest to adopt it. I am convinced, that this is the safest course for your liberty, your dignity, and your happiness. I affect not reserves, which I do not feel. I will not amuse you with an appearance of deliberation, when I have decided. I frankly acknowledge to you my convictions, and I will freely lay before you the reasons on which they are founded. The consciousness of good intentions disdains ambiguity. I shall not however multiply professions on this head. My motives must remain in the depository of my own breast: my arguments will be open to all, and may be judged of by all. They shall at least be offered in a spirit, which will not disgrace the cause of truth.
I propose, in a series of papers, to discuss the following interesting particulars . . . The utility of the UNION to your political prosperity . . . The insufficiency of the present confederation to preserve that Union . . . The necessity of a government at least equally energetic with the one proposed, to the attainment of this object . . . The conformity of the proposed constitution to the true principles of republican government . . . Its analogy to your own state constitution . . . and lastly, The additional security, which its adoption will afford to the preservation of that species of government, to liberty and to property.

In the progress of this discussion, I shall endeavour to give a satisfactory answer to all the objections which shall have made their appearance, that may seem to have any claim to attention.

It may perhaps be thought superfluous to offer arguments to prove the utility of the UNION, a point, no doubt, deeply engraved on the hearts of the great body of the people in every state, and one which, it may be imagined, has no adversaries. But the fact is, that we already hear it whispered in the private circles of those who oppose the new constitution, that the Thirteen States are of too great extent for any general system, and that we must of necessity resort to separate confederacies of distinct portions of the whole. This doctrine will, in all probability, be gradually propagated, till it has votaries enough to countenance its open avowal. For nothing can be more evident, to those who are able to take an enlarged view of the subject, than the alternative of an adoption of the constitution, or a dismemberment of the Union. It may, therefore, be essential to examine particularly the advantages of that Union, the certain evils, and the probable dangers, to which every state will be exposed from its dissolution. This shall accordingly be done.

Publius
Publius (Secretary of Foreign Affairs John Jay)

Federalist No. 2

Essay

October 31, 1787

The Independent Journal | New York City, New York

BACKGROUND

Publius (John Jay) argues for the proposed Constitution by explaining how the government it proposes is fitting to the American states, the people living within them, and their past dispositions toward government.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Is government convenient or necessary?
2. What are some of the topographical features that are conducive to union?
3. What are some of the features that Americans share that make union possible?
4. How do these features help the states to be united?
5. What are some of the ways in which the states have already acted in unison?
6. Why is it important that the new Constitution is being recommended rather than imposed?
Concerning Dangers From Foreign Force & Influence

When the people of America reflect, that the question now submitted to their determination, is one of the most important that has engaged, or can well engage, their attention, the propriety of their taking a very comprehensive, as well as a very serious, view of it, must be evident.

Nothing is more certain than the indispensable necessity of government; and it is equally undeniable, that whenever and however it is instituted, the people must cede to it some of their natural rights, in order to vest it with requisite powers. It is well worthy of consideration, therefore, whether it would conduce more to the interest of the people of America, that they should, to all general purposes, be one nation, under one federal government, than that they should divide themselves into separate confederacies, and give to the head of each, the same kind of powers which they are advised to place in one national government.

It has until lately been a received and uncontradicted opinion, that the prosperity of the people of America depended on their continuing firmly united, and the wishes, prayers and efforts of our best and wisest citizens have been constantly directed to that object. But politicians now appear, who insist that this opinion is erroneous, and that instead of looking for safety and happiness in union, we ought to seek it in a division of the states into distinct confederacies or sovereignties. However extraordinary this new doctrine may appear, it nevertheless has its advocates; and certain characters who were formerly much opposed to it, are at present of the number. Whatever may be the arguments or inducements which have wrought this change in the sentiments and declarations of these gentlemen, it certainly would not be wise in the people at large to adopt these new political tenets, without being fully convinced that they are founded in truth and sound policy.

It has often given me pleasure to observe, that independent America was not composed of detached and distant territories, but that one connected, fertile, wide spreading country, was the portion of our western sons of liberty. Providence has in a particular manner blessed it with a variety of soils and productions, and watered it with innumerable streams,
for the delight and accommodation of its inhabitants. A succession of navigable waters forms a kind of chain round its borders, as if to bind it together; while the most noble rivers in the world, running at convenient distances, present them with highways for the easy communication of friendly aids, and the mutual transportation and exchange of their various commodities.

With equal pleasure I have as often taken notice, that Providence has been pleased to give this one connected country, to one united people; a people descended from the same ancestors, speaking the same language, professing the same religion, attached to the same principles of government, very similar in their manners and customs, and who, by their joint counsels, arms and efforts, fighting side by side throughout a long and bloody war, have nobly established their general liberty and independence.

This country and this people seem to have been made for each other, and it appears as if it was the design of Providence, that an inheritance so proper and convenient for a band of brethren, united to each other by the strongest ties, should never be split into a number of unsocial, jealous and alien sovereignties.

Similar sentiments have hitherto prevailed among all orders and denominations of men among us. To all general purposes we have uniformly been one people... each individual citizen every where enjoying the same national rights, privileges, and protection. As a nation we have made peace and war: as a nation we have vanquished our common enemies: as a nation we have formed alliances and made treaties, and entered into various compacts and conventions with foreign states.

A strong sense of the value and blessings of Union induced the people, at a very early period, to institute a federal government to preserve and perpetuate it. They formed it almost as soon as they had a political existence; nay, at a time, when their habitations were in flames, when many of them were bleeding in the field, and when the progress of hostility and desolation left little room for those calm and mature inquiries and reflections, which must ever precede the formation of a wise and well balanced government for a free people. It is not to be wondered at that a government instituted in times so inauspicious, should
This intelligent people perceived and regretted these defects. Still continuing no less attached to union, than enamoured of liberty, they observed the danger which immediately threatened the former, and more remotely the latter; and being persuaded that ample security for both, could only be found in a national government more wisely framed, they, as with one voice, convened the late convention at Philadelphia, to take that important subject under consideration.

This convention, composed of men who possessed the confidence of the people, and many of whom had become highly distinguished by their patriotism, virtue, and wisdom, in times which tried the souls of men, undertook the arduous task. In the mild season of peace, with minds unoccupied by other subjects, they passed many months in cool uninterrupted and daily consultations; and finally, without having been awed by power, or influenced by any passion, except love for their country, they presented and recommended to the people the plan produced by their joint and very unanimous councils.

Admit, for so is the fact, that this plan is only recommended, not imposed, yet let it be remembered, that it is neither recommended to blind approbation, nor to blind reprobation; but to that sedate and candid consideration, which the magnitude and importance of the subject demand, and which it certainly ought to receive. But, as has been already remarked, it is more to be wished than expected that it may be so considered and examined. Experience on a former occasion teaches us not to be too sanguine in such hopes. It is not yet forgotten, that well grounded apprehensions of imminent danger induced the people of America to form the memorable Congress of 1774. That body recommended certain measures to their constituents, and the event proved their wisdom; yet it is fresh in our memories how soon the press began to teem with pamphlets and weekly papers against those very measures. Not only many of the officers of government who obeyed the dictates of personal interest, but others from a mistaken estimate of consequences, from the undue
influence of ancient attachments, or whose ambition aimed at objects which did not correspond with the public good, were indefatigable in their endeavours to persuade the people to reject the advice of that patriotic congress. Many indeed were deceived and deluded, but the great majority reasoned and decided judiciously; and happy they are in reflecting that they did so.

They considered that the congress was composed of many wise and experienced men. That being convened from different parts of the country, they brought with them and communicated to each other a variety of useful information. That in the course of the time they passed together in inquiring into and discussing the true interests of their country, they must have acquired very accurate knowledge on that head. That they were individually interested in the public liberty and prosperity, and therefore that it was not less their inclination, than their duty, to recommend such measures only, as after the most mature deliberation they really thought prudent and advisable.

These and similar considerations then induced the people to rely greatly on the judgment and integrity of the congress; and they took their advice, notwithstanding the various arts and endeavours used to deter and dissuade them from it. But if the people at large had reason to confide in the men of that congress, few of whom had then been fully tried or generally known, still greater reason have they now to respect the judgment and advice of the convention; for it is well known that some of the most distinguished members of that congress, who have been since tried and justly approved for patriotism and abilities, and who have grown old in acquiring political information, were also members of this convention, and carried into it their accumulated knowledge and experience.

It is worthy of remark, that not only the first, but every succeeding congress, as well as the late convention, have invariably joined with the people in thinking that the prosperity of America depended on its Union. To preserve and perpetuate it, was the great object of the people in forming that convention, and it is also the great object of the plan which the convention has advised them to adopt. With what propriety, therefore, or for what good
purposes, are attempts at this particular period made, by some men, to depreciate the im-
portance of the union? or why is it suggested that three or four confederacies would be
better than one? I am persuaded in my own mind, that the people have always thought
right on this subject, and that their universal and uniform attachment to the cause of the
union, rests on great and weighty reasons. They who promote the idea of substituting a
number of distinct confederacies in the room of the plan of the convention, seem clearly to
foresee that the rejection of it would put the continuance of the union in the utmost jeop-
ardy: that certainly would be the case; and I sincerely wish that it may be as clearly forseen
by every good citizen, that whenever the dissolution of the union arrives, America will have
reason to exclaim in the words of the Poet, “FAREWELL! A LONG FAREWELL, TO ALL
MY GREATNESS.”

Publius
Publius (Alexander Hamilton)

Federalist No. 6

Essay

November 14, 1787

The Independent Journal | New York City, New York

BACKGROUND

Publius (Alexander Hamilton) argues for the proposed Constitution by outlining the benefits of forming a union given the propensity of human nature to division and war.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. How does Hamilton describe human nature?

2. What is it about human nature that leads men to conflict?

3. Will engaging in commerce be sufficient to keep the peace between nations?

4. What are some historical examples of nations engaging in war that Hamilton notes in particular?

5. What are the reasons people have gone to war in the past?

Concerning Dangers From War Between The States

The three last numbers of this work have been dedicated to an enumeration of the dangers to which we should be exposed, in a state of disunion, from the arms and arts of foreign nations. I shall now proceed to delineate dangers of a different, and, perhaps, still more alarming kind, those which will in all probability flow from dissensions between the states themselves, and from domestic factions and convulsions. These have been already in some instances slightly anticipated; but they deserve a more particular and more full investigation.

If these states should either be wholly disunited, or only united in partial confederacies, a man must be far gone in Utopian speculations, who can seriously doubt that the subdivisions into which they might be thrown, would have frequent and violent contests with each other. To presume a want of motives for such contests, as an argument against their existence, would be to forget that men are ambitions, vindictive, and rapacious. To look for a continuation of harmony between a number of independent unconnected sovereignties, situated in the same neighbourhood, would be to disregard the uniform course of human events, and to set at defiance the accumulated experience of ages.

The causes of hostility among nations are innumerable. There are some which have a general and almost constant operation upon the collective bodies of society. Of this description are the love of power, or the desire of pre-eminence and dominion . . . the jealousy of power, or the desire of equality and safety. There are others which have a more circumscribed, though an equally operative influence, within their spheres: such are the rivalships and competitions of commerce between commercial nations. And there are others, not less numerous than either of the former, which take their origin entirely in private passions; in the attachments, enmities, interests, hopes, and fears, of leading individuals in the communities of which they are members. Men of this class, whether the favourites of a king or of a people, have in too many instances abused the confidence they possessed; and assuming the pretext of some public motive, have not scrupled to sacrifice the national tranquillity to personal advantage, or personal gratification.
The celebrated Pericles, in compliance with the resentments of a prostitute, at the expense of much of the blood and treasure of his countrymen, attacked, vanquished, and destroyed the city of the Samnians. The same man, stimulated by private pique against the Magarensians, another nation of Greece, or to avoid a prosecution with which he was threatened as an accomplice in a supposed theft of the statuary Phidias, or to get rid of the accusations prepared to be brought against him for dissipating the funds of the state in the purchase of popularity, or from a combination of all these causes, was the primitive author of that famous and fatal war, distinguished in the Grecian annals by the name of the Peloponnesian war; which, after various vicissitudes, intermissions, and renewals, terminated in the ruin of the Athenian commonwealth.

The ambitious cardinal, who was prime minister to Henry VIIIth, permitting his vanity to aspire to the triple crown, entertained hopes of succeeding in the acquisition of that splendid prize by the influence of the emperor Charles Vth. To secure the favour and interest of this enterprising and powerful monarch, he precipitated England into a war with France, contrary to the plainest dictates of policy, and at the hazard of the safety and independence, as well of the kingdom over which he presided by his counsels, as of Europe in general. For if there ever was a sovereign who bid fair to realize the project of universal monarchy, it was the emperor Charles Vth, of whose intrigues Wolsey was at once the instrument and the dupe.

The influence which the bigotry of one female, the petulances of another, and the cabals of a third,‡ had in the cotemporary policy, ferments, and pacifications, of a considerable part of Europe, are topics that have been too often descanted upon not to be generally known.

To multiply examples of the agency of personal considerations in the production of great national events, either foreign or domestic, according to their direction, would be an unnecessary waste of time. Those who have but a superficial acquaintance with the sources from which they are to be drawn, will themselves recollect a variety of instances; and those who have a tolerable knowledge of human nature, will not stand in need of such lights, to
form their opinion either of the reality or extent of that agency. Perhaps, however, a refer-
ence, tending to illustrate the general principle, may with propriety be made to a case which
has lately happened among ourselves. If SHAYS had not been a desperate debtor, it is much
to be doubted whether Massachusetts would have been plunged into a civil war.

But notwithstanding the concurring testimony of experience, in this particular, there are
still to be found visionary, or designing men, who stand ready to advocate the paradox of
perpetual peace between the states, though dismembered and alienated from each other. . .
. The genius of republics, say they, is pacific; the spirit of commerce has a tendency to soften
the manners of men, and to extinguish those inflammable humours which have so often
kindled into wars. Commercial republics, like ours, will never be disposed to waste them-

We may ask these projectors in politics, whether it is not the true interest of all nations to
cultivate the same benevolent and philosophic spirit? If this be their true interest, have they
in fact pursued it? Has it not, on the contrary, invariably been found, that momentary pas-
sions, and immediate interests, have a more active and imperious control over human con-
duct, than general or remote considerations of policy, utility, or justice? Have republics in
practice been less addicted to war than monarchies? Are not the former administered by
men as well as the latter? Are there not aversions, predilections, rivalships, and desires of
unjust acquisition, that affect nations, as well as kings? Are not popular assemblies fre-

frequently subject to the impulses of rage, resentment, jealousy, avarice, and of other irregular
and violent propensities? Is it not well known, that their determinations are often governed
by a few individuals in whom they place confidence, and that they are of course liable to be
tintured by the passions and views of those individuals? Has commerce hitherto done any
thing more than change the objects of war? Is not the love of wealth as domineering and
enterprising a passion as that of power or glory? Have there not been as many wars founded
upon commercial motives, since that has become the prevailing system of nations, as were
before occasioned by the cupidity of territory or dominion? Has not the spirit of commerce,
in many instances, administered new incentives to the appetite both for the one and for the
other? Let experience, the least fallible guide of human opinions, be appealed to for an answer to these inquiries.

Sparta, Athens, Rome, and Carthage, were all republics; two of them, Athens and Carthage, of the commercial kind. Yet were they as often engaged in wars, offensive and defensive, as the neighbouring monarchies of the same times. Sparta was little better than a well regulated camp; and Rome was never sated of carnage and conquest.

Carthage, though a commercial republic, was the aggressor in the very war that ended in her destruction. Hannibal had carried her arms into the heart of Italy, and even to the gates of Rome, before Scipio, in turn, gave him an overthrow in the territories of Carthage, and made a conquest of the commonwealth.

Venice, in latter times, figured more than once in wars of ambition; till becoming an object of terror to the other Italian states, Pope Julius the Second found means to accomplish that formidable league, which gave a deadly blow to the power and pride of that haughty republic.

The provinces of Holland, till they were overwhelmed in debts and taxes, took a leading and conspicuous part in the wars of Europe. They had furious contests with England for the dominion of the sea; and were among the most persevering and most implacable of the opponents of Lewis XIV.

In the government of Britain the representatives of the people compose one branch of the national legislature. Commerce has been for ages the predominant pursuit of that country. Yet few nations have been more frequently engaged in war; and the wars, in which that kingdom has been engaged, have in numerous instances proceeded from the people. There have been, if I may so express it, almost as many popular as royal wars. The cries of the nation and the importunities of their representatives have, upon various occasions, dragged their monarchs into war, or continued them in it, contrary to their inclinations, and sometimes contrary to the real interests of the state. In that memorable struggle for superiority, between the rival houses of Austria and Bourbon, which so long kept Europe in a flame, it
is well known that the antipathies of the English against the French, seconding the ambition, or rather the avarice, of a favourite leader, protracted the war beyond the limits marked out by sound policy, and for a considerable time in opposition to the views of the court.

The wars of these two last mentioned nations have in a great measure grown out of commercial considerations: the desire of supplanting, and the fear of being supplanted either in particular branches of traffic, or in the general advantages of trade and navigation; and sometimes even the more culpable desire of sharing in the commerce of other nations, without their consent.

The last war but two between Britain and Spain, sprang from the attempts of the English merchants, to prosecute an illicit trade with the Spanish main. These unjustifiable practices on their part, produced severities on the part of the Spaniards, towards the subjects of Great Britain, which were not more justifiable; because they exceeded the bounds of a just retaliation, and were chargeable with inhumanity and cruelty. Many of the English who were taken on the Spanish coasts, were sent to dig in the mines of Potosi; and by the usual progress of a spirit of resentment, the innocent were after a while confounded with the guilty in indiscriminate punishment. The complaints of the merchants kindled a violent flame throughout the nation, which soon after broke out in the house of commons, and was communicated from that body to the ministry. Letters of reprisal were granted, and a war ensued; which, in its consequences, overthrew all the alliances that but twenty years before had been formed, with sanguine expectations of the most beneficial fruits.

From this summary of what has taken place in other countries, whose situations have borne the nearest resemblance to our own, what reason can we have to confide in those reveries, which would seduce us into the expectation of peace and cordiality between the members of the present confederacy, in a state of separation? Have we not already seen enough of the fallacy and extravagance of those idle theories which have amused us with promises of an exemption from the imperfections, the weaknesses, and the evils incident to society in every shape? Is it not time to awake from the deceitful dream of a golden age, and to adopt
as a practical maxim for the direction of our political conduct, that we, as well as the other inhabitants of the globe, are yet remote from the happy empire of perfect wisdom and perfect virtue?

Let the point of extreme depression to which our national dignity and credit have sunk; let the inconveniencies felt every where from a lax and ill administration of government; let the revolt of a part of the state of North Carolina; the late menacing disturbances in Pennsylvania, and the actual insurrections and rebellions in Massachusetts, declare!

So far is the general sense of mankind from corresponding with the tenets of those, who endeavour to lull asleep our apprehensions of discord and hostility between the states, in the event of disunion, that it has from long observation of the progress of society become a sort of axiom in politics, that vicinity, or nearness of situation, constitutes nations natural enemies. An intelligent writer expresses himself on this subject to this effect: “NEIGHBOURING NATIONS (says he) are naturally ENEMIES of each other, unless their common weakness forces them to league in a CONFEDERATE REPUBLIC, and their constitution prevents the differences that neighbourhood occasions, extinguishing that secret jealousy, which disposes all states to aggrandize themselves at the expense of their neighbours.” This passage, at the same time, points out the EVIL and suggests the REMEDY.
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PUBLIUS (ALEXANDER HAMILTON)

Federalist No. 9

ESSAY

November 21, 1787

The Independent Journal | New York City, New York

BACKGROUND

Publius (Alexander Hamilton) argues for the proposed Constitution by explaining the new understandings in political philosophy that informed its creation.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What was the problem with disunited republics of the past?

2. What are the five key elements of the advanced understanding of politics?

3. How does Publius respond to Anti-Federalist arguments claiming that Montesquieu rejected large republics?

4. According to Publius, does Montesquieu support a federal government intervening in the affairs of the states?

The Union as a Safeguard Against Domestic Faction and Insurrection

A firm Union will be of the utmost moment to the peace and liberty of the States, as a barrier against domestic faction and insurrection. It is impossible to read the history of the petty republics of Greece and Italy without feeling sensations of horror and disgust at the distractions with which they were continually agitated, and at the rapid succession of revolutions by which they were kept in a state of perpetual vibration between the extremes of tyranny and anarchy. If they exhibit occasional calms, these only serve as short-lived contrast to the furious storms that are to succeed. If now and then intervals of felicity open to view, we behold them with a mixture of regret, arising from the reflection that the pleasing scenes before us are soon to be overwhelmed by the tempestuous waves of sedition and party rage. If momentary rays of glory break forth from the gloom, while they dazzle us with a transient and fleeting brilliancy, they at the same time admonish us to lament that the vices of government should pervert the direction and tarnish the lustre of those bright talents and exalted endowments for which the favored soils that produced them have been so justly celebrated.

From the disorders that disfigure the annals of those republics the advocates of despotism have drawn arguments, not only against the forms of republican government, but against the very principles of civil liberty. They have decried all free government as inconsistent with the order of society, and have indulged themselves in malicious exultation over its friends and partisans. Happily for mankind, stupendous fabrics reared on the basis of liberty, which have flourished for ages, have, in a few glorious instances, refuted their gloomy sophisms. And, I trust, America will be the broad and solid foundation of other edifices, not less magnificent, which will be equally permanent monuments of their errors.

But it is not to be denied that the portraits they have sketched of republican government were too just copies of the originals from which they were taken. If it had been found impracticable to have devised models of a more perfect structure, the enlightened friends to liberty would have been obliged to abandon the cause of that species of government as
indefensible. The science of politics, however, like most other sciences, has received great improvement. The efficacy of various principles is now well understood, which were either not known at all, or imperfectly known to the ancients. The regular distribution of power into distinct departments; the introduction of legislative balances and checks; the institution of courts composed of judges holding their offices during good behavior; the representation of the people in the legislature by deputies of their own election: these are wholly new discoveries, or have made their principal progress towards perfection in modern times. They are means, and powerful means, by which the excellences of republican government may be retained and its imperfections lessened or avoided. To this catalogue of circumstances that tend to the amelioration of popular systems of civil government, I shall venture, however novel it may appear to some, to add one more, on a principle which has been made the foundation of an objection to the new Constitution; I mean the ENLARGEMENT of the ORBIT within which such systems are to revolve, either in respect to the dimensions of a single State or to the consolidation of several smaller States into one great Confederacy. The latter is that which immediately concerns the object under consideration. It will, however, be of use to examine the principle in its application to a single State, which shall be attended to in another place.

The utility of a Confederacy, as well to suppress faction and to guard the internal tranquility of States, as to increase their external force and security, is in reality not a new idea. It has been practiced upon in different countries and ages, and has received the sanction of the most approved writers on the subject of politics. The opponents of the PLAN proposed have, with great assiduity, cited and circulated the observations of Montesquieu on the necessity of a contracted territory for a republican government. But they seem not to have been apprised of the sentiments of that great man expressed in another part of his work, nor to have adverted to the consequences of the principle to which they subscribe with such ready acquiescence.
When Montesquieu recommends a small extent for republics, the standards he had in view were of dimensions far short of the limits of almost every one of these States. Neither Virginia, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New York, North Carolina, nor Georgia can by any means be compared with the models from which he reasoned and to which the terms of his description apply. If we therefore take his ideas on this point as the criterion of truth, we shall be driven to the alternative either of taking refuge at once in the arms of monarchy, or of splitting ourselves into an infinity of little, jealous, clashing, tumultuous commonwealths, the wretched nurseries of unceasing discord, and the miserable objects of universal pity or contempt. Some of the writers who have come forward on the other side of the question seem to have been aware of the dilemma; and have even been bold enough to hint at the division of the larger States as a desirable thing. Such an infatuated policy, such a desperate expedient, might, by the multiplication of petty offices, answer the views of men who possess not qualifications to extend their influence beyond the narrow circles of personal intrigue, but it could never promote the greatness or happiness of the people of America.

Referring the examination of the principle itself to another place, as has been already mentioned, it will be sufficient to remark here that, in the sense of the author who has been most emphatically quoted upon the occasion, it would only dictate a reduction of the size of the more considerable members of the Union, but would not militate against their being all comprehended in one confederate government. And this is the true question, in the discussion of which we are at present interested.

So far are the suggestions of Montesquieu from standing in opposition to a general Union of the States, that he explicitly treats of a confederate republic as the expedient for extending the sphere of popular government, and reconciling the advantages of monarchy with those of republicanism.

"It is very probable," (says he) "that mankind would have been obliged at length to live constantly under the government of a single person, had they not contrived a kind of
constitution that has all the internal advantages of a republican, together with the external force of a monarchical government. I mean a CONFEDERATE REPUBLIC.

"This form of government is a convention by which several smaller states agree to become members of a larger one, which they intend to form. It is a kind of assemblage of societies that constitute a new one, capable of increasing, by means of new associations, till they arrive to such a degree of power as to be able to provide for the security of the united body.

"A republic of this kind, able to withstand an external force, may support itself without any internal corruptions. The form of this society prevents all manner of inconveniences.

"If a single member should attempt to usurp the supreme authority, he could not be supposed to have an equal authority and credit in all the confederate states. Were he to have too great influence over one, this would alarm the rest. Were he to subdue a part, that which would still remain free might oppose him with forces independent of those which he had usurped and overpower him before he could be settled in his usurpation.

"Should a popular insurrection happen in one of the confederate states the others are able to quell it. Should abuses creep into one part, they are reformed by those that remain sound. The state may be destroyed on one side, and not on the other; the confederacy may be dissolved, and the confederates preserve their sovereignty.

"As this government is composed of small republics, it enjoys the internal happiness of each; and with respect to its external situation, it is possessed, by means of the association, of all the advantages of large monarchies."

I have thought it proper to quote at length these interesting passages, because they contain a luminous abridgment of the principal arguments in favor of the Union, and must effectually remove the false impressions which a misapplication of other parts of the work was calculated to make. They have, at the same time, an intimate connection with the more
immediate design of this paper; which is, to illustrate the tendency of the Union to repress domestic faction and insurrection.

A distinction, more subtle than accurate, has been raised between a *confederacy* and a *consolidation* of the States. The essential characteristic of the first is said to be, the restriction of its authority to the members in their collective capacities, without reaching to the individuals of whom they are composed. It is contended that the national council ought to have no concern with any object of internal administration. An exact equality of suffrage between the members has also been insisted upon as a leading feature of a confederate government. These positions are, in the main, arbitrary; they are supported neither by principle nor precedent. It has indeed happened, that governments of this kind have generally operated in the manner which the distinction taken notice of, supposes to be inherent in their nature; but there have been in most of them extensive exceptions to the practice, which serve to prove, as far as example will go, that there is no absolute rule on the subject. And it will be clearly shown in the course of this investigation that as far as the principle contended for has prevailed, it has been the cause of incurable disorder and imbecility in the government.

The definition of a *confederate republic* seems simply to be "an assemblage of societies," or an association of two or more states into one state. The extent, modifications, and objects of the federal authority are mere matters of discretion. So long as the separate organization of the members be not abolished; so long as it exists, by a constitutional necessity, for local purposes; though it should be in perfect subordination to the general authority of the union, it would still be, in fact and in theory, an association of states, or a confederacy. The proposed Constitution, so far from implying an abolition of the State governments, makes them constituent parts of the national sovereignty, by allowing them a direct representation in the Senate, and leaves in their possession certain exclusive and very important portions of sovereign power. This fully corresponds, in every rational import of the terms, with the idea of a federal government.
In the Lycian confederacy, which consisted of twenty-three CITIES or republics, the largest were entitled to *three* votes in the COMMON COUNCIL, those of the middle class to *two*, and the smallest to *one*. The COMMON COUNCIL had the appointment of all the judges and magistrates of the respective CITIES. This was certainly the most, delicate species of interference in their internal administration; for if there be any thing that seems exclusively appropriated to the local jurisdictions, it is the appointment of their own officers. Yet Montesquieu, speaking of this association, says: "Were I to give a model of an excellent Confederate Republic, it would be that of Lycia." Thus we perceive that the distinctions insisted upon were not within the contemplation of this enlightened civilian; and we shall be led to conclude, that they are the novel refinements of an erroneous theory.
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BACKGROUND

Publius (James Madison) argues for the proposed Constitution by explaining the risks of factions and majority tyranny and how the Constitution addresses them.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. How does Madison define faction?
2. How is faction part of human nature?
3. Can the problem of faction be solved by removing the causes of faction?
4. Is it practicable to make all people of one mind? How are opinions and passions related to the problem of faction?
5. What is the first task of government?
6. Since the causes of faction cannot be removed, what must be controlled?
7. How is minority faction solved?
8. What is the solution for majority faction?
9. What is the role of elected representatives in solving the problem of faction?
10. How does a large republic address the problem of majority faction?
11. What are the concerns of a republic being too large or too small?

The Union as a Safeguard Against Domestic Faction and Insurrection

Among the numerous advantages promised by a well-constructed Union, none deserves to be more accurately developed than its tendency to break and control the violence of faction. The friend of popular governments never finds himself so much alarmed for their character and fate as when he contemplates their propensity to this dangerous vice. He will not fail, therefore, to set a due value on any plan which, without violating the principles to which he is attached, provides a proper cure for it. The instability, injustice, and confusion introduced into the public councils have, in truth, been the mortal diseases under which popular governments have everywhere perished, as they continue to be the favorite and fruitful topics from which the adversaries to liberty derive their most specious declamations. The valuable improvements made by the American constitutions on the popular models, both ancient and modern, cannot certainly be too much admired; but it would be an unwarrantable partiality to contend that they have as effectually obviated the danger on this side, as was wished and expected. Complaints are everywhere heard from our most considerate and virtuous citizens, equally the friends of public and private faith and of public and personal liberty, that our governments are too unstable, that the public good is disregarded in the conflicts of rival parties, and that measures are too often decided, not according to the rules of justice and the rights of the minor party, but by the superior force of an interested and overbearing majority. However anxiously we may wish that these complaints had no foundation, the evidence of known facts will not permit us to deny that they are in some degree true. It will be found, indeed, on a candid review of our situation, that some of the distresses under which we labor have been erroneously charged on the operation of our governments; but it will be found, at the same time, that other causes will not alone account for many of our heaviest misfortunes; and, particularly, for that prevailing and increasing distrust of public engagements and alarm for private rights which are echoed from one end of the continent to the other. These must be chiefly, if not wholly, effects of the unsteadiness and injustice with which a factious spirit has tainted our public administration.
By a faction I understand a number of citizens, whether amounting to a majority or minority of the whole, who are united and actuated by some common impulse of passion, or of interest, adverse to the rights of other citizens, or to the permanent and aggregate interests of the community.

There are two methods of curing the mischiefs of faction: the one, by removing its causes; the other, by controlling its effects.

There are again two methods of removing the causes of faction: the one, by destroying the liberty which is essential to its existence; the other, by giving to every citizen the same opinions, the same passions, and the same interests.

It could never be more truly said than of the first remedy that it was worse than the disease. Liberty is to faction what air is to fire, an aliment without which it instantly expires. But it could not be a less folly to abolish liberty, which is essential to political life, because it nourishes faction than it would be to wish the annihilation of air, which is essential to animal life, because it imparts to fire its destructive agency.

The second expedient is as impracticable as the first would be unwise. As long as the reason of man continues fallible, and he is at liberty to exercise it, different opinions will be formed. As long as the connection subsists between his reason and his self-love, his opinions and his passions will have a reciprocal influence on each other; and the former will be objects to which the latter will attach themselves. The diversity in the faculties of men, from which the rights of property originate, is not less an insuperable obstacle to a uniformity of interests. The protection of these faculties is the first object of government. From the protection of different and unequal faculties of acquiring property, the possession of different degrees and kinds of property immediately results; and from the influence of these on the sentiments and views of the respective proprietors ensues a division of the society into different interests and parties.
The latent causes of faction are thus sown in the nature of man; and we see them everywhere brought into different degrees of activity, according to the different circumstances of civil society. A zeal for different opinions concerning religion, concerning government, and many other points, as well as speculation as of practice; an attachment to different leaders ambitiously contending for preeminence and power; or to persons of other descriptions whose fortunes have been interesting to the human passions, have, in turn, divided mankind into parties, inflamed them with mutual animosity, and rendered them much more disposed to vex and oppress each other than to cooperate for their common good. So strong is this propensity of mankind to fall into mutual animosities that where no substantial occasion presents itself the most frivolous and fanciful distinctions have been sufficient to kindle their unfriendly passions and excite their most violent conflicts. But the most common and durable source of factions has been the various and unequal distribution of property. Those who hold and those who are without property have ever formed distinct interests in society. Those who are creditors, and those who are debtors, fall under a like discrimination. A landed interest, a manufacturing interest, a mercantile interest, a moneyed interest, with many lesser interests, grow up of necessity in civilized nations, and divide them into different classes, actuated by different sentiments and views. The regulation of these various and interfering interests forms the principal task of modern legislation and involves the spirit of party and faction in the necessary and ordinary operations of government.

No man is allowed to be a judge in his own cause because his interest would certainly bias his judgment, and, not improbably, corrupt his integrity. With equal, nay with greater reason, a body of men are unfit to be both judges and parties at the same time; yet what are many of the most important acts of legislation but so many judicial determinations, not indeed concerning the rights of single persons, but concerning the rights of large bodies of citizens? And what are the different classes of legislators but advocates and parties to the causes which they determine? Is a law proposed concerning private debts? It is a question to which the creditors are parties on one side and the debtors on the other. Justice ought to hold the balance between them. Yet the parties are, and must be, themselves the judges;
and the most numerous party, or in other words, the most powerful faction must be expected to prevail. Shall domestic manufactures be encouraged, and in what degree, by restrictions on foreign manufactures? Are questions which would be differently decided by the landed and the manufacturing classes, and probably by neither with a sole regard to justice and the public good. The apportionment of taxes on the various descriptions of property is an act which seems to require the most exact impartiality; yet there is, perhaps, no legislative act in which greater opportunity and temptation are given to a predominant party to trample on the rules of justice. Every shilling with which they overburden the inferior number is a shilling saved to their own pockets.

It is in vain to say that enlightened statesmen will be able to adjust these clashing interests and render them all subservient to the public good. Enlightened statesmen will not always be at the helm. Nor, in many cases, can such an adjustment be made at all without taking into view indirect and remote considerations, which will rarely prevail over the immediate interest which one party may find in disregarding the rights of another or the good of the whole.

The inference to which we are brought is that the causes of faction cannot be removed and that relief is only to be sought in the means of controlling its effects.

If a faction consists of less than a majority, relief is supplied by the republican principle, which enables the majority to defeat its sinister views by regular vote. It may clog the administration, it may convulse the society; but it will be unable to execute and mask its violence under the forms of the Constitution. When a majority is included in a faction, the form of popular government, on the other hand, enables it to sacrifice to its ruling passion or interest both the public good and the rights of other citizens. To secure the public good and private rights against the danger of such a faction, and at the same time to preserve the spirit and the form of popular government, is then the great object to which our inquiries
are directed. Let me add that it is the great desideratum by which alone this form of gov-
ernment can be rescued from the opprobrium under which it has so long labored and be recommended to the esteem and adoption of mankind.

By what means is this object attainable? Evidently by one of two only. Either the existence of the same passion or interest in a majority at the same time must be prevented, or the majority, having such coexistent passion or interest, must be rendered, by their number and local situation, unable to concert and carry into effect schemes of oppression. If the impulse and the opportunity be suffered to coincide, we well know that neither moral nor religious motives can be relied on as an adequate control. They are not found to be such on the injustice and violence of individuals, and lose their efficacy in proportion to the number combined together, that is, in proportion as their efficacy becomes needful.

From this view of the subject it may be concluded that a pure democracy, by which I mean a society consisting of a small number of citizens, who assemble and administer the government in person, can admit of no cure for the mischiefs of faction. A common passion or interest will, in almost every case, be felt by a majority of the whole; a communication and concert result from the form of government itself; and there is nothing to check the inducements to sacrifice the weaker party or an obnoxious individual. Hence it is that such democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention; have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property; and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths. Theoretic politicians, who have patronized this species of government, have erroneously supposed that by reducing mankind to a perfect equality in their political rights, they would at the same time be perfectly equalized and assimilated in their possessions, their opinions, and their passions.

A republic, by which I mean a government in which the scheme of representation takes place, opens a different prospect and promises the cure for which we are seeking. Let us examine the points in which it varies from pure democracy, and we shall comprehend both the nature of the cure and the efficacy which it must derive from the Union.
The two great points of difference between a democracy and a republic are: first, the delegation of the government, in the latter, to a small number of citizens elected by the rest; secondly, the greater number of citizens and greater sphere of country over which the latter may be extended.

The effect of the first difference is, on the one hand, to refine and enlarge the public views by passing them through the medium of a chosen body of citizens, whose wisdom may best discern the true interest of their country and whose patriotism and love of justice will be least likely to sacrifice it to temporary or partial considerations. Under such a regulation it may well happen that the public voice, pronounced by the representatives of the people, will be more consonant to the public good than if pronounced by the people themselves, convened for the purpose. On the other hand, the effect may be inverted. Men of factious tempers, of local prejudices, or of sinister designs, may, by intrigue, by corruption, or by other means, first obtain the suffrages, and then betray the interests of the people. The question resulting is, whether small or extensive republics are most favorable to the election of proper guardians of the public weal; and it is clearly decided in favor of the latter by two obvious considerations.

In the first place it is to be remarked that however small the republic may be the representatives must be raised to a certain number in order to guard against the cabals of a few; and that however large it may be they must be limited to a certain number in order to guard against the confusion of a multitude. Hence, the number of representatives in the two cases not being in proportion to that of the two constituents, and being proportionally greatest in the small republic, it follows that if the proportion of fit characters be not less in the large than in the small republic, the former will present a greater option, and consequently a greater probability of a fit choice.

In the next place, as each representative will be chosen by a greater number of citizens in the large than in the small republic, it will be more difficult for unworthy candidates to
practise with success the vicious arts by which elections are too often carried; and the suf-frages of the people being more free, will be more likely to center on men who possess the most attractive merit and the most diffusive and established characters.

It must be confessed that in this, as in most other cases, there is a mean, on both sides of which inconveniences will be found to lie. By enlarging too much the number of electors, you render the representative too little acquainted with all their local circumstances and lesser interests; as by reducing it too much, you render him unduly attached to these, and too little fit to comprehend and pursue great and national objects. The federal Constitution forms a happy combination in this respect; the great and aggregate interests being referred to the national, the local and particular to the State legislatures.

The other point of difference is the greater number of citizens and extent of territory which may be brought within the compass of republican than of democratic government; and it is this circumstance principally which renders factious combinations less to be dreaded in the former than in the latter. The smaller the society, the fewer probably will be the distinct parties and interests composing it; the fewer the distinct parties and interests, the more frequently will a majority be found of the same party; and the smaller the number of individuals composing a majority, and the smaller the compass within which they are placed, the more easily will they concert and execute their plans of oppression. Extend the sphere and you take in a greater variety of parties and interests; you make it less probable that a majority of the whole will have a common motive to invade the rights of other citizens; or if such a common motive exists, it will be more difficult for all who feel it to discover their own strength and to act in unison with each other. Besides other impediments, it may be remarked that, where there is a consciousness of unjust or dishonorable purposes, communication is always checked by distrust in proportion to the number whose concurrence is necessary.

Hence, it clearly appears that the same advantage which a republic has over a democracy in controlling the effects of faction is enjoyed by a large over a small republic—is enjoyed
by the Union over the States composing it. Does this advantage consist in the substitution of representatives whose enlightened views and virtuous sentiments render them superior to local prejudices and to schemes of injustice? It will not be denied that the representation of the Union will be most likely to possess these requisite endowments. Does it consist in the greater security afforded by a greater variety of parties, against the event of any one party being able to outnumber and oppress the rest? In an equal degree, does the increased variety of parties comprised within the Union increase this security? Does it, in fine, consist in the greater obstacles opposed to the concert and accomplishment of the secret wishes of an unjust and interested majority? Here again the extent of the Union gives it the most palpable advantage.

The influence of factious leaders may kindle a flame within their particular States but will be unable to spread a general conflagration through the other States. A religious sect may degenerate into a political faction in a part of the Confederacy; but the variety of sects dispersed over the entire face of it must secure the national councils against any danger from that source. A rage for paper money, for an abolition of debts, for an equal division of property, or for any other improper or wicked project, will be less apt to pervade the whole body of the Union than a particular member of it, in the same proportion as such a malady is more likely to taint a particular county or district than an entire State.

In the extent and proper structure of the Union, therefore, we behold a republican remedy for the diseases most incident to republican government. And according to the degree of pleasure and pride we feel in being republicans ought to be our zeal in cherishing the spirit and supporting the character of federalists.
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ESSAY

December 18, 1787

The New-York Packet | New York City, New York

BACKGROUND

Publius (Alexander Hamilton) argues for the proposed Constitution by explaining how the new government will have the energy necessary to function better than the Articles of Confederation.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What are the objects of the federal government?
2. What are the principal purposes of the Union?
3. What does it mean to say that the powers granted by the Constitution to the federal government are enumerated but limitless?
4. Did the Articles of Confederation give the government an adequate means to enforce its authority? Why or why not?
5. What does Hamilton believe is the strongest argument for an energetic government?

---

The necessity of a constitution, at least equally energetic with the one proposed, to the preservation of the union, is the point, at the examination of which we are now arrived.

This inquiry will naturally divide itself into three branches. The objects to be provided for by a federal government: the quantity of power necessary to the accomplishment of those objects: the persons upon whom that power ought to operate. Its distribution and organization will more properly claim our attention under the succeeding head.

The principal purposes to be answered by union, are these: the common defence of the members; the preservation of the public peace, as well against internal convulsions as external attacks; the regulation of commerce with other nations, and between the states; the superintendence of our intercourse, political and commercial, with foreign countries.

The authorities essential to the care of the common defence, are these: to raise armies; to build and equip fleets; to prescribe rules for the government of both; to direct their operations; to provide for their support. These powers ought to exist without limitation; because it is impossible to foresee or to define the extent and variety of national exigencies, and the correspondent extent and variety of the means which may be necessary to satisfy them. The circumstances that endanger the safety of nations are infinite; and for this reason, no constitutional shackles can wisely be imposed on the power to which the care of it is committed. This power ought to be co-extensive with all the possible combinations of such circumstances; and ought to be under the direction of the same councils which are appointed to preside over the common defence.

This is one of those truths which, to a correct and unprejudiced mind, carries its own evidence along with it; and may be obscured, but cannot be made plainer by argument or reasoning. It rests upon axioms, as simple as they are universal . . . the means ought to be proportioned to the end; the persons from whose agency the attainment of any end is expected, ought to possess the means by which it is to be attained.
Whether there ought to be a federal government intrusted with the care of the common 5
defence, is a question, in the first instance, open to discussion; but the moment it is decided in
the affirmative, it will follow, that, that government ought to be clothed with all the pow-
ers requisite to the complete execution of its trust. And unless it can be shown, that the
circumstances which may affect the public safety, are reducible within certain determinate 10
limits: unless the contrary of this position can be fairly and rationally disputed, it must be
admitted as a necessary consequence, that there can be no limitation of that authority, 15
which is to provide for the defence and protection of the community, in any matter essen-
tial to its efficacy; that is, in any matter essential to the formation, direction, or support of
the NATIONAL FORCES.

Defective as the present confederation has been proved to be, this principle appears to have
been fully recognized by the framers of it; though they have not made proper or adequate 20
provision for its exercise. Congress have an unlimited discretion to make requisitions of
men and money; to govern the army and navy; to direct their operations. As their requisi-
tions are made constitutionally binding upon the states, who are in fact under the most 25
solemn obligations to furnish the supplies required of them, the intention evidently was,
that the United States should command whatever resources were by them judged requisite
to the “common defence and general welfare.” It was presumed, that a sense of their true
interests, and a regard to the dictates of good faith, would be found sufficient pledges for
the punctual performance of the duty of the members to the federal head.

The experiment has however demonstrated, that this expectation was ill founded and illu-
sory; and the observations made under the last head will, I imagine, have sufficed to con-
vince the impartial and discerning, that there is an absolute necessity for an entire change in
the first principles of the system. That if we are in earnest about giving the union energy 30
and duration, we must abandon the vain project of legislating upon the states in their col-
lective capacities; we must extend the laws of the federal government to the individual cit-
izens of America; we must discard the fallacious scheme of quotas and requisitions, as
equally impracticable and unjust. The result from all this is, that the union ought to be
invested with full power to levy troops; to build and equip fleets; and to raise the revenues
which will be required for the formation and support of an army and navy, in the customary and ordinary modes practised in other governments.

If the circumstances of our country are such as to demand a compound, instead of a simple . . . a confederate, instead of a sole government, the essential point which will remain to be adjusted, will be to discriminate the OBJECTS, as far as it can be done, which shall appertain to the different provinces or departments of power: allowing to each the most ample authority for fulfilling THOSE which may be committed to its charge. Shall the union be constituted the guardian of the common safety? Are fleets, and armies, and revenues, necessary to this purpose? The government of the union must be empowered to pass all laws, and to make all regulations which have relation to them. The same must be the case in respect to commerce, and to every other matter to which its jurisdiction is permitted to extend. Is the administration of justice between the citizens of the same state, the proper department of the local governments? These must possess all the authorities which are connected with this object, and with every other that may be allotted to their particular cognizance and direction. Not to confer in each case a degree of power commensurate to the end, would be to violate the most obvious rules of prudence and propriety, and improvidently to trust the great interests of the nation to hands which are disabled from managing them with vigour and success.

Who so likely to make suitable provisions for the public defence, as that body to which the guardianship of the public safety is confided? Which, as the centre of information, will best understand the extent and urgency of the dangers that threaten; as the representative of the WHOLE, will feel itself most deeply interested in the preservation of every part; which, from the responsibility implied in the duty assigned to it, will be most sensibly impressed with the necessity of proper exactions; and which, by the extension of its authority throughout the states, can alone establish uniformity and concert in the plans and measures, by which the common safety is to be secured? Is there not a manifest inconsistency in devolving upon the federal government the care of the general defence, and leaving in the state governments the effective powers, by which it is to be provided for? Is not a want of cooperation the infallible consequence of such a system? And will not weakness, disorder, an
undue distribution of the burthens and calamities of war, an unnecessary and intolerable increase of expense, be its natural and inevitable concomitants? Have we not had unequivocal experience of its effects in the course of the revolution which we have just achieved?

Every view we may take of the subject, as candid inquirers after truth, will serve to convince us, that it is both unwise and dangerous to deny the federal government an unconfined authority, in respect to all those objects which are intrusted to its management. It will indeed deserve the most vigilant and careful attention of the people, to see that it be modelled in such a manner as to admit of its being safely vested with the requisite powers. If any plan which has been, or may be, offered to our consideration, should not, upon a dispassionate inspection, be found to answer this description it ought to be rejected. A government, the constitution of which renders it unfit to be intrusted with all the powers which a free people ought to delegate to any government, would be an unsafe and improper depository of the NATIONAL INTERESTS. Wherever THESE can with propriety be confided, the coincident powers may safely accompany them. This is the true result of all just reasoning upon the subject. And the adversaries of the plan promulgated by the convention, would have given a better impression of their candour, if they had confined themselves to showing, that the internal structure of the proposed government was such as to render it unworthy of the confidence of the people. They ought not to have wandered into inflammatory declamations and unmeaning cavils, about the extent of the powers. The POWERS are not too extensive for the OBJECTS of federal administration, or, in other words, for the management of our NATIONAL INTERESTS; nor can any satisfactory argument be framed to show that they are chargeable with such an excess. If it be true, as has been insinuated by some of the writers on the other side, that the difficulty arises from the nature of the thing, and that the extent of the country will not permit us to form a government in which such ample powers can safely be reposed, it would prove that we ought to contract our views, and resort to the expedient of separate confederacies, which will move within more practicable spheres. For the absurdity must continually stare us in the face, of confiding to a government the direction of the most essential national concerns, without daring to trust it with the authorities.
which are indispensable to their proper and efficient management. Let us not attempt to reconcile contradictions, but firmly embrace a rational alternative.

I trust, however, that the impracticability of one general system cannot be shown. I am greatly mistaken, if any thing of weight has yet been advanced of this tendency; and I flatter myself, that the observations which have been made in the course of these papers, have served to place the reverse of that position in as clear a light as any matter, still in the womb of time and experience, is susceptible of. This, at all events, must be evident, that the very difficulty itself, drawn from the extent of the country, is the strongest argument in favour of an energetic government; for any other can certainly never preserve the union of so large an empire. If we embrace, as the standard of our political creed, the tenets of those who oppose the adoption of the proposed constitution, we cannot fail to verify the gloomy doctrines, which predict the impracticability of a national system, pervading the entire limits of the present confederacy.

Publius
Publius (James Madison)

Federalist No. 37

ESSAY EXCERPT

January 11, 1788

Daily Advertiser | New York City, New York

BACKGROUND

Publius (James Madison) argues for the proposed Constitution by explaining the arduous task of the convention but also the confidence Americans should have in light of the ease with which the delegates arrived at a consensus structure of government.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What are some of the difficulties the convention encountered in producing the Constitution?

2. Were there difficulties in delineating the different branches of government?

3. Did different states have different interests they wanted to pursue? What were some of these differences?

4. What facets to human nature made the task difficult?

5. Does Madison believe their work was in some way divinely guided?

---

Concerning The Difficulties Which The Convention Must Have Experienced In The Formation Of A Proper Plan

...With equal readiness will it be perceived, that besides these inducements to candour, many allowances ought to be made, for the difficulties inherent in the very nature of the undertaking referred to the convention.

The novelty of the undertaking immediately strikes us. It has been shown in the course of these papers, that the existing confederation is founded on principles which are fallacious; that we must consequently change this first foundation, and with it, the superstructure resting upon it. It has been shown, that the other confederacies which could be consulted as precedents, have been vitiated by the same erroneous principles, and can therefore furnish no other light than that of beacons, which give warning of the course to be shunned, without pointing out that which ought to be pursued. The most that the convention could do in such a situation, was to avoid the errors suggested by the past experience of other countries, as well as of our own; and to provide a convenient mode of rectifying their own errors as future experience may unfold them.

Among the difficulties encountered by the convention, a very important one must have lain, in combining the requisite stability and energy in government, with the inviolable attention due to liberty, and to the republican form. Without substantially accomplishing this part of their undertaking, they would have very imperfectly fulfilled the object of their appointment, or the expectation of the public: yet, that it could not be easily accomplished, will be denied by no one who is unwilling to betray his ignorance of the subject. Energy in government, is essential to that security against external and internal danger, and to that prompt and salutary execution of the laws, which enter into the very definition of good government. Stability in government, is essential to national character, and to the advantages annexed to it, as well as to that repose and confidence in the minds of the people, which are among the chief blessings of civil society. An irregular and mutable legislation is not more an evil in itself, than it is odious to the people; and it may be pronounced with assurance, that the people of this country, enlightened as they are, with regard to the nature,
and interested, as the great body of them are, in the effects of good government, will never be satisfied, till some remedy be applied to the vicissitudes and uncertainties, which characterize the state administrations. On comparing, however, these valuable ingredients with the vital principles of liberty, we must perceive at once, the difficulty of mingling them together in their due proportions. The genius of republican liberty, seems to demand on one side, not only that all power should be derived from the people; but, that those intrusted with it should be kept in dependence on the people, by a short duration of their appointments; and that, even during this short period, the trust should be placed not in a few, but in a number of hands. Stability, on the contrary, requires, that the hands, in which power is lodged, should continue for a length of time the same. A frequent change of men will result from a frequent return of electors; and a frequent change of measures, from a frequent change of men: whilst energy in government requires not only a certain duration of power, but the execution of it by a single hand. . . .

When we pass from the works of nature, in which all the delineations are perfectly accurate, and appear to be otherwise only from the imperfection of the eye which surveys them, to the institutions of man, in which the obscurity arises as well from the object itself, as from the organ by which it is contemplated; we must perceive the necessity of moderating still further our expectations and hopes from the efforts of human sagacity. Experience has instructed us, that no skill in the science of government has yet been able to discriminate and define, with sufficient certainty, its three great provinces, the legislative, executive, and judiciary; or even the privileges and powers of the different legislative branches. Questions daily occur in the course of practice, which prove the obscurity which reigns in these subjects, and which puzzle the greatest adepts in political science.

The experience of ages, with the continued and combined labours of the most enlightened legislators and jurists, have been equally unsuccessful in delineating the several objects and limits of different codes of laws, and different tribunals of justice. The precise extent of the common law, the statute law, the maritime law, the ecclesiastical law, the law of corporations, and other local laws and customs, remain still to be clearly and finally established in
Great Britain, where accuracy in such subjects has been more industriously pursued than in any other part of the world.

Here then are three sources of vague and incorrect definitions; indistinctness of the object, imperfection of the organ of perception, inadequateness of the vehicle of ideas. Any one of these must produce a certain degree of obscurity. The convention, in delineating the boundary between the federal and state jurisdictions, must have experienced the full effect of them all.

To the difficulties already mentioned, may be added the interfering pretensions of the larger and smaller states. We cannot err, in supposing that the former would contend for a participation in the government, fully proportioned to their superior wealth and importance; and that the latter would not be less tenacious of the equality at present enjoyed by them.

Would it be wonderful if, under the pressure of all these difficulties, the convention should have been forced into some deviations from that artificial structure and regular symmetry, which an abstract view of the subject might lead an ingenious theorist to bestow on a constitution planned in his closet, or in his imagination? The real wonder is, that so many difficulties should have been surmounted; and surmounted with an unanimity almost as unprecedented, as it must have been unexpected. It is impossible for any man of candour to reflect on this circumstance, without partaking of the astonishment. It is impossible, for the man of pious reflection, not to perceive in it a finger of that Almighty Hand, which has been so frequently and signally extended to our relief in the critical stages of the revolution.

We had occasion in a former paper, to take notice of the repeated trials which have been unsuccessfully made in the United Netherlands, for reforming the baneful and notorious vices of their constitution. The history of almost all the great councils and consultations, held among mankind for reconciling their discordant opinions, assuaging their mutual jealousies, and adjusting their respective interests, is a history of factions, contentions, and disappointments; and may be classed among the most dark and degrading pictures, which
display the infirmities and depravities of the human character. If, in a few scattered instances, a brighter aspect is presented, they serve only as exceptions to admonish us of the general truth; and by their lustre to darken the gloom of the adverse prospect to which they are contrasted. In revolving the causes from which these exceptions result, and applying them to the particular instance before us, we are necessarily led to two important conclusions. The first is, that the convention must have enjoyed in a very singular degree, an exemption from the pestilential influence of party animosities; the diseases most incident to deliberative bodies, and most apt to contaminate their proceedings. The second conclusion is, that all the deputations composing the convention, were either satisfactorily accommodated by the final act; or were induced to accede to it, by a deep conviction of the necessity of sacrificing private opinions and partial interests to the public good; and by a despair of seeing this necessity diminished by delays or by new experiments.

Publius
Publius (James Madison)  
Federalist No. 39  
ESSAY  
January 16, 1788  
The Independent Journal | New York City, New York

BACKGROUND

Publius (James Madison) argues for the proposed Constitution by noting that the proposed Constitution is compatible with a republican form of government and that it contains both federal and national elements to its arrangement of power.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. How does Madison define a republican form of government?

2. How is the election of the members of the three branches of government consistent with the principles of republicanism defined by Madison?

3. How are the different branches set up to be both national and federal in character? Explain each one.

4. How is Madison using the terms "national" and "federal"?

5. What historical examples does Madison use to support his points?

Federalist No. 39
James Madison

The Conformity Of The Plan To Republican Principles

The last paper having concluded the observations, which were meant to introduce a candid survey of the plan of government reported by the convention, we now proceed to the execution of that part of our undertaking.

The first question that offers itself is, whether the general form and aspect of the government be strictly republican? It is evident that no other form would be reconcileable with the genius of the people of America; with the fundamental principles of the revolution; or with that honourable determination which animates every votary of freedom, to rest all our political experiments on the capacity of mankind for self-government. If the plan of the convention, therefore, be found to depart from the republican character, its advocates must abandon it as no longer defensible.

What then are the distinctive characters of the republican form? Were an answer to this question to be sought, not by recurring to principles, but in the application of the term by political writers, to the constitutions of different states, no satisfactory one would ever be found. Holland, in which no particle of the supreme authority is derived from the people, has passed almost universally under the denomination of a republic. The same title has been bestowed on Venice, where absolute power over the great body of the people is exercised, in the most absolute manner, by a small body of hereditary nobles. Poland, which is a mixture of aristocracy and of monarchy in their worst forms, has been dignified with the same appellation. The government of England, which has one republican branch only, combined with a hereditary aristocracy and monarchy, has, with equal impropriety, been frequently placed on the list of republics. These examples, which are nearly as dissimilar to each other as to a genuine republic, show the extreme inaccuracy with which the term has been used in political disquisitions.

If we resort for a criterion, to the different principles on which different forms of government are established, we may define a republic to be, or at least may bestow that name on, a government which derives all its powers directly or indirectly from the great body of the people; and is administered by persons holding their offices during pleasure, for a limited
period, or during good behaviour. It is essential to such a government, that it be derived from the great body of the society, not from an inconsiderable proportion, or a favoured class of it; otherwise a handful of tyrannical nobles, exercising their oppressions by a delegation of their powers, might aspire to the rank of republicans, and claim for their government the honourable title of republic. It is sufficient for such a government, that the persons administering it be appointed, either directly or indirectly, by the people; and that they hold their appointments by either of the tenures just specified; otherwise every government in the United States, as well as every other popular government that has been, or can be well organized or well executed, would be degraded from the republican character. According to the constitution of every state in the union, some or other of the officers of government are appointed indirectly only by the people. According to most of them, the chief magistrate himself is so appointed. And according to one, this mode of appointment is extended to one of the co-ordinate branches of the legislature. According to all the constitutions also, the tenure of the highest offices is extended to a definite period, and in many instances, both within the legislative and executive departments, to a period of years. According to the provisions of most of the constitutions, again, as well as according to the most respectable and received opinions on the subject, the members of the judiciary department are to retain their offices by the firm tenure of good behaviour.

On comparing the constitution planned by the convention, with the standard here fixed, we perceive at once, that it is, in the most rigid sense, conformable to it. The house of representatives, like that of one branch at least of all the state legislatures, is elected immediately by the great body of the people. The senate, like the present congress, and the senate of Maryland, derives its appointment indirectly from the people. The president is indirectly derived from the choice of the people, according to the example in most of the states. Even the judges, with all other officers of the union, will, as in the several states, be the choice, though a remote choice, of the people themselves. The duration of the appointments is equally conformable to the republican standard, and to the model of the state constitutions. The house of representatives is periodically elective, as in all the states; and for the period of two years, as in the state of South Carolina. The senate is elective, for the period of six
years; which is but one year more than the period of the senate of Maryland; and but two more than that of the senates of New York and Virginia. The president is to continue in office for the period of four years; as in New York and Delaware, the chief magistrate is elected for three years, and in South Carolina for two years. In the other states the election is annual. In several of the states, however, no explicit provision is made for the impeachment of the chief magistrate. And in Delaware and Virginia, he is not impeachable till out of office. The president of the United States is impeachable at any time during his continuance in office. The tenure by which the judges are to hold their places, is, as it unquestionably ought to be, that of good behaviour. The tenure of the ministerial offices generally, will be a subject of legal regulation, conformably to the reason of the case, and the example of the state constitutions.

Could any further proof be required of the republican complexion of this system, the most decisive one might be found in its absolute prohibition of titles of nobility, both under the federal and the state governments; and in its express guarantee of the republican form to each of the latter.

“But it was not sufficient,” say the adversaries of the proposed constitution, “for the convention to adhere to the republican form. They ought, with equal care, to have preserved the federal form, which regards the union as a confederacy of sovereign states; instead of which, they have framed a national government, which regards the union as a consolidation of the states.” And it is asked, by what authority this bold and radical innovation was undertaken? The handle which has been made of this objection requires, that it should be examined with some precision.

Without inquiring into the accuracy of the distinction on which the objection is founded, it will be necessary to a just estimate of its force, first, to ascertain the real character of the government in question; secondly, to inquire how far the convention were authorized to propose such a government; and thirdly, how far the duty they owed to their country, could supply any defect of regular authority.
First. In order to ascertain the real character of the government, it may be considered in relation to the foundation on which it is to be established; to the sources from which its ordinary powers are to be drawn; to the operation of those powers; to the extent of them; and to the authority by which future changes in the government are to be introduced.

On examining the first relation, it appears, on one hand, that the constitution is to be founded on the assent and ratification of the people of America, given by deputies elected for the special purpose; but on the other, that this assent and ratification is to be given by the people, not as individuals composing one entire nation, but as composing the distinct and independent states to which they respectively belong. It is to be the assent and ratification of the several states, derived from the supreme authority in each state . . . the authority of the people themselves. The act, therefore, establishing the constitution, will not be a national, but a federal act.

That it will be a federal, and not a national act, as these terms are understood by the objectors, the act of the people, as forming so many independent states, not as forming one aggregate nation, is obvious from this single consideration, that it is to result neither from the decision of a majority of the people of the union, nor from that of a majority of the states. It must result from the unanimous assent of the several states that are parties to it, differing no otherwise from their ordinary assent than in its being expressed, not by the legislative authority, but by that of the people themselves. Were the people regarded in this transaction as forming one nation, the will of the majority of the whole people of the United States would bind the minority; in the same manner as the majority in each state must bind the minority; and the will of the majority must be determined either by a comparison of the individual votes, or by considering the will of the majority of the states, as evidence of the will of a majority of the people of the United States. Neither of these rules has been adopted.

Each state, in ratifying the constitution, is considered as a sovereign body, independent of all others, and only to be bound by its own voluntary act. In this relation, then, the new constitution will, if established, be a federal, and not a national constitution.
The next relation is, to the sources from which the ordinary powers of government are to be derived. The house of representatives will derive its powers from the people of America, and the people will be represented in the same proportion, and on the same principle, as they are in the legislature of a particular state. So far the government is national, not federal.

The senate, on the other hand, will derive its powers from the states, as political and co-equal societies; and these will be represented on the principle of equality in the senate, as they now are in the existing congress. So far the government is federal, not national. The executive power will be derived from a very compound source. The immediate election of the president is to be made by the states in their political characters. The votes allotted to them are in a compound ratio, which considers them partly as distinct and co-equal societies; partly as unequal members of the same society. The eventual election, again, is to be made by that branch of the legislature which consists of the national representatives; but in this particular act, they are to be thrown into the form of individual delegations, from so many distinct and co-equal bodies politic. From this aspect of the government, it appears to be of a mixed character, presenting at least as many federal as national features.

The difference between a federal and national government, as it relates to the operation of the government, is, by the adversaries of the plan of the convention, supposed to consist in this, that in the former, the powers operate on the political bodies composing the confederacy, in their political capacities; in the latter, on the individual citizens composing the nation, in their individual capacities. On trying the constitution by this criterion, it falls under the national, not the federal character; though perhaps not so completely as has been understood. In several cases, and particularly in the trial of controversies to which states may be parties, they must be viewed and proceeded against in their collective and political capacities only. But the operation of the government on the people in their individual capacities, in its ordinary and most essential proceedings, will, on the whole, in the sense of its opponents, designate it in this relation, a national government.

But if the government be national, with regard to the operation of its powers, it changes its aspect again, when we contemplate it in relation to the extent of its powers. The idea of a national government involves in it, not only an authority over the individual citizens, but...
an indefinite supremacy over all persons and things, so far as they are objects of lawful
government. Among a people consolidated into one nation, this supremacy is completely
vested in the national legislature. Among communities united for particular purposes, it is
vested partly in the general, and partly in the municipal legislatures. In the former case, all
local authorities are subordinate to the supreme; and may be controled, directed, or abol-
ished by it at pleasure. In the latter, the local or municipal authorities form distinct and
independent portions of the supremacy, no more subject, within their respective spheres,
to the general authority, than the general authority is subject to them within its own sphere.
In this relation, then, the proposed government cannot be deemed a national one; since its
jurisdiction extends to certain enumerated objects only, and leaves to the several states, a
residuary and inviolable sovereignty over all other objects. It is true, that in controversies
relating to the boundary between the two jurisdictions, the tribunal which is ultimately to
decide, is to be established under the general government. But this does not change the
principle of the case. The decision is to be impartially made, according to the rules of the
constitution: and all the usual and most effectual precautions are taken to secure this im-
partiality. Some such tribunal is clearly essential to prevent an appeal to the sword, and a
dissolution of the compact; and that it ought to be established under the general, rather
than under the local governments; or, to speak more properly, that it could be safely estab-
lished under the first alone, is a position not likely to be combated.

If we try the constitution by its last relation, to the authority by which amendments are to
be made, we find it neither wholly national, nor wholly federal. Were it wholly national,
the supreme and ultimate authority would reside in the majority of the people of the union;
and this authority would be competent at all times, like that of a majority of every national
society, to alter or abolish its established government. Were it wholly federal on the other
hand, the concurrence of each state in the union would be essential to every alteration that
would be binding on all. The mode provided by the plan of the convention, is not founded
on either of these principles. In requiring more than a majority, and particularly, in com-
puting the proportion by states, not by citizens, it departs from the national, and advances
towards the federal character. In rendering the concurrence of less than the whole number of states sufficient, it loses again the federal, and partakes of the national character.

The proposed constitution, therefore, even when tested by the rules laid down by its antagonists, is, in strictness, neither a national nor a federal constitution; but a composition of both. In its foundation it is federal, not national; in the sources from which the ordinary powers of the government are drawn, it is partly federal, and partly national; in the operation of these powers, it is national, not federal; in the extent of them again, it is federal, not national; and finally, in the authoritative mode of introducing amendments, it is neither wholly federal, nor wholly national.

Publius
Publius (James Madison) argues for the proposed Constitution by describing the responsibilities of the state governments and the federal government, including the new power to regulate commerce.

1. What is the difference between the powers the federal constitution gives to the federal government and those left to state governments?

2. According to Publius' intent, would the federal government interfere with the power of state governments?

3. If the powers listed by Publius already existed in the Articles of Confederation, why was the Constitution needed?
A Further Discussion Of The Supposed Danger From The Powers Of The Union, To The State Governments

...The powers delegated by the proposed constitution to the federal government, are few and defined. Those which are to remain in the state governments, are numerous and indefinite. The former will be exercised principally on external objects, as war, peace, negotiation, and foreign commerce; with which last the power of taxation will, for the most part, be connected. The powers reserved to the several states will extend to all the objects, which, in the ordinary course of affairs, concern the lives, liberties, and properties of the people; and the internal order, improvement, and prosperity of the state.

The operations of the federal government will be most extensive and important in times of war and danger; those of the state governments in times of peace and security. As the former periods will probably bear a small proportion to the latter, the state governments will here enjoy another advantage over the federal government. The more adequate indeed the federal powers may be rendered to the national defence, the less frequent will be those scenes of danger which might favour their ascendancy over the governments of the particular states.

If the new constitution be examined with accuracy and candour, it will be found that the change which it proposes, consists much less in the addition of NEW POWERS to the union, than in the invigoration of its ORIGINAL POWERS. The regulation of commerce, it is true, is a new power; but that seems to be an addition which few oppose, and from which no apprehensions are entertained. The powers relating to war and peace, armies and fleets, treaties and finance, with the other more considerable powers, are all vested in the existing congress by the articles of confederation. The proposed change does not enlarge these powers; it only substitutes a more effectual mode of administering them. The change relating to taxation, may be regarded as the most important: and yet the present congress have as complete authority to require of the states, indefinite supplies of money for the common defence and general welfare, as the future congress will have to require them of individual citizens; and the latter will be no more bound than the states themselves have been, to pay
the quotas respectively taxed on them. Had the states complied punctually with the articles of confederation, or could their compliance have been enforced by as peaceable means as may be used with success towards single persons, our past experience is very far from countenancing an opinion, that the state governments would have lost their constitutional powers, and have gradually undergone an entire consolidation. To maintain that such an event would have ensued, would be to say at once, that the existence of the state governments is incompatible with any system whatever, that accomplishes the essential purposes of the union.
Publius (James Madison)
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BACKGROUND

Publius (James Madison) argues for the proposed Constitution by explaining its core principle: the separation of powers.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What is one of the main objections to the Constitution?

2. What does Madison consider to be the very definition of tyranny?

3. Whom does Madison chiefly cite in support of the separation of powers?

The Particular Structure of the New Government and the Distribution of Power Among Its Different Parts

HAVING reviewed the general form of the proposed government and the general mass of power allotted to it, I proceed to examine the particular structure of this government, and the distribution of this mass of power among its constituent parts.

One of the principal objections inculcated by the more respectable adversaries to the Constitution, is its supposed violation of the political maxim, that the legislative, executive, and judiciary departments ought to be separate and distinct. In the structure of the federal government, no regard, it is said, seems to have been paid to this essential precaution in favor of liberty. The several departments of power are distributed and blended in such a manner as at once to destroy all symmetry and beauty of form, and to expose some of the essential parts of the edifice to the danger of being crushed by the disproportionate weight of other parts.

No political truth is certainly of greater intrinsic value, or is stamped with the authority of more enlightened patrons of liberty, than that on which the objection is founded. The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hands, whether of one, a few, or many, and whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny. Were the federal Constitution, therefore, really chargeable with the accumulation of power, or with a mixture of powers, having a dangerous tendency to such an accumulation, no further arguments would be necessary to inspire a universal reprobation of the system. I persuade myself, however, that it will be made apparent to every one, that the charge cannot be supported, and that the maxim on which it relies has been totally misconceived and misapplied. In order to form correct ideas on this important subject, it will be proper to investigate the sense in which the preservation of liberty requires that the three great departments of power should be separate and distinct.

The oracle who is always consulted and cited on this subject is the celebrated Montesquieu. If he be not the author of this invaluable precept in the science of politics, he has the merit...
at least of displaying and recommending it most effectually to the attention of mankind. Let us endeavor, in the first place, to ascertain his meaning on this point.

The British Constitution was to Montesquieu what Homer has been to the didactic writers on epic poetry. As the latter have considered the work of the immortal bard as the perfect model from which the principles and rules of the epic art were to be drawn, and by which all similar works were to be judged, so this great political critic appears to have viewed the Constitution of England as the standard, or to use his own expression, as the mirror of political liberty; and to have delivered, in the form of elementary truths, the several characteristic principles of that particular system. That we may be sure, then, not to mistake his meaning in this case, let us recur to the source from which the maxim was drawn.

On the slightest view of the British Constitution, we must perceive that the legislative, executive, and judiciary departments are by no means totally separate and distinct from each other. The executive magistrate forms an integral part of the legislative authority. He alone has the prerogative of making treaties with foreign sovereigns, which, when made, have, under certain limitations, the force of legislative acts. All the members of the judiciary department are appointed by him, can be removed by him on the address of the two Houses of Parliament, and form, when he pleases to consult them, one of his constitutional councils. One branch of the legislative department forms also a great constitutional council to the executive chief, as, on another hand, it is the sole depositary of judicial power in cases of impeachment, and is invested with the supreme appellate jurisdiction in all other cases. The judges, again, are so far connected with the legislative department as often to attend and participate in its deliberations, though not admitted to a legislative vote.

From these facts, by which Montesquieu was guided, it may clearly be inferred that, in saying "There can be no liberty where the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person, or body of magistrates," or, "if the power of judging be not separated from the legislative and executive powers," he did not mean that these departments ought to have no PARTIAL AGENCY in, or no CONTROL over, the acts of each other. His meaning, as his own words import, and still more conclusively as illustrated by the example in his eye,
can amount to no more than this, that where the WHOLE power of one department is exercised by the same hands which possess the WHOLE power of another department, the fundamental principles of a free constitution are subverted. This would have been the case in the constitution examined by him, if the king, who is the sole executive magistrate, had possessed also the complete legislative power, or the supreme administration of justice; or if the entire legislative body had possessed the supreme judiciary, or the supreme executive authority. This, however, is not among the vices of that constitution. The magistrate in whom the whole executive power resides cannot of himself make a law, though he can put a negative on every law; nor administer justice in person, though he has the appointment of those who do administer it. The judges can exercise no executive prerogative, though they are shoots from the executive stock; nor any legislative function, though they may be advised with by the legislative councils. The entire legislature can perform no judiciary act, though by the joint act of two of its branches the judges may be removed from their offices, and though one of its branches is possessed of the judicial power in the last resort. The entire legislature, again, can exercise no executive prerogative, though one of its branches constitutes the supreme executive magistracy, and another, on the impeachment of a third, can try and condemn all the subordinate officers in the executive department.

The reasons on which Montesquieu grounds his maxim are a further demonstration of his meaning. "When the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person or body," says he, "there can be no liberty, because apprehensions may arise lest THE SAME monarch or senate should ENACT tyrannical laws to EXECUTE them in a tyrannical manner. " Again: "Were the power of judging joined with the legislative, the life and liberty of the subject would be exposed to arbitrary control, for THE JUDGE would then be THE LEGISLATOR. Were it joined to the executive power, THE JUDGE might behave with all the violence of AN OPPRESSOR." Some of these reasons are more fully explained in other passages; but briefly stated as they are here, they sufficiently establish the meaning which we have put on this celebrated maxim of this celebrated author....
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Essay

BACKGROUND

Publius (James Madison) argues for the proposed Constitution in outlining the various checks and balances each branch of the government is afforded to guard itself against the encroachments of the others.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Which branch of government in the U.S. is thought to be the strongest and most ambitious for power?

2. What is not sufficient to prevent tyranny?

3. What historical evidence does Madison give to show the tendency of branches to encroach on one another?

IT WAS shown in the last paper that the political apothegm there examined does not re-
quire that the legislative, executive, and judiciary departments should be wholly uncon-
nected with each other. I shall undertake, in the next place, to show that unless these de-
partments be so far connected and blended as to give to each a constitutional control over
the others, the degree of separation which the maxim requires, as essential to a free gov-
ernment, can never in practice be duly maintained.

It is agreed on all sides, that the powers properly belonging to one of the departments ought
not to be directly and completely administered by either of the other departments. It is
equally evident, that none of them ought to possess, directly or indirectly, an overruling
influence over the others, in the administration of their respective powers. It will not be
denied, that power is of an encroaching nature, and that it ought to be effectually restrained
from passing the limits assigned to it. After discriminating, therefore, in theory, the several
classes of power, as they may in their nature be legislative, executive, or judiciary, the next
and most difficult task is to provide some practical security for each, against the invasion
of the others. What this security ought to be, is the great problem to be solved.

Will it be sufficient to mark, with precision, the boundaries of these departments, in the
constitution of the government, and to trust to these parchment barriers against the en-
croaching spirit of power? This is the security which appears to have been principally relied
on by the compilers of most of the American constitutions. But experience assures us, that
the efficacy of the provision has been greatly overrated; and that some more adequate de-
fense is indispensably necessary for the more feeble, against the more powerful, members
of the government. The legislative department is everywhere extending the sphere of its
activity, and drawing all power into its impetuous vortex.

The founders of our republics have so much merit for the wisdom which they have dis-
played, that no task can be less pleasing than that of pointing out the errors into which they
have fallen. A respect for truth, however, obliges us to remark, that they seem never for a
moment to have turned their eyes from the danger to liberty from the overgrown and all-
grasping prerogative of an hereditary magistrate, supported and fortified by an hereditary
branch of the legislative authority. They seem never to have recollected the danger from legislative usurpations, which, by assembling all power in the same hands, must lead to the same tyranny as is threatened by executive usurpations.

In a government where numerous and extensive prerogatives are placed in the hands of an hereditary monarch, the executive department is very justly regarded as the source of danger, and watched with all the jealousy which a zeal for liberty ought to inspire. In a democracy, where a multitude of people exercise in person the legislative functions, and are continually exposed, by their incapacity for regular deliberation and concerted measures, to the ambitious intrigues of their executive magistrates, tyranny may well be apprehended, on some favorable emergency, to start up in the same quarter. But in a representative republic, where the executive magistracy is carefully limited; both in the extent and the duration of its power; and where the legislative power is exercised by an assembly, which is inspired, by a supposed influence over the people, with an intrepid confidence in its own strength; which is sufficiently numerous to feel all the passions which actuate a multitude, yet not so numerous as to be incapable of pursuing the objects of its passions, by means which reason prescribes; it is against the enterprising ambition of this department that the people ought to indulge all their jealousy and exhaust all their precautions.

The legislative department derives a superiority in our governments from other circumstances. Its constitutional powers being at once more extensive, and less susceptible of precise limits, it can, with the greater facility, mask, under complicated and indirect measures, the encroachments which it makes on the co-ordinate departments. It is not unfrequently a question of real nicety in legislative bodies, whether the operation of a particular measure will, or will not, extend beyond the legislative sphere. On the other side, the executive power being restrained within a narrower compass, and being more simple in its nature, and the judiciary being described by landmarks still less uncertain, projects of usurpation by either of these departments would immediately betray and defeat themselves. Nor is this all: as the legislative department alone has access to the pockets of the people, and has in some constitutions full discretion, and in all a prevailing influence, over the pecuniary rewards
of those who fill the other departments, a dependence is thus created in the latter, which gives still greater facility to encroachments of the former.

I have appealed to our own experience for the truth of what I advance on this subject. Were it necessary to verify this experience by particular proofs, they might be multiplied without end. I might find a witness in every citizen who has shared in, or been attentive to, the course of public administrations. I might collect vouchers in abundance from the records and archives of every State in the Union. But as a more concise, and at the same time equally satisfactory, evidence, I will refer to the example of two States, attested by two unexceptionable authorities.

The first example is that of Virginia, a State which, as we have seen, has expressly declared in its constitution, that the three great departments ought not to be intermixed. The authority in support of it is Mr. Jefferson, who, besides his other advantages for remarking the operation of the government, was himself the chief magistrate of it. In order to convey fully the ideas with which his experience had impressed him on this subject, it will be necessary to quote a passage of some length from his very interesting "Notes on the State of Virginia," p. 195. "All the powers of government, legislative, executive, and judiciary, result to the legislative body. The concentrating these in the same hands, is precisely the definition of despotic government. It will be no alleviation, that these powers will be exercised by a plurality of hands, and not by a single one. One hundred and seventy-three despots would surely be as oppressive as one. Let those who doubt it, turn their eyes on the republic of Venice. As little will it avail us, that they are chosen by ourselves. An ELECTIVE DESPOTISM was not the government we fought for; but one which should not only be founded on free principles, but in which the powers of government should be so divided and balanced among several bodies of magistracy, as that no one could transcend their legal limits, without being effectually checked and restrained by the others. For this reason, that convention which passed the ordinance of government, laid its foundation on this basis, that the legislative, executive, and judiciary departments should be separate and distinct, so that no person should exercise the powers of more than one of them at the same time. BUT NO BARRIER WAS PROVIDED BETWEEN THESE SEVERAL POWERS. The judiciary and the
executive members were left dependent on the legislative for their subsistence in office, and some of them for their continuance in it. If, therefore, the legislature assumes executive and judiciary powers, no opposition is likely to be made; nor, if made, can be effectual; because in that case they may put their proceedings into the form of acts of Assembly, which will render them obligatory on the other branches. They have accordingly, IN MANY instances, DECIDED RIGHTS which should have been left to JUDICIARY CONTROVERSY, and THE DIRECTION OF THE EXECUTIVE, DURING THE WHOLE TIME OF THEIR SESSION, IS BECOMING HABITUAL AND FAMILIAR.”

The other State which I shall take for an example is Pennsylvania; and the other authority, the Council of Censors, which assembled in the years 1783 and 1784. A part of the duty of this body, as marked out by the constitution, was "to inquire whether the constitution had been preserved inviolate in every part; and whether the legislative and executive branches of government had performed their duty as guardians of the people, or assumed to themselves, or exercised, other or greater powers than they are entitled to by the constitution. "

In the execution of this trust, the council were necessarily led to a comparison of both the legislative and executive proceedings, with the constitutional powers of these departments; and from the facts enumerated, and to the truth of most of which both sides in the council subscribed, it appears that the constitution had been flagrantly violated by the legislature in a variety of important instances.

A great number of laws had been passed, violating, without any apparent necessity, the rule requiring that all bills of a public nature shall be previously printed for the consideration of the people; although this is one of the precautions chiefly relied on by the constitution against improper acts of legislature.

The constitutional trial by jury had been violated, and powers assumed which had not been delegated by the constitution.

Executive powers had been usurped.
The salaries of the judges, which the constitution expressly requires to be fixed, had been occasionally varied; and cases belonging to the judiciary department frequently drawn within legislative cognizance and determination.

Those who wish to see the several particulars falling under each of these heads, may consult the journals of the council, which are in print. Some of them, it will be found, may be imputable to peculiar circumstances connected with the war; but the greater part of them may be considered as the spontaneous shoots of an ill-constituted government.

It appears, also, that the executive department had not been innocent of frequent breaches of the constitution. There are three observations, however, which ought to be made on this head: FIRST, a great proportion of the instances were either immediately produced by the necessities of the war, or recommended by Congress or the commander-in-chief; SECONDLY, in most of the other instances, they conformed either to the declared or the known sentiments of the legislative department; THIRDLY, the executive department of Pennsylvania is distinguished from that of the other States by the number of members composing it. In this respect, it has as much affinity to a legislative assembly as to an executive council. And being at once exempt from the restraint of an individual responsibility for the acts of the body, and deriving confidence from mutual example and joint influence, unauthorized measures would, of course, be more freely hazarded, than where the executive department is administered by a single hand, or by a few hands.

The conclusion which I am warranted in drawing from these observations is, that a mere demarcation on parchment of the constitutional limits of the several departments, is not a sufficient guard against those encroachments which lead to a tyrannical concentration of all the powers of government in the same hands.
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BACKGROUND

Publius (James Madison) argues for the proposed Constitution by explaining the risks in changing the form of government too often.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What is Jefferson's proposal (the author of Notes on the State of Virginia)?

2. Why does Madison think Jefferson’s proposal would weaken the necessary reverence for the Constitution?

THE author of the "Notes on the State of Virginia," quoted in the last paper, has subjoined to that valuable work the draught of a constitution, which had been prepared in order to be laid before a convention, expected to be called in 1783, by the legislature, for the establishment of a constitution for that commonwealth. The plan, like every thing from the same pen, marks a turn of thinking, original, comprehensive, and accurate; and is the more worthy of attention as it equally displays a fervent attachment to republican government and an enlightened view of the dangerous propensities against which it ought to be guarded. One of the precautions which he proposes, and on which he appears ultimately to rely as a palladium to the weaker departments of power against the invasions of the stronger, is perhaps altogether his own, and as it immediately relates to the subject of our present inquiry, ought not to be overlooked.

His proposition is, "that whenever any two of the three branches of government shall concur in opinion, each by the voices of two thirds of their whole number, that a convention is necessary for altering the constitution, or CORRECTING BREACHES OF IT, a convention shall be called for the purpose."

As the people are the only legitimate fountain of power, and it is from them that the constitutional charter, under which the several branches of government hold their power, is derived, it seems strictly consonant to the republican theory, to recur to the same original authority, not only whenever it may be necessary to enlarge, diminish, or new-model the powers of the government, but also whenever any one of the departments may commit encroachments on the chartered authorities of the others. The several departments being perfectly co-ordinate by the terms of their common commission, none of them, it is evident, can pretend to an exclusive or superior right of settling the boundaries between their respective powers; and how are the encroachments of the stronger to be prevented, or the wrongs of the weaker to be redressed, without an appeal to the people themselves, who, as the grantors of the commissions, can alone declare its true meaning, and enforce its observance?
There is certainly great force in this reasoning, and it must be allowed to prove that a constitutional road to the decision of the people ought to be marked out and kept open, for certain great and extraordinary occasions. But there appear to be insuperable objections against the proposed recurrence to the people, as a provision in all cases for keeping the several departments of power within their constitutional limits.

In the first place, the provision does not reach the case of a combination of two of the departments against the third. If the legislative authority, which possesses so many means of operating on the motives of the other departments, should be able to gain to its interest either of the others, or even one third of its members, the remaining department could derive no advantage from its remedial provision. I do not dwell, however, on this objection, because it may be thought to be rather against the modification of the principle, than against the principle itself.

In the next place, it may be considered as an objection inherent in the principle, that as every appeal to the people would carry an implication of some defect in the government, frequent appeals would, in a great measure, deprive the government of that veneration which time bestows on every thing, and without which perhaps the wisest and freest governments would not possess the requisite stability. If it be true that all governments rest on opinion, it is no less true that the strength of opinion in each individual, and its practical influence on his conduct, depend much on the number which he supposes to have entertained the same opinion. The reason of man, like man himself, is timid and cautious when left alone, and acquires firmness and confidence in proportion to the number with which it is associated. When the examples which fortify opinion are ANCIENT as well as NUMEROUS, they are known to have a double effect. In a nation of philosophers, this consideration ought to be disregarded. A reverence for the laws would be sufficiently inculcated by the voice of an enlightened reason. But a nation of philosophers is as little to be expected as the philosophical race of kings wished for by Plato. And in every other nation, the most rational government will not find it a superfluous advantage to have the prejudices of the community on its side.
The danger of disturbing the public tranquillity by interesting too strongly the public passions, is a still more serious objection against a frequent reference of constitutional questions to the decision of the whole society. Notwithstanding the success which has attended the revisions of our established forms of government, and which does so much honor to the virtue and intelligence of the people of America, it must be confessed that the experiments are of too ticklish a nature to be unnecessarily multiplied. We are to recollect that all the existing constitutions were formed in the midst of a danger which repressed the passions most unfriendly to order and concord; of an enthusiastic confidence of the people in their patriotic leaders, which stifled the ordinary diversity of opinions on great national questions; of a universal ardor for new and opposite forms, produced by a universal resentment and indignation against the ancient government; and whilst no spirit of party connected with the changes to be made, or the abuses to be reformed, could mingle its leaven in the operation. The future situations in which we must expect to be usually placed, do not present any equivalent security against the danger which is apprehended.

But the greatest objection of all is, that the decisions which would probably result from such appeals would not answer the purpose of maintaining the constitutional equilibrium of the government. We have seen that the tendency of republican governments is to an aggrandizement of the legislative at the expense of the other departments. The appeals to the people, therefore, would usually be made by the executive and judiciary departments. But whether made by one side or the other, would each side enjoy equal advantages on the trial? Let us view their different situations. The members of the executive and judiciary departments are few in number, and can be personally known to a small part only of the people. The latter, by the mode of their appointment, as well as by the nature and permanency of it, are too far removed from the people to share much in their prepossessions. The former are generally the objects of jealousy, and their administration is always liable to be discolored and rendered unpopular. The members of the legislative department, on the other hand, are numerous. They are distributed and dwell among the people at large. Their connections of blood, of friendship, and of acquaintance embrace a great proportion of the most influential part of the society. The nature of their public trust implies a personal
influence among the people, and that they are more immediately the confidential guardians of the rights and liberties of the people. With these advantages, it can hardly be supposed that the adverse party would have an equal chance for a favorable issue.

But the legislative party would not only be able to plead their cause most successfully with the people. They would probably be constituted themselves the judges. The same influence which had gained them an election into the legislature, would gain them a seat in the convention. If this should not be the case with all, it would probably be the case with many, and pretty certainly with those leading characters, on whom every thing depends in such bodies. The convention, in short, would be composed chiefly of men who had been, who actually were, or who expected to be, members of the department whose conduct was arraigned. They would consequently be parties to the very question to be decided by them.

It might, however, sometimes happen, that appeals would be made under circumstances less adverse to the executive and judiciary departments. The usurpations of the legislature might be so flagrant and so sudden, as to admit of no specious coloring. A strong party among themselves might take side with the other branches. The executive power might be in the hands of a peculiar favorite of the people. In such a posture of things, the public decision might be less swayed by prepossessions in favor of the legislative party. But still it could never be expected to turn on the true merits of the question. It would inevitably be connected with the spirit of pre-existing parties, or of parties springing out of the question itself. It would be connected with persons of distinguished character and extensive influence in the community. It would be pronounced by the very men who had been agents in, or opponents of, the measures to which the decision would relate. The PASSIONS, therefore, not the REASON, of the public would sit in judgment. But it is the reason, alone, of the public, that ought to control and regulate the government. The passions ought to be controlled and regulated by the government.

We found in the last paper, that mere declarations in the written constitution are not sufficient to restrain the several departments within their legal rights. It appears in this, that occasional appeals to the people would be neither a proper nor an effectual provision for
that purpose. How far the provisions of a different nature contained in the plan above quoted might be adequate, I do not examine. Some of them are unquestionably founded on sound political principles, and all of them are framed with singular ingenuity and precision.
Publius (James Madison)
Federalist No. 51

BACKGROUND

Publius (James Madison) argues for the proposed Constitution by explaining the risks of a concentration of power and how the Constitution addresses them.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What does it mean for each branch of government to have a will of its own?
2. Is the separation of powers absolute, or should the powers overlap? Why or why not?
3. What additional methods help the government to control itself?
4. How is the executive branch strengthened?
5. How is the power surrendered by the people divided to protect from government encroachment?
6. How does the argument against majority tyranny here relate to the argument made in Federalist 10?
7. What is the end of government and civil society according to Publius in Federalist 51?

The Structure of the Government Must Furnish the Proper Checks and Balances Between the Different Departments

To what expedient, then, shall we finally resort, for maintaining in practice the necessary partition of power among the several departments, as laid down in the Constitution? The only answer that can be given is, that as all these exterior provisions are found to be inadequate, the defect must be supplied, by so contriving the interior structure of the government as that its several constituent parts may, by their mutual relations, be the means of keeping each other in their proper places. Without presuming to undertake a full development of this important idea, I will hazard a few general observations, which may perhaps place it in a clearer light, and enable us to form a more correct judgment of the principles and structure of the government planned by the convention.

In order to lay a due foundation for that separate and distinct exercise of the different powers of government, which to a certain extent is admitted on all hands to be essential to the preservation of liberty, it is evident that each department should have a will of its own; and consequently should be so constituted that the members of each should have as little agency as possible in the appointment of the members of the others. Were this principle rigorously adhered to, it would require that all the appointments for the supreme executive, legislative, and judiciary magistracies should be drawn from the same fountain of authority, the people, through channels having no communication whatever with one another. Perhaps such a plan of constructing the several departments would be less difficult in practice than it may in contemplation appear. Some difficulties, however, and some additional expense would attend the execution of it. Some deviations, therefore, from the principle must be admitted.

In the constitution of the judiciary department in particular, it might be inexpedient to insist rigorously on the principle: first, because peculiar qualifications being essential in the members, the primary consideration ought to be to select that mode of choice which best secures these qualifications; secondly, because the permanent tenure by which the appointments are held in that department, must soon destroy all sense of dependence on the authority conferring them.
It is equally evident, that the members of each department should be as little dependent as possible on those of the others, for the emoluments annexed to their offices. Were the executive magistrate, or the judges, not independent of the legislature in this particular, their independence in every other would be merely nominal.

But the great security against a gradual concentration of the several powers in the same department, consists in giving to those who administer each department the necessary constitutional means and personal motives to resist encroachments of the others. The provision for defense must in this, as in all other cases, be made commensurate to the danger of attack. Ambition must be made to counteract ambition. The interest of the man must be connected with the constitutional rights of the place. It may be a reflection on human nature, that such devices should be necessary to control the abuses of government. But what is government itself, but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary. In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself. A dependence on the people is, no doubt, the primary control on the government; but experience has taught mankind the necessity of auxiliary precautions.

This policy of supplying, by opposite and rival interests, the defect of better motives, might be traced through the whole system of human affairs, private as well as public. We see it particularly displayed in all the subordinate distributions of power, where the constant aim is to divide and arrange the several offices in such a manner as that each may be a check on the other that the private interest of every individual may be a sentinel over the public rights. These inventions of prudence cannot be less requisite in the distribution of the supreme powers of the State.

But it is not possible to give to each department an equal power of self-defense. In republican government, the legislative authority necessarily predominates. The remedy for this
inconvenience is to divide the legislature into different branches; and to render them, by different modes of election and different principles of action, as little connected with each other as the nature of their common functions and their common dependence on the society will admit. It may even be necessary to guard against dangerous encroachments by still further precautions. As the weight of the legislative authority requires that it should be thus divided, the weakness of the executive may require, on the other hand, that it should be fortified. An absolute negative on the legislature appears, at first view, to be the natural defense with which the executive magistrate should be armed. But perhaps it would be neither altogether safe nor alone sufficient. On ordinary occasions it might not be exerted with the requisite firmness, and on extraordinary occasions it might be perfidiously abused. May not this defect of an absolute negative be supplied by some qualified connection between this weaker department and the weaker branch of the stronger department, by which the latter may be led to support the constitutional rights of the former, without being too much detached from the rights of its own department?

If the principles on which these observations are founded be just, as I persuade myself they are, and they be applied as a criterion to the several State constitutions, and to the federal Constitution it will be found that if the latter does not perfectly correspond with them, the former are infinitely less able to bear such a test.

There are, moreover, two considerations particularly applicable to the federal system of America, which place that system in a very interesting point of view.

First. In a single republic, all the power surrendered by the people is submitted to the administration of a single government; and the usurpations are guarded against by a division of the government into distinct and separate departments. In the compound republic of America, the power surrendered by the people is first divided between two distinct governments, and then the portion allotted to each subdivided among distinct and separate departments. Hence a double security arises to the rights of the people. The different governments will control each other, at the same time that each will be controlled by itself.
Second. It is of great importance in a republic not only to guard the society against the oppression of its rulers, but to guard one part of the society against the injustice of the other part. Different interests necessarily exist in different classes of citizens. If a majority be united by a common interest, the rights of the minority will be insecure. There are but two methods of providing against this evil: the one by creating a will in the community independent of the majority that is, of the society itself; the other, by comprehending in the society so many separate descriptions of citizens as will render an unjust combination of a majority of the whole very improbable, if not impracticable. The first method prevails in all governments possessing an hereditary or self-appointed authority. This, at best, is but a precarious security; because a power independent of the society may as well espouse the unjust views of the major, as the rightful interests of the minor party, and may possibly be turned against both parties. The second method will be exemplified in the federal republic of the United States. Whilst all authority in it will be derived from and dependent on the society, the society itself will be broken into so many parts, interests, and classes of citizens, that the rights of individuals, or of the minority, will be in little danger from interested combinations of the majority. In a free government the security for civil rights must be the same as that for religious rights. It consists in the one case in the multiplicity of interests, and in the other in the multiplicity of sects. The degree of security in both cases will depend on the number of interests and sects; and this may be presumed to depend on the extent of country and number of people comprehended under the same government. This view of the subject must particularly recommend a proper federal system to all the sincere and considerate friends of republican government, since it shows that in exact proportion as the territory of the Union may be formed into more circumscribed Confederacies, or States oppressive combinations of a majority will be facilitated: the best security, under the republican forms, for the rights of every class of citizens, will be diminished; and consequently the stability and independence of some member of the government, the only other security, must be proportionately increased. Justice is the end of government. It is the end of civil society. It ever has been and ever will be pursued until it be obtained, or until liberty be lost in the pursuit. In a society under the forms of which the stronger faction can readily unite and oppress the weaker, anarchy may as truly be said to reign as in a state of nature,
where the weaker individual is not secured against the violence of the stronger; and as, in the latter state, even the stronger individuals are prompted, by the uncertainty of their condition, to submit to a government which may protect the weak as well as themselves; so, in the former state, will the more powerful factions or parties be gradually induced, by a like motive, to wish for a government which will protect all parties, the weaker as well as the more powerful. It can be little doubted that if the State of Rhode Island was separated from the Confederacy and left to itself, the insecurity of rights under the popular form of government within such narrow limits would be displayed by such reiterated oppressions of factious majorities that some power altogether independent of the people would soon be called for by the voice of the very factions whose misrule had proved the necessity of it. In the extended republic of the United States, and among the great variety of interests, parties, and sects which it embraces, a coalition of a majority of the whole society could seldom take place on any other principles than those of justice and the general good; whilst there being thus less danger to a minor from the will of a major party, there must be less pretext, also, to provide for the security of the former, by introducing into the government a will not dependent on the latter, or, in other words, a will independent of the society itself. It is no less certain than it is important, notwithstanding the contrary opinions which have been entertained, that the larger the society, provided it lie within a practical sphere, the more duly capable it will be of self-government. And happily for the republican cause, the practicable sphere may be carried to a very great extent, by a judicious modification and mixture of the federal principle.
UNIT 3

Governing in the Constitution

45-50-minute classes | 12-16 classes

UNIT PREVIEW

Structure

LESSON 1 The Congress in the Constitution 4-5 classes p. 5
LESSON 2 The Presidency in the Constitution 2-3 classes p. 9
LESSON 3 The Judiciary in the Constitution 2-3 classes p. 13
LESSON 4 The Bill of Rights 2-3 classes p. 16
APPENDIX A Study Guide, Test, and Writing Assignment p. 21
APPENDIX B Primary Sources p. 31

Why Teach Governing in the Constitution

It is common for traditional American government classes to teach the “nuts and bolts” of government. While this class seeks a deeper and more meaningful understanding than the mere mechanics of government, students do need to know how lawmaking works in the United States. In the twenty-first century, however, there are effectively two sets of “nuts and bolts.” Unit 6, on “Institutions and Policy,” deals with the way government functions today after the changes the progressive movement has brought to federal and state institutions. This unit, “Governing in the Constitution,” is reserved for a study of the Framers’ original design and intentions for the government they established through the Constitution. It is important for students to understand how and why the Framers formed the three branches and how they were intended to operate just as they will later study the ways in which progressives departed from this arrangement. This unit also covers the added safeguards to freedom in the first ten amendments to the Constitution: The Bill of Rights.
What Teachers Should Consider

After treating of the main principles that the framers brought to bear on the Constitution, it passes next to examine the actual text of the Constitution. The different articles lay out the structure, selection, and powers of each branch of the federal government. It is here that students come to see how the principles of the Constitution informed the way that the federal government is structured and how it functions.

The chief goal behind every clause to the Constitution is to allow the people to govern but to do so justly, that is, without violating the rights of the minority. The importance of representation, therefore, underlies every consideration. Students should be asked to identify this principle as it functions within each branch of the government and how certain requirements of the Constitution seek to foster good representation.

At the same time, the Constitution limits the power of each branch and official. In the event that good representatives gain power—but given the nature of human beings with respect to power—the Constitution sets guardrails for how much power a branch can accumulate and how that power is wielded. Ultimately, every government decision comes back to the will of the people through elections.

In addition to making these connections between principles and practice, students must learn the simple facts of how the federal government is composed and how it functions. This information is necessary to being a well-informed citizen. Fortunately, students’ background knowledge in the principles of the Constitution lend such straightforward study an additional degree of understanding and appreciation. The facts of governing through the Constitution are significant because they were carefully determined, the product of reflective thought and experience. Their historical success, moreover, is a testimony to how well conceived they turned out to be.

Finally, the addition of the Bill of Rights is worthy of careful study on the part of students. Contentious at the time of the ratification debates, the Bill of Rights has proven to be a bulwark against government violations of rights. Students should examine them closely and tie their inclusion both to historical situations which the framers had recently experienced and to the principles of the Declaration of Independence.
How Teachers Can Learn More

**TEXTS**

*The U.S. Constitution: A Reader*, ed. Hillsdale College Politics Faculty  
Chapters 4–6

*The Federalist*, Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay  
Chapters 2, 3, and 15

*The Anti-Federalist*  
*American Government and Politics*, Joseph Bessette and John Pitney

**ONLINE COURSES** | Online.Hillsdale.edu

*Introduction to the Constitution*  
*Constitution 101*  
*The Federalist Papers*  
*Civil Rights in American History*

**Primary Sources Studied in This Unit**

The U.S. Constitution  
*The Federalist*, Nos. 55, 57, 62, 63, 70, 78, and 84  
Essay 11, Brutus  
*Marbury v. Madison*  
*McCulloch v. Maryland*  
The Bill of Rights
LESSON PLANS, ASSIGNMENTS, AND FORMATIVE QUIZ
Lesson 1 — The Congress in the Constitution

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn how the Constitution structures the federal legislature to ensure that the will of the people is both expressed as well as refined and enlarged by the people’s representatives to effect good government.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

The Federalist Papers  Lecture 6
Congress  Lectures 1 and 2

PRIMARY SOURCES

Students are to read or, if they have previously read, review the following primary source(s). While reading, students should annotate these sources. For particularly challenging texts or if the class is offered earlier in high school, the teacher may wish to provide students with guided reading questions to assist with comprehension, clarity, and direction. Using their annotations and any guided reading questions, students should come to class prepared to participate in a seminar conversation on each text.

The U.S. Constitution, Articles I and IV
The Federalist, Nos. 55, 57, 62, 63

TERMS AND TOPICS

- legislature
- legislative power
- Virginia Plan
- New Jersey Plan
- Great Compromise
- bill
- Congress
- bicameralism
- House of Representatives
- Senate
- term
- refine and enlarge

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- Which purposes and powers does Congress have?
- How does the Constitution place and structure the legislative power in the Congress?
- What is bicameralism, and what are its advantages?
- What are the similarities and differences between the structure of the House of Representatives and the Senate?
- What are the chief characteristics of the House of Representatives, and why?
- What are the chief characteristics of the Senate, and why?
- How does the design of the legislature provide stability?
- How does representation itself and the differences between the House of Representatives and the Senate combine to refine and enlarge the will of the people?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 18: What part of the federal government writes laws?
  - Question 19: What are the two parts of the U.S. Congress?
  - Question 20: Name one power of the U.S. Congress.
  - Question 21: How many U.S. senators are there?
  - Question 22: How long is a term for a U.S. senator?
  - Question 24: How many voting members are in the House of Representatives?
  - Question 25: How long is a term for a member of the House of Representatives?
  - Question 26: Why do U.S. representatives serve shorter terms than U.S. senators?
  - Question 27: How many senators does each state have?
  - Question 28: Why does each state have two senators?
  - Question 31: Who does a U.S. senator represent?
  - Question 32: Who elects U.S. senators?
  - Question 33: Who does a member of the House of Representatives represent?
  - Question 34: Who elects members of the House of Representatives?
  - Question 35: Some states have more representatives than other states. Why?

**Keys to the Lesson**

The United States Congress, composed of the House Representatives and the Senate, was intended by the Framers to be the embodiment of representative self-government. Hence it is listed first among the three equal branches of government. Its bicameral structure satisfied both large and small states and has proven to be a bulwark against the accumulation of power and against momentary passions that sweep through the country while carrying out government’s core function of making law. While representation in and of itself seeks to elevate the will of the majority through relatively talented and mindful Representatives, the further refinement and broadening of legislation through the Senate brings an additional safeguard. Prudent and effective legislation supported by a broad legislative consensus was the goal the Framers had in mind when forming the Congress. For all of these reasons, over much of American history, the Congress has operated as the core representative branch—and thus the heart—of American constitutional government.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Congress in the Constitution with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Throughout this lesson, have students consider how the Constitution repeatedly structures the government to refine and enlarge public opinion so as to reflect their consent through the rule of law.
- Help students to understand the very meaningful words *legislative*, *executive*, *judicial*, and *power*. All four words are not merely conventions but are full of significance. In fact, they are true to the very nature of the rule of law. They connote the act of lawmaking, the act of enforcing the law made, and the act of determining whether the law has been violated, either by an individual against a specific law, or by a law itself against the Supreme Law of the Land, the Constitution.
- Clarify for students that under the Constitution the United States is not a democracy but rather a republic. The main distinction is that in a pure democracy, everyone votes on actually making
every law, and the only factor to consider in enacting a law is 51 percent of the people. In a republic, the people elect certain of the fellow citizens to represent their views and interests in deliberating and making decisions. The deliberations and voting record of representatives should not only reflect the opinions of the people they represent but also their settled concerns and common good as understood by the representative. How well they have represented the opinions and good of their constituents is determined by election of those being represented. Other terms relevant to these distinctions are direct democracy versus representative democracy.

- Ask students why the Constitution begins by describing the legislative power and legislative branch. The reason is Congress is most connected with the people at large. Lawmaking is the chief governing act, and in a democratic republic, it is the representatives of the people who do the lawmaking. Students should understand how very different the locus of lawmaking and power is today when one considers the present executive, judiciary, and bureaucracy.

- Have students discuss and understand the purpose of each legislative power granted to Congress. Students should be able to connect each of these powers with the purposes of the Constitution as outlined in the Preamble. The structure, character, and operation of Congress are designed in the way most fitting to the function of lawmaking, that is, to exercise the power of making law on behalf of (or as representatives of) the people. Make clear that the legislative power is vested uniquely in the legislative branch, not in the federal government as a whole or in another branch.

- Note also how the Constitution limits the number and kind of legislative powers to those “herein granted.” There are other implied legislative powers, such as under things “necessary and proper” to carry out is granted powers, but the Constitution intended to limit significantly the scope of what the Congress could do with its lawmaking power.

- Spend some time considering the necessary and proper clause. Although this clause could be mistaken as a way for the Congress to do whatever it wants, this clause only enables the Congress to carry out its enumerated powers. The Founders wanted to create an energetic yet limited government, and enumerating the powers of the legislature (even with the necessary and proper clause) restricted the scope of the federal government overall, leaving most of the general powers of government to the state governments or undelegated to remain with the people themselves. They wanted each separate branch of the government, which together make up the federal government, to do only the things specified by the Constitution—but to do them well.

- Explain the ways in which the House of Representatives is meant to be a purer or more direct expression of popular opinion while the Senate is meant to be more reflective and refining of the people’s will.

- Read with students the relevant essays of the Federalist on the House of Representatives. Federalist 55 explains the appropriateness of the quantity of representatives that the Constitution had originally set, while Federalist 57 speaks to the quality required of such representatives and the ways in which the Constitution seeks to ensure such individuals are more likely to be elected.

- Read with students the relevant essays of the Federalist on the Senate. Federalist 62 and 63 explain how the Senate is structured and chosen, and how these features provide stability and wisdom to the legislature, as well as strengthen federalism and the importance of states in the federal government structure. It is worth noting how the 17th Amendment in 1913 altered this arrangement and changed the role played by the Senate.
**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment 1:** Explain the overall powers of Congress and why Congress, as opposed to other branches, has these powers (2–3 paragraphs).

**Assignment 2:** Explain the differences between the House of Representatives and the Senate and the reasons for the distinctions (2–3 paragraphs).
Lesson 2 — The Presidency in the Constitution

LENSS OBJECTIVE

Students learn how the Constitution arranges the executive power in the presidency and the purposes and powers of the office.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

| The Federalist Papers | Lecture 7
| The Presidency and the Constitution | Lectures 2 and 3

PRIMARY SOURCES

Students are to read or, if they have previously read, review the following primary source(s). While reading, students should annotate these sources. For particularly challenging texts or if the class is offered earlier in high school, the teacher may wish to provide students with guided reading questions to assist with comprehension, clarity, and direction. Using their annotations and any guided reading questions, students should come to class prepared to participate in a seminar conversation on each text.

The U.S. Constitution, Article II
The Federalist, No. 70

TERMS AND TOPICS

executive power
presidency
Electoral College
term
veto power
impeachment
cabinet
Commander-in-Chief

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What purposes and powers does the presidency have?
- How does the Constitution place and structure the executive power in the presidency?
- What are the chief characteristics of the presidency, and why?
- How does the presidency ensure energy in the executive?
- What is the importance of the executive power being unitive?
- What is the Electoral College, how did it originally work, and what is its purpose?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 17: The President of the United States is in charge of which branch of government?
  - Question 36: The President of the United States is elected for how many years?
  - Question 37: The President of the United States can serve only two terms. Why?
  - Question 40: If the president can no longer serve, who becomes president?
- Question 41: Name one power of the president.
- Question 42: Who is Command in Chief of the U.S. military?
- Question 43: Who signs bills to become laws?
- Question 44: Who vetoes bills?
- Question 45: Who appoints federal judges?
- Question 46: The executive branch has many parts. Name one.
- Question 47: What does the President’s cabinet do?
- Question 48: What are two Cabinet-level positions?
- Question 49: Why is the Electoral College important?

**Keys to the Lesson**

The office of president demonstrated some of the most significant changes the Framers put into the Constitution, compared to the Articles of Confederation. The Framers saw the need of a stronger executive, especially in the area of representing the United States on the world stage and in providing for the nation’s security and carrying out its foreign policy. The president’s first responsibility, however, was simply to enforce the laws passed by Congress. This job required cooperation with Congress to pass laws but then the restraint to act under the laws that Congress had passed. The presidency has since then taken on a sort of aura and power all its own, but students should understand that the original intention for the office was to execute laws passed by Congress, uphold the rule of law, and defend the Constitution.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Presidency in the Constitution with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Share with students that the office of the president was crafted by the Framers with both hindsight and foresight. On one hand, they had learned that the legitimate concern of the Articles of Confederation to prevent executive tyranny resulted in a weak if non-existent executive with no independent power to enforce the laws or conduct foreign policy. The Constitution defined the proper ground by creating the president vested with the executive power to enforce the law and administer the affairs of government at home and abroad while also preventing and checking executive tyranny. On the other hand, the Founders created the office with the knowledge that George Washington—who had already relinquished his military authority as general—would assuredly be the first president to exercise these powers and in doing so set precedents for the future. They were confident he would do so with vigor but also with prudence and justice for the sake of establishing the Constitution.

- Note for students that the president’s executive power in Article II is a general grant of power, not “herein granted” or enumerated as in Article I. While Congress has great powers to control and influence the means of the president, especially through its control of the budget, the presidency is designed to embody the executive power of government, primarily enforcing all the laws enacted by Congress but also maintaining the rule of law, seeing to the nation’s security, and conducting the nation’s foreign policy. Make clear that the executive power is vested uniquely in the president, not in the federal government as a whole or in any other branch.

- Explain the circumstances under which the president can exercise the powers of Commander-in-Chief. Students should be aware that, as the most popular branch, only Congress has the power to declare war, while the president has the power to carry out that declaration and otherwise direct the armed forces in circumstances of military necessity. Emphasize for students how a unique
trait of the American armed forces is that they are under civilian control, in particular a civilian, elected president, checked by Congress (and a Supreme Court), subservient to the Constitution and the rule of law.

- Read aloud and discussion with students the president’s unique oath of office, found in Article II, Section 1, Clause 8: “I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.”

- Clarify with students how the Electoral College works and why the Founders decided on this process for choosing the president. The first original reason was to provide a way for the people’s representatives in the states to check against a tyrannical or fraudulent choice of the president, a purpose which most states abandoned when they enacted laws tying a state’s choice of electors to the state’s popular vote and then usually requiring those electors to be faithful to the state’s popular vote. The second reason was to ensure that presidential candidates would have to pay attention to the interests and opinions of all the states and their populations. This prevented regional and encourage national candidates, and forced presidential candidates to address the concerns not merely of large population centers like cities but also of rural and more remote populations. Together with the equal representation among states in the Senate, the Electoral College has discouraged majority tyranny in favor of a broader and more settled national consensus.

- Read with students Federalist 70 and examine Publius’s arguments for the presidency and the necessity of an energetic executive, especially the unity (one person) that is necessary for "decision, activity, secrecy, and dispatch" in executive actions.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

**Assignment:** Explain the overall powers of the presidency and why the presidency, as opposed to other branches, has these powers (2–3 paragraphs).
Unit 3 — Formative Quiz

Covering Lessons 1-2
10-15 minutes

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. What is bicameralism, and what are its advantages?

2. What are the chief characteristics of the House of Representatives, and why?

3. What are the chief characteristics of the Senate, and why?

4. What are the chief characteristics of the presidency, and why?

5. What is the Electoral College, how did it originally work, and what is its purpose?
Lesson 3 — The Judiciary in the Constitution

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the judicial power in the Constitution and about the Supreme Court’s power of judicial review.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

- The Federalist Papers Lecture 8
- The U.S. Supreme Court Lecture 1

PRIMARY SOURCES

Students are to read or, if they have previously read, review the following primary source(s). While reading, students should annotate these sources. For particularly challenging texts or if the class is offered earlier in high school, the teacher may wish to provide students with guided reading questions to assist with comprehension, clarity, and direction. Using their annotations and any guided reading questions, students should come to class prepared to participate in a seminar conversation on each text.

- The U.S. Constitution, Article III
- The Federalist, No. 78
- Essay 11, Brutus
- Marbury v. Madison
- McCulloch v. Maryland

TERMS AND TOPICS

- judicial power
- Supreme Court
- coequality of branches
- Judiciary Act of 1789
- appellate courts
- jurisdiction
- original jurisdiction
- appellate jurisdiction
- judicial review

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- Which purposes and powers does the Supreme Court have?
- How does the Constitution place and structure the judicial power in the Supreme Court?
- What are the chief characteristics of the Supreme Court, and why?
- What is judicial review? How was the power first claimed and asserted?
- What were the arguments for and against the Supreme Court?
- Who has the power to establish “lesser courts”?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 2: What is the supreme law of the land?
Question 13: What is the rule of law?

Question 50: What is one part of the judicial branch?

Question 51: What does the judicial branch do?

Question 52: What is the highest court in the United States?

Question 53: How many seats are on the Supreme Court?

Question 54: How many Supreme Court justices are usually needed to decide a case?

Question 55: How long do Supreme Court justices serve?

Question 56: Supreme Court justices serve for life. Why?

**Keys to the Lesson**

In many respects, the Supreme Court was not given much consideration by the founding generation. They certainly never envisioned the tremendous power the Court has acquired today. The relatively minimal amount of detail and deliberation concerning the judiciary may have been the result of the rather straightforward nature of the judicial power: to use reason to judge whether or not a law has been violated in particular cases. The keys to exercising such a power, which has historic origins, depended on the wisdom of the judge as well as their understanding of the law. The requirement that the more deliberative Senate would have to consent to an elected president’s appointment of federal judges acted as a check against judicial tyranny. A key innovation the Framers brought to the judiciary was making it separate from the lawmaking or law-enforcing parts of the government and independent by lifetime appointment. The coequality of the judiciary was also an important element in enacting the separation of powers to ensure that justice would be effectively served. Most important was that the judiciary would be the constant guard of the Constitution and the rule of law.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Judiciary in the Constitution with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Explain that the judicial power is vested by Article III in the Supreme Court and in such inferior Courts as Congress creates by law. The judicial power (and the judiciary’s function) is to decide (or adjudicate) the “cases and controversies” that come before the courts according to the jurisdiction assigned by the Constitution or by Congress.
- Point out that the key to understanding the role of the judiciary in upholding the rule of law is that the “Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof” is “the supreme Law of the Land” (Article VI). This means not only that all laws consistent with the Constitution must be followed but also that the Constitution is above ordinary laws.
- Explain that while lower court decision may be appealed, the decisions of the Supreme Court in particular cases before it are final. While the precedents of the Supreme Court (the doctrine of *stare decisis*) are important for instructing lower courts and predicting how the Supreme Court might decide similar cases in the future, the precedent of a particular case is neither final nor absolute. Significant cases (such as *Dred Scott v. Sandford* in 1857 and *Plessy v. Ferguson* in 1896) have been overturned years later despite the Court’s earlier decisions.
- Read with students *Federalist* 78. Consider how Publius explains and defends the judicial power and the principle of judicial review—the authority of the courts to declare a law unconstitutional. It is important to note what Publius considered the role of the judge to be: not a legislator who...
makes laws but rather an impartial judge in a particular case who will uphold and apply the law fairly. In carrying out the judicial power, the judge must also support and defend the Constitution, which means that in making their decisions they are obligated to side with the Constitution if a law is inconsistent with the “supreme Law of the Land.” The judge must therefore interpret the laws and the Constitution. In doing so they should look at the intentions of Congress in making the laws, and to the courts’ own precedents, but most important they should abide by the original meaning of the Constitution as the intent expressed by the American people.

- Explain that while judicial review is rightly understood as a crucial element implied in the Constitution’s grant of judicial power, this does not mean that the Supreme Court has either the only or the final say over the Constitution and its meaning. Each branch of government is responsible to the Constitution as the source and extent of their authority, and are obligated to uphold it in carrying out their constitutional duties. This means Congress should consider the constitutionality of the laws it passes (and repeal those it considers unconstitutional), presidents should veto bills that they believe are unconstitutional and execute laws only in a constitutional manner, and that courts should strike down laws that are inconsistent with the Constitution. Nevertheless, when the three branches are at odds about the Constitution, the sovereign people have the final say as to the meaning of the Constitution by electing legislators who will make different laws, presidents who will appoint different judges, or by amending the Constitution itself. No singular branch has a monopoly on what the Constitution means.

- Share with students excerpts from the anti-Federalist writer Brutus and the Supreme Court decisions Marbury v. Madison and McCulloch v. Maryland in which the idea of judicial review is debated and asserted. As explained above, note how the argument for judicial review asserted by the Supreme Court in Marbury v. Madison is distinct from judicial absolutism or judicial finality.

- Note for students how Congress began to establish lesser courts, per the Constitution, with the Judiciary Act of 1789. Students should be generally familiar with lower courts established throughout American history, their jurisdictions, and the general workings of lawsuits, trials, etc. Some of these elements to the judiciary will be revisited in Unit 8 on “Late 20th Century Government and Politics,” but since the Constitution lets Congress determine much of the structure and operation of the judiciary, it is best to teach about the institutions of the judicial branch in this lesson instead of a separate lesson in Unit 6 on “Institutions and Policy.” Referencing Chapter 15 of American Government and Politics may be helpful.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

**Assignment:** Explain the overall structure and powers of the Supreme Court and lesser courts, and why the judiciary, as opposed to other branches, has these powers (2-3 paragraphs).
Lesson 4 — The Bill of Rights

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the arguments for and against a Bill of Rights, what each of the first ten amendments to the Constitution protects, and why each was included and written the way it was.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

- The Federalist Papers Lecture 9
- Civil Rights in American History Lecture 2

PRIMARY SOURCES

Students are to read or, if they have previously read, review the following primary source(s). While reading, students should annotate these sources. For particularly challenging texts or if the class is offered earlier in high school, the teacher may wish to provide students with guided reading questions to assist with comprehension, clarity, and direction. Using their annotations and any guided reading questions, students should come to class prepared to participate in a seminar conversation on each text.

- The U.S. Constitution, Articles V-VII
- The Bill of Rights
- The Federalist, No. 84

TERMS AND TOPICS

- Bill of Rights
- freedom of religion
- free exercise
- establishment clause
- freedom of speech
- freedom of the press
- right to assembly
- right to bear arms
- due process

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What were the arguments for and against a Bill of Rights?
- What do each of the following amendments in the Bill of Rights guarantee and why: 1st, 2nd, 4th, 5th, 9th, and 10th?
- What is the origin of the rights protected in the Bill of Rights?
- Where does the phrase "separation of church and state" come from? Does it have any legal authority?
- Why does the 2nd Amendment make it evident that the Founders found it necessary to guarantee to private citizens the right to possess tools used for their self-defense?
- What is due process? Why is it such an important legal guarantor of freedom?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
Question 5: How are changes made to the U.S. Constitution?
Question 7: How many amendments does the U.S. Constitution have?
Question 60: What is the purpose of the 10th Amendment?
Question 65: What are three rights of everyone living in the United States?

**Keys to the Lesson**

The genius of the Bill of Rights was in the recognition that while future changes would produce new debates on government power, there nevertheless were fundamental rights not subject to change. Some sort of absolute prohibition that makes clear what is nonnegotiable seemed prudent. It is important to note that the list of rights guaranteed by the Constitution did not indicate a view by the framers that rights came from the government. Rather, these rights were recognized as fundaments which no government created or may violate. What is somewhat remarkable about this list of rights is how universal they are now considered. That is in many respects owing to their articulation and inclusion by the framers in America.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Bill of Rights with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Before looking at the Bill of Rights itself, read with students Articles V-VII of the Constitution. Students should be familiar with what these Articles, particularly concerning the amendment process and the status of the Constitution in the American constitutional system of law. Remind them that the Bill of Rights are ten amendments to the Constitution but do not replace or redefine the main Constitution as the main bulwark of liberty.
- Teach students about the Anti-Federalists’ concerns with the Constitution, the arguments for and against a Bill of Rights, and how the Federalists ultimately convinced key states to support the Constitution by guaranteeing to add a Bill of Rights if it was ratified. Of special note is the argument in Federalist 84 that a Bill of Rights was not needed and would be potentially dangerous as it may be interpreted as implying powers that government had not been granted concerning other rights that were not listed.
- Lead students through a complete reading of the Bill of Rights. Pause frequently to ask students questions on the various parts of the text. Sometimes the Bill of Rights comes across as special rights that the government has given to the people (and, therefore, may conceivably take away). This is not the case. These are fundamental rights recognized and protected by the Constitution. The people may point to and claim these rights when government threatens them.
- Help students understand how the rights found in the Bill of Rights are related to the preservation of life, liberty, property, or the pursuit of happiness, or how they answer some of the grievances in the Declaration of Independence or problems discovered under the Articles of Confederation. Spend time especially considering the 1st, 2nd, 4th, 5th, 9th, and 10th Amendments and the following guarantees:
  - Religious Liberty: When the Founders wrote that “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion,” they were not at all against religion playing a significant public role in society. But they did not want to establish an official church and creed, because they feared this would become a threat to “the free exercise of religion,” which was also protected in the First Amendment. They wanted to encourage and protect religious belief and exercise from a government that was either hostile to religion in general or to a specific religion, as was the case in other countries where church and state were not officially separated. The Founders emphatically believed that religion was...
necessary to promote morality, to shape civil society, and to form virtuous, responsible, wise, and caring citizens. They believed that government should encourage and support religion in general. But they did not think the government should endorse or fund one single, official church or do anything to obstruct the people from exercising their religious faith.

- Freedom of Speech: It is essential for any free society to have freedom of speech for citizens to hold government accountable and to discuss and debate ideas. Freedom of speech helps society to flourish by promoting the sharing of ideas, innovations, scientific thought, and virtue. The Founders also wanted to keep politicians and the government accountable to the people by allowing for the free expression of ideas in support of or critical of elected officials’ choices and character. Freedom of the Press applies freedom of speech to printed speech as well.

- Freedom of Assembly and to Petition. Any group of citizens can gather without the government’s permission as long as their activities are peaceful. Similarly, citizens have the right to make their interests known to the government, including to specific branches of the government and specific elected members of the government.

- The Right of Self-Defense: The right to bear arms reflects two essential principles: 1) individuals have a natural right to protect and defend their own lives, families, and property against the tyrannical actions of another person; and 2) citizens may protect their own lives, families, and properties against the tyrannical actions of the government itself. The right to bear arms protects citizens’ ability and right to counter any attempt at oppression by the government.

- Due Process: Due process is the legal process that every person under the rule of law is due as a matter of equal justice. It establishes that any deprivations of a person’s natural rights to life, liberty, and property must be accompanied by a legal process in which the law was already a law at the time of being violated and in which the opportunity to defend one’s innocence is afforded. Innocence is presumed until evidence is judged in a fair trial to prove guilt. All are equal before the law and are guaranteed the same fair and impartial justice and the equal protection of the law. The right of the criminally accused to a jury of their peers (meaning fellow citizens) is also an important and long established element of due process. This ensures that the government’s executives and judges are held accountable to public opinion and that those judging whether a law was broken are those who could one day have that same judgment applied to them, thus ensuring a fair trial and verdict.

- Explain that the Founders did not believe the Bill of Rights encompassed all the rights of men in society. While some of the rights in the Bill of Rights are natural rights, others are generally civil rights (rights existing in law) intended to preserve certain natural rights, particularly from the misapplication of government power. Many of these rights, moreover, require prudential judgment to determine if they have been violated in a particular instance. There are certainly other natural and civil rights retained by the people that might not be listed in the Constitution. Note that the 9th Amendment suggests and guarantees just that.

- Discuss how the 10th Amendment was written to affirm that any other powers that are not delegated to the government by the Constitution are reserved to the States or to the people. By this amendment, the Constitution recognizes that key powers remain with the States, which have the general authority over the safety and well-being of their state citizens. It also means (especially when read in conjunction with the 9th Amendment) that the ultimate sovereign are the people,
who are endowed with all rights and (as a result) are the only ones who can delegate any power to government.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

**Assignment:** Explain the meaning and importance of the freedom of religion, the freedom of speech, the right to bear arms, due process, and the 10th Amendment (3–4 paragraphs).
APPENDIX A

Study Guide
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Writing Assignment
Study Guide — Governing in the Constitution Test

TERMS AND TOPICS

Explain each of the following and the context in which it was discussed during this unit’s lessons.

- legislature
- legislative power
- Virginia Plan
- New Jersey Plan
- Great Compromise
- Congress
- bicameralism
- House of Representatives
- Senate
- term
- refine and enlarge
- bill
- executive power
- presidency
- Electoral College
- veto power
- impeachment
- cabinet
- Commander-in-Chief
- judicial power
- Supreme Court
- coequality of branches
- Judiciary Act of 1789
- appellate courts
- original jurisdiction
- appellate jurisdiction
- judicial review
- Bill of Rights
- freedom of religion
- free exercise
- establishment clause
- freedom of speech
- freedom of the press
- right to assembly
- right to bear arms
- due process

PRIMARY SOURCES

Explain the main arguments in each of the following sources and their significance to our understanding of how governing was originally intended to function in the Constitution.

The U.S. Constitution, Article I
Federalist 57
Federalist 62
Federalist 63

The U.S. Constitution, Article II
Federalist 70

The U.S. Constitution, Article III
Federalist 78
Marbury v. Madison

1st Amendment
2nd Amendment
4th Amendment
5th Amendment
9th Amendment
10th Amendment
**QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND**

*Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.*

**Lesson 1 | The Congress in the Constitution**

☐ What purposes and powers does Congress have?
☐ How does the Constitution place and structure the legislative power in the Congress?
☐ What is bicameralism, and what are its advantages?
☐ What are the similarities and differences in the structure of the House of Representatives and the Senate?
☐ What are the chief characteristics of the House of Representatives, and why?
☐ What are the chief characteristics of the Senate, and why?
☐ How does the design of the legislature provide stability?
☐ How does representation itself and the differences between the House of Representatives and the Senate combine to refine and enlarge the will of the people?

**Lesson 2 | The Presidency in the Constitution**

☐ What purposes and powers does the presidency have?
☐ How does the Constitution place and structure the executive power in the presidency?
☐ What are the chief characteristics of the presidency, and why?
☐ How does the presidency ensure energy in the executive?
☐ What is the importance of the executive power being unitive?
☐ What is the Electoral College, how did it originally work, and what is its purpose?

**Lesson 3 | The Judiciary in the Constitution**

☐ Which purposes and powers does the Supreme Court have?
☐ How does the Constitution place and structure the judicial power in the Supreme Court?
☐ What are the chief characteristics of the Supreme Court, and why?
☐ What is judicial review? How was the power first claimed and asserted?
☐ What were the arguments for and against the Supreme Court?
☐ Who has the power to establish “lesser courts”?

**Lesson 4 | The Bill of Rights**

☐ What were the arguments for and against a Bill of Rights?
☐ What do each of the following amendments in the Bill of Rights guarantee, and why: 1st, 2nd, 4th, 5th, 9th, and 10th?
☐ What is the origin of the rights protected in the Bill of Rights?
☐ Where does the phrase “separation of church and state” come from? Does it have any legal authority?
☐ Why does the 2nd Amendment make it evident that the Founders found it necessary to guarantee to private citizen the right to possess tools used for their self-defense?
☐ What is due process? Why is it such an important legal guarantor of freedom?
Test — Governing in the Constitution

TERMS AND TOPICS

Explain each of the following and the context in which it was discussed during this unit’s lessons.

1. legislative power

2. Great Compromise

3. bicameralism

4. refine and enlarge

5. executive power

6. Electoral College

7. impeachment

8. cabinet

9. judicial power

10. coequality of branches

11. judicial review

12. Bill of Rights
13. free exercise

14. right to assembly

15. due process

**PRIMARY SOURCES**

*Explain the main arguments in each of the following sources and their significance to our understanding of how governing was originally intended to function in the Constitution.*

16. *Federalist 62*

17. The U.S. Constitution, Article II

18. *Marbury v. Madison*

19. 1st Amendment
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and writing should be employed, and responses must fully answer each question.

22. Why did the Anti-Federalists prefer smaller, simpler, more local, and more democratic government?

23. What purposes and powers does Congress have?

24. What are the similarities and differences between the structure of the House of Representatives and the Senate?

25. What are the chief characteristics of the House of Representatives, and why?

26. How does representation itself and the differences between the House of Representatives and the Senate combine to refine and enlarge the will of the people?

27. How does the presidency ensure energy in the executive?
28. What is the importance of the executive power being unitive?

29. What is the Electoral College, how did it originally work, and what is its purpose?

30. What were the arguments for and against the Supreme Court?

31. What purposes and powers does the Supreme Court have?

32. What are the chief characteristics of the Supreme Court, and why?

33. What is the origin of the rights protected in the Bill of Rights?

34. Where does the phrase “separation of church and state” come from? Does it have any legal authority?

35. What is due process? Why is it such an important legal guarantor of freedom?
Writing Assignment — Governing in the Constitution

DIRECTIONS

Citing primary sources and conversations from class in your argument, write a 500–800-word essay answering the question…

Across all three branches of the federal government, what are the most important designs that the Constitution puts in place to ensure the very best governance, i.e., governance that will be effective at protecting natural rights, representing the majority, and avoiding tyranny?
APPENDIX B

Primary Sources

The American People

James Madison

Alexander Hamilton

Brutus

John Marshall
THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Constitution

LAW

March 4, 1789
United States of America

BACKGROUND

Delegates to the Constitutional Convention drafted and the states ratified this Constitution, forming the second national government for the United States of America.

ANNOTATIONS

Preamble

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

Section 1. All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Section 2. The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States, and the Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature.

No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the Age of twenty five Years, and been seven Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected,
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be an Inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons, including those bound to Service for a Term of Years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three fifths of all other Persons. The actual Enumeration shall be made within three Years after the first Meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent Term of ten Years, in such Manner as they shall by Law direct. The Number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every thirty Thousand, but each State shall have at Least one Representative; and until such enumeration shall be made, the State of New Hampshire shall be entitled to choose three, Massachusetts eight, Rhode-Island and Providence Plantations one, Connecticut five, New-York six, New Jersey four, Pennsylvania eight, Delaware one, Maryland six, Virginia ten, North Carolina five, South Carolina five, and Georgia three.

When vacancies happen in the Representation from any State, the Executive Authority thereof shall issue Writs of Election to fill such Vacancies.

The House of Representatives shall choose their Speaker and other Officers; and shall have the sole Power of Impeachment.

Section 3. The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the Legislature thereof, for six Years; and each Senator shall have one Vote.

Immediately after they shall be assembled in Consequence of the first Election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three Classes. The Seats of the Senators of the first Class shall be vacated at the Expiration of the second Year, of the second Class at the Expiration of the fourth Year, and of the third Class at the Expiration of the sixth Year, so that one third may be chosen every second Year; and if Vacancies happen by Resignation, or otherwise, during the Recess of the Legislature of any State, the Executive thereof may make temporary Appointments until the next Meeting of the Legislature, which shall then fill such Vacancies.
No Person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty Years, and
been nine Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an In-
habitant of that State for which he shall be chosen.

The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no
Vote, unless they be equally divided.

The Senate shall choose their other Officers, and also a President pro tempore, in the Ab-
sence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the Office of President of the United
States.

The Senate shall have the sole Power to try all Impeachments. When sitting for that Pur-
pose, they shall be on Oath or Affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried,
the Chief Justice shall preside: And no Person shall be convicted without the Concurrence
of two thirds of the Members present.

Judgment in Cases of Impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from Office,
and disqualification to hold and enjoy any Office of honor, Trust or Profit under the United
States: but the Party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to Indictment, Trial,
Judgment and Punishment, according to Law.

Section 4. The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Represent-
atives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at
any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of choosing Sena-
tors.

The Congress shall assemble at least once in every Year, and such Meeting shall be on the
first Monday in December, unless they shall by Law appoint a different Day.

Section 5. Each House shall be the Judge of the Elections, Returns and Qualifications of its
own Members, and a Majority of each shall constitute a Quorum to do Business; but a
smaller Number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the At-
tendance of absent Members, in such Manner, and under such Penalties as each House may
provide.
Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behavior, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.

Each House shall keep a Journal of its Proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such Parts as may in their Judgment require Secrecy; and the Yeas and Nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the Desire of one fifth of those Present, be entered on the Journal.

Neither House, during the Session of Congress, shall, without the Consent of the other, adjourn for more than three days, nor to any other Place than that in which the two Houses shall be sitting.

Section 6. The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States. They shall in all Cases, except Treason, Felony and Breach of the Peace, be privileged from Arrest during their Attendance at the Session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any Speech or Debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other Place.

No Senator or Representative shall, during the Time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil Office under the Authority of the United States, which shall have been created, or the Emoluments whereof shall have been encreased during such time; and no Person holding any Office under the United States, shall be a Member of either House during his Continuance in Office.

Section 7. All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills.

Every Bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a Law, be presented to the President of the United States; If he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his Objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the Objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If after such Reconsideration two thirds of that House shall agree to pass the Bill, it shall be sent, together with the Objections, to the other House, by which it shall
likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two thirds of that House, it shall become a Law. But in all such Cases the Votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and Nays, and the Names of the Persons voting for and against the Bill shall be entered on the Journal of each House respectively. If any Bill shall not be returned by the President within ten days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the Same shall be a Law, in like Manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress by their Adjournment prevent its Return in which Case it shall not be a Law.

Every Order, Resolution, or Vote to which the Concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of Adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the Same shall take Effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the Rules and Limitations prescribed in the Case of a Bill.

Section 8. The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow Money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and post Roads;
To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;—And

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.
Section 9. The Migration or Importation of such Persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the Year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a Tax or duty may be imposed on such Importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each Person.

The Privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it.

No Bill of Attainder or ex post facto Law shall be passed.

No Capitation, or other direct, Tax shall be laid, unless in Proportion to the Census or Enumeration herein before directed to be taken.

No Tax or Duty shall be laid on Articles exported from any State.

No Preference shall be given by any Regulation of Commerce or Revenue to the Ports of one State over those of another: nor shall Vessels bound to, or from, one State, be obliged to enter, clear, or pay Duties in another.

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.

Section 10. No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts; pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, or Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts, or grant any Title of Nobility.

No State shall, without the Consent of the Congress, lay any Imposts or Duties on Imports or Exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection Laws: and
the net Produce of all Duties and Imposts, laid by any State on Imports or Exports, shall be for the Use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such Laws shall be subject to the Revision and Control of the Congress.

No State shall, without the Consent of Congress, lay any duty of Tonnage, keep Troops, or Ships of War in time of Peace, enter into any Agreement or Compact with another State, or with a foreign Power, or engage in War, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent Danger as will not admit of delay.

Article II

Section 1. The executive Power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his Office during the Term of four Years, and, together with the Vice-President chosen for the same Term, be elected as follows:

Each State shall appoint, in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors, equal to the whole Number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress: but no Senator or Representative, or Person holding an Office of Trust or Profit under the United States, shall be appointed an Elector.

The Electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by Ballot for two Persons, of whom one at least shall not be an Inhabitant of the same State with themselves. And they shall make a List of all the Persons voted for, and of the Number of Votes for each; which List they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the Seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall, in the Presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the Certificates, and the Votes shall then be counted. The Person having the greatest Number of Votes shall be the President, if such Number be a Majority of the whole Number of Electors appointed; and if there be more than one who have such Majority, and have an equal Number of Votes, then the House of Representatives shall immediately choose by Ballot one of them for President; and if no Person have a Majority, then from the five highest on the List the said House shall in like Manner choose the President. But in choosing the President, the Votes shall be taken by States, the Representation from each State having one Vote; a quorum for
this Purpose shall consist of a Member or Members from two thirds of the States, and a
Majority of all the States shall be necessary to a Choice. In every Case, after the Choice of
the President, the Person having the greatest Number of Votes of the Electors shall be the
Vice President. But if there should remain two or more who have equal Votes, the Senate
shall choose from them by Ballot the Vice President.

The Congress may determine the Time of choosing the Electors, and the Day on which
they shall give their Votes; which Day shall be the same throughout the United States.

No Person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of
the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President; neither shall
any Person be eligible to that Office who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty-five
Years, and been fourteen Years a Resident within the United States.

In Case of the Removal of the President from Office, or of his Death, Resignation, or Ina-
Bility to discharge the Powers and Duties of the said Office, the Same shall devolve on the
Vice President, and the Congress may by Law provide for the Case of Removal, Death,
Resignation or Inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what Officer
shall then act as President, and such Officer shall act accordingly, until the Disability be
removed, or a President shall be elected.

The President shall, at stated Times, receive for his Services, a Compensation, which shall
neither be increased nor diminished during the Period for which he shall have been elected,
and he shall not receive within that Period any other Emolument from the United States,
or any of them.

Before he enter on the Execution of his Office, he shall take the following Oath or Affirma-
tion:—"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President
of the United States, and will to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and defend the
Constitution of the United States."

Section 2. The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United
States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the
United States; he may require the Opinion, in writing, of the principal Officer in each of

Copyright © 2021 Hillsdale College. All Rights Reserved.
the executive Departments, upon any subject relating to the Duties of their respective Offices, and he shall have Power to grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offenses against the United States, except in Cases of Impeachment.

He shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law: but the Congress may by Law vest the Appointment of such inferior Officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the Courts of Law, or in the Heads of Departments.

The President shall have Power to fill up all Vacancies that may happen during the Recess of the Senate, by granting Commissions which shall expire at the End of their next Session.

Section 3. He shall from time to time give to the Congress Information of the State of the Union, and recommend to their Consideration such Measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient; he may, on extraordinary Occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them, and in Case of Disagreement between them, with Respect to the Time of Adjournment, he may adjourn them to such Time as he shall think proper; he shall receive Ambassadors and other public Ministers; he shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed, and shall Commission all the Officers of the United States.

Section 4. The President, Vice President and all civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.

Article III

Section 1. The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good
Behavior, and shall, at stated Times, receive for their Services a Compensation, which shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office.

Section 2. The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority;—to all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls;—to all Cases of admiralty and maritime Jurisdiction; —to Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party;—to Controversies between two or more States;—between a State and Citizens of another State;—between Citizens of different States;—between Citizens of the same State claiming Lands under Grants of different States, and between a State, or the Citizens thereof, and foreign States, Citizens or Subjects.

In all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, and those in which a State shall be Party, the supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction. In all the other Cases before mentioned, the supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make.

The Trial of all Crimes, except in Cases of Impeachment, shall be by Jury; and such Trial shall be held in the State where the said Crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State, the Trial shall be at such Place or Places as the Congress may by Law have directed.

Section 3. Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying War against them, or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort. No Person shall be convicted of Treason unless on the Testimony of two Witnesses to the same overt Act, or on Confession in open Court.

The Congress shall have Power to declare the Punishment of Treason, but no Attainder of Treason shall work Corruption of Blood, or Forfeiture except during the Life of the Person attained.
Article IV

Section 1. Full Faith and Credit shall be given in each State to the public Acts, Records, and judicial Proceedings of every other State. And the Congress may by general Laws prescribe the Manner in which such Acts, Records and Proceedings shall be proved, and the Effect thereof.

Section 2. The Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of Citizens in the several States.

A Person charged in any State with Treason, Felony, or other Crime, who shall flee from Justice, and be found in another State, shall on Demand of the executive Authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having Jurisdiction of the Crime.

No Person held to Service or Labor in one State, under the Laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in Consequence of any Law or Regulation therein, be discharged from such Service or Labor, but shall be delivered up on Claim of the Party to whom such Service or Labor may be due.

Section 3. New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the Junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the Consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

Section 4. The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic Violence.
Article V

The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

Article VI

All Debts contracted and Engagements entered into, before the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation.

This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States.
Article VII

The Ratification of the Conventions of nine States, shall be sufficient for the Establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the Same.

Done in Convention by the Unanimous Consent of the States present the Seventeenth Day of September in the Year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and Eighty seven and of the Independence of the United States of America the Twelfth In witness whereof We have hereunto subscribed our Names.

George Washington—
President and deputy from Virginia

Delaware

George Read, Gunning Bedford, Jr., John Dickinson, Richard Bassett, Jacob Broom

Maryland

James McHenry, Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer, Daniel Carroll

Virginia

John Blair, James Madison, Jr.

North Carolina

William Blount, Richard Dobbs Spaight, Hugh Williamson

South Carolina

John Rutledge, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, Charles Pinckney, Pierce Butler
Georgia

William Few, Abraham Baldwin

New Hampshire

John Langdon, Nicholas Gilman

Massachusetts

Nathaniel Gorham, Rufus King

Connecticut

William Samuel Johnson, Roger Sherman

New York

Alexander Hamilton

New Jersey

William Livingston, David Brearley, William Paterson, Jonathan Dayton

Pennsylvania

Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Mifflin, Robert Morris, George Clymer, Thomas FitzSimmons, Jared Ingersoll, James Wilson, Gouverneur Morris

Attest William Jackson Secretary
Amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America

Amendment I

Ratified December 15, 1791

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Amendment II

Ratified December 15, 1791

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

Amendment III

Ratified December 15, 1791

No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

Amendment IV

Ratified December 15, 1791

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.
Amendment V
Ratified December 15, 1791

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Amendment VI
Ratified December 15, 1791

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defense.

Amendment VII
Ratified December 15, 1791

In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.
Amendment VIII

Ratified December 15, 1791

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

Amendment IX

Ratified December 15, 1791

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Amendment X

Ratified December 15, 1791

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Amendment XI

Ratified February 7, 1795

The Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State.

Amendment XII

Ratified June 15, 1804

The Electors shall meet in their respective states and vote by ballot for President and Vice-President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same state with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice-President, and they shall make distinct lists of all per-
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ANNOTATIONS                    NOTES & QUESTIONS

sons voted for as President, and of all persons voted for as Vice-President, and of the num-
ber of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat
of the government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate;—the Pres-
ident of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open
all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted;—The person having the greatest
number of votes for President, shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the
whole number of Electors appointed; and if no person have such majority, then from the
persons having the highest numbers not exceeding three on the list of those voted for as
President, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President.

But in choosing the President, the votes shall be taken by states, the representation from
each state having one vote; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or mem-
bers from two-thirds of the states, and a majority of all the states shall be necessary to a
choice. And if the House of Representatives shall not choose a President whenever the right
of choice shall devolve upon them, before the fourth day of March next following, then the
Vice-President shall act as President, as in the case of the death or other constitutional dis-
ability of the President.—The person having the greatest number of votes as Vice-Presi-
dent, shall be the Vice-President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of
Electors appointed, and if no person have a majority, then from the two highest numbers
on the list, the Senate shall choose the Vice-President; a quorum for the purpose shall con-
sist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number
shall be necessary to a choice. But no person constitutionally ineligible to the office of Pres-
ident shall be eligible to that of Vice-President of the United States.

Amendment XIII

Ratified December 6, 1865

Section 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime
whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or
any place subject to their jurisdiction.

Section 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.
Amendment XIV

Ratified July 9, 1868

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

Section 3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice-President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.
Section 4. The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.

Section 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

Amendment XV

10 Ratified February 3, 1870

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment XVI

15 Ratified February 3, 1913

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

Amendment XVII

20 Ratified April 8, 1913

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.
When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: Provided, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.

This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.

**Amendment XVIII**

Ratified January 16, 1919

Section 1. After one year from the ratification of this article the manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof for beverage purposes is hereby prohibited.

Section 2. The Congress and the several States shall have concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Section 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress.

**Amendment XIX**

Ratified August 18, 1920

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.
Amendment XX

Ratified January 23, 1933

Section 1. The terms of the President and the Vice President shall end at noon on the 20th day of January, and the terms of Senators and Representatives at noon on the 3rd day of January, of the years in which such terms would have ended if this article had not been ratified; and the terms of their successors shall then begin.

Section 2. The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall begin at noon on the 3rd day of January, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.

Section 3. If, at the time fixed for the beginning of the term of the President, the President elect shall have died, the Vice President elect shall become President. If a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or if the President elect shall have failed to qualify, then the Vice President elect shall act as President until a President shall have qualified; and the Congress may by law provide for the case wherein neither a President elect nor a Vice President shall have qualified, declaring who shall then act as President, or the manner in which one who is to act shall be selected, and such person shall act accordingly until a President or Vice President shall have qualified.

Section 4. The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.

Section 5. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect on the 15th day of October following the ratification of this article.

Section 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission.
Amendment XXI

Ratified December 5, 1933

Section 1. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

Section 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited.

Section 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress.

Amendment XXII

Ratified February 27, 1951

Section 1. No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than two years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of President more than once. But this Article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President when this Article was proposed by the Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this Article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term.

Section 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.
Amendment XXIII

Ratified March 29, 1961

Section 1. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct:

5 A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the twelfth article of amendment.

10 Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment XXIV

Ratified January 23, 1964

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

15 Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment XXV

Ratified February 10, 1967

Section 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

20 Section 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.
Section 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

Section 4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session.

If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office.
Amendment XXVI

Ratified July 1, 1971

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States, who are eighteen years of age or older, to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment XXVII

Ratified May 7, 1992

No law varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives shall take effect, until an election of Representatives shall have intervened.
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BACKGROUND

Publius (James Madison) argues for the proposed Constitution by showing how the number of representatives for the House is appropriate considering the rate of growth of the population at the time.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Is there a straightforward answer to the question of how many representatives the U.S. House should have? Why or why not?

2. Is having more representatives necessarily better? Why or why not?

3. What are some of the checks imposed on representatives?

4. How does Madison portray human nature here?

5. Is virtue important for a republican form of government? Why?

The number of which the house of representatives is to consist, forms another, and a very interesting point of view, under which this branch of the federal legislature may be contemplated. Scarce any article indeed in the whole constitution, seems to be rendered more worthy of attention, by the weight of character, and the apparent force of argument, with which it has been assailed. The charges exhibited against it are, first, that so small a number of representatives will be an unsafe depository of the public interests; secondly, that they will not possess a proper knowledge of the local circumstances of their numerous constituents; thirdly, that they will be taken from that class of citizens which will sympathize least with the feelings of the mass of the people, and be most likely to aim at a permanent elevation of the few, on the depression of the many; fourthly, that defective as the number will be in the first instance, it will be more and more disproportionate, by the increase of the people, and the obstacles which will prevent a correspondent increase of the representatives.

In general it may be remarked on this subject, that no political problem is less susceptible of a precise solution, than that which relates to the number most convenient for a representative legislature: nor is there any point on which the policy of the several states is more at variance; whether we compare their legislative assemblies directly with each other, or consider the proportions which they respectively bear to the number of their constituents.

Passing over the difference between the smallest and largest states, as Delaware, whose most numerous branch consists of twenty-one representatives, and Massachusetts, where it amounts to between three and four hundred; a very considerable difference is observable among states nearly equal in population. The number of representatives in Pennsylvania is not more than one-fifth of that in the state last mentioned. New York, whose population is to that of South Carolina as six to five, has little more than one-third of the number of representatives. As great a disparity prevails between the states of Georgia and Delaware or Rhode Island. In Pennsylvania, the representatives do not bear a greater proportion to their constituents, than of one for every four or five thousand. In Rhode Island, they bear a proportion of at least one for every thousand. And according to the constitution of Georgia,
the proportion may be carried to one for every ten electors; and must unavoidably far exceed the proportion in any of the other states.

Another general remark to be made is that the ratio between the representatives and the people, ought not to be the same, where the latter are very numerous, as where they are very few. Were the representatives in Virginia to be regulated by the standard in Rhode Island, they would, at this time, amount to between four and five hundred; and twenty or thirty years hence, to a thousand. On the other hand, the ratio of Pennsylvania, if applied to the state of Delaware, would reduce the representative assembly of the latter to seven or eight members. Nothing can be more fallacious, than to found our political calculations on arithmetical principles. Sixty or seventy men may be more properly trusted with a given degree of power, than six or seven. But it does not follow, that six or seven hundred would be proportionably a better depository. And if we carry on the supposition to six or seven thousand, the whole reasoning ought to be reversed. The truth is, that in all cases, a certain number at least seems to be necessary to secure the benefits of free consultation and discussion; and to guard against too easy a combination for improper purposes: as on the other hand, the number ought at most to be kept within a certain limit, in order to avoid the confusion and intemperance of a multitude. In all very numerous assemblies, of whatever characters composed, passion never fails to wrest the sceptre from reason. Had every Athenian citizen been a Socrates, every Athenian assembly would still have been a mob.

It is necessary also to recollect here, the observations which were applied to the case of biennial elections. For the same reason that the limited powers of the congress, and the control of the state legislatures, justify less frequent elections than the public safety might otherwise require; the members of the congress need be less numerous than if they possessed the whole power of legislation, and were under no other than the ordinary restraints of other legislative bodies.

With these general ideas in our minds, let us weigh the objections which have been stated against the number of members proposed for the house of representatives. It is said, in the first place, that so small a number cannot be safely trusted with so much power.
The number of which this branch of the legislature is to consist, at the outset of the government, will be sixty-five. Within three years a census is to be taken, when the number may be augmented to one for every thirty thousand inhabitants; and within every successive period of ten years, the census is to be renewed, and augmentations may continue to be made under the above limitation. It will not be thought an extravagant conjecture, that the first census will, at the rate of one for every thirty thousand, raise the number of representatives to at least one hundred. Estimating the negroes in the proportion of three-fifths, it can scarcely be doubted, that the population of the United States will, by that time, if it does not already, amount to three millions. At the expiration of twenty-five years, according to the computed rate of increase, the number of representatives will amount to two hundred; and of fifty years, to four hundred. This is a number, which I presume will put an end to all fears arising from the smallness of the body. I take for granted here, what I shall, in answering the fourth objection, hereafter show, that the number of representatives will be augmented, from time to time, in the manner provided by the constitution. On a contrary supposition, I should admit the objection to have very great weight indeed.

The true question to be decided, then, is whether the smallness of the number, as a temporary regulation, be dangerous to the public liberty? Whether sixty-five members for a few years, and a hundred, or two hundred, for a few more, be a safe depository for a limited and well-guarded power of legislating for the United States? I must own that I could not give a negative answer to this question, without first obliterating every impression which I have received, with regard to the present genius of the people of America, the spirit which actuates the state legislatures, and the principles which are incorporated with the political character of every class of citizens. I am unable to conceive, that the people of America, in their present temper, or under any circumstances which can speedily happen, will choose, and every second year repeat the choice, of sixty-five or a hundred men, who would be disposed to form and pursue a scheme of tyranny or treachery. I am unable to conceive, that the state legislatures, which must feel so many motives to watch, and which possess so many means of counteracting the federal legislature, would fail either to detect or to defeat a conspiracy of the latter against the liberties of their common constituents. I am equally
unable to conceive, that there are at this time, or can be in any short time in the United States, any sixty-five or a hundred men, capable of recommending themselves to the choice of the people at large, who would either desire or dare, within the short space of two years, to betray the solemn trust committed to them. What change of circumstances, time, and a fuller population of our country, may produce, requires a prophetic spirit to declare, which makes no part of my pretensions. But judging from the circumstances now before us, and from the probable state of them within a moderate period of time, I must pronounce, that the liberties of America cannot be unsafe, in the number of hands proposed by the federal constitution.

From what quarter can the danger proceed? Are we afraid of foreign gold? If foreign gold could so easily corrupt our federal rulers, and enable them to ensnare and betray their constituents, how has it happened that we are at this time a free and independent nation? The congress which conducted us through the revolution, were a less numerous body than their successors will be: they were not chosen by, nor responsible to, their fellow citizens at large: though appointed from year to year, and recallable at pleasure, they were generally continued for three years; and prior to the ratification of the federal articles, for a still longer term: they held their consultations always under the veil of secrecy: they had the sole transaction of our affairs with foreign nations: through the whole course of the war, they had the fate of their country more in their hands, than it is to be hoped will ever be the case with our future representatives; and from the greatness of the prize at stake, and the eagerness of the party which lost it, it may well be supposed, that the use of other means than force would not have been scrupled: yet we know by happy experience, that the public trust was not betrayed; nor has the purity of our public councils in this particular ever suffered, even from the whispers of calumny.

Is the danger apprehended from the other branches of the federal government? But where are the means to be found by the president or the senate, or both? Their emoluments of office, it is to be presumed, will not, and without a previous corruption of the house of representatives cannot, more than suffice for very different purposes: their private fortunes, as they must all be American citizens, cannot possibly be sources of danger. The only means
then which they can possess, will be in the dispensation of appointments. Is it here that suspicion rests her charge? Sometimes we are told, that this fund of corruption is to be exhausted by the president, in subduing the virtue of the senate. Now, the fidelity of the other house is to be the victim. The improbability of such a mercenary and perfidious combination of the several members of government, standing on as different foundations as republican principles will well admit, and at the same time accountable to the society over which they are placed, ought alone to quiet this apprehension. But fortunately, the constitution has provided a still further safeguard. The members of the congress are rendered ineligible to any civil offices, that may be created, or of which the emoluments may be increased, during the term of their election. No offices therefore can be dealt out to the existing members, but such as may become vacant by ordinary casualties; and to suppose that these would be sufficient to purchase the guardians of the people, selected by the people themselves, is to renounce every rule by which events ought to be calculated, and to substitute an indiscriminate and unbounded jealousy, with which all reasoning must be vain. The sincere friends of liberty, who give themselves up to the extravagancies of this passion, are not aware of the injury they do their own cause. As there is a degree of depravity in mankind, which requires a certain degree of circumspection and distrust: so there are other qualities in human nature, which justify a certain portion of esteem and confidence. Republican government presupposes the existence of these qualities in a higher degree than any other form. Were the pictures which have been drawn by the political jealousy of some among us, faithful likenesses of the human character, the inference would be, that there is not sufficient virtue among men for self-government; and that nothing less than the chains of despotism can restrain them from destroying and devouring one another.
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BACKGROUND

Publius (James Madison) argues for the proposed Constitution by defending the House of Representatives against the criticism that it would become the rule of the few above the many.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What ought to be the aim of every political constitution?

2. In what way is the federal House of Representatives the most popular branch of government?

3. What has always been deemed one of the strongest bonds by which a society can connect the people and the rulers together?

4. What examples does Madison give to justify his claim that size will not adversely affect the choice of representatives?

The Alleged Tendency of the New Plan to Elevate the Few at the Expense of the Many Considered in Connection with Representation

The third charge against the house of representatives is, that it will be taken from that class of citizens which will have least sympathy with the mass of the people; and be most likely to aim at an ambitious sacrifice of the many, to the aggrandizement of the few.

Of all the objections which have been framed against the federal constitution, this is perhaps the most extraordinary. Whilst the objection itself is levelled against a pretended oligarchy, the principle of it strikes at the very root of republican government.

The aim of every political constitution is, or ought to be, first, to obtain for rulers men who possess most wisdom to discern, and most virtue to pursue, the common good of the society; and in the next place, to take the most effectual precautions for keeping them virtuous, whilst they continue to hold their public trust. The elective mode of obtaining rulers, is the characteristic policy of republican government. The means relied on in this form of government for preventing their degeneracy, are numerous and various. The most effectual one, is such a limitation of the term of appointments, as will maintain a proper responsibility to the people.

Let me now ask, what circumstance there is in the constitution of the house of representatives, that violates the principles of republican government; or favours the elevation of the few, on the ruins of the many? Let me ask, whether every circumstance is not, on the contrary, strictly conformable to these principles; and scrupulously impartial to the rights and pretensions of every class and description of citizens?

Who are to be the electors of the federal representatives? Not the rich, more than the poor; not the learned, more than the ignorant; not the haughty heirs of distinguished names, more than the humble sons of obscure and unpropitious fortune. The electors are to be the great body of the people of the United States. They are to be the same who exercise the right in every state of electing the correspondent branch of the legislature of the state.
Who are to be the objects of popular choice? Every citizen whose merit may recommend him to the esteem and confidence of his country. No qualification of wealth, of birth, of religious faith, or of civil profession, is permitted to fetter the judgment, or disappoint the inclination of the people.

If we consider the situation of the men on whom the free suffrages of their fellow citizens may confer the representative trust, we shall find it involving every security which can be devised or desired for their fidelity to their constituents.

In the first place, as they will have been distinguished by the preference of their fellow citizens, we are to presume that, in general, they will be somewhat distinguished also by those qualities which entitle them to it, and which promise a sincere and scrupulous regard to the nature of their engagements.

In the second place, they will enter into the public service under circumstances which cannot fail to produce a temporary affection at least to their constituents. There is in every breast a sensibility to marks of honour, of favour, of esteem, and of confidence, which, apart from all considerations of interest, is some pledge for grateful and benevolent returns. Ingratitude is a common topic of declamation against human nature; and it must be confessed, that instances of it are but too frequent and flagrant, both in public and in private life. But the universal and extreme indignation which it inspires, is itself a proof of the energy and prevalence of the contrary sentiment.

In the third place, those ties which bind the representative to his constituents, are strengthened by motives of a more selfish nature. His pride and vanity attach him to a form of government which favours his pretensions, and gives him a share in its honours and distinctions. Whatever hopes or projects might be entertained by a few aspiring characters, it must generally happen, that a great proportion of the men deriving their advancement from their influence with the people, would have more to hope from a preservation of their favour, than from innovations in the government subversive of the authority of the people.
All these securities, however, would be found very insufficient without the restraint of frequent elections. Hence, in the fourth place, the house of representatives is so constituted, as to support in the members an habitual recollection of their dependence on the people. Before the sentiments impressed on their minds by the mode of their elevation can be effaced by the exercise of power, they will be compelled to anticipate the moment when their power is to cease, when their exercise of it is to be reviewed, and when they must descend to the level from which they were raised; there for ever to remain, unless a faithful discharge of their trust shall have established their title to a renewal of it.

I will add, as a fifth circumstance in the situation of the house of representatives, restraining them from oppressive measures, that they can make no law which will not have its full operation on themselves and their friends, as well as on the great mass of the society. This has always been deemed one of the strongest bonds by which human policy can connect the rulers and the people together. It creates between them that communion of interest, and sympathy of sentiments, of which few governments have furnished examples; but without which every government degenerates into tyranny. If it be asked, what is to restrain the house of representatives from making legal discriminations in favour of themselves, and a particular class of the society? I answer, the genius of the whole system; the nature of just and constitutional laws; and, above all, the vigilant and manly spirit which actuates the people of America; a spirit which nourishes freedom, and in return is nourished by it.

If this spirit shall ever be so far debased, as to tolerate a law not obligatory on the legislature, as well as on the people, the people will be prepared to tolerate any thing but liberty.

Such will be the relation between the house of representatives and their constituents. Duty, gratitude, interest, ambition itself, are the chords by which they will be bound to fidelity and sympathy with the great mass of the people. It is possible that these may all be insufficient to control the caprice and wickedness of men. But are they not all that government will admit, and that human prudence can devise? Are they not the genuine, and the characteristic means, by which republican government provides for the liberty and happiness of the people? Are they not the identical means on which every state government in the
union relies for the attainment of these important ends? What then are we to understand
by the objection which this paper has combatted? What are we to say to the men who pro-
fess the most flaming zeal for republican government, yet boldly impeach the fundamental
principle of it; who pretend to be champions for the right and the capacity of the people to
choose their own rulers, yet maintain that they will prefer those only who will immediately
and infallibly betray the trust committed to them?

Were the objection to be read by one who had not seen the mode prescribed by the consti-
tution for the choice of representatives, he could suppose nothing less, than that some un-
reasonable qualification of property was annexed to the right of suffrage; or that the right
of eligibility was limited to persons of particular families or fortunes; or at least, that the
mode prescribed by the state constitutions was, in some respect or other, very grossly de-
parted from. We have seen how far such a supposition would err, as to the two first points.
Nor would it, in fact, be less erroneous as to the last. The only difference discoverable be-
tween the two cases is, that each representative of the United States will be elected by five
or six thousand citizens; whilst, in the individual states, the election of a representative is
left to about as many hundred. Will it be pretended, that this difference is sufficient to
justify an attachment to the state governments, and an abhorrence to the federal govern-
ment? If this be the point on which the objection turns, it deserves to be examined.

Is it supported by reason? This cannot be said, without maintaining, that five or six thou-
sand citizens are less capable of choosing a fit representative, or more liable to be corrupted
by an unfit one, than five or six hundred. Reason, on the contrary, assures us that, as in so
great a number, a fit representative would be most likely to be found; so the choice would
be less likely to be diverted from him, by the intrigues of the ambitious, or the bribes of the
rich.

Is the consequence from this doctrine admissible? If we say that five or six hundred citizens
are as many as can jointly exercise their right of suffrage, must we not deprive the people
of the immediate choice of their public servants in every instance, where the administration
of the government does not require as many of them as will amount to one for that number of citizens?

Is the doctrine warranted by facts? It was shown in the last paper, that the real representation in the British house of commons, very little exceeds the proportion of one for every thirty thousand inhabitants. Besides a variety of powerful causes, not existing here, and which favour in that country the pretensions of frank and wealth, no person is eligible as a representative of a county, unless he possess real estate of the clear value of six hundred pounds sterling per year; nor of a city or borough, unless he possess a like estate of half that annual value. To this qualification, on the part of the county representatives, is added another on the part of the county electors, which restrains the right of suffrage to persons having a freehold estate of the annual value of more than twenty pounds sterling, according to the present rate of money. Notwithstanding these unfavourable circumstances, and notwithstanding some very unequal laws in the British code, it cannot be said, that the representatives of the nation have elevated the few, on the ruins of the many.

But we need not resort to foreign experience on this subject. Our own is explicit and decisive. The districts in New Hampshire, in which the senators are chosen immediately by the people, are nearly as large as will be necessary for her representatives in the congress. Those of Massachusetts are larger than will be necessary for that purpose. And those of New York still more so. In the last state, the members of assembly, for the cities and counties of New York and Albany, are elected by very nearly as many voters as will be entitled to a representative in the congress, calculating on the number of sixty-five representatives only. It makes no difference that, in these senatorial districts and counties, a number of representatives are voted for by each elector at the same time. If the same electors, at the same time, are capable of choosing four or five representatives, they cannot be incapable of choosing one. Pennsylvania is an additional example. Some of her counties, which elect her state representatives, are almost as large as her districts will be by which her federal representatives will be elected. The city of Philadelphia is supposed to contain between fifty and sixty thousand souls. It will, therefore, form nearly two districts for the choice of federal representatives. It forms, however, but one county, in which every elector votes for each of its
representatives in the state legislature. And what may appear to be still more directly to our purpose, the whole city actually elects a single member for the executive council. This is the case in all the other counties of the state.

Are not these facts the most satisfactory proofs of the fallacy, which has been employed against the branch of the federal government under consideration? Has it appeared on trial, that the senators of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and New York; or the executive council of Pennsylvania; or the members of the assembly in the two last states, have betrayed any peculiar disposition to sacrifice the many to the few; or are in any respect less worthy of their places, than the representatives and magistrates appointed in other states, by very small divisions of the people?

But there are cases of a stronger complexion than any which I have yet quoted. One branch of the legislature of Connecticut is so constituted, that each member of it is elected by the whole state. So is the governor of that state, of Massachusetts, and of this state, and the president of New Hampshire. I leave every man to decide, whether the result of any one of these experiments can be said to countenance a suspicion, that a diffusive mode of choosing representatives of the people, tends to elevate traitors, and to undermine the public liberty.
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BACKGROUND

Publius (James Madison) argues for the proposed Constitution by introducing the Senate and explaining how it is structured.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What are the qualifications for senators?
2. The Senate exhibits what principle of representation?
3. Why is having a second branch in the legislature a good thing?
4. How does a Senate provide stability to government?

The Senate

Having examined the constitution of the House of Representatives, and answered such of the objections against it as seemed to merit notice, I enter next on the examination of the Senate.

The heads into which this member of the government may be considered are: I. The qualification of senators; II. The appointment of them by the State legislatures; III. The equality of representation in the Senate; IV. The number of senators, and the term for which they are to be elected; V. The powers vested in the Senate.

I. The qualifications proposed for senators, as distinguished from those of representatives, consist in a more advanced age and a longer period of citizenship. A senator must be thirty years of age at least; as a representative must be twenty-five. And the former must have been a citizen nine years; as seven years are required for the latter. The propriety of these distinctions is explained by the nature of the senatorial trust, which, requiring greater extent of information and stability of character, requires at the same time that the senator should have reached a period of life most likely to supply these advantages; and which, participating immediately in transactions with foreign nations, ought to be exercised by none who are not thoroughly weaned from the prepossessions and habits incident to foreign birth and education. The term of nine years appears to be a prudent mediocrity between a total exclusion of adopted citizens, whose merits and talents may claim a share in the public confidence, and an indiscriminate and hasty admission of them, which might create a channel for foreign influence on the national councils.

II. It is equally unnecessary to dilate on the appointment of senators by the State legislatures. Among the various modes which might have been devised for constituting this branch of the government, that which has been proposed by the convention is probably the most congenial with the public opinion. It is recommended by the double advantage of favoring a select appointment, and of giving to the State governments such an agency in the formation of the federal government as must secure the authority of the former, and may form a convenient link between the two systems.
III. The equality of representation in the Senate is another point, which, being evidently the result of compromise between the opposite pretensions of the large and the small States, does not call for much discussion. If indeed it be right, that among a people thoroughly incorporated into one nation, every district ought to have a PROPORTIONAL share in the government, and that among independent and sovereign States, bound together by a simple league, the parties, however unequal in size, ought to have an EQUAL share in the common councils, it does not appear to be without some reason that in a compound republic, partaking both of the national and federal character, the government ought to be founded on a mixture of the principles of proportional and equal representation. But it is superfluous to try, by the standard of theory, a part of the Constitution which is allowed on all hands to be the result, not of theory, but "of a spirit of amity, and that mutual deference and concession which the peculiarity of our political situation rendered indispensable." A common government, with powers equal to its objects, is called for by the voice, and still more loudly by the political situation, of America. A government founded on principles more consonant to the wishes of the larger States, is not likely to be obtained from the smaller States. The only option, then, for the former, lies between the proposed government and a government still more objectionable. Under this alternative, the advice of prudence must be to embrace the lesser evil; and, instead of indulging a fruitless anticipation of the possible mischiefs which may ensue, to contemplate rather the advantageous consequences which may qualify the sacrifice.

In this spirit it may be remarked, that the equal vote allowed to each State is at once a constitutional recognition of the portion of sovereignty remaining in the individual States, and an instrument for preserving that residuary sovereignty. So far the equality ought to be no less acceptable to the large than to the small States; since they are not less solicitous to guard, by every possible expedient, against an improper consolidation of the States into one simple republic.

Another advantage accruing from this ingredient in the constitution of the Senate is, the additional impediment it must prove against improper acts of legislation. No law or resolution can now be passed without the concurrence, first, of a majority of the people, and
then, of a majority of the States. It must be acknowledged that this complicated check on legislation may in some instances be injurious as well as beneficial; and that the peculiar defense which it involves in favor of the smaller States, would be more rational, if any interests common to them, and distinct from those of the other States, would otherwise be exposed to peculiar danger. But as the larger States will always be able, by their power over the supplies, to defeat unreasonable exertions of this prerogative of the lesser States, and as the faculty and excess of law-making seem to be the diseases to which our governments are most liable, it is not impossible that this part of the Constitution may be more convenient in practice than it appears to many in contemplation.

IV. The number of senators, and the duration of their appointment, come next to be considered. In order to form an accurate judgment on both of these points, it will be proper to inquire into the purposes which are to be answered by a senate; and in order to ascertain these, it will be necessary to review the inconveniences which a republic must suffer from the want of such an institution.

First. It is a misfortune incident to republican government, though in a less degree than to other governments, that those who administer it may forget their obligations to their constituents, and prove unfaithful to their important trust. In this point of view, a senate, as a second branch of the legislative assembly, distinct from, and dividing the power with, a first, must be in all cases a salutary check on the government. It doubles the security to the people, by requiring the concurrence of two distinct bodies in schemes of usurpation or perfidy, where the ambition or corruption of one would otherwise be sufficient. This is a precaution founded on such clear principles, and now so well understood in the United States, that it would be more than superfluous to enlarge on it. I will barely remark, that as the improbability of sinister combinations will be in proportion to the dissimilarity in the genius of the two bodies, it must be politic to distinguish them from each other by every circumstance which will consist with a due harmony in all proper measures, and with the genuine principles of republican government.
Second. The necessity of a senate is not less indicated by the propensity of all single and numerous assemblies to yield to the impulse of sudden and violent passions, and to be seduced by factious leaders into intemperate and pernicious resolutions. Examples on this subject might be cited without number; and from proceedings within the United States, as well as from the history of other nations. But a position that will not be contradicted, need not be proved. All that need be remarked is, that a body which is to correct this infirmity ought itself to be free from it, and consequently ought to be less numerous. It ought, moreover, to possess great firmness, and consequently ought to hold its authority by a tenure of considerable duration.

Third. Another defect to be supplied by a senate lies in a want of due acquaintance with the objects and principles of legislation. It is not possible that an assembly of men called for the most part from pursuits of a private nature, continued in appointment for a short time, and led by no permanent motive to devote the intervals of public occupation to a study of the laws, the affairs, and the comprehensive interests of their country, should, if left wholly to themselves, escape a variety of important errors in the exercise of their legislative trust. It may be affirmed, on the best grounds, that no small share of the present embarrassments of America is to be charged on the blunders of our governments; and that these have proceeded from the heads rather than the hearts of most of the authors of them. What indeed are all the repealing, explaining, and amending laws, which fill and disgrace our voluminous codes, but so many monuments of deficient wisdom; so many impeachments exhibited by each succeeding against each preceding session; so many admonitions to the people, of the value of those aids which may be expected from a well-constituted senate?

A good government implies two things: first, fidelity to the object of government, which is the happiness of the people; secondly, a knowledge of the means by which that object can be best attained. Some governments are deficient in both these qualities; most governments are deficient in the first. I scruple not to assert, that in American governments too little attention has been paid to the last. The federal Constitution avoids this error; and what merits particular notice, it provides for the last in a mode which increases the security for the first.
Fourth. The mutability in the public councils arising from a rapid succession of new members, however qualified they may be, points out, in the strongest manner, the necessity of some stable institution in the government. Every new election in the States is found to change one half of the representatives. From this change of men must proceed a change of opinions; and from a change of opinions, a change of measures. But a continual change even of good measures is inconsistent with every rule of prudence and every prospect of success. The remark is verified in private life, and becomes more just, as well as more important, in national transactions.

To trace the mischievous effects of a mutable government would fill a volume. I will hint a few only, each of which will be perceived to be a source of innumerable others.

In the first place, it forfeits the respect and confidence of other nations, and all the advantages connected with national character. An individual who is observed to be inconstant to his plans, or perhaps to carry on his affairs without any plan at all, is marked at once, by all prudent people, as a speedy victim to his own unsteadiness and folly. His more friendly neighbors may pity him, but all will decline to connect their fortunes with his; and not a few will seize the opportunity of making their fortunes out of his. One nation is to another what one individual is to another; with this melancholy distinction perhaps, that the former, with fewer of the benevolent emotions than the latter, are under fewer restraints also from taking undue advantage from the indiscretions of each other. Every nation, consequently, whose affairs betray a want of wisdom and stability, may calculate on every loss which can be sustained from the more systematic policy of their wiser neighbors. But the best instruction on this subject is unhappily conveyed to America by the example of her own situation. She finds that she is held in no respect by her friends; that she is the derision of her enemies; and that she is a prey to every nation which has an interest in speculating on her fluctuating councils and embarrassed affairs.

The internal effects of a mutable policy are still more calamitous. It poisons the blessing of liberty itself. It will be of little avail to the people, that the laws are made by men of their own choice, if the laws be so voluminous that they cannot be read, or so incoherent that
they cannot be understood; if they be repealed or revised before they are promulgated, or undergo such incessant changes that no man, who knows what the law is to-day, can guess what it will be to-morrow. Law is defined to be a rule of action; but how can that be a rule, which is little known, and less fixed?

Another effect of public instability is the unreasonable advantage it gives to the sagacious, the enterprising, and the moneyed few over the industrious and uniformed mass of the people. Every new regulation concerning commerce or revenue, or in any way affecting the value of the different species of property, presents a new harvest to those who watch the change, and can trace its consequences; a harvest, reared not by themselves, but by the toils and cares of the great body of their fellow-citizens. This is a state of things in which it may be said with some truth that laws are made for the FEW, not for the MANY.

In another point of view, great injury results from an unstable government. The want of confidence in the public councils damps every useful undertaking, the success and profit of which may depend on a continuance of existing arrangements. What prudent merchant will hazard his fortunes in any new branch of commerce when he knows not but that his plans may be rendered unlawful before they can be executed? What farmer or manufacturer will lay himself out for the encouragement given to any particular cultivation or establishment, when he can have no assurance that his preparatory labors and advances will not render him a victim to an inconstant government? In a word, no great improvement or laudable enterprise can go forward which requires the auspices of a steady system of national policy.

But the most deplorable effect of all is that diminution of attachment and reverence which steals into the hearts of the people, towards a political system which betrays so many marks of infirmity, and disappoints so many of their flattering hopes. No government, any more than an individual, will long be respected without being truly respectable; nor be truly respectable, without possessing a certain portion of order and stability.
Publius (James Madison) argues for the proposed Constitution by continuing the discussion of the Senate.

**GUIDING QUESTIONS**

1. How does a Senate provide a due sense of national character?
2. How does a Senate provide responsibility in government?
3. What is the chief difference between ancient republics and American republics?
4. What must happen to the Senate before it can become tyrannical?

A fifth desideratum, illustrating the utility of a senate, is the want of a due sense of national character. Without a select and stable member of the government, the esteem of foreign powers will not only be forfeited by an unenlightened and variable policy, proceeding from the causes already mentioned, but the national councils will not possess that sensibility to the opinion of the world, which is perhaps not less necessary in order to merit, than it is to obtain, its respect and confidence.

An attention to the judgment of other nations is important to every government for two reasons: the one is, that, independently of the merits of any particular plan or measure, it is desirable, on various accounts, that it should appear to other nations as the offspring of a wise and honorable policy; the second is, that in doubtful cases, particularly where the national councils may be warped by some strong passion or momentary interest, the presumed or known opinion of the impartial world may be the best guide that can be followed. What has not America lost by her want of character with foreign nations; and how many errors and follies would she not have avoided, if the justice and propriety of her measures had, in every instance, been previously tried by the light in which they would probably appear to the unbiased part of mankind?

Yet however requisite a sense of national character may be, it is evident that it can never be sufficiently possessed by a numerous and changeable body. It can only be found in a number so small that a sensible degree of the praise and blame of public measures may be the portion of each individual; or in an assembly so durably invested with public trust, that the pride and consequence of its members may be sensibly incorporated with the reputation and prosperity of the community. The half-yearly representatives of Rhode Island would probably have been little affected in their deliberations on the iniquitous measures of that State, by arguments drawn from the light in which such measures would be viewed by foreign nations, or even by the sister States; whilst it can scarcely be doubted that if the concurrence of a select and stable body had been necessary, a regard to national character alone would have prevented the calamities under which that misguided people is now laboring.
I add, as a sixth defect the want, in some important cases, of a due responsibility in the
government to the people, arising from that frequency of elections which in other cases
produces this responsibility. This remark will, perhaps, appear not only new, but paradox-
ical. It must nevertheless be acknowledged, when explained, to be as undeniable as it is
important.

Responsibility, in order to be reasonable, must be limited to objects within the power of the
responsible party, and in order to be effectual, must relate to operations of that power, of
which a ready and proper judgment can be formed by the constituents. The objects of gov-
ernment may be divided into two general classes: the one depending on measures which
have singly an immediate and sensible operation; the other depending on a succession of
well-chosen and well-connected measures, which have a gradual and perhaps unobserved
operation. The importance of the latter description to the collective and permanent welfare
of every country, needs no explanation. And yet it is evident that an assembly elected for
so short a term as to be unable to provide more than one or two links in a chain of measures,
on which the general welfare may essentially depend, ought not to be answerable for the
final result, any more than a steward or tenant, engaged for one year, could be justly made
to answer for places or improvements which could not be accomplished in less than half a
dozens years. Nor is it possible for the people to estimate the SHARE of influence which
their annual assemblies may respectively have on events resulting from the mixed transac-
tions of several years. It is sufficiently difficult to preserve a personal responsibility in the
members of a NUMEROUS body, for such acts of the body as have an immediate, detached,
and palpable operation on its constituents.

The proper remedy for this defect must be an additional body in the legislative department,
which, having sufficient permanency to provide for such objects as require a continued
attention, and a train of measures, may be justly and effectually answerable for the attain-
ment of those objects.

Thus far I have considered the circumstances which point out the necessity of a well-con-
structed Senate only as they relate to the representatives of the people. To a people as little
blinded by prejudice or corrupted by flattery as those whom I address, I shall not scruple to add, that such an institution may be sometimes necessary as a defense to the people against their own temporary errors and delusions. As the cool and deliberate sense of the community ought, in all governments, and actually will, in all free governments, ultimately prevail over the views of its rulers; so there are particular moments in public affairs when the people, stimulated by some irregular passion, or some illicit advantage, or misled by the artful misrepresentations of interested men, may call for measures which they themselves will afterwards be the most ready to lament and condemn. In these critical moments, how salutary will be the interference of some temperate and respectable body of citizens, in order to check the misguided career, and to suspend the blow meditated by the people against themselves, until reason, justice, and truth can regain their authority over the public mind? What bitter anguish would not the people of Athens have often escaped if their government had contained so provident a safeguard against the tyranny of their own passions? Popular liberty might then have escaped the indelible reproach of decreeing to the same citizens the hemlock on one day and statues on the next.

It may be suggested, that a people spread over an extensive region cannot, like the crowded inhabitants of a small district, be subject to the infection of violent passions, or to the danger of combining in pursuit of unjust measures. I am far from denying that this is a distinction of peculiar importance. I have, on the contrary, endeavored in a former paper to show, that it is one of the principal recommendations of a confederated republic. At the same time, this advantage ought not to be considered as superseding the use of auxiliary precautions. It may even be remarked, that the same extended situation, which will exempt the people of America from some of the dangers incident to lesser republics, will expose them to the inconvenience of remaining for a longer time under the influence of those misrepresentations which the combined industry of interested men may succeed in distributing among them.

It adds no small weight to all these considerations, to recollect that history informs us of no long-lived republic which had not a senate. Sparta, Rome, and Carthage are, in fact, the only states to whom that character can be applied. In each of the two first there was a senate...
for life. The constitution of the senate in the last is less known. Circumstantial evidence makes it probable that it was not different in this particular from the two others. It is at least certain, that it had some quality or other which rendered it an anchor against popular fluctuations; and that a smaller council, drawn out of the senate, was appointed not only for life, but filled up vacancies itself. These examples, though as unfit for the imitation, as they are repugnant to the genius, of America, are, notwithstanding, when compared with the fugitive and turbulent existence of other ancient republics, very instructive proofs of the necessity of some institution that will blend stability with liberty. I am not unaware of the circumstances which distinguish the American from other popular governments, as well ancient as modern; and which render extreme circumspection necessary, in reasoning from the one case to the other. But after allowing due weight to this consideration, it may still be maintained, that there are many points of similitude which render these examples not unworthy of our attention. Many of the defects, as we have seen, which can only be supplied by a senatorial institution, are common to a numerous assembly frequently elected by the people, and to the people themselves. There are others peculiar to the former, which require the control of such an institution. The people can never wilfully betray their own interests; but they may possibly be betrayed by the representatives of the people; and the danger will be evidently greater where the whole legislative trust is lodged in the hands of one body of men, than where the concurrence of separate and dissimilar bodies is required in every public act.

The difference most relied on, between the American and other republics, consists in the principle of representation; which is the pivot on which the former move, and which is supposed to have been unknown to the latter, or at least to the ancient part of them. The use which has been made of this difference, in reasonings contained in former papers, will have shown that I am disposed neither to deny its existence nor to undervalue its importance. I feel the less restraint, therefore, in observing, that the position concerning the ignorance of the ancient governments on the subject of representation, is by no means precisely true in the latitude commonly given to it. Without entering into a disquisition which here would be misplaced, I will refer to a few known facts, in support of what I advance.
In the most pure democracies of Greece, many of the executive functions were performed, not by the people themselves, but by officers elected by the people, and REPRESENTING the people in their EXECUTIVE capacity.

Prior to the reform of Solon, Athens was governed by nine Archons, annually ELECTED BY THE PEOPLE AT LARGE. The degree of power delegated to them seems to be left in great obscurity. Subsequent to that period, we find an assembly, first of four, and afterwards of six hundred members, annually ELECTED BY THE PEOPLE; and PARTIALLY representing them in their LEGISLATIVE capacity, since they were not only associated with the people in the function of making laws, but had the exclusive right of originating legislative propositions to the people. The senate of Carthage, also, whatever might be its power, or the duration of its appointment, appears to have been ELECTIVE by the suffrages of the people. Similar instances might be traced in most, if not all the popular governments of antiquity.

Lastly, in Sparta we meet with the Ephori, and in Rome with the Tribunes; two bodies, small indeed in numbers, but annually ELECTED BY THE WHOLE BODY OF THE PEOPLE, and considered as the REPRESENTATIVES of the people, almost in their PLENIPOTENTIARY capacity. The Cosmi of Crete were also annually ELECTED BY THE PEOPLE, and have been considered by some authors as an institution analogous to those of Sparta and Rome, with this difference only, that in the election of that representative body the right of suffrage was communicated to a part only of the people.

From these facts, to which many others might be added, it is clear that the principle of representation was neither unknown to the ancients nor wholly overlooked in their political constitutions. The true distinction between these and the American governments, lies IN THE TOTAL EXCLUSION OF THE PEOPLE, IN THEIR COLLECTIVE CAPACITY, from any share in the LATTER, and not in the TOTAL EXCLUSION OF THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PEOPLE from the administration of the FORMER. The distinction, however, thus qualified, must be admitted to leave a most advantageous superiority in favor of the United States. But to insure to this advantage its full effect, we must be careful
not to separate it from the other advantage, of an extensive territory. For it cannot be believed, that any form of representative government could have succeeded within the narrow limits occupied by the democracies of Greece.

In answer to all these arguments, suggested by reason, illustrated by examples, and enforced by our own experience, the jealous adversary of the Constitution will probably content himself with repeating, that a senate appointed not immediately by the people, and for the term of six years, must gradually acquire a dangerous pre-eminence in the government, and finally transform it into a tyrannical aristocracy.

To this general answer, the general reply ought to be sufficient, that liberty may be endangered by the abuses of liberty as well as by the abuses of power; that there are numerous instances of the former as well as of the latter; and that the former, rather than the latter, are apparently most to be apprehended by the United States. But a more particular reply may be given.

Before such a revolution can be effected, the Senate, it is to be observed, must in the first place corrupt itself; must next corrupt the State legislatures; must then corrupt the House of Representatives; and must finally corrupt the people at large. It is evident that the Senate must be first corrupted before it can attempt an establishment of tyranny. Without corrupting the State legislatures, it cannot prosecute the attempt, because the periodical change of members would otherwise regenerate the whole body. Without exerting the means of corruption with equal success on the House of Representatives, the opposition of that coequal branch of the government would inevitably defeat the attempt; and without corrupting the people themselves, a succession of new representatives would speedily restore all things to their pristine order. Is there any man who can seriously persuade himself that the proposed Senate can, by any possible means within the compass of human address, arrive at the object of a lawless ambition, through all these obstructions?

If reason condemns the suspicion, the same sentence is pronounced by experience. The constitution of Maryland furnishes the most apposite example. The Senate of that State is elected, as the federal Senate will be, indirectly by the people, and for a term less by one
year only than the federal Senate. It is distinguished, also, by the remarkable prerogative of filling up its own vacancies within the term of its appointment, and, at the same time, is not under the control of any such rotation as is provided for the federal Senate. There are some other lesser distinctions, which would expose the former to colorable objections, that do not lie against the latter. If the federal Senate, therefore, really contained the danger which has been so loudly proclaimed, some symptoms at least of a like danger ought by this time to have been betrayed by the Senate of Maryland, but no such symptoms have appeared. On the contrary, the jealousies at first entertained by men of the same description with those who view with terror the correspondent part of the federal Constitution, have been gradually extinguished by the progress of the experiment; and the Maryland constitution is daily deriving, from the salutary operation of this part of it, a reputation in which it will probably not be rivalled by that of any State in the Union.

But if any thing could silence the jealousies on this subject, it ought to be the British example. The Senate there instead of being elected for a term of six years, and of being unconfined to particular families or fortunes, is an hereditary assembly of opulent nobles. The House of Representatives, instead of being elected for two years, and by the whole body of the people, is elected for seven years, and, in very great proportion, by a very small proportion of the people. Here, unquestionably, ought to be seen in full display the aristocratic usurpations and tyranny which are at some future period to be exemplified in the United States. Unfortunately, however, for the anti-federal argument, the British history informs us that this hereditary assembly has not been able to defend itself against the continual encroachments of the House of Representatives; and that it no sooner lost the support of the monarch, than it was actually crushed by the weight of the popular branch.

As far as antiquity can instruct us on this subject, its examples support the reasoning which we have employed. In Sparta, the Ephori, the annual representatives of the people, were found an overmatch for the senate for life, continually gained on its authority and finally drew all power into their own hands. The Tribunes of Rome, who were the representatives of the people, prevailed, it is well known, in almost every contest with the senate for life, and in the end gained the most complete triumph over it. The fact is the more remarkable,
as unanimity was required in every act of the Tribunes, even after their number was augmented to ten. It proves the irresistible force possessed by that branch of a free government, which has the people on its side. To these examples might be added that of Carthage, whose senate, according to the testimony of Polybius, instead of drawing all power into its vortex, had, at the commencement of the second Punic War, lost almost the whole of its original portion.

Besides the conclusive evidence resulting from this assemblage of facts, that the federal Senate will never be able to transform itself, by gradual usurpations, into an independent and aristocratic body, we are warranted in believing, that if such a revolution should ever happen from causes which the foresight of man cannot guard against, the House of Representatives, with the people on their side, will at all times be able to bring back the Constitution to its primitive form and principles. Against the force of the immediate representatives of the people, nothing will be able to maintain even the constitutional authority of the Senate, but such a display of enlightened policy, and attachment to the public good, as will divide with that branch of the legislature the affections and support of the entire body of the people themselves.
**BACKGROUND**

Publius (Alexander Hamilton) argues for the proposed Constitution by explaining how an energetic executive is compatible with republican government.

**GUIDING QUESTIONS**

1. What does Hamilton say is a leading character in the definition of good government?
2. What kind of executive is conducive to energy?
3. What is one of the weightiest objections to a plural executive?
4. What are the two greatest securities of which a plural executive deprives people?
5. From what does the idea of a plural executive originate?

There is an idea, which is not without its advocates, that a vigorous Executive is inconsistent with the genius of republican government. The enlightened well-wishers to this species of government must at least hope that the supposition is destitute of foundation; since they can never admit its truth, without at the same time admitting the condemnation of their own principles. Energy in the Executive is a leading character in the definition of good government. It is essential to the protection of the community against foreign attacks; it is not less essential to the steady administration of the laws; to the protection of property against those irregular and high-handed combinations which sometimes interrupt the ordinary course of justice; to the security of liberty against the enterprises and assaults of ambition, of faction, and of anarchy. Every man the least conversant in Roman story, knows how often that republic was obliged to take refuge in the absolute power of a single man, under the formidable title of Dictator, as well against the intrigues of ambitious individuals who aspired to the tyranny, and the seditions of whole classes of the community whose conduct threatened the existence of all government, as against the invasions of external enemies who menaced the conquest and destruction of Rome.

There can be no need, however, to multiply arguments or examples on this head. A feeble Executive implies a feeble execution of the government. A feeble execution is but another phrase for a bad execution; and a government ill executed, whatever it may be in theory, must be, in practice, a bad government.

Taking it for granted, therefore, that all men of sense will agree in the necessity of an energetic Executive, it will only remain to inquire, what are the ingredients which constitute this energy? How far can they be combined with those other ingredients which constitute safety in the republican sense? And how far does this combination characterize the plan which has been reported by the convention?

The ingredients which constitute energy in the Executive are, first, unity; secondly, duration; thirdly, an adequate provision for its support; fourthly, competent powers.

The ingredients which constitute safety in the republican sense are, first, a due dependence on the people, secondly, a due responsibility.
Those politicians and statesmen who have been the most celebrated for the soundness of their principles and for the justice of their views, have declared in favor of a single Executive and a numerous legislature. They have with great propriety, considered energy as the most necessary qualification of the former, and have regarded this as most applicable to power in a single hand, while they have, with equal propriety, considered the latter as best adapted to deliberation and wisdom, and best calculated to conciliate the confidence of the people and to secure their privileges and interests.

That unity is conducive to energy will not be disputed. Decision, activity, secrecy, and despatch will generally characterize the proceedings of one man in a much more eminent degree than the proceedings of any greater number; and in proportion as the number is increased, these qualities will be diminished.

This unity may be destroyed in two ways: either by vesting the power in two or more magistrates of equal dignity and authority; or by vesting it ostensibly in one man, subject, in whole or in part, to the control and co-operation of others, in the capacity of counsellors to him. Of the first, the two Consuls of Rome may serve as an example; of the last, we shall find examples in the constitutions of several of the States. New York and New Jersey, if I recollect right, are the only States which have intrusted the executive authority wholly to single men. Both these methods of destroying the unity of the Executive have their partisans; but the votaries of an executive council are the most numerous. They are both liable, if not to equal, to similar objections, and may in most lights be examined in conjunction.

The experience of other nations will afford little instruction on this head. As far, however, as it teaches any thing, it teaches us not to be enamoured of plurality in the Executive. We have seen that the Achaæans, on an experiment of two Praetors, were induced to abolish one. The Roman history records many instances of mischiefs to the republic from the dissensions between the Consuls, and between the military Tribunes, who were at times substituted for the Consuls. But it gives us no specimens of any peculiar advantages derived to the state from the circumstance of the plurality of those magistrates. That the dissensions between them were not more frequent or more fatal, is a matter of astonishment, until we
advert to the singular position in which the republic was almost continually placed, and to the prudent policy pointed out by the circumstances of the state, and pursued by the Consuls, of making a division of the government between them. The patricians engaged in a perpetual struggle with the plebeians for the preservation of their ancient authorities and dignities; the Consuls, who were generally chosen out of the former body, were commonly united by the personal interest they had in the defense of the privileges of their order. In addition to this motive of union, after the arms of the republic had considerably expanded the bounds of its empire, it became an established custom with the Consuls to divide the administration between themselves by lot one of them remaining at Rome to govern the city and its environs, the other taking the command in the more distant provinces. This expedient must, no doubt, have had great influence in preventing those collisions and rivalships which might otherwise have embroiled the peace of the republic.

But quitting the dim light of historical research, attaching ourselves purely to the dictates of reason and good sense, we shall discover much greater cause to reject than to approve the idea of plurality in the Executive, under any modification whatever.

Wherever two or more persons are engaged in any common enterprise or pursuit, there is always danger of difference of opinion. If it be a public trust or office, in which they are clothed with equal dignity and authority, there is peculiar danger of personal emulation and even animosity. From either, and especially from all these causes, the most bitter dissensions are apt to spring. Whenever these happen, they lessen the respectability, weaken the authority, and distract the plans and operation of those whom they divide. If they should unfortunately assail the supreme executive magistracy of a country, consisting of a plurality of persons, they might impede or frustrate the most important measures of the government, in the most critical emergencies of the state. And what is still worse, they might split the community into the most violent and irreconcilable factions, adhering differently to the different individuals who composed the magistracy.
Men often oppose a thing, merely because they have had no agency in planning it, or because it may have been planned by those whom they dislike. But if they have been consulted, and have happened to disapprove, opposition then becomes, in their estimation, an indispensable duty of self-love. They seem to think themselves bound in honor, and by all the motives of personal infallibility, to defeat the success of what has been resolved upon contrary to their sentiments. Men of upright, benevolent tempers have too many opportunities of remarking, with horror, to what desperate lengths this disposition is sometimes carried, and how often the great interests of society are sacrificed to the vanity, to the conceit, and to the obstinacy of individuals, who have credit enough to make their passions and their caprices interesting to mankind. Perhaps the question now before the public may, in its consequences, afford melancholy proofs of the effects of this despicable frailty, or rather detestable vice, in the human character.

Upon the principles of a free government, inconveniences from the source just mentioned must necessarily be submitted to in the formation of the legislature; but it is unnecessary, and therefore unwise, to introduce them into the constitution of the Executive. It is here too that they may be most pernicious. In the legislature, promptitude of decision is oftener an evil than a benefit. The differences of opinion, and the jarrings of parties in that department of the government, though they may sometimes obstruct salutary plans, yet often promote deliberation and circumspection, and serve to check excesses in the majority.

When a resolution too is once taken, the opposition must be at an end. That resolution is a law, and resistance to it punishable. But no favorable circumstances palliate or atone for the disadvantages of dissension in the executive department. Here, they are pure and unmixed. There is no point at which they cease to operate. They serve to embarrass and weaken the execution of the plan or measure to which they relate, from the first step to the final conclusion of it. They constantly counteract those qualities in the Executive which are the most necessary ingredients in its composition, vigor and expedition, and this without any counterbalancing good. In the conduct of war, in which the energy of the Executive is the bulwark of the national security, every thing would be to be apprehended from its plurality.
It must be confessed that these observations apply with principal weight to the first case supposed that is, to a plurality of magistrates of equal dignity and authority a scheme, the advocates for which are not likely to form a numerous sect; but they apply, though not with equal, yet with considerable weight to the project of a council, whose concurrence is made constitutionally necessary to the operations of the ostensible Executive. An artful cabal in that council would be able to distract and to enervate the whole system of administration. If no such cabal should exist, the mere diversity of views and opinions would alone be sufficient to tincture the exercise of the executive authority with a spirit of habitual feebleness and dilatoriness.

But one of the weightiest objections to a plurality in the Executive, and which lies as much against the last as the first plan, is, that it tends to conceal faults and destroy responsibility.

Responsibility is of two kinds to censure and to punishment. The first is the more important of the two, especially in an elective office. Man, in public trust, will much oftener act in such a manner as to render him unworthy of being any longer trusted, than in such a manner as to make him obnoxious to legal punishment. But the multiplication of the Executive adds to the difficulty of detection in either case. It often becomes impossible, amidst mutual accusations, to determine on whom the blame or the punishment of a pernicious measure, or series of pernicious measures, ought really to fall. It is shifted from one to another with so much dexterity, and under such plausible appearances, that the public opinion is left in suspense about the real author. The circumstances which may have led to any national miscarriage or misfortune are sometimes so complicated that, where there are a number of actors who may have had different degrees and kinds of agency, though we may clearly see upon the whole that there has been mismanagement, yet it may be impracticable to pronounce to whose account the evil which may have been incurred is truly chargeable.

“I was overruled by my council. The council were so divided in their opinions that it was impossible to obtain any better resolution on the point.” These and similar pretexts are constantly at hand, whether true or false. And who is there that will either take the trouble
or incur the odium, of a strict scrutiny into the secret springs of the transaction? Should there be found a citizen zealous enough to undertake the unpromising task, if there happen to be collusion between the parties concerned, how easy it is to clothe the circumstances with so much ambiguity, as to render it uncertain what was the precise conduct of any of those parties?

In the single instance in which the governor of this State is coupled with a council that is, in the appointment to offices, we have seen the mischiefs of it in the view now under consideration. Scandalous appointments to important offices have been made. Some cases, indeed, have been so flagrant that ALL PARTIES have agreed in the impropriety of the thing. When inquiry has been made, the blame has been laid by the governor on the members of the council, who, on their part, have charged it upon his nomination; while the people remain altogether at a loss to determine, by whose influence their interests have been committed to hands so unqualified and so manifestly improper. In tenderness to individuals, I forbear to descend to particulars.

It is evident from these considerations, that the plurality of the Executive tends to deprive the people of the two greatest securities they can have for the faithful exercise of any delegated power, first, the restraints of public opinion, which lose their efficacy, as well on account of the division of the censure attendant on bad measures among a number, as on account of the uncertainty on whom it ought to fall; and, secondly, the opportunity of discovering with facility and clearness the misconduct of the persons they trust, in order either to their removal from office or to their actual punishment in cases which admit of it.

In England, the king is a perpetual magistrate; and it is a maxim which has obtained for the sake of the public peace, that he is unaccountable for his administration, and his person sacred. Nothing, therefore, can be wiser in that kingdom, than to annex to the king a constitutional council, who may be responsible to the nation for the advice they give. Without this, there would be no responsibility whatever in the executive department an idea inadmissible in a free government. But even there the king is not bound by the resolutions of his council, though they are answerable for the advice they give. He is the absolute master
of his own conduct in the exercise of his office, and may observe or disregard the counsel
given to him at his sole discretion.

But in a republic, where every magistrate ought to be personally responsible for his behav-
ior in office the reason which in the British Constitution dictates the propriety of a council,
not only ceases to apply, but turns against the institution. In the monarchy of Great Britain,
it furnishes a substitute for the prohibited responsibility of the chief magistrate, which
serves in some degree as a hostage to the national justice for his good behavior. In the
American republic, it would serve to destroy, or would greatly diminish, the intended and
necessary responsibility of the Chief Magistrate himself.

The idea of a council to the Executive, which has so generally obtained in the State consti-
tutions, has been derived from that maxim of republican jealousy which considers power
as safer in the hands of a number of men than of a single man. If the maxim should be
admitted to be applicable to the case, I should contend that the advantage on that side
would not counterbalance the numerous disadvantages on the opposite side. But I do not
think the rule at all applicable to the executive power. I clearly concur in opinion, in this
particular, with a writer whom the celebrated Junius pronounces to be "deep, solid, and
ingenious," that "the executive power is more easily confined when it is ONE"; that it is far
more safe there should be a single object for the jealousy and watchfulness of the people;
and, in a word, that all multiplication of the Executive is rather dangerous than friendly to
liberty.

A little consideration will satisfy us, that the species of security sought for in the multipli-
cation of the Executive, is attainable. Numbers must be so great as to render combination
difficult, or they are rather a source of danger than of security. The united credit and influ-
ence of several individuals must be more formidable to liberty, than the credit and influence
of either of them separately. When power, therefore, is placed in the hands of so small a
number of men, as to admit of their interests and views being easily combined in a common
enterprise, by an artful leader, it becomes more liable to abuse, and more dangerous when
abused, than if it be lodged in the hands of one man; who, from the very circumstance of
his being alone, will be more narrowly watched and more readily suspected, and who cannot unite so great a mass of influence as when he is associated with others. The Decemvirs of Rome, whose name denotes their number, were more to be dreaded in their usurpation than any one of them would have been. No person would think of proposing an Executive much more numerous than that body; from six to a dozen have been suggested for the number of the council. The extreme of these numbers, is not too great for an easy combination; and from such a combination America would have more to fear, than from the ambition of any single individual. A council to a magistrate, who is himself responsible for what he does, are generally nothing better than a clog upon his good intentions, are often the instruments and accomplices of his bad and are almost always a cloak to his faults.

I forbear to dwell upon the subject of expense; though it be evident that if the council should be numerous enough to answer the principal end aimed at by the institution, the salaries of the members, who must be drawn from their homes to reside at the seat of government, would form an item in the catalogue of public expenditures too serious to be incurred for an object of equivocal utility. I will only add that, prior to the appearance of the Constitution, I rarely met with an intelligent man from any of the States, who did not admit, as the result of experience, that the UNITY of the executive of this State was one of the best of the distinguishing features of our constitution.
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**BACKGROUND**

Publius (Alexander Hamilton) argues for the proposed Constitution by explaining how the federal judiciary works.

**GUIDING QUESTIONS**

1. How long are judges to hold office?
2. Why is the judicial branch the least dangerous of the three?
3. Why must the judiciary be independent?
4. Why must judges possess permanent appointments?
5. How does Hamilton define a limited Constitution?

We proceed now to an examination of the judiciary department of the proposed government.

In unfolding the defects of the existing Confederation, the utility and necessity of a federal judicature have been clearly pointed out. It is the less necessary to recapitulate the considerations there urged, as the propriety of the institution in the abstract is not disputed; the only questions which have been raised being relative to the manner of constituting it, and to its extent. To these points, therefore, our observations shall be confined.

The manner of constituting it seems to embrace these several objects: 1st. The mode of appointing the judges. 2d. The tenure by which they are to hold their places. 3d. The partition of the judiciary authority between different courts, and their relations to each other.

First. As to the mode of appointing the judges; this is the same with that of appointing the officers of the Union in general, and has been so fully discussed in the two last numbers, that nothing can be said here which would not be useless repetition.

Second. As to the tenure by which the judges are to hold their places; this chiefly concerns their duration in office; the provisions for their support; the precautions for their responsibility.

According to the plan of the convention, all judges who may be appointed by the United States are to hold their offices DURING GOOD BEHAVIOR; which is conformable to the most approved of the State constitutions and among the rest, to that of this State. Its propriety having been drawn into question by the adversaries of that plan, is no light symptom of the rage for objection, which disorders their imaginations and judgments. The standard of good behavior for the continuance in office of the judicial magistracy, is certainly one of the most valuable of the modern improvements in the practice of government. In a monarchy it is an excellent barrier to the despotism of the prince; in a republic it is a no less excellent barrier to the encroachments and oppressions of the representative body. And it is the best expedient which can be devised in any government, to secure a steady, upright, and impartial administration of the laws.
Whoever attentively considers the different departments of power must perceive, that, in a government in which they are separated from each other, the judiciary, from the nature of its functions, will always be the least dangerous to the political rights of the Constitution; because it will be least in a capacity to annoy or injure them. The Executive not only dispenses the honors, but holds the sword of the community. The legislature not only commands the purse, but prescribes the rules by which the duties and rights of every citizen are to be regulated. The judiciary, on the contrary, has no influence over either the sword or the purse; no direction either of the strength or of the wealth of the society; and can take no active resolution whatever. It may truly be said to have neither FORCE nor WILL, but merely judgment; and must ultimately depend upon the aid of the executive arm even for the efficacy of its judgments.

This simple view of the matter suggests several important consequences. It proves incontrovertably, that the judiciary is beyond comparison the weakest of the three departments of power; that it can never attack with success either of the other two; and that all possible care is requisite to enable it to defend itself against their attacks. It equally proves, that though individual oppression may now and then proceed from the courts of justice, the general liberty of the people can never be endangered from that quarter; I mean so long as the judiciary remains truly distinct from both the legislature and the Executive. For I agree, that "there is no liberty, if the power of judging be not separated from the legislative and executive powers." And it proves, in the last place, that as liberty can have nothing to fear from the judiciary alone, but would have every thing to fear from its union with either of the other departments; that as all the effects of such a union must ensue from a dependence of the former on the latter, notwithstanding a nominal and apparent separation; that as, from the natural feebleness of the judiciary, it is in continual jeopardy of being overpowered, awed, or influenced by its co-ordinate branches; and that as nothing can contribute so much to its firmness and independence as permanency in office, this quality may therefore be justly regarded as an indispensable ingredient in its constitution, and, in a great measure, as the citadel of the public justice and the public security.
The complete independence of the courts of justice is peculiarly essential in a limited Constitution. By a limited Constitution, I understand one which contains certain specified exceptions to the legislative authority; such, for instance, as that it shall pass no bills of attainder, no ex-post-facto laws, and the like. Limitations of this kind can be preserved in practice no other way than through the medium of courts of justice, whose duty it must be to declare all acts contrary to the manifest tenor of the Constitution void. Without this, all the reservations of particular rights or privileges would amount to nothing.

Some perplexity respecting the rights of the courts to pronounce legislative acts void, because contrary to the Constitution, has arisen from an imagination that the doctrine would imply a superiority of the judiciary to the legislative power. It is urged that the authority which can declare the acts of another void, must necessarily be superior to the one whose acts may be declared void. As this doctrine is of great importance in all the American constitutions, a brief discussion of the ground on which it rests cannot be unacceptable.

There is no position which depends on clearer principles, than that every act of a delegated authority, contrary to the tenor of the commission under which it is exercised, is void. No legislative act, therefore, contrary to the Constitution, can be valid. To deny this, would be to affirm, that the deputy is greater than his principal; that the servant is above his master; that the representatives of the people are superior to the people themselves; that men acting by virtue of powers, may do not only what their powers do not authorize, but what they forbid.

If it be said that the legislative body are themselves the constitutional judges of their own powers, and that the construction they put upon them is conclusive upon the other departments, it may be answered, that this cannot be the natural presumption, where it is not to be collected from any particular provisions in the Constitution. It is not otherwise to be supposed, that the Constitution could intend to enable the representatives of the people to substitute their WILL to that of their constituents. It is far more rational to suppose, that the courts were designed to be an intermediate body between the people and the legislature, in order, among other things, to keep the latter within the limits assigned to their authority.
The interpretation of the laws is the proper and peculiar province of the courts. A constitution is, in fact, and must be regarded by the judges, as a fundamental law. It therefore belongs to them to ascertain its meaning, as well as the meaning of any particular act proceeding from the legislative body. If there should happen to be an irreconcilable variance between the two, that which has the superior obligation and validity ought, of course, to be preferred; or, in other words, the Constitution ought to be preferred to the statute, the intention of the people to the intention of their agents.

Nor does this conclusion by any means suppose a superiority of the judicial to the legislative power. It only supposes that the power of the people is superior to both; and that where the will of the legislature, declared in its statutes, stands in opposition to that of the people, declared in the Constitution, the judges ought to be governed by the latter rather than the former. They ought to regulate their decisions by the fundamental laws, rather than by those which are not fundamental.

This exercise of judicial discretion, in determining between two contradictory laws, is exemplified in a familiar instance. It not uncommonly happens, that there are two statutes existing at one time, clashing in whole or in part with each other, and neither of them containing any repealing clause or expression. In such a case, it is the province of the courts to liquidate and fix their meaning and operation. So far as they can, by any fair construction, be reconciled to each other, reason and law conspire to dictate that this should be done; where this is impracticable, it becomes a matter of necessity to give effect to one, in exclusion of the other. The rule which has obtained in the courts for determining their relative validity is, that the last in order of time shall be preferred to the first. But this is a mere rule of construction, not derived from any positive law, but from the nature and reason of the thing. It is a rule not enjoined upon the courts by legislative provision, but adopted by themselves, as consonant to truth and propriety, for the direction of their conduct as interpreters of the law. They thought it reasonable, that between the interfering acts of an EQUAL authority, that which was the last indication of its will should have the preference.
But in regard to the interfering acts of a superior and subordinate authority, of an original and derivative power, the nature and reason of the thing indicate the converse of that rule as proper to be followed. They teach us that the prior act of a superior ought to be preferred to the subsequent act of an inferior and subordinate authority; and that accordingly, whenever a particular statute contravenes the Constitution, it will be the duty of the judicial tribunals to adhere to the latter and disregard the former.

It can be of no weight to say that the courts, on the pretense of a repugnancy, may substitute their own pleasure to the constitutional intentions of the legislature. This might as well happen in the case of two contradictory statutes; or it might as well happen in every adjudication upon any single statute. The courts must declare the sense of the law; and if they should be disposed to exercise WILL instead of JUDGMENT, the consequence would equally be the substitution of their pleasure to that of the legislative body. The observation, if it prove any thing, would prove that there ought to be no judges distinct from that body.

If, then, the courts of justice are to be considered as the bulwarks of a limited Constitution against legislative encroachments, this consideration will afford a strong argument for the permanent tenure of judicial offices, since nothing will contribute so much as this to that independent spirit in the judges which must be essential to the faithful performance of so arduous a duty.

This independence of the judges is equally requisite to guard the Constitution and the rights of individuals from the effects of those ill humors, which the arts of designing men, or the influence of particular conjunctures, sometimes disseminate among the people themselves, and which, though they speedily give place to better information, and more deliberate reflection, have a tendency, in the meantime, to occasion dangerous innovations in the government, and serious oppressions of the minor party in the community. Though I trust the friends of the proposed Constitution will never concur with its enemies, in questioning that fundamental principle of republican government, which admits the right of the people to alter or abolish the established Constitution, whenever they find it incon-
sistent with their happiness, yet it is not to be inferred from this principle, that the repre-
sentatives of the people, whenever a momentary inclination happens to lay hold of a ma-
5 jority of their constituents, incompatible with the provisions in the existing Constitution,
would, on that account, be justifiable in a violation of those provisions; or that the courts
would be under a greater obligation to connive at infractions in this shape, than when they
had proceeded wholly from the cabals of the representative body. Until the people have, by
some solemn and authoritative act, annulled or changed the established form, it is binding
upon themselves collectively, as well as individually; and no presumption, or even
knowledge, of their sentiments, can warrant their representatives in a departure from it,
prior to such an act. But it is easy to see, that it would require an uncommon portion of
fortitude in the judges to do their duty as faithful guardians of the Constitution, where
legislative invasions of it had been instigated by the major voice of the community.

But it is not with a view to infractions of the Constitution only, that the independence of
the judges may be an essential safeguard against the effects of occasional ill humors in the
society. These sometimes extend no farther than to the injury of the private rights of par-
ticular classes of citizens, by unjust and partial laws. Here also the firmness of the judicial
magistracy is of vast importance in mitigating the severity and confining the operation of
such laws. It not only serves to moderate the immediate mischiefs of those which may have
been passed, but it operates as a check upon the legislative body in passing them; who,
perceiving that obstacles to the success of iniquitous intention are to be expected from the
scruples of the courts, are in a manner compelled, by the very motives of the injustice they
meditate, to qualify their attempts. This is a circumstance calculated to have more influence
upon the character of our governments, than but few may be aware of. The benefits of the
integrity and moderation of the judiciary have already been felt in more States than one;
and though they may have displeased those whose sinister expectations they may have dis-
appointed, they must have commanded the esteem and applause of all the virtuous and
disinterested. Considerate men, of every description, ought to prize whatever will tend to
beget or fortify that temper in the courts: as no man can be sure that he may not be to-
morrow the victim of a spirit of injustice, by which he may be a gainer to-day. And every
man must now feel, that the inevitable tendency of such a spirit is to sap the foundations of public and private confidence, and to introduce in its stead universal distrust and distress.

That inflexible and uniform adherence to the rights of the Constitution, and of individuals, which we perceive to be indispensable in the courts of justice, can certainly not be expected from judges who hold their offices by a temporary commission. Periodical appointments, however regulated, or by whomsoever made, would, in some way or other, be fatal to their necessary independence. If the power of making them was committed either to the Executive or legislature, there would be danger of an improper complaisance to the branch which possessed it; if to both, there would be an unwillingness to hazard the displeasure of either; if to the people, or to persons chosen by them for the special purpose, there would be too great a disposition to consult popularity, to justify a reliance that nothing would be consulted but the Constitution and the laws.

There is yet a further and a weightier reason for the permanency of the judicial offices, which is deducible from the nature of the qualifications they require. It has been frequently remarked, with great propriety, that a voluminous code of laws is one of the inconveniences necessarily connected with the advantages of a free government. To avoid an arbitrary discretion in the courts, it is indispensable that they should be bound down by strict rules and precedents, which serve to define and point out their duty in every particular case that comes before them; and it will readily be conceived from the variety of controversies which grow out of the folly and wickedness of mankind, that the records of those precedents must unavoidably swell to a very considerable bulk, and must demand long and laborious study to acquire a competent knowledge of them. Hence it is, that there can be but few men in the society who will have sufficient skill in the laws to qualify them for the stations of judges. And making the proper deductions for the ordinary depravity of human nature, the number must be still smaller of those who unite the requisite integrity with the requisite knowledge. These considerations apprise us, that the government can have no great option between fit character; and that a temporary duration in office, which would naturally discourage such characters from quitting a lucrative line of practice to accept a seat on the
bench, would have a tendency to throw the administration of justice into hands less able, and less well qualified, to conduct it with utility and dignity. In the present circumstances of this country, and in those in which it is likely to be for a long time to come, the disadvantages on this score would be greater than they may at first sight appear; but it must be confessed, that they are far inferior to those which present themselves under the other aspects of the subject.

Upon the whole, there can be no room to doubt that the convention acted wisely in copying from the models of those constitutions which have established GOOD BEHAVIOR as the tenure of their judicial offices, in point of duration; and that so far from being blamable on this account, their plan would have been inexcusably defective, if it had wanted this important feature of good government. The experience of Great Britain affords an illustrious comment on the excellence of the institution.
BRUTUS

Essay XI

ESSAY EXCERPT

January 31, 1788


BACKGROUND

The anonymous Brutus penned this article criticizing the proposed Constitution, focusing on the power of the independent judiciary.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Why will the opinions of the Supreme Court have the force of law, according to Brutus?

2. How will the independent judiciary affect the powers and rights of the state governments?

3. Why does Brutus expect the federal judiciary to try to extend its authority and power?

The nature and extent of the judicial power of the United States, proposed to be granted by this constitution, claims our particular attention.

Much has been said and written upon the subject of this new system on both sides, but I have not met with any writer, who has discussed the judicial powers with any degree of accuracy. And yet it is obvious, that we can form but very imperfect ideas of the manner in which this government will work, or the effect it will have in changing the internal police and mode of distributing justice at present subsisting in the respective states, without a thorough investigation of the powers of the judiciary and of the manner in which they will operate. This government is a complete system, not only for making, but for executing laws.

And the courts of law, which will be constituted by it, are not only to decide upon the constitution and the laws made in pursuance of it, but by officers subordinate to them to execute all their decisions. The real effect of this system of government, will therefore be brought home to the feelings of the people, through the medium of the judicial power. It is, moreover, of great importance, to examine with care the nature and extent of the judicial power, because those who are to be vested with it, are to be placed in a situation altogether unprecedented in a free country. They are to be rendered totally independent, both of the people and the legislature, both with respect to their offices and salaries. No errors they may commit can be corrected by any power above them, if any such power there be, nor can they be removed from office for making ever so many erroneous adjudications.

The only causes for which they can be displaced, is, conviction of treason, bribery, and high crimes and misdemeanors.

This part of the plan is so modeled, as to authorize the courts, not only to carry into execution the powers expressly given, but where these are wanting or ambiguously expressed, to supply what is wanting by their own decisions.

That we may be enabled to form a just opinion on this subject, I shall, in considering it,

1st. Examine the nature and extent of the judicial powers—and
2d. Inquire, whether the courts who are to exercise them, are so constituted as to afford reasonable ground of confidence, that they will exercise them for the general good....

In article 3d, section 2d, it is said, “The judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and equity arising under this constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority, etc.”...

This article…vests the judicial with a power to resolve all questions that may arise on any case on the construction of the constitution, either in law or in equity.

1st. They are authorized to determine all questions that may arise upon the meaning of the constitution in law. This article vests the courts with authority to give the constitution a legal construction, or to explain it according to the rules laid down for construing a law.—

These rules give a certain degree of latitude of explanation. According to this mode of construction, the courts are to give such meaning to the constitution as comports best with the common, and generally received acceptation of the words in which it is expressed, regarding their ordinary and popular use, rather than their grammatical propriety. Where words are dubious, they will be explained by the context....

2d. The judicial are not only to decide questions arising upon the meaning of the constitution in law, but also in equity.

By this they are empowered, to explain the constitution according to the reasoning spirit of it, without being confined to the words or letter....

From these remarks, the authority and business of the courts of law, under this clause, may be understood.

They will give the sense of every article of the constitution, that may from time to time come before them. And in their decisions they will not confine themselves to any fixed or established rules, but will determine, according to what appears to them, the reason and spirit of the constitution. The opinions of the supreme court, whatever they may be, will
have the force of law; because there is no power provided in the constitution, that can cor-
rect their errors, or control their adjudications. From this court there is no appeal. And I
conceive the legislature themselves, cannot set aside a judgment of this court, because they
are authorized by the constitution to decide in the last resort. The legislature must be con-
trolled by the constitution, and not the constitution by them. They have therefore no more
right to set aside any judgment pronounced upon the construction of the constitution, than
they have to take from the president, the chief command of the army and navy, and commit
it to some other person. The reason is plain; the judicial and executive derive their authority
from the same source, that the legislature do theirs; and therefore in all cases, where the
constitution does not make the one responsible to, or controllable by the other, they are
altogether independent of each other.

The judicial power will operate to affect, in the most certain, but yet silent and impercepti-
ble manner, what is evidently the tendency of the constitution:—I mean, an entire subver-
sion of the legislative, executive and judicial powers of the individual states. Every adjudi-
cation of the supreme court, on any question that may arise upon the nature and extent of
the general government, will affect the limits of the state jurisdiction. In proportion as the
former enlarge the exercise of their powers, will that of the latter be restricted.

That the judicial power of the United States, will lean strongly in favor of the general gov-
ernment, and will give such an explanation to the constitution, as will favor an extension
of its jurisdiction, is very evident from a variety of considerations.

1st. The constitution itself strongly countenances such a mode of construction. Most of the
articles in this system, which convey powers of any considerable importance, are conceived
in general and indefinite terms, which are either equivocal, ambiguous, or which require
long definitions to unfold the extent of their meaning. The two most important powers
committed to any government, those of raising money, and of raising and keeping up
troops, have already been considered, and shown to be unlimited by any thing but the dis-
cretion of the legislature. The clause which vests the power to pass all laws which are proper
and necessary, to carry the powers given into execution, it has been shown, leaves the legislature at liberty, to do every thing, which in their judgment is best. It is said, I know, that this clause confers no power on the legislature, which they would not have had without it—though I believe this is not the fact, yet, admitting it to be, it implies that the constitution is not to receive an explanation strictly, according to its letter; but more power is implied than is expressed. And this clause, if it is to be considered, as explanatory of the extent of the powers given, rather than giving a new power, is to be understood as declaring, that in construing any of the articles conveying power, the spirit, intent and design of the clause, should be attended to, as well as the words in their common acceptation.

This constitution gives sufficient color for adopting an equitable construction, if we consider the great end and design it professedly has in view—these appear from its preamble to be, “to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and posterity.” The design of this system is here expressed, and it is proper to give such a meaning to the various parts, as will best promote the accomplishment of the end; this idea suggests itself naturally upon reading the preamble, and will countenance the court in giving the several articles such a sense, as will the most effectually promote the ends the constitution had in view—how this manner of explaining the constitution will operate in practice, shall be the subject of future inquiry.

2d. Not only will the constitution justify the courts in inclining to this mode of explaining it, but they will be interested in using this latitude of interpretation. Every body of men invested with office are tenacious of power; they feel interested, and hence it has become a kind of maxim, to hand down their offices, with all its rights and privileges, unimpaired to their successors; the same principle will influence them to extend their power, and increase their rights; this of itself will operate strongly upon the courts to give such a meaning to the constitution in all cases where it can possibly be done, as will enlarge the sphere of their own authority. Every extension of the power of the general legislature, as well as of the judicial powers, will increase the powers of the courts; and the dignity and importance of the judges, will be in proportion to the extent and magnitude of the powers they exercise. I
add, it is highly probable the emolument of the judges will be increased, with the increase of the business they will have to transact and its importance. From these considerations the judges will be interested to extend the powers of the courts, and to construe the constitution as much as possible, in such a way as to favor it; and that they will do it, appears probable.

3d. Because they will have precedent to plead, to justify them in it. It is well known, that the courts in England, have by their own authority, extended their jurisdiction far beyond the limits set them in their original institution, and by the laws of the land....

When the courts will have a precedent before them of a court which extended its jurisdiction in opposition to an act of the legislature, is it not to be expected that they will extend theirs, especially when there is nothing in the constitution expressly against it? and they are authorized to construe its meaning, and are not under any control?

This power in the judicial, will enable them to mold the government, into almost any shape they please....
BACKGROUND

The Supreme Court issued its ruling after William Marbury sued then-Secretary of State James Madison over his appointment to a government office.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What is Marbury seeking?

2. What authority does the Supreme Court have, according to Marshall’s discussion of the judicial power of the United States?

3. What is a writ of mandamus?

4. What kind of law is the Constitution?

5. According to Marshall, what is the essence of judicial duty?

Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137 (1803).
Mr. Chief Justice Marshall delivered the Opinion of the Court:

...1st. Has the applicant a right to the commission he demands?

2nd. If he has a right, and that right has been violated, do the laws of his country afford him a remedy?

3rd. If they do afford him a remedy, is it a mandamus issuing from this court?...

It is...the opinion of the Court,

1st. That by signing the commission of Mr. Marbury, the President of the United States appointed him a justice of peace for the county of Washington, in the District of Columbia; and that the seal of the United States, affixed thereto by the Secretary of State, is conclusive testimony of the verity of the signature, and of the completion of the appointment; and that the appointment conferred on him a legal right to the office for the space of five years.

2nd. That, having this legal title to the office, he has a consequent right to the commission; a refusal to deliver which is a plain violation of that right, for which the laws of his country afford him a remedy.

It remains to be inquired whether,

3rd. He is entitled to the remedy for which he applies. This depends on,

1st. The nature of the writ applied for; and,

2nd. The power of this court.

This, then, is a plain case for a mandamus, either to deliver the commission, or a copy of it from the record; and it only remains to be inquired,

Whether it can issue from this court....
The act to establish the judicial courts of the United States authorizes the Supreme Court "to issue writs of mandamus in cases warranted by the principles and usages of law, to any courts appointed, or persons holding office, under the authority of the United States."

The Secretary of State, being a person holding an office under the authority of the United States, is precisely within the letter of the description, and if this court is not authorized to issue a writ of mandamus to such an officer, it must be because the law is unconstitutional, and therefore absolutely incapable of conferring the authority, and assigning the duties which its words purport to confer and assign.

The constitution vests the whole judicial power of the United States in one Supreme Court, and such inferior courts as congress shall, from time to time, ordain and establish. This power is expressly extended to all cases arising under the laws of the United States; and, consequently, in some form, may be exercised over the present case; because the right claimed is given by a law of the United States.

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

It has been insisted, at the bar, that as the original grant of jurisdiction, to the Supreme and inferior courts, is general, and the clause, assigning original jurisdiction to the Supreme Court, contains no negative or restrictive words, the power remains to the legislature, to assign original jurisdiction to that court in other cases than those specified in the article which has been recited; provided those cases belong to the judicial power of the United States.

If it had been intended to leave it in the discretion of the legislature to apportion the judicial power between the supreme and inferior courts according to the will of that body, it would certainly have been useless to have proceeded further than to have defined the judicial power, and the tribunals in which it should be vested. The subsequent part of the section is
mere surplusage, is entirely without meaning, if such is to be the construction. If congress remains at liberty to give this court appellate jurisdiction, where the constitution has declared their jurisdiction shall be original; and original jurisdiction where the constitution has declared it shall be appellate; the distribution of jurisdiction, made in the constitution, is form without substance....

It is the essential criterion of appellate jurisdiction, that it revises and corrects the proceedings in a cause already instituted, and does not create that cause. Although, therefore, a mandamus may be directed to courts, yet to issue such a writ to an officer for the delivery of a paper, is in effect the same as to sustain an original action for that paper, and, therefore, seems not to belong to appellate, but to original jurisdiction. Neither is it necessary in such a case as this, to enable the court to exercise its appellate jurisdiction.

The authority, therefore, given to the Supreme Court, by the act establishing the judicial courts of the United States, to issue writs of mandamus to public officers, appears not to be warranted by the constitution; and it becomes necessary to inquire whether a jurisdiction so conferred can be exercised.

The question, whether an act, repugnant to the constitution, can become the law of the land, is a question deeply interesting to the United States; but, happily, not of an intricacy proportioned to its interest. It seems only necessary to recognize certain principles, supposed to have been long and well established, to decide it.

That the people have an original right to establish, for their future government, such principles, as, in their opinion, shall most conduce to their own happiness is the basis on which the whole American fabric has been erected. The exercise of this original right is a very great exertion; nor can it, nor ought it, to be frequently repeated. The principles, therefore, so established, are deemed fundamental. And as the authority from which they proceed is supreme, and can seldom act, they are designed to be permanent.
This original and supreme will organizes the government, and assigns to different departments their respective powers. It may either stop here, or establish certain limits not to be transcended by those departments.

The government of the United States is of the latter description. The powers of the legislature are defined and limited; and that those limits may not be mistaken, or forgotten, the constitution is written. To what purpose are powers limited, and to what purpose is that limitation committed to writing, if these limits may, at any time, be passed by those intended to be restrained? The distinction between a government with limited and unlimited powers is abolished, if those limits do not confine the persons on whom they are imposed, and if acts prohibited and acts allowed, are of equal obligation. It is a proposition too plain to be contested, that the constitution controls any legislative act repugnant to it; or, that the legislature may alter the constitution by an ordinary act.

Between these alternatives there is no middle ground. The constitution is either a superior paramount law, unchangeable by ordinary means, or it is on a level with ordinary legislative acts, and, like other acts, is alterable when the legislature shall please to alter it.

If the former part of the alternative be true, then a legislative act contrary to the constitution is not law: if the latter part be true, then written constitutions are absurd attempts, on the part of the people, to limit a power in its own nature illimitable.

Certainly all those who have framed written constitutions contemplate them as forming the fundamental and paramount law of the nation, and, consequently, the theory of every such government must be, that an act of the legislature, repugnant to the constitution, is void.

This theory is essentially attached to a written constitution, and, is consequently, to be considered, by this court, as one of the fundamental principles of our society. It is not therefore to be lost sight of in the further consideration of this subject.

If an act of the legislature, repugnant to the constitution, is void, does it, notwithstanding its invalidity, bind the courts, and oblige them to give it effect? Or, in other words, though
it be not law, does it constitute a rule as operative as if it was a law? This would be to over-
throw in fact what was established in theory; and would seem, at first view, an absurdity
too gross to be insisted on. It shall, however, receive a more attentive consideration.

It is emphatically the province and duty of the judicial department to say what the law is.
Those who apply the rule to particular cases, must of necessity expound and interpret that rule. If two laws conflict with each other, the courts must decide on the operation of each.

So if a law be in opposition to the constitution; if both the law and the constitution apply to a particular case, so that the court must either decide that case conformably to the law, disregarding the constitution; or conformably to the constitution, disregarding the law; the court must determine which of these conflicting rules governs the case. This is of the very essence of judicial duty.

If, then, the courts are to regard the constitution, and the constitution is superior to any ordinary act of the legislature, the constitution, and not such ordinary act, must govern the case to which they both apply.

Those, then, who controvert the principle that the constitution is to be considered, in court, as a paramount law, are reduced to the necessity of maintaining that courts must close their eyes on the constitution, and see only the law.

This doctrine would subvert the very foundation of all written constitutions. It would de-
clare that an act which, according to the principles and theory of our government, is en-
tirely void, is yet, in practice, completely obligatory. It would declare that if the legislature shall do what is expressly forbidden, such act, notwithstanding the express prohibition, is in reality effectual. It would be giving to the legislature a practical and real omnipotence, with the same breath which professes to restrict their powers within narrow limits. It is prescribing limits, and declaring that those limits may be passed at pleasure.

That it thus reduces to nothing what we have deemed the greatest improvement on political institutions, a written constitution, would of itself be sufficient, in America, where written constitutions have been viewed with so much reverence, for rejecting the construction. But
the peculiar expressions of the constitution of the United States furnish additional arguments in favor of its rejection.

The judicial power of the United States is extended to all cases arising under the constitution.

Could it be the intention of those who gave this power, to say that in using it the constitution should not be looked into? That a case arising under the constitution should be decided without examining the instrument under which it arises?

This is too extravagant to be maintained.

In some cases, then, the constitution must be looked into by the judges. And if they can open it at all, what part of it are they forbidden to read or to obey?

There are many other parts of the constitution which serve to illustrate this subject.

It is declared that "no tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any state." Suppose a duty on the export of cotton, of tobacco, or of flour; and a suit instituted to recover it. Ought judgment to be rendered in such a case? Ought the judges to close their eyes on the constitution, and only see the law?

The constitution declares "that no bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed."

If, however, such a bill should be passed, and a person should be prosecuted under it; must the court condemn to death those victims whom the constitution endeavors to preserve?

"No person," says the constitution, "shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court."

Here the language of the constitution is addressed especially to the courts. It prescribes, directly for them, a rule of evidence not to be departed from. If the legislature should change that rule, and declare one witness, or a confession out of court, sufficient for conviction, must the constitutional principle yield to the legislative act?
From these, and many other selections which might be made, it is apparent, that the framers of the constitution contemplated that instrument as a rule for the government of courts, as well as of the legislature.

Why otherwise does it direct the judges to take an oath to support it? This oath certainly applies in an especial manner, to their conduct in their official character. How immoral to impose it on them, if they were to be used as the instruments, and the knowing instruments, for violating what they swear to support!...

It is also not entirely unworthy of observation, that in declaring what shall be the supreme law of the land, the constitution itself is first mentioned; and not the laws of the United States generally, but those only which shall be made in pursuance of the constitution, have that rank.

Thus, the particular phraseology of the constitution of the United States confirms and strengthens the principle, supposed to be essential to all written constitutions, that a law repugnant to the constitution is void; and that courts, as well as other departments, are bound by that instrument.
Chief Justice John Marshall

James McCulloch v. the State of Maryland,

John James

U.S. Supreme Court Majority Opinion Excerpt

March 6, 1819

Supreme Court | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

The Supreme Court issued its ruling in a case involving the constitutionality of the national bank and a tax which the state of Maryland imposed on the bank.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What was the nature of the Maryland law at issue in this case?

2. From where does the Constitution derive its authority?

3. What does it mean to say that the U.S. government is one of "enumerated powers"?

4. What does the Necessary and Proper Clause add to the idea of enumerated powers?

5. How does Marshall interpret the word "necessary"?

6. What "means" are appropriate and constitutional for executing an act of the national legislature?

7. Why does Marshall deem the Maryland tax to be contrary to the Constitution?

8. What is the extent of a state's sovereignty with respect to the Constitution?

McCulloch v. Maryland, 17 U.S. 316 (1819).
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Chief Justice MARSHALL delivered the opinion of the court...

. . . [Maryland] denies the obligation of a law enacted by the legislature of the Union, and [McCulloch], on his part, contests the validity of an act which has been passed by the legislature of that state. . . . No tribunal can approach such a question without a deep sense of its importance, and of the awful responsibility involved in its decision. But it must be decided peacefully, or remain a source of hostile legislation, perhaps, of hostility of a still more serious nature; and if it is to be so decided, by this tribunal alone can the decision be made. On the Supreme Court of the United States has the Constitution of our country devolved this important duty.

The first question made in the cause is—has Congress power to incorporate a bank? It has been truly said, that this can scarcely be considered as an open question entirely unprejudiced by the former proceedings of the Nation respecting it. The principle now contested was introduced at a very early period of our history, has been recognized by many successive legislatures, and has been acted upon by the Judicial Department, in cases of peculiar delicacy, as a law of undoubted obligation. . . .

In discussing this question, the counsel for the State of Maryland have deemed it of some importance, in the construction of the Constitution, to consider that instrument not as emanating from the people, but as the act of sovereign and independent States. The powers of the General Government, it has been said, are delegated by the States, who alone are truly sovereign, and must be exercised in subordination to the States, who alone possess supreme dominion. It would be difficult to sustain this proposition. The convention which framed the Constitution was indeed elected by the State legislatures. But the instrument, when it came from their hands, was a mere proposal, without obligation or pretensions to it. It was reported to the then existing Congress of the United States with a request that it might “be submitted to a convention of delegates, chosen in each state by the people thereof, under the recommendation of its legislature, for their assent and ratification.” This mode of proceeding was adopted, and by the convention, by Congress, and by the State legislatures, the instrument was submitted to the people. They acted upon it in the only manner in which
they can act safely, effectively and wisely, on such a subject—by assembling in convention. It is true, they assembled in their several States—and where else should they have assembled? No political dreamer was ever wild enough to think of breaking down the lines which separate the States, and of compounding the American people into one common mass. Of consequence, when they act, they act in their States. But the measures they adopt do not, on that account, cease to be the measures of the people themselves, or become the measures of the State governments.

From these conventions the Constitution derives its whole authority. The government proceeds directly from the people; is “ordained and established” in the name of the people, and is declared to be ordained, “in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, and secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and to their posterity.” The assent of the States in their sovereign capacity is implied in calling a convention, and thus submitting that instrument to the people. But the people were at perfect liberty to accept or reject it, and their act was final. It required not the affirmance, and could not be negatived, by the State Governments. The Constitution, when thus adopted, was of complete obligation, and bound the State sovereignties. . . .

. . . The Government of the Union then . . . is, emphatically and truly, a Government of the people. In form and in substance, it emanates from them. Its powers are granted by them, and are to be exercised directly on them, and for their benefit.

This Government is acknowledged by all to be one of enumerated powers. The principle that it can exercise only the powers granted to it would seem too apparent to have required to be enforced by all those arguments which its enlightened friends, while it was depending before the people, found it necessary to urge; that principle is now universally admitted. But the question respecting the extent of the powers actually granted is perpetually arising, and will probably continue to arise so long as our system shall exist. In discussing these questions, the conflicting powers of the General and State governments must be brought into view, and the supremacy of their respective laws, when they are in opposition, must be settled.
If any one proposition could command the universal assent of mankind, we might expect it would be this—that the Government of the Union, though limited in its powers, is supreme within its sphere of action. This would seem to result necessarily from its nature. It is the Government of all; its powers are delegated by all; it represents all, and acts for all. Though any one State may be willing to control its operations, no State is willing to allow others to control them. The nation, on those subjects on which it can act, must necessarily bind its component parts. But this question is not left to mere reason; the people have, in express terms, decided it by saying [in Article VI, section 2], “this Constitution, and the laws of the United States, which shall be made in pursuance thereof,” “shall be the supreme law of the land,” and by requiring that the members of the State legislatures and the officers of the executive and judicial departments of the States shall take the oath of fidelity to it. The Government of the United States, then, though limited in its powers, is supreme, and its laws, when made in pursuance of the Constitution, form the supreme law of the land, “anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.”

Among the enumerated powers, we do not find that of establishing a bank or creating a corporation. But there is no phrase in the instrument which, like the Articles of Confederation, excludes incidental or implied powers, and which requires that everything granted shall be expressly and minutely described. Even the Tenth Amendment, which was framed for the purpose of quieting the excessive jealousies which had been excited, omits the word “expressly,” and declares only that the powers “not delegated to the United States, nor prohibited to the States, are reserved to the States or to the people,” thus leaving the question whether the particular power which may become the subject of contest has been delegated to the one Government, or prohibited to the other, to depend on a fair construction of the whole instrument. . . . A Constitution, to contain an accurate detail of all the subdivisions of which its great powers will admit, and of all the means by which they may be carried into execution, would partake of the prolixity of a legal code, and could scarcely be embraced by the human mind. It would probably never be understood by the public. Its nature, therefore, requires, that only its great outlines should be marked, its important objects designated, and the minor ingredients which compose those objects be deduced from the nature
of the objects themselves. That this idea was entertained by the framers of the American Constitution is not only to be inferred from the nature of the instrument, but from the language. Why else were some of the limitations found in the 9th section of the 1st article introduced? It is also in some degree warranted by their having omitted to use any restrictive term which might prevent its receiving a fair and just interpretation. In considering this question, then, we must never forget that it is a Constitution we are expounding.

Although, among the enumerated powers of Government, we do not find the word “bank” or “incorporation,” we find the great powers, to lay and collect taxes; to borrow money; to regulate commerce; to declare and conduct a war; and to raise and support armies and navies. The sword and the purse, all the external relations, and no inconsiderable portion of the industry of the nation, are intrusted to its government. . . . [A] government intrusted with such ample powers, on the due execution of which the happiness and prosperity of the Nation so vitally depends, must also be intrusted with ample means for their execution. The power being given, it is the interest of the Nation to facilitate its execution. It can never be their interest, and cannot be presumed to have been their intention, to clog and embarrass its execution by withholding the most appropriate means. . . . The exigencies of the Nation may require that the treasure raised in the north should be transported to the south that raised in the east, conveyed to the west, or that this order should be reversed. Is that construction of the Constitution to be preferred which would render these operations difficult, hazardous and expensive? Can we adopt that construction (unless the words imperiously require it) which would impute to the framers of that instrument, when granting these powers for the public good, the intention of impeding their exercise, by withholding a choice of means? If, indeed, such be the mandate of the Constitution, we have only to obey; but that instrument does not profess to enumerate the means by which the powers it confers may be executed; nor does it prohibit the creation of a corporation, if the existence of such a being be essential, to the beneficial exercise of those powers. It is, then, the subject of fair inquiry, how far such means may be employed.

It is not denied that the powers given to the Government imply the ordinary means of execution. That, for example, of raising revenue and applying it to national purposes is
admitted to imply the power of conveying money from place to place as the exigencies of
the Nation may require, and of employing the usual means of conveyance. But it is denied
that the Government has its choice of means, or that it may employ the most convenient
means if, to employ them, it be necessary to erect a corporation. On what foundation does
this argument rest? On this alone: the power of creating a corporation is one appertaining
to sovereignty, and is not expressly conferred on Congress. This is true. But all legislative
powers appertain to sovereignty. The original power of giving the law on any subject what-
ever is a sovereign power, and if the Government of the Union is restrained from creating
a corporation as a means for performing its functions, on the single reason that the creation
of a corporation is an act of sovereignty, if the sufficiency of this reason be acknowledged,
there would be some difficulty in sustaining the authority of congress to pass other laws for
the accomplishment of the same objects. The government which has a right to do an act
and has imposed on it the duty of performing that act must, according to the dictates of
reason, be allowed to select the means, and those who contend that it may not select any
appropriate means that one particular mode of effecting the object is excepted take upon
themselves the burden of establishing that exception. . . .

But the Constitution of the United States has not left the right of Congress to employ the
necessary means for the execution of the powers conferred on the Government to general
reasoning. To its enumeration of powers is added that of making “all  laws which shall be
necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other pow-
ers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any depart-
ment thereof.” . . .

But the argument [against the Bank] on which most reliance is placed is drawn from that
peculiar language of this clause. Congress is not empowered by it to make all laws which
may have relation to the powers conferred on the Government, but such only as may be
“necessary and proper” for carrying them into execution. The word “necessary” is consid-
ered as controlling the whole sentence, and as limiting the right to pass laws for the execu-
tion of the granted powers to such as are indispensable, and without which the power
would be nugatory. That it excludes the choice of means, and leaves to Congress in each case that only which is most direct and simple.

Is it true that this is the sense in which the word “necessary” is always used? Does it always import an absolute physical necessity so strong that one thing to which another may be termed necessary cannot exist without that other? We think it does not. If reference be had to its use in the common affairs of the world or in approved authors, we find that it frequently imports no more than that one thing is convenient, or useful, or essential to another. To employ the means necessary to an end is generally understood as employing any means calculated to produce the end, and not as being confined to those single means, without which the end would be entirely unattainable. Such is the character of human language that no word conveys to the mind in all situations one single definite idea, and nothing is more common than to use words in a figurative sense. Almost all compositions contain words which, taken in a their [sic] rigorous sense, would convey a meaning different from that which is obviously intended. It is essential to just construction that many words which import something excessive should be understood in a more mitigated sense—in that sense which common usage justifies. The word “necessary” is of this description. It has not a fixed character peculiar to itself. It admits of all degrees of comparison, and is often connected with other words which increase or diminish the impression the mind receives of the urgency it imports. A thing may be necessary, very necessary, absolutely or indisispensably necessary. To no mind would the same idea be conveyed by these several phrases. The comment on the word is well illustrated by the passage cited at the bar from the 10th section of the 1st article of the Constitution. It is, we think, impossible to compare the sentence which prohibits a State from laying “imposts, or duties on imports or exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection laws,” with that which authorizes Congress “to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution” the powers of the General Government without feeling a conviction that the convention understood itself to change materially the meaning of the word “necessary,” by prefixing the word “absolutely.” This word, then, like others, is used in various senses, and, in its
construction, the subject, the context, the intention of the person using them are all to be taken into view.

Let this be done in the case under consideration. The subject is the execution of those great powers on which the welfare of a Nation essentially depends. It must have been the intention of those who gave these powers to insure, so far as human prudence could insure, their beneficial execution. This could not be done, by confiding the choice of means to such narrow limits as not to leave it in the power of Congress to adopt any which might be appropriate, and which were conducive to the end. This provision is made in a Constitution intended to endure for ages to come, and consequently to be adapted to the various crises of human affairs. To have prescribed the means by which Government should, in all future time, execute its powers would have been to change entirely the character of the instrument and give it the properties of a legal code. It would have been an unwise attempt to provide by immutable rules for exigencies which, if foreseen at all, must have been seen dimly, and which can be best provided for as they occur. To have declared that the best means shall not be used, but those alone without which the power given would be nugatory, would have been to deprive the legislature of the capacity to avail itself of experience, to exercise its reason, and to accommodate its legislation to circumstances. . . .

But the argument which most conclusively demonstrates the error of the construction contended for by the counsel for the State of Maryland is founded on the intention of the convention as manifested in the whole clause. To waste time and argument in proving that, without it, Congress might carry its powers into execution would be not much less idle than to hold a lighted taper to the sun. As little can it be required to prove that in the absence of this clause, Congress would have some choice of means. That it might employ those which, in its judgment, would most advantageously effect the object to be accomplished. That any means adapted to the end, any means which tended directly to the execution of the constitutional powers of the Government, were in themselves Constitutional. This clause, as construed by the state of Maryland, would abridge, and almost annihilate, this useful and necessary right of the legislature to select its means. That this could not be intended is, we should think, had it not been already controverted, too apparent for controversy.
We think so for the following reasons: 1st. The clause is placed among the powers of Congress, not among the limitations on those powers. 2d. Its terms purport to enlarge, not to diminish, the powers vested in the Government. It purports to be an additional power, not a restriction on those already granted. . . .

The result of the most careful and attentive consideration bestowed upon this clause is that, if it does not enlarge, it cannot be construed to restrain, the powers of Congress, or to impair the right of the legislature to exercise its best judgment in the selection of measures to carry into execution the Constitutional powers of the Government. If no other motive for its insertion can be suggested, a sufficient one is found in the desire to remove all doubts respecting the right to legislate on that vast mass of incidental powers which must be involved in the Constitution if that instrument be not a splendid bauble.

We admit, as all must admit, that the powers of the Government are limited, and that its limits are not to be transcended. But we think the sound construction of the Constitution must allow to the national legislature that discretion with respect to the means by which the powers it confers are to be carried into execution which will enable that body to perform the high duties assigned to it in the manner most beneficial to the people. Let the end be legitimate, let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consist with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are Constitutional. . . .

After the most deliberate consideration, it is the unanimous and decided opinion of this Court that the act to incorporate the Bank of the United States is a law made in pursuance of the Constitution, and is a part of the supreme law of the land. . . .

It being the opinion of the Court that the act incorporating the bank is constitutional, and that the power of establishing a branch in the State of Maryland might be properly exercised by the bank itself, we proceed to inquire:

Whether the State of Maryland may, without violating the Constitution, tax that branch?
That the power of taxation is one of vital importance; that it is retained by the States; that it is not abridged by the grant of a similar power to the Government of the Union; that it is to be concurrently exercised by the two Governments—are truths which have never been denied. But such is the paramount character of the Constitution that . . . if it may restrain a State from the exercise of its taxing power on imports and exports[,] the same paramount character would seem to restrain, as it certainly may restrain, a State from such other exercise of this power as is in its nature incompatible with, and repugnant to, the constitutional laws of the Union. A law absolutely repugnant to another as entirely repeals that other as if express terms of repeal were used.

On this ground, the counsel for the bank place its claim to be exempted from the power of a State to tax its operations. There is no express provision for the case, but the claim has been sustained on a principle which so entirely pervades the Constitution, is so intermixed with the materials which compose it, so interwoven with its web, so blended with its texture, as to be incapable of being separated from it without rending it into shreds. This great principle is that the Constitution and the laws made in pursuance thereof are supreme; that they control the Constitution and laws of the respective States, and cannot be controlled by them. From this, which may be almost termed an axiom, other propositions are deduced as corollaries, on the truth or error of which, and on their application to this case, the cause has been supposed to depend. These are, 1st. That a power to create implies a power to preserve; 2d. That a power to destroy, if wielded by a different hand, is hostile to, and incompatible with these powers to create and to preserve; 3d. That, where this repugnancy exists, that authority which is supreme must control, not yield to that over which it is supreme. . . .

That the power of taxing [the Bank] by the States may be exercised so as to destroy it is too obvious to be denied. . . .

The argument on the part of the State of Maryland is not that the States may directly resist a law of Congress, but that they may exercise their acknowledged powers upon it, and that the Constitution leaves them this right, in the confidence that they will not abuse it. . . .
The sovereignty of a State extends to everything which exists by its own authority or is introduced by its permission, but does it extend to those means which are employed by Congress to carry into execution powers conferred on that body by the people of the United States? We think it demonstrable that it does not. Those powers are not given by the people of a single State. They are given by the people of the United States, to a Government whose laws, made in pursuance of the Constitution, are declared to be supreme. Consequently, the people of a single State cannot confer a sovereignty which will extend over them.

If we measure the power of taxation residing in a State by the extent of sovereignty which the people of a single State possess and can confer on its Government, we have an intelligible standard, applicable to every case to which the power may be applied. We have a principle which leaves the power of taxing the people and property of a State unimpaired; which leaves to a State the command of all its resources, and which places beyond its reach all those powers which are conferred by the people of the United States on the Government of the Union, and all those means which are given for the purpose of carrying those powers into execution. We have a principle which is safe for the States and safe for the Union. . . .

If we apply the principle for which the State of Maryland contends, to the Constitution generally, we shall find it capable of changing totally the character of that instrument. We shall find it capable of arresting all the measures of the Government, and of prostrating it at the foot of the States. The American people have declared their Constitution and the laws made in pursuance thereof to be supreme, but this principle would transfer the supremacy, in fact, to the States.

If the States may tax one instrument, employed by the Government in the execution of its powers, they may tax any and every other instrument. They may tax the mail; they may tax the mint; they may tax patent rights; they may tax the papers of the custom house; they may tax judicial process; they may tax all the means employed by the Government to an excess which would defeat all the ends of Government. This was not intended by the American people. They did not design to make their government dependent on the states. . . .
It has also been insisted that, as the power of taxation in the General and State Governments is acknowledged to be concurrent, every argument which would sustain the right of the General Government to tax banks chartered by the States, will equally sustain the right of the States to tax banks chartered by the general government.

But the two cases are not on the same reason. The people of all the States have created the General Government, and have conferred upon it the general power of taxation. The people of all the States, and the States themselves, are represented in Congress, and, by their representatives, exercise this power. When they tax the chartered institutions of the States, they tax their constituents, and these taxes must be uniform. But when a State taxes the operations of the government of the United States, it acts upon institutions created not by their own constituents, but by people over whom they claim no control. It acts upon the measures of a Government created by others as well as themselves, for the benefit of others in common with themselves. The difference is that which always exists, and always must exist, between the action of the whole on a part, and the action of a part on the whole—between the laws of a Government declared to be supreme, and those of a Government which, when in opposition to those laws, is not supreme.

But if the full application of this argument could be admitted, it might bring into question the right of Congress to tax the State banks, and could not prove the rights of the States to tax the Bank of the United States.

The court has bestowed on this subject its most deliberate consideration. The result is a conviction that the States have no power, by taxation or otherwise, to retard, impede, burden, or in any manner control the operations of the constitutional laws enacted by Congress to carry into execution the powers vested in the General Government. This is, we think, the unavoidable consequence of that supremacy which the constitution has declared.

We are unanimously of opinion that the law passed by the Legislature of Maryland, imposing a tax on the Bank of the United States, is unconstitutional and void. . . .
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Bill of Rights

BACKGROUND

As part of a compromise to secure the ratification of the Constitution, Federalists introduced in the first Congress a Bill of Rights as twelve amendments to the new Constitution. Below are the ten amendments that were ultimately ratified.

ANNOTATIONS

Amendment I

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Amendment II

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms shall not be infringed.

Amendment III

No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

NOTES & QUESTIONS

5 Amendment II

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms shall not be infringed.

10 Amendment III

No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

Amendment IV

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Amendment V

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Amendment VI

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.

Amendment VII

In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.
Amendment VIII

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

Amendment IX

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Amendment X

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.
Publius (Alexander Hamilton) argues for the proposed Constitution by explaining Publius's objections to a Bill of Rights.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What is the cornerstone of republican government, according to Hamilton?

2. Why does Hamilton think a bill of rights would be unnecessary and dangerous?

3. In what way is the Constitution itself a bill of rights?

In the course of the foregoing review of the Constitution, I have taken notice of, and en-
deavored to answer most of the objections which have appeared against it. There, however,
remain a few which either did not fall naturally under any particular head or were forgotten
in their proper places. These shall now be discussed; but as the subject has been drawn into
great length, I shall so far consult brevity as to comprise all my observations on these mis-
cellaneous points in a single paper.

The most considerable of the remaining objections is that the plan of the convention con-
tains no bill of rights. Among other answers given to this, it has been upon different occa-
sions remarked that the constitutions of several of the States are in a similar predicament.

I add that New York is of the number. And yet the opposers of the new system, in this State,
who profess an unlimited admiration for its constitution, are among the most intemperate
partisans of a bill of rights. To justify their zeal in this matter, they allege two things: one is
that, though the constitution of New York has no bill of rights prefixed to it, yet it contains,
in the body of it, various provisions in favor of particular privileges and rights, which, in
substance amount to the same thing; the other is, that the Constitution adopts, in their full
extent, the common and statute law of Great Britain, by which many other rights, not ex-
pressed in it, are equally secured.

To the first I answer, that the Constitution proposed by the convention contains, as well as
the constitution of this State, a number of such provisions.

Independent of those which relate to the structure of the government, we find the follow-
ing: Article 1, section 3, clause 7 "Judgment in cases of impeachment shall not extend fur-
ther than to removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor,
trust, or profit under the United States; but the party convicted shall, nevertheless, be liable
and subject to indictment, trial, judgment, and punishment according to law." Section 9, of
the same article, clause 2 "The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended,
unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it." Clause 3 "No
bill of attainder or ex-post-facto law shall be passed." Clause 7 "No title of nobility shall be
granted by the United States; and no person holding any office of profit or trust under
them, shall, without the consent of the Congress, accept of any present, emolument, office, or title of any kind whatever, from any king, prince, or foreign state." Article 3, section 2, clause 3 "The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury; and such trial shall be held in the State where the said crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State, the trial shall be at such place or places as the Congress may by law have directed." Section 3, of the same article "Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort. No person shall be convicted of treason, unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court." And clause 3, of the same section "The Congress shall have power to declare the punishment of treason; but no attainder of treason shall work corruption of blood, or forfeiture, except during the life of the person attainted."

It may well be a question, whether these are not, upon the whole, of equal importance with any which are to be found in the constitution of this State. The establishment of the writ of habeas corpus, the prohibition of ex-post-facto laws, and of TITLES OF NOBILITY, TO WHICH WE HAVE NO CORRESPONDING PROVISION IN OUR CONSTITUTION, are perhaps greater securities to liberty and republicanism than any it contains. The creation of crimes after the commission of the fact, or, in other words, the subjecting of men to punishment for things which, when they were done, were breaches of no law, and the practice of arbitrary imprisonments, have been, in all ages, the favorite and most formidable instruments of tyranny. The observations of the judicious Blackstone, in reference to the latter, are well worthy of recital: "To bereave a man of life, Usays he,e or by violence to confiscate his estate, without accusation or trial, would be so gross and notorious an act of despotism, as must at once convey the alarm of tyranny throughout the whole nation; but confinement of the person, by secretly hurrying him to jail, where his sufferings are unknown or forgotten, is a less public, a less striking, and therefore A MORE DANGEROUS ENGINE of arbitrary government." And as a remedy for this fatal evil he is everywhere peculiarly emphatical in his encomiums on the habeas-corpus act, which in one place he calls "the BULWARK of the British Constitution."
Nothing need be said to illustrate the importance of the prohibition of titles of nobility. This may truly be denominated the corner-stone of republican government; for so long as they are excluded, there can never be serious danger that the government will be any other than that of the people.

To the second that is, to the pretended establishment of the common and state law by the Constitution, I answer, that they are expressly made subject "to such alterations and provisions as the legislature shall from time to time make concerning the same." They are therefore at any moment liable to repeal by the ordinary legislative power, and of course have no constitutional sanction. The only use of the declaration was to recognize the ancient law and to remove doubts which might have been occasioned by the Revolution. This consequently can be considered as no part of a declaration of rights, which under our constitutions must be intended as limitations of the power of the government itself.

It has been several times truly remarked that bills of rights are, in their origin, stipulations between kings and their subjects, abridgements of prerogative in favor of privilege, reservations of rights not surrendered to the prince. Such was MAGNA CHARTA, obtained by the barons, sword in hand, from King John. Such were the subsequent confirmations of that charter by succeeding princes. Such was the PETITION OF RIGHT assented to by Charles I., in the beginning of his reign. Such, also, was the Declaration of Right presented by the Lords and Commons to the Prince of Orange in 1688, and afterwards thrown into the form of an act of parliament called the Bill of Rights. It is evident, therefore, that, according to their primitive signification, they have no application to constitutions professedly founded upon the power of the people, and executed by their immediate representatives and servants. Here, in strictness, the people surrender nothing; and as they retain every thing they have no need of particular reservations. "WE, THE PEOPLE of the United States, to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ORDAIN and ESTABLISH this Constitution for the United States of America." Here is a better recognition of popular rights, than volumes of those aphorisms which make the principal figure in several of our State bills of rights, and which would sound much better in a treatise of ethics than in a constitution of government.
But a minute detail of particular rights is certainly far less applicable to a Constitution like that under consideration, which is merely intended to regulate the general political interests of the nation, than to a constitution which has the regulation of every species of personal and private concerns. If, therefore, the loud clamors against the plan of the convention, on this score, are well founded, no epithets of reprobation will be too strong for the constitution of this State. But the truth is, that both of them contain all which, in relation to their objects, is reasonably to be desired.

I go further, and affirm that bills of rights, in the sense and to the extent in which they are contended for, are not only unnecessary in the proposed Constitution, but would even be dangerous. They would contain various exceptions to powers not granted; and, on this very account, would afford a colorable pretext to claim more than were granted. For why declare that things shall not be done which there is no power to do? Why, for instance, should it be said that the liberty of the press shall not be restrained, when no power is given by which restrictions may be imposed? I will not contend that such a provision would confer a regulating power; but it is evident that it would furnish, to men disposed to usurp, a plausible pretense for claiming that power. They might urge with a semblance of reason, that the Constitution ought not to be charged with the absurdity of providing against the abuse of an authority which was not given, and that the provision against restraining the liberty of the press afforded a clear implication, that a power to prescribe proper regulations concerning it was intended to be vested in the national government. This may serve as a specimen of the numerous handles which would be given to the doctrine of constructive powers, by the indulgence of an injudicious zeal for bills of rights.

On the subject of the liberty of the press, as much as has been said, I cannot forbear adding a remark or two: in the first place, I observe, that there is not a syllable concerning it in the constitution of this State; in the next, I contend, that whatever has been said about it in that of any other State, amounts to nothing. What signifies a declaration, that "the liberty of the press shall be inviolably preserved"? What is the liberty of the press? Who can give it any definition which would not leave the utmost latitude for evasion? I hold it to be impracticable; and from this I infer, that its security, whatever fine declarations may be inserted in
any constitution respecting it, must altogether depend on public opinion, and on the general spirit of the people and of the government. And here, after all, as is intimated upon another occasion, must we seek for the only solid basis of all our rights.

There remains but one other view of this matter to conclude the point. The truth is, after all the declamations we have heard, that the Constitution is itself, in every rational sense, and to every useful purpose, A BILL OF RIGHTS. The several bills of rights in Great Britain form its Constitution, and conversely the constitution of each State is its bill of rights. And the proposed Constitution, if adopted, will be the bill of rights of the Union. Is it one object of a bill of rights to declare and specify the political privileges of the citizens in the structure and administration of the government? This is done in the most ample and precise manner in the plan of the convention; comprehending various precautions for the public security, which are not to be found in any of the State constitutions. Is another object of a bill of rights to define certain immunities and modes of proceeding, which are relative to personal and private concerns? This we have seen has also been attended to, in a variety of cases, in the same plan. Adverting therefore to the substantial meaning of a bill of rights, it is absurd to allege that it is not to be found in the work of the convention. It may be said that it does not go far enough, though it will not be easy to make this appear; but it can with no propriety be contended that there is no such thing. It certainly must be immaterial what mode is observed as to the order of declaring the rights of the citizens, if they are to be found in any part of the instrument which establishes the government. And hence it must be apparent, that much of what has been said on this subject rests merely on verbal and nominal distinctions, entirely foreign from the substance of the thing....
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Why Teach Equality in America

The United States was the first country in history founded on a commitment to equality: that “all men are created equal.” Since 1776, Americans’ efforts to live and govern by this principle have resulted in the greatest degrees of freedom, prosperity, and security for most people in human history, both for American citizens and for the peoples of the world. It is unprecedented. It is what makes America exceptional. But it is also true that America has not always lived up to the great truth of equality. Thus while the American Founders were at the vanguard of asserting and securing the equal natural rights of all people—setting the nation on the path to establishing such equality—they also allowed the inhumane institution of slavery to become the foremost stumbling block toward achieving the fundamental human equality they had proclaimed. Nevertheless, by the 1850s and 1860s a strong majority of Americans, growing out of an abolitionist movement inspired by the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and led by Abraham Lincoln and the soldiers of the Union, would take up the Founders’ charge to ensure that America would be a nation of equality and freedom for all.
What Teachers Should Consider

Probably the greatest charge against the founders and the founding of the United States is that slavery existed in America. There is absolutely no denying that this was the case. Additionally, it is undeniable that slavery was immensely consequential, most so to African Americans who were held in bondage and suffered under the institution.

So when the truth that slavery was present when the United States was being founded is set side-by-side with the truth that America was founded on the idea that “all men are created equal,” judgements of hypocrisy at best and outright lying at worst are entirely expected. And such judgments were made at the time of the founding as they are made today. By themselves, these two facts can only lead to these two conclusions.

And yet, these facts do not stand by themselves. Like everything in history, an individual moment cannot be isolated from the moments that came before and after it.

As we travel backwards from the time when the Declaration of Independence’s argument that “all men are created equal” established this contradiction, we see slavery that was permitted in all thirteen colonies, though practiced most in the southern colonies. We see its gradual codification in colonial Virginia during the 1600s. But as we broaden our geography from not just what would be the future United States but also to the entire world, we see that slavery and the slave trade were practiced almost everywhere, including by Arab and European slave traders and even among Africans themselves. We see systems of slavery that introduced other forms of brutality to even more enslaved Africans in many colonies that would not become parts of America, such as in the Caribbean. And as we look around the world all through human history, we see slavery in every culture in every part of the world back to the dawn of man.

America in 1776 was exceptional in many ways, but the existence of slavery was not one of them.

But if we return to 1776 and move forward from July 4, we see divisions among the founders themselves on the morality of slavery, the creation of abolitionist societies, and the outlawing of slavery in several states during the Revolution. We see increased citations of the Declaration of Independence as justification to abolish slavery. The Constitution permitted the existence of slavery but placed limitations on it. We see several founders themselves free slaves they had previously claimed to own. Writings of individual founders anticipate the natural decline of slavery simply on the basis of being unprofitable with the principles of the Declaration continuing to change public opinion. And when these projections unexpectedly proved to be wrong with the invention of the cotton gin, a revival in the institution was checked by a growing abolitionist movement that cited the principle that “all men are created equal.” Americans fought the bloodiest war in their history, neighbor against neighbor, a war that ended slavery with an appeal to the principles on which America was founded. Great efforts towards civil rights were made during Reconstruction and, when these failed, figures such as Martin Luther King, Jr. referred to the Declaration’s statement that “all men are created equal” as a “promissory note” in the quest for civil rights a century later, finally achieved in 1964. All the while peoples across the world turned to America and its founding principle of equality to end tyrannies, colonization, and other injustices, establishing the way of life we have come to consider to be the normal state of affairs for human beings.
These are the other facts surrounding the contradiction in America’s founding. Teachers and students must know and understand all of these in order to see America—both her good accomplishments and her moral failures—as they are, not as we wish them to be.

How Teachers Can Learn More

**TEXTS**

*The U.S. Constitution: A Reader*, ed. Hillsdale College Politics Faculty Chapters 7–9

**ONLINE COURSES** | Online.Hillsdale.edu

*Introduction to the Constitution*
*Constitution 101*
*Civil Rights in American History*

Primary Sources Studied in This Unit

Statements on slavery, George Washington, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, James Madison  
*Notes on the State of Virginia*, Query 18: “Manners,” Thomas Jefferson  
“What to the Slave Is the Fourth of July?” Frederick Douglass  
“The Constitution of the United States: Is It Pro-Slavery or Anti-Slavery?” Frederick Douglass  
Speech on the reception of abolition petitions, John C. Calhoun  
Speech on the Oregon Bill, John C. Calhoun  
The Perpetuation of Our Political Institutions, Abraham Lincoln  
Speech at Peoria, Abraham Lincoln  
*Dred Scott v. Sandford*  
Speech on the *Dred Scott* decision, Abraham Lincoln  
“House Divided” speech, Abraham Lincoln  
Speech at Chicago, Stephen Douglas  
The Seventh Lincoln-Douglas Debate  
Address at Cooper Institute, Abraham Lincoln  
Cornerstone Speech, Alexander Stephens  
First inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln  
Message to Congress in Special Session, Abraham Lincoln  
The Emancipation Proclamation, Abraham Lincoln  
Gettysburg Address, Abraham Lincoln  
Second inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln  
Civil Rights Act of 1866  
13th Amendment to the Constitution  
14th Amendment to the Constitution  
15th Amendment to the Constitution  
The Atlanta Exposition Address, Booker T. Washington  
“The Talented Tenth,” W.E.B. DuBois
LESSON PLANS, ASSIGNMENTS, AND FORMATIVE QUIZ
Lesson 1 — Self-Government vs. Slavery

**LESSON OBJECTIVE**

Students learn about the status of slavery during the American founding and the ways in which its status changed afterward.

**ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS** | Online.Hillsdale.edu

- *Introduction to the Constitution* | Lecture 3
- *Constitution 101* | Lecture 6
- *Civil Rights in American History* | Lectures 1 and 2

**PRIMARY SOURCES**

Students are to read or, if they have previously read, review the following primary sources. While reading, students should annotate these sources. For particularly challenging texts or if the class is offered earlier in high school, the teacher may wish to provide students with guided reading questions to assist with comprehension, clarity, and direction. Using their annotations and any guided reading questions, students should come to class prepared to participate in a seminar conversation on each text.

- Statements on slavery, George Washington, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, James Madison
- *Notes on the State of Virginia*, Query 18: “Manners,” Thomas Jefferson
- “What to the Slave Is the Fourth of July?” Frederick Douglass
- “The Constitution of the United States: Is It Pro-Slavery or Anti-Slavery?” Frederick Douglass
- Speech on the reception of abolition petitions, John C. Calhoun
- Speech on the Oregon Bill, John C. Calhoun
- The Perpetuation of Our Political Institutions, Abraham Lincoln

**TERMS AND TOPICS**

- equality
- slavery
- Northwest Ordinance
- abolition
- cotton gin
- Missouri Compromise
- positive good
- concurrent majority
- sectionalism
- Compromise of 1850
- self-government
- rule of law
- civic education
- civic religion
- statesmanship
- morality
- political persuasion
- political moderation
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- How did the Founders understand the tension between slavery and the principle of equality in the Declaration of Independence?
- What was the nature of the Founders’ compromise with slavery at the time of the founding for the sake of the union? Would it have been possible to abolish slavery in the southern colonies without union?
- Why did many in the founding generation expect that slavery would eventually die out so long as it was not allowed to expand?
- What efforts did some founders make to abolish slavery?
- What are the three clauses related to slavery in the Constitution? Explain each.
- How was the Three-Fifth Compromise a partial victory for slaveholders and a partial victory for abolitionists?
- How did Frederick Douglass’s views on the founding with respect to slavery change during his work for abolition?
- What were the unforeseen consequences of the cotton gin, invented in 1793, four years after the adoption of the Constitution?
- What was the argument in the defense of slavery as a “positive good” that emerged among slaveholding apologists in the decades after the founding?
- How did the idea of slavery as a “positive good” challenge the Constitution’s stance on slavery and the path on which the founding generation had set slavery?
- How did John C. Calhoun critique the Founders on equality, natural rights, and the social contract?
- How did John C. Calhoun reject the ideas of the Declaration of Independence in arguing for slavery?
- How did John C. Calhoun’s theory of the concurrent majority differ and depart from the Founders’ constitutionalism?
- How did sectionalism rise after the founding generation?
- What was Abraham Lincoln’s understandings of the following?
  - the vulnerabilities of self-government
  - how to preserve self-government
  - the rule of law
  - the need for civic education
  - the need for civic religion
  - statesmanship
  - morality
  - political persuasion
  - political moderation

KEYS TO THE LESSON

To begin the study of equality in America, it is necessary that students learn about slavery and the participation of women in the political process before and during the American founding. This involves reviewing an array of facts and being able to put them all in context with one another. What students should discover is how much our present day understandings of certain moral issues are very much the exception, and one of the first exceptions, to the rule in history. They may also discover how these understandings can trace at least some of their ubiquity today back to the American founding. Students will be asked to look at the specific words and deeds of particular individuals, how these views did or did not change, and what actions were taken in law with respect to equality.
Teachers might best plan and teach Self-Government vs. Slavery with emphasis on the following approaches:

- **Familiarize students with the views of the leading Founders on slavery.** Northern Founders—most of whom were strongly opposed to slavery—and even some southern Founders who believed slavery immoral were politically unable to end slavery. For instance, Gouverneur Morris repeatedly railed against slaveholders in the Constitutional Convention and Thomas Jefferson, who owned slaves himself, included a condemnation of the slave trade and referred to slaves as “men” in the draft of the Declaration of Independence, a section the slaveholding interest demanded be removed. Most anti-slavery Founders continued nevertheless in the belief that the only way that they could have any influence in order to end slavery in the southern states was through union. Without unity, the Americans would very likely have lost the Revolutionary War (giving up their independence and freedom to continued British rule that would perpetuate slavery anyways) or the southern colonies would have formed their own country, in which case those who opposed slavery would have no power to abolish slavery where it existed in the South. During the Civil War, Frederick Douglass made similar arguments for preserving the Union against fellow abolitionists who wanted to let the South secede with slavery intact.

- **Consider with students how America is unprecedented in the history of the world because it was founded on the principle that “all men are created equal and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights.”** Consider the view of many Founders—as well as abolitionists Abraham Lincoln and Frederick Douglass, and the meaning of the “promissory note” of Martin Luther King Jr.—that America is founded on this principle of the inherent equality of every human being based on humanity and natural rights; and that consequently, the role of the American nation and her citizens, as well as her history, has been one of trying to establish this principle in practice through a self-governing people. The majority of the Founders recognized at the very least that the statement of the principle of equality, despite a compromise that allowed for the pre-existing institution’s continuing existence, philosophically and legally undermined the legitimacy of slavery. For example, nowhere in the founding did the Founders establish in federal law legal “property in man.”

- **Take the time to consider, read, and discuss the ways in which slavery was addressed in the Constitution, including the extents to which the Constitution both left slavery in place and also placed new national limits on it.** As Frederick Douglass and Abraham Lincoln would later acknowledge, the Declaration’s principle of equality and the Constitution’s arrangements gave the Founders the belief that they had placed slavery on the path to eventual extinction. This of course does not excuse the fact that many of these founders still held African Americans in slavery during their lifetimes.

- **Note for students the history-changing invention of Eli Whitney’s cotton gin in 1793, four years after the adoption of the Constitution.** The cotton gin would greatly increase the profitability of slavery in the cotton-growing states of the South and thereby create a significant interest in perpetuating the institution of slavery, especially on southern plantations and among northern textile manufacturers. The new economics of slavery that would grow out of the cotton gin and
the vast cotton industry questioned the assumption and changed the projection of the founding generation concerning the viability and eventual demise of slavery.

- Clarify for students the arguments of northerners and southerners concerning the Three-Fifths Clause. The clause was not about the humanity of slaves; it was strictly about how much representation slave-owning states would receive in Congress and the Electoral College. The great hypocrisy of the slaveholders was that while they refused to call a slave a human being, they insisted that each slave be counted as a whole person for purposes of representation. In fact, it was the anti-slavery Founders who did not want slaves counted at all in the Constitution for the purposes of representation. The fact that slaves were only counted as three-fifths for the purposes of representation was a disappointment for southern states, as they had demanded they be counted as a whole person. It was a partial victory for northern opponents to slavery, as it would give the slaveholding states less influence in lawmaking than they wished. Additionally, students should understand that in the mind of those opposed to slavery, this compromise was the only politically viable route if they were to secure southern support for the Constitution, without which the country would become disunited, with the South able to perpetuate slavery indefinitely as their own country without northern abolitionists. Students need not agree with the tenets of the compromise, but they must understand it as the founders themselves understood it.

- Remind students that the slave trade was not formally limited in the states (the Continental Congress had temporarily banned the practice in 1774) until the passage of the Constitution, which allowed for it to be outlawed nationwide in 1808 (which it was) and for Congress to discourage it by imposing tariffs on the slave trade in the meantime. Students should understand that without the compromise that allowed this twenty-year delay, the power to abolish the slave trade would not have been granted by the slaveholding interest in the first place.

- Consider with students the significance of the Constitution not using the word “slave” and instead using “person.” Refusing to use the word “slave” avoided giving legal legitimacy to slavery. Even Article IV, Section 2, Clause 3 emphasizes that slavery was legal based on certain state, not federal, laws. The use of the word “person” forced even slaveholders to recognize the humanity of the slave: that he or she was in fact a human person, not property. There would be no federally-recognized “property in man.”

- Point out for students that clauses that were not about slavery but which slaveholding interests could use to their benefit were not therefore deliberately pro-slavery clauses. Such a logical fallacy would implicate as morally evil anything hijacked for use in committing a wrong act, for example, a road used by bank robbers in their getaway would be “pro-robbery.”

- Consider with students the sectional nature of views on slavery during the founding. The majority of northerners and northern founders (e.g., John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Benjamin Rush, Gouverneur Morris, and John Jay) spoke and wrote extensively on the immorality of slavery and its need to be abolished. Some northern founders, such as John Jay, Alexander Hamilton, and Benjamin Franklin, founded or served in abolitionist societies.

- Consider also that even among the southern founders who supported slavery or held slaves, several leading founders expressed regret and fear of divine retribution for slavery in America, such as Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and George Washington. Some freed their slaves as well, such as George Washington, who by the end of his life freed the slaves in his family estate.
And many, like Thomas Jefferson, nevertheless maintained that slaves were men in full possession of the natural rights of all men. Making these observations does not diminish the inhumaneness of slavery or dismiss the wrong of racism by certain colonists or other individual Americans living in other generations.

- Ask students how to judge the Founders who owned slaves and yet supported the Declaration of Independence and Constitution. Students should consider their public and private lives as well as their words and deeds. Taken altogether, students should recognize the difficulty in assigning an absolute moral judgment that a person is entirely bad or entirely good while still being able to pass judgment on specific actions.

- Have students also consider the distinction between judging character absolutely versus judging individual actions. When they do, students will encounter figures who did both much that was good and also some that was bad, and that this contradiction runs through the heart of every person.

- Be careful with the phrase “consider the times,” as this phrase can easily give the impression that truth and morality (good and evil) are merely relative to one’s viewpoint or historical time period. Instead, help students understand that “to consider the times” in which the American colonists and Founders lived is not to excuse moral injustices or to justify relativism. We should consider the circumstances at the time and weigh them against principles that transcend time. It is not whitewashing or rewriting history. It is recognizing the reality of history and honestly assessing how figures at the time acted within their circumstances in light of the truth.

- Have students consider the status of slavery over the initial decades of the country’s history. At the founding, slavery was either openly condemned by northerners or defended (but seldom celebrated) by southerners. Its toleration at the time of the founding was for the sake of a unity that even many abolitionists believed was the only eventual path toward abolition. Based on the evidence at the time, many leading Founders believed slavery was naturally destined for extinction, that public opinion had steadily grown toward seeing slavery for the moral evil that it was, and that the principles of the Declaration of Independence and Revolution helped shape this public opinion and would also be the vehicle for eventual equality. The Founders also believed the Constitution both permitted and yet restricted slavery, created a path to restricting it further (by holding the union together), and kept slavery on the path it was already travelling: to extinction. The Declaration of Independence founded the country on principles of equality that could and would be used to demand the end of slavery. The Northwest Ordinance had prohibited the expansion of slavery. The Constitution refused to give legal standing to the institution, and many states had abolished slavery outright. Even Founders who held slaves believed the profitability of slavery was gradually but decisively waning and that slavery would die out on its own in a short period of time.

- Explain to students how the growth in population in the North would eventually allow northern states to restrict slavery further and perhaps even abolish it via a constitutional amendment. Southern slaveholders recognized that they had to expand the number of slave states if they were to prohibit such actions by northerners. The challenge, however, was that they needed northern states to acquiesce to such expansion. To do so, they appealed first to the argument that slavery was a positive good, as captured in the writings of John C. Calhoun. Students should read
Calhoun’s writings in order to examine his arguments and to understand how Calhoun explicitly rejected the American founding as captured in the Declaration of Independence. Students should work through and identify the serious faults in Calhoun’s arguments.

- Have students read and annotate Frederick Douglass’s works and follow his thoughts as he moved away from viewing the Constitution as pro-slavery.
- Spend time with students to understand Abraham Lincoln’s moral and political philosophy in reading his early speeches.

STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT

Assignment: Explain the ways the Founders addressed the issue of slavery during the American founding and how subsequent events and individuals changed the status of slavery between 1793 and 1850 (4–5 paragraphs).
Lesson 2 — Slavery and Moral Relativism

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn how Abraham Lincoln understood the nation’s division over slavery to be a question of objective moral truth, and how only in acknowledging the moral evil of slavery and working to return it to the path of extinction would America’s founding ideas be proven true.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS  |  Online.Hillsdale.edu

Constitution 101  |  Lecture 6
Civil Rights in American History  |  Lectures 2 and 3

PRIMARY SOURCES

Students are to read or, if they have previously read, review the following primary sources. While reading, students should annotate these sources. For particularly challenging texts or if the class is offered earlier in high school, the teacher may wish to provide students with guided reading questions to assist with comprehension, clarity, and direction. Using their annotations and any guided reading questions, students should come to class prepared to participate in a seminar conversation on each text.

Speech at Peoria, Abraham Lincoln
*Dred Scott v. Sandford*
Speech on the *Dred Scott* decision, Abraham Lincoln
“House Divided” speech, Abraham Lincoln
Speech at Chicago, Stephen Douglas
The Seventh Lincoln-Douglas Debate
Address at Cooper Institute, Abraham Lincoln
Cornerstone Speech, Alexander Stephens

TERMS AND TOPICS

Kansas-Nebraska Act  |  majority tyranny
*Dred Scott v. Sandford*  |  objective truth
“a house divided”  |  moral relativism
popular sovereignty  |  “don’t care”
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What was Abraham Lincoln’s understanding of the following?
  - the vulnerabilities in self-government
  - how to preserve self-government
  - the rule of law
  - the need for civic education
  - the need for civic religion
  - statesmanship
  - morality
  - political persuasion
  - political moderation

- What did the Kansas-Nebraska Act and Dred Scott v. Sandford do, both in law and as a threat to public opinion on slavery at the time, and how did they contribute to the coming civil war?

- Why did Abraham Lincoln argue that it was impossible to remain a “house divided”?

- How did Abraham Lincoln try to halt the expansion of slavery and win the moral battle against it?

- Contrary to its status at the founding, how was mid-nineteenth-century slavery unlikely to die out on its own?

- What were Abraham Lincoln’s reasons not to assume that politics always progresses toward freedom?

- How did Abraham Lincoln and Stephen Douglas disagree on each of the following?
  - the meaning of the founding, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution
  - the meaning of self-government as either unchecked popular sovereignty and majority rule, or grounded and limited by our equal natural rights
  - the limits of democracy and the danger of majority tyranny

- As he expressed in his debates with Stephen Douglas, how did Abraham Lincoln understand equality and the injustice of slavery?

- What were Abraham Lincoln’s arguments against moral neutrality or relativism (“don’t care”) on the fundamental question of slavery?

- How was slavery the true cause of the Civil War?

- In which ways did the Confederacy reject the principle of equality from the Declaration of Independence and insist on the inequality of the races?

KEYS TO THE LESSON

The passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act in 1854 brought Abraham Lincoln back to the political arena. He saw a tremendous threat in the argument put forward by the bill’s sponsor, Stephen Douglas, namely that slavery was not a moral question but rather one that should simply be decided by the will of the majority. From 1854 to the outbreak of the Civil War in 1861, Lincoln would combat this notion that slavery was morally relative depending on the will of the majority. Students must learn about this arc to Lincoln’s words and deeds and how he took up and articulated the heart of the matter regarding slavery: that the morality of slavery struck at the very founding idea of the United States, i.e., that all men are created equal. Roger Taney’s majority opinion in Dred Scott v. Sandford confirmed Lincoln’s predictions, and Lincoln argued the same points throughout his debates with Douglas.

Teachers might best plan and teach Slavery and Moral Relativism with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Read with students parts of Lincoln’s speech in Peoria in response to the Kansas-Nebraska Act. Students should understand that Lincoln saw slavery to be, above all, a moral question, and one
that every American ought to take seriously as such. Lincoln also believed that moral relativism over the question of slavery, as conveyed in the idea of popular sovereignty, was antithetical to the ideas of the Declaration of Independence, and that slavery was simply a form of majority tyranny, the very danger latent in democracy that the Founders had warned against. Finally, Lincoln condemned the Kansas-Nebraska Act as achieving a complete reversal of the stance the Constitution, the Northwest Ordinance, and the founding generation had toward slavery: that it should be contained until it was abolished and by no means allowed to spread.

- Have students consider Abraham Lincoln’s arguments on how Roger Taney’s majority opinion in *Dred Scott v. Sandford* effectively ruled that slaves are not humans but property, and that the Constitution protects their enslavement just as it does any other property. Lincoln points out that Taney’s ruling rejected the Founders’ view on slavery and would lead, in tandem with Stephen Douglas’s popular sovereignty, to the spread of slavery throughout the country. By extension, this reasoning would also allow for any form of majority tyranny. Put another way, Taney’s argument in *Dred Scott*, the idea of “might makes right,” is the same argument that animated despotic regimes like Communist Russia, Fascist Italy, or Nazi Germany.

- Help students think through Lincoln’s understanding of the morality of slavery and its relationship to the founding ideas of America: that all men are created equal, have unalienable rights, and that legitimate government is based on the consent of the governed. Students should see that, although central to the Civil War, the practical question regarding the expansion of slavery ultimately turned on the moral status of slavery.

- Consider the apparently benign stance that Stephen Douglas takes in his position of popular sovereignty—that he does not care about what a group of people does regarding slavery so long as the majority opinion decides it. Students should be asked why this is problematic.

- Emphasize that the governing state known as the Confederacy was founded on the rejection of the principle of equality from the Declaration of Independence, and on an argument of the inequality of races, as asserted in Alexander Stephens’s “Cornerstone Speech.”

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

**Assignment:** Explain how Abraham Lincoln saw slavery as a moral question and how this question was related to the moral foundation on which America was established (2–3 paragraphs).
Unit 4 — Formative Quiz

Covering Lessons 1-2
10-15 minutes

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. How did those who were opposed to slavery believe that slavery could be abolished only if the union were preserved?

2. Why did the Founders expect that slavery would eventually die out?

3. How did the idea of slavery as a “positive good” challenge the Constitution’s stance on slavery and the path on which the founding generation had set slavery?

4. How did Abraham Lincoln and Stephen Douglas disagree about the limits of democracy and the danger of majority tyranny?

5. What were Abraham Lincoln’s arguments against moral neutrality or relativism (“don’t care”) on the fundamental question of slavery?
Lesson 3 — Lincoln’s Statesmanship and the End of Slavery

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the statesmanship of Abraham Lincoln during the Civil War, which required Lincoln to maintain the union, preserve the Constitution and rule of law, and end slavery, all of which he accomplished successfully.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

Constitution 101 Lecture 7
Civil Rights in American History Lecture 3

PRIMARY SOURCES

Students are to read or, if they have previously read, review the following primary sources. While reading, students should annotate these sources. For particularly challenging texts or if the class is offered earlier in high school, the teacher may wish to provide students with guided reading questions to assist with comprehension, clarity, and direction. Using their annotations and any guided reading questions, students should come to class prepared to participate in a seminar conversation on each text.

First inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln
Message to Congress in Special Session, Abraham Lincoln
The Emancipation Proclamation, Abraham Lincoln
Gettysburg Address, Abraham Lincoln
Second inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln

TERMS AND TOPICS

prudence states’ rights
justice war powers
rule of law Emancipation Proclamation
secession tragedy

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- In what ways did Abraham Lincoln manifest the ideal qualities of a statesman and the virtue of prudence?
- How did Abraham Lincoln manage to accomplish his competing objectives to maintain the union, preserve the Constitution and the rule of law, and end slavery?
- What were the arguments for and against Southern secession?
- What were the arguments for and against the Union fighting to keep the South from seceding?
- What were the benefits of union, including for the prospects of abolishing slavery?
How did secession threaten to undermine the Constitution and the moral integrity of the people and its government?

What are a president’s war powers per the Constitution?

What were the arguments for and against the legality and necessity of the extraordinary measures taken by Abraham Lincoln to win the war and put down the rebellion?

How did Abraham Lincoln strive to maintain the rule of law?

What did the Emancipation Proclamation do? How was Abraham Lincoln able to justify, issue, and enforce it successfully?

How does the example of Abraham Lincoln show the need and benefits of an energetic executive?

How does Abraham Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address assert that freedom and self-government require devotion—and even a willingness to sacrifice for—the country and its principles of justice? How are these principles of justice grounded in nature?

As presented in his second inaugural address, how did Abraham Lincoln view the Civil War as a tragedy, and what do these reflections reveal about the tragic nature of politics and the need for political moderation?

What are Abraham Lincoln’s reflections on providence?

Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:

- Question 94: Abraham Lincoln is famous for many things. Name one.
- Question 95: What did the Emancipation Proclamation do?
- Question 97: What amendment gives citizenship to all persons born in the United States?

**Keys to the Lesson**

“Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent, a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure.” These famous opening lines from President Abraham Lincoln on the battlefield at Gettysburg is what the Civil War was about. And whether America, founded in liberty and equality, could long endure depended on whether the nation’s original sin, slavery, would be abolished while still preserving the country’s existence as a union. American students must know how the ideas at the heart of their country were undermined by slavery; but they must also learn how heroic Americans committed to America’s founding ideas sacrificed their all, that these ideas of liberty and equality should prevail over the tyranny and dehumanization of slavery. And students must learn that, like those in Lincoln’s audience, it is up to each of them to similarly conduct themselves if “government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.”

Teachers might best plan and teach Lincoln’s Statesmanship and the End of Slavery with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Have students consider the arguments by the South and by Abraham Lincoln regarding the idea of “states’ rights” and the constitutionality of secession, particularly by reading and discussing Abraham Lincoln’s first inaugural address. Students should understand that there is no such thing as a “state right,” since rights belong only to persons. States (as governments) possess powers (not rights), as outlined in their state and in the federal Constitution, which the states are to use to protect the rights and the common good of their citizens (including from encroachment by the federal government). Lincoln’s first inaugural address presents the case for how secession is
unconstitutional and how he, having taken an oath in his office as president, can and must preserve the Constitution and Union.

- Teach students about the delicacy with which Abraham Lincoln had to approach the border states (slave states that remained in the Union) and why this delicacy was needed. Have students work with Lincoln’s first inaugural address, one purpose of which was to keep wavering states in the Union.

- Explain that Abraham Lincoln’s first goal in fighting the Civil War was to preserve the Union. It is important that students understand Lincoln’s reasoning. He was against slavery and wanted it abolished, but his constitutional obligation was to preserve the Union. If he acted otherwise, he would violate the Constitution and the rule of law, becoming no better than the seceding states and forfeiting his moral authority as the defender of the rule of law. Students should also know that while Lincoln did not believe he could abolish slavery alone or that abolishing slavery was the purpose for fighting the war, he nonetheless believed, like many of the Founders, that the only way to abolish slavery would be if the Union were preserved.

- Read aloud in class the Emancipation Proclamation and teach students the technicalities Abraham Lincoln navigated in thinking of it, drawing it up, and the timing of its promulgation. He had to retain the border states, abide by the Constitution, achieve victory, and earn the support of public opinion in order for slaves to be effectively freed—and he did it all. Students should understand that Lincoln’s justification for freeing the slaves involved exercising his executive powers as commander-in-chief of the armed forces during an armed rebellion. This is why Lincoln only had the authority to apply the Emancipation Proclamation to those states in actual rebellion, why it could not be applied to slave-holding border states not in rebellion, and why he knew that after the war, an amendment to the Constitution would be necessary to bring emancipation to all the states and make it permanent.

- Have students read and hold a seminar conversation on the Gettysburg Address. It is a magnificent work of oratory, but it also gets at the heart of the American founding and the ideas that maintain the United States. It also shows the importance of defending and advancing those ideas, both in the Civil War and in our own day, as is incumbent on every American citizen.

- Read and have a seminar conversation about Abraham Lincoln’s second inaugural address. Lincoln addresses many topics within the speech, both reflecting on the war and outlining a plan for after the war. In some respects, this speech is “part two” of what Lincoln began to assert in the Gettysburg Address. One of the main ideas Lincoln suggests, however, is that the Civil War was a punishment for the whole nation. This punishment was not necessarily for the mere existence of slavery but because, unlike the founding generation, the nation had in the time since the founding not continued to work for the abolition of the evil of slavery. While no country will ever be perfect, a people should work to make sure its laws do not promote the perpetuation of a practice that violates the equal natural rights of its fellow citizens.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

**Assignment:** Explain the qualities of statesmanship that Abraham Lincoln exhibited and examples of how they were employed during the Civil War (3–4 paragraphs).
Lesson 4 — Civil Rights and Reconstruction

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the remarkable realization of civil rights for freedmen during Reconstruction and the immediate reversal of many of those realizations in Southern states with the sudden end of Reconstruction in 1877.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

Constitution 101 Lecture 7
Civil Rights in American History Lectures 4 and 5

PRIMARY SOURCES

Students are to read or, if they have previously read, review the following primary sources. While reading, students should annotate these sources. For particularly challenging texts or if the class is offered earlier in high school, the teacher may wish to provide students with guided reading questions to assist with comprehension, clarity, and direction. Using their annotations and any guided reading questions, students should come to class prepared to participate in a seminar conversation on each text.

Civil Rights Act of 1866
13th Amendment to the Constitution
14th Amendment to the Constitution
15th Amendment to the Constitution
The Atlanta Exposition Address, Booker T. Washington
“The Talented Tenth,” W.E.B. DuBois

TERMS AND TOPICS

Civil Rights Act of 1866 15th Amendment
13th Amendment black codes
14th Amendment Compromise of 1877

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

▪ What were Abraham Lincoln’s plans for reconstruction following the Civil War, as outlined in his second inaugural address and from what we know of his private meetings in the war’s final weeks?
▪ Compare Andrew Johnson’s Reconstruction actions and those of the Radical Republicans.
▪ What did a Confederate state have to do in order to be readmitted fully into the Union?
▪ Regarding the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments, what did each do?
▪ What did the Ku Klux Klan Acts do?
▪ In which ways did Southern states attempt to curtail the rights of freedmen during Reconstruction? How did they respond to the actions of Republicans in the north?
- What kinds of gains did African Americans attain during Reconstruction after slavery was explicitly abolished via the 13th Amendment?
- What happened in the election of 1876 and in the subsequent compromise of 1877?
- What were the immediate consequences, especially for African Americans living in the South, of the end to Reconstruction in 1877?
- How do Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. DuBois agree and disagree on how to secure civil rights for African Americans? In which ways are their views each compatible with the American founding?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 63: There are four amendments to the U.S. Constitution about who can vote. Describe one of them.
  - Question 97: What amendment gives citizenship to all persons born in the United States?
  - Question 98: When did all men get the right to vote?

**Keys to the Lesson**

Reconstruction was a period in which Congress attempted to secure civil rights for African Americans in accordance with the principles on which America was founded. The fact that the division over civil rights was geographic and that it came in the wake of a bitter war meant for less than ideal circumstances for achieving long-term successes. Nonetheless, slavery as explicitly abolished by the Constitution and civil rights were enacted and guaranteed, albeit only by military force. The gains witnessed for African Americans were impressive in many respects, but racial ideologies and resentments left over from the Civil War made for a fraught effort to achieve civil rights and heal the country. Students should study the very real accomplishments in fulfilling the promises of the founding during Reconstruction as well as the challenges and ultimate failure of Reconstruction.

Teachers might best plan and teach Civil Rights and Reconstruction with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Have students consider the effect of Abraham Lincoln’s assassination on Reconstruction and the future of America, especially as regards civil rights for African Americans. Lincoln’s focus was healing the nation while simultaneously providing for the effective and long-term establishment of equal rights for African Americans. Lincoln was succeeded after his assassination by Vice President Andrew Johnson.
- The transformation of a society away from decades of slavery was no small task. Depict Reconstruction as being tragically undermined and strained by the conflicts between congressional Republicans (who strongly opposed slavery), President Andrew Johnson (a pro-Union Democrat with little sympathy for former slaves), and lawmakers in the Southern states (who mostly wished to restrict the rights of the new freedmen), all of whom operated out of distrust following a painful and bloody Civil War.
- Have students read the three amendments to the Constitution and the laws passed during Reconstruction, especially the Civil Rights Act of 1866, related to the abolition of slavery and citizenship of freedmen. It is important to note the major and meaningful efforts Republicans made to guarantee the rights of African Americans.
- Teach students about both the important gains and protections Republicans won for African Americans during Reconstruction as well as the ways in which these were undermined by actions
in the former Confederate states and Johnson himself. Students should gain an appreciation of the remarkable speed and degrees to which former slaves were incorporated into the civil body early in Reconstruction, including the thousands of African Americans who would hold office at the local, state, and even federal level. But they should also understand the ways that Johnson resisted equal treatment of African Americans and in doing so encouraged and allowed certain bad policies (such as “black codes” passed by state legislatures and movements such as what would become the Ku Klux Klan) in the former Confederacy. In fact, many of the reversals of reconstruction began during the presidential reconstruction of Johnson, who was decisively against secession but by no means opposed to slavery. Congress repeatedly had to override his vetoes and enact Constitutional amendments to prevent his defense of inequalities. Such Congressional action, however, also laid the groundwork for the expansion of federal power into and over state law, especially through the 14th Amendment and military government.

- Have students learn about the ways in which many civil rights achievements were thwarted or undone both during and after Reconstruction. For instance, spend time discussing how as Southerners were refranchised, African American officials were voted out of office and how “black codes” would eventually become Jim Crow laws. Discuss how “black codes” limited freedmen’s civil rights and imposed economic restrictions, including making being unemployed illegal, prohibiting landownership, requiring long-term labor contracts, prohibiting assemblies of freedmen only, prohibiting teaching freedmen to read or write, segregating public facilities, prohibiting freedmen from serving on juries, and carrying out corporal punishments for violators, among other restrictions and injustices. Note also the use of poll taxes and literacy tests to prohibit African Americans from voting.

- Teach students how Republicans passed and President Ulysses S. Grant signed into law the Ku Klux Klan Acts to prohibit intimidation of freedmen exercising their civil rights. Grant also empowered the president to use the armed forces against those who tried to deny freedmen equal protection under the laws. Nonetheless, such measures were usually sloppily or half-heartedly enforced.

- At the same time, note the improvements during Reconstruction in building hospitals, creating a public school system, securing civil rights in principle, and fostering community within the freedmen community, especially in marital and family stability and through vibrant churches.

- Explain that Reconstruction effectively ended with the Compromise of 1877 that settled the disputed election of 1876. Congress (now controlled by the Democratic Party) would allow Republican Rutherford B. Hayes to be declared president in exchange for his withdrawing federal troops in former confederate states. Point out that in the backdrop was both continuing Southern resistance and a gradual waning of Northern zeal for (and political interest in) reform within the South.

- Ask students to consider the tragic nature of Reconstruction: a time of so much hoped for and achieved in applying the principle of equal natural rights was repeatedly undermined and mismanaged, then suddenly ended for political expediency, enabling new forms of injustice in certain areas of the country, after a war to end injustice had consumed the lives of hundreds of thousands of Americans.

- Nevertheless, make sure students do not lose sight of the momentous achievements in liberty, equality, and self-government fulfilled because of the Civil War. Students should appreciate the very significant achievements of Lincoln and the Civil War while looking forward to future
generations of Americans who would seek to live up to the fundamental principles of America in their own times.

- Following Reconstruction and in referencing American history, read with students Booker T. Washington’s and W.E.B. DuBois’s two sometimes complementary and sometimes competing approaches to securing equal civil rights for African Americans. These two pieces capture the major responses to Jim Crow during the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

**Assignment:** Explain the fulfillments in civil rights during Reconstruction and the attempts to undermine and reverse these realizations during and especially after Reconstruction (2–3 paragraphs).
APPENDIX A

Study Guide

Test

Writing Assignment
Study Guide — Equality in America Test

 TERMS AND TOPICS

Explain each of the following and the context in which it was discussed during this unit’s lessons.

equality  civic education  objective truth
slavery  civic religion  moral relativism
Northwest Ordinance  statesmanship  “don’t care”
abolition  morality  prudence
Cotton gin  political persuasion  justice
Missouri Compromise  political moderation  secession
positive good  Kansas-Nebraska Act  states’ rights
concurrent majority  Dred Scott v. Sandford  war powers
sectionalism  a house divided  Emancipation Proclamation
Compromise of 1850  popular sovereignty  black codes
self-government  majority tyranny  Compromise of 1877
rule of law

PRIMARY SOURCES

Explain the main arguments in each of the following sources and their significance to our understanding of equality in America.

Notes on the State of Virginia, Query 18: “Manners.” Thomas Jefferson
“The Constitution of the United States: Is It Pro-Slavery or Anti-Slavery?” Frederick Douglass
Speech on the reception of abolition petitions, John C. Calhoun
Speech at Peoria, Abraham Lincoln
Speech on the Dred Scott Decision, Abraham Lincoln
“House Divided” speech, Abraham Lincoln
The Seventh Lincoln-Douglas Debate
First inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln
Gettysburg Address, Abraham Lincoln
Second inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln
Civil Rights Act of 1866
13th Amendment
14th Amendment
15th Amendment
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.

Lesson 1 | Self-Government vs. Slavery

□ How did the Founders understand the tension between slavery and the principle of equality in the Declaration of Independence?
□ What was the nature of the Founders’ compromise with slavery at the time of the founding for the sake of the union? Would it have been possible to abolish slavery in the southern colonies without union?
□ Why did many in the founding generation expect that slavery would eventually die out so long as it was not allowed to expand?
□ What efforts did some founders make to abolish slavery?
□ What are the three clauses related to slavery in the Constitution? Explain each.
□ How was the Three-Fifth Compromise a partial victory for slaveholders and a partial victory for abolitionists?
□ How did Frederick Douglass’s views on the founding with respect to slavery change during his work for abolition?
□ What were the unforeseen consequences of the cotton gin, invented in 1793, four years after the adoption of the Constitution?
□ What was the argument in the defense of slavery as a “positive good” that emerged among Southern apologists in the decades after the founding?
□ How did the idea of slavery as a “positive good” challenge the Constitution’s stance on slavery and the path on which the founding generation had set slavery?
□ How did John C. Calhoun critique the Founders on equality, natural rights, and the social contract?
□ How did John C. Calhoun reject the ideas of the Declaration of Independence in arguing for slavery?
□ How did sectionalism rise after the founding generation?

Lesson 2 | Slavery and Moral Relativism

□ What was Abraham Lincoln’s understanding of the following?
   - the vulnerabilities of self-government
   - how to preserve self-government
   - the rule of law
   - the need for civic education
   - the need for civic religion
   - statesmanship
   - morality
   - political persuasion
   - political moderation
□ What did the Kansas-Nebraska Act and Dred Scott v. Sandford do, both in law and as a threat to public opinion on slavery at the time, and how did they contribute to the coming civil war?
□ Why did Abraham Lincoln argue that it was impossible to remain a “house divided”?
□ How did Abraham Lincoln try to halt the expansion of slavery and win the moral battle against it?
□ Contrary to its status at the founding, how was mid-nineteenth-century slavery unlikely to die out on its own?
□ What were Abraham Lincoln’s reasons not to assume that politics always progresses toward freedom?
□ How did Abraham Lincoln and Stephen Douglas disagree on each of the following?
  - the meaning of the founding, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution
  - the meaning of self-government as either unchecked popular sovereignty and majority rule, or grounded and limited by our equal natural rights
  - the limits of democracy and the danger of majority tyranny
□ As he expressed in his debates with Stephen Douglas, how did Abraham Lincoln understand equality and the injustice of slavery?
□ What were Abraham Lincoln’s arguments against moral neutrality or relativism (“don’t care”) on the fundamental question of slavery?
□ In what sense was slavery the true cause of the Civil War?
□ In what ways did the Confederacy reject the principle of equality from the Declaration of Independence and insist on the inequality of the races?

Lesson 3 | Lincoln’s Statesmanship and the End of Slavery

□ In what ways did Abraham Lincoln manifest the ideal qualities of a statesman and the virtue of prudence?
□ How did Abraham Lincoln manage to accomplish his competing efforts to maintain the union, preserve the Constitution and the rule of law, and end slavery?
□ What were the arguments for and against Southern secession?
□ What were the arguments for and against the Union fighting to keep the South from seceding?
□ What were the benefits of union, including for the prospects of abolishing slavery?
□ How did secession threaten to undermine the Constitution and the moral integrity of the people and its government?
□ What are a president’s war powers per the Constitution?
□ What were the arguments for and against the legality and necessity of the extraordinary measures taken by Abraham Lincoln to win the war and put down the rebellion?
□ How did Abraham Lincoln strive to maintain the rule of law?
□ What did the Emancipation Proclamation do? How was Abraham Lincoln able to justify, issue, and enforce it successfully?
□ How does the example of Abraham Lincoln show the need and benefits of an energetic executive?
□ How does Abraham Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address assert that freedom and self-government require devotion—and even a willingness to sacrifice for—the country and its principles of justice? How are these principles of justice grounded in nature?
□ As presented in his second inaugural address, how did Abraham Lincoln view the Civil War as a tragedy, and what do these reflections reveal about the tragic nature of politics and the need for political moderation?
□ What are Abraham Lincoln’s reflections on providence?

Lesson 4 | Civil Rights and Reconstruction

□ What were Abraham Lincoln’s plans for reconstruction following the Civil War, as outlined in his second inaugural address and from what we know of his private meetings in the war’s final weeks?
□ Compare Andrew Johnson’s Reconstruction actions and those of the Radical Republicans.
□ What did a Confederate state have to do in order to be readmitted fully into the Union?
Regarding the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments, what did each do?

In what ways did Southern states attempt to curtail the rights of freedmen during Reconstruction? How did they respond to the actions of Republicans in the North?

What kinds of gains did African Americans attain during Reconstruction after slavery was explicitly abolished via the 13th Amendment?

What were the immediate consequences, especially for African Americans living in the South, of the end to Reconstruction in 1877?

How do Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. DuBois agree and disagree on how to secure civil rights for African Americans? In which ways are their views each compatible with the American founding?
Test — Equality in America

Terms and Topics

Explain each of the following and the context in which it was discussed during this unit’s lessons.

1. Northwest Ordinance
2. abolition
3. Missouri Compromise
4. positive good
5. Compromise of 1850
6. rule of law
7. statesmanship
8. political persuasion
9. Kansas-Nebraska Act
10. *Dred Scott v. Sandford*
11. popular sovereignty
12. majority tyranny
13. “don’t care”

14. Emancipation Proclamation

15. black codes

**PRIMARY SOURCES**

*Explain the main arguments in each of the following sources and their significance to our understanding of equality in America.*


17. “The Constitution of the United States: Is It Pro-Slavery or Anti-Slavery?” Frederick Douglass

18. “House Divided” speech, Abraham Lincoln

19. First inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln
20. Gettysburg Address, Abraham Lincoln

21. Second inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and writing should be employed, and responses must fully answer each question.

22. What was the nature of the Founders’ compromise with slavery at the time of the founding for the sake of the union? Would it have been possible to abolish slavery in the southern colonies without union?

23. Why did many in the founding generation expect that slavery would eventually die out so long as it was not allowed to expand?

24. What efforts did some founders make to abolish slavery?

25. What are the three clauses related to slavery in the Constitution? Explain each.
26. How did John C. Calhoun reject the ideas of the Declaration of Independence in arguing for slavery?

27. What was Abraham Lincoln’s understanding of self-government’s vulnerabilities, the rule of law, morality, and civic education?

28. What were Abraham Lincoln’s reasons not to assume that politics always progresses toward freedom?

29. How did Abraham Lincoln and Stephen Douglas disagree on the meaning of self-government as either popular sovereignty and majority rule, or grounded and limited by our equal natural rights?

30. What were Abraham Lincoln’s arguments against moral neutrality or relativism (“don’t care”) on the fundamental question of slavery?

31. How was slavery the true cause of the Civil War?

32. How did Abraham Lincoln manage to accomplish his competing efforts to maintain the union, preserve the Constitution and the rule of law, and end slavery?

33. How did secession threaten to undermine the Constitution and the moral integrity of the people and its government?

34. Regarding the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments, what did each do?

35. What kinds of gains did African Americans attain during Reconstruction after slavery was officially abolished?
Writing Assignment — Equality in America

DIRECTIONS

Citing primary sources and conversations from class in your argument, write a 500–800-word essay answering the question:

How did America’s principles allow for the abolition of slavery as demonstrated by the founding generation and the statesmanship of Abraham Lincoln? To what extent have some Americans and government failed to pursue equality before the law during the founding, before the Civil War, and after Reconstruction?
APPENDIX B

Primary Sources

George Washington
John Adams
Benjamin Franklin
Alexander Hamilton
James Madison
Thomas Jefferson
Frederick Douglass
John C. Calhoun
Abraham Lincoln
Roger Taney
Stephen Douglas
Alexander Stephens
The United States Congress
The American People
Booker T. Washington
W.E.B. DuBois
Statements on Slavery
EXCERPTS FROM FIVE FOUNDERS
1786-1819

BACKGROUND

The following excerpts catalog views of five leading Founders on the slave trade and the institution of slavery in America during the first few decades of the country’s existence.

ANNOTATIONS

George Washington

Letter to Robert Morris, April 12, 1786

"...[T]here is not a man living who wishes more sincerely than I do, to see a plan adopted for the abolition of it...."

John Adams

Letter to Robert J. Evans, June 8, 1819

"...Every measure of prudence, therefore, ought to be assumed for the eventual total extirpation of slavery from the United States.... I have, through my whole life, held the practice of slavery in...abhorrence...."

Benjamin Franklin

An Address to the Public from the Pennsylvania Society, November 9, 1789

"...Slavery is such an atrocious debasement of human nature, that its very extirpation, if not performed with solicitous care, may sometimes open a source of serious evils...."

Alexander Hamilton

Philo Camillus no. 2, August 1795

"...The laws of certain states which give an ownership in the service of negroes as personal property, constitute a similitude between them and other articles of personal property, and thereby subject them to the right of capture by war. But being men, by the laws of God and nature, they were capable of acquiring liberty—and when the captor in war, to whom by the capture the ownership was transferred, thought fit to give them liberty, the gift was not only valid, but irrevocable...."

James Madison

Speech at the Constitutional Convention, June 6, 1787

"...We have seen the mere distinction of color made in the most enlightened period of time, a ground of the most oppressive dominion ever exercised by man over man...."
Anonymous (Thomas Jefferson)

Query XVIII: Manners

Chapter from Notes on the State of Virginia

May 1785

Paris, France

Background


Guiding Questions

1. How did the institution of slavery harm both the enslaved and their masters?

2. Why does Jefferson fear God’s wrath?

3. What does Jefferson think of the prospects for an end to slavery?

---

The particular customs and manners that may happen to be received in that state?

It is difficult to determine on the standard by which the manners of a nation may be tried, whether catholic or particular. It is more difficult for a native to bring to that standard the manners of his own nation, familiarized to him by habit. There must doubtless be an unhappy influence on the manners of our people produced by the existence of slavery among us. The whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions, the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submissions on the other. Our children see this, and learn to imitate it; for man is an imitative animal. This quality is the germ of all education in him. From his cradle to his grave he is learning to do what he sees others do. If a parent could find no motive either in his philanthropy or his self-love, for restraining the intemperance of passion towards his slave, it should always be a sufficient one that his child is present. But generally it is not sufficient. The parent storms, the child looks on, catches the lineaments of wrath, puts on the same airs in the circle of smaller slaves, gives a loose to the worst of passions, and thus nursed, educated, and daily exercised in tyranny, cannot but be stamped by it with odious peculiarities. The man must be a prodigy who can retain his manners and morals undepraved by such circumstances. And with what execration should the statesman be loaded, who, permitting one half the citizens thus to trample on the rights of the other, transforms those into despots, and these into enemies, destroys the morals of the one part, and the amor patriae of the other. For if a slave can have a country in this world, it must be any other in preference to that in which he is born to live and labor for another; in which he must lock up the faculties of his nature, contribute as far as depends on his individual endeavors to the evanishment of the human race, or entail his own miserable condition on the endless generations proceeding from him. With the morals of the people, their industry also is destroyed. For in a warm climate, no man will labor for himself who can make another labor for him. This is so true, that of the proprietors of slaves a very small proportion indeed are ever seen to labor. And can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are of the gift of God? That they are not to be violated but with His wrath? Indeed I tremble for
my country when I reflect that God is just; that his justice cannot sleep forever; that considering numbers, nature and natural means only, a revolution of the wheel of fortune, an exchange of situation is among possible events; that it may become probable by supernatural interference! The Almighty has no attribute which can take side with us in such a contest. But it is impossible to be temperate and to pursue this subject through the various considerations of policy, of morals, of history natural and civil. We must be contented to hope they will force their way into every one's mind. I think a change already perceptible, since the origin of the present revolution. The spirit of the master is abating, that of the slave rising from the dust, his condition mollifying, the way I hope preparing, under the auspices of heaven, for a total emancipation, and that this is disposed, in the order of events, to be with the consent of the masters, rather than by their extirpation.
FREDERICK DOUGLASS
What to the Slave Is the Fourth of July?
SPEECH
July 5, 1852
Corinthian Hall | Rochester, New York

BACKGROUND
Frederick Douglass gave this speech to the Ladies’ Anti-Slavery Society, intentionally on the day following the celebration of the nation’s birthday.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Why does Douglass use July 4th for the backdrop of his point on slavery?

2. Does Douglass think that slavery is consistent with the principles of America?

3. At this time, does Douglass view the Constitution as a pro-slavery document?

Frederick Douglass, Selected Speeches and Writings, ed. Philip S. Foner (Chicago: Lawrence Hill, 1999), 188-206.
My subject, then, fellow-citizens, is American slavery. I shall see, this day, and its popular characteristics, from the slave’s point of view. Standing, there, identified with the American bondman, making his wrongs mine, I do not hesitate to declare, with all my soul, that the character and conduct of this nation never looked blacker to me than on this 4th of July!

Whether we turn to the declarations of the past, or to the professions of the present, the conduct of the nation seems equally hideous and revolting. America is false to the past, false to the present, and solemnly binds herself to be false to the future. Standing with God and the crushed and bleeding slave on this occasion, I will, in the name of humanity which is outraged, in the name of liberty which is fettered, in the name of the constitution and the Bible, which are disregarded and trampled upon, dare to call in question and to denounce, with all the emphasis I can command, everything that serves to perpetuate slavery—the great sin and shame of America! “I will not equivocate; I will not excuse;” I will use the severest language I can command; and yet not one word shall escape me that any man, whose judgment is not blinded by prejudice, or who is not at heart a slaveholder, shall not confess to be right and just.

But I fancy I hear some one of my audience say, it is just in this circumstance that you and your brother abolitionists fail to make a favorable impression on the public mind. Would you argue more, and denounce less, would you persuade more, and rebuke less, your cause would be much more likely to succeed. But, I submit, where all is plain there is nothing to be argued. What point in the anti-slavery creed would you have me argue? On what branch of the subject do the people of this country need light? Must I undertake to prove that the slave is a man? That point is conceded already. Nobody doubts it. The slaveholders themselves acknowledge it in the enactment of laws for their government. They acknowledge it when they punish disobedience on the part of the slave. There are seventy-two crimes in the state of Virginia, which, if committed by a black man, (no matter how ignorant he be), subject him to the punishment of death; while only two of the same crimes will subject a white man to the like punishment. What is this but the acknowledgement that the slave is a moral, intellectual and responsible being? The manhood of the slave is conceded. It is admitted in the fact that Southern statute books are covered with enactments forbidding,
under severe fines and penalties, the teaching of the slave to read or to write. When you can point to any such laws, in reference to the beasts of the field, then I may consent to argue the manhood of the slave. When the dogs in your streets, when the fowls of the air, when the cattle on your hills, when the fish of the sea, and the reptiles that crawl, shall be unable to distinguish the slave from a brute, then will I argue with you that the slave is a man!

For the present, it is enough to affirm the equal manhood of the Negro race. Is it not astonishing that, while we are ploughing, planting and reaping, using all kinds of mechanical tools, erecting houses, constructing bridges, building ships, working in metals of brass, iron, copper, silver and gold; that, while we are reading, writing and cyphering, acting as clerks, merchants and secretaries, having among us lawyers, doctors, ministers, poets, authors, editors, orators and teachers; that, while we are engaged in all manner of enterprises common to other men, digging gold in California, capturing the whale in the Pacific, feeding sheep and cattle on the hill-side, living, moving, acting, thinking, planning, living in families as husbands, wives and children, and, above all, confessing and worshipping the Christian’s God, and looking hopefully for life and immortality beyond the grave, we are called upon to prove that we are men!

Would you have me argue that man is entitled to liberty? that he is the rightful owner of his own body? You have already declared it. Must I argue the wrongfulness of slavery? Is that a question for Republicans? Is it to be settled by the rules of logic and argumentation, as a matter beset with great difficulty, involving a doubtful application of the principle of justice, hard to be understood? How should I look to-day, in the presence of Americans, dividing, and subdividing a discourse, to show that men have a natural right to freedom? speaking of it relatively, and positively, negatively, and affirmatively. To do so, would be to make myself ridiculous, and to offer an insult to your understanding. There is not a man beneath the canopy of heaven, that does not know that slavery is wrong for him.

What, am I to argue that it is wrong to make men brutes, to rob them of their liberty, to work them without wages, to keep them ignorant of their relations to their fellow men, to beat them with sticks, to flay their flesh with the lash, to load their limbs with irons, to hunt
them with dogs, to sell them at auction, to sunder their families, to knock out their teeth, to burn their flesh, to starve them into obedience and submission to their masters? Must I argue that a system thus marked with blood, and stained with pollution, is wrong? No! I will not. I have better employments for my time and strength than such arguments would imply.

What, then, remains to be argued? Is it that slavery is not divine; that God did not establish it; that our doctors of divinity are mistaken? There is blasphemy in the thought. That which is inhuman, cannot be divine! Who can reason on such a proposition? They that can, may; I cannot. The time for such argument is passed.

At a time like this, scorching irony, not convincing argument, is needed. O! had I the ability, and could I reach the nation’s ear, I would, today, pour out a fiery stream of biting ridicule, blasting reproach, withering sarcasm, and stern rebuke. For it is not light that is needed, but fire; it is not the gentle shower, but thunder. We need the storm, the whirlwind, and the earthquake. The feeling of the nation must be quickened; the conscience of the nation must be roused; the propriety of the nation must be startled; the hypocrisy of the nation must be exposed; and its crimes against God and man must be proclaimed and denounced.

What, to the American slave, is your 4th of July? I answer: a day that reveals to him, more than all other days in the year, the gross injustice and cruelty to which he is the constant victim. To him, your celebration is a sham; your boasted liberty, an unholy license; your national greatness, swelling vanity; your sounds of rejoicing are empty and heartless; your denunciations of tyrants, brass fronted impudence; your prayers and hymns, your sermons and thanksgivings, with all your religious parade, and solemnity, are, to him, mere bombast, fraud, deception, impiety, and hypocrisy—a thin veil to cover up crimes which would disgrace a nation of savages. There is not a nation on the earth guilty of practices, more shocking and bloody, than are the people of these United States, at this very hour. . . .

Take the American slave trade, which, we are told by the papers, is especially prosperous just now. . . . That trade has long since been denounced by this government, as piracy. It
What to the Slave Is the Fourth of July?
Frederick Douglass

has been denounced with burning words, from the high places of the nation, as an execrable traffic. To arrest it, to put an end to it, this nation keeps a squadron, at immense cost, on the coast of Africa. Everywhere, in this country, it is safe to speak of this foreign slave trade, as a most inhuman traffic, opposed alike to the laws of God and of man. . . . It is, however, a notable fact that, while so much execration is poured out by Americans upon those engaged in the foreign slave trade, the men engaged in the slave trade between the states pass without condemnation, and their business is deemed honorable. . . .

But a still more inhuman, disgraceful, and scandalous state of things remains to be presented. By an act of the American Congress, not yet two years old, slavery has been nationalized in its most horrible and revolting form. By that act, Mason and Dixon’s line has been obliterated; New York has become as Virginia; and the power to hold, hunt, and sell men, women, and children as slaves remains no longer a mere state institution, but is now an institution of the whole United States. The power is co-extensive with the Star-Spangled Banner and American Christianity. Where these go, may also go the merciless slave-hunter. . . . For black men there are neither law, justice, humanity, nor religion. The Fugitive Slave Law makes mercy to them a crime; and bribes the judge who tries them. An American judge gets ten dollars for every victim he consigns to slavery, and five, when he fails to do so. The oath of any two villains is sufficient, under this hell-black enactment, to send the most pious and exemplary black man into the remorseless jaws of slavery! His own testimony is nothing. He can bring no witnesses for himself. The minister of American justice is bound by the law to hear but one side; and that side, is the side of the oppressor. Let this damning fact be perpetually told. Let it be thundered around the world, that, in tyrant-killing, king-hating, people-loving, democratic, Christian America, the seats of justice are filled with judges, who hold their offices under an open and palpable bribe, and are bound, in deciding in the case of a man’s liberty, hear only his accusers! . . .

[T]he church of this country is not only indifferent to the wrongs of the slave, it actually takes sides with the oppressors. It has made itself the bulwark of American slavery, and the shield of American slave-hunters. Many of its most eloquent Divines, who stand as the very lights of the church, have shamelessly given the sanction of religion and the Bible to the
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whole slave system. They have taught that man may, properly, be a slave; that the relation of master and slave is ordained of God; that to send back an escaped bondman to his master is clearly the duty of all the followers of the Lord Jesus Christ; and this horrible blasphemy is palmed off upon the world for Christianity. . . .

Let the religious press, the pulpit, the Sunday school, the conference meeting, the great ecclesiastical, missionary, Bible and tract associations of the land array their immense powers against slavery and slaveholding; and the whole system of crime and blood would be scattered to the winds; and that they do not do this involves them in the most awful responsibility of which the mind can conceive. . . .

Fellow-citizens! I will not enlarge further on your national inconsistencies. The existence of slavery in this country brands your republicanism as a sham, your humanity as a base pretense, and your Christianity as a lie. It destroys your moral power abroad; it corrupts your politicians at home. It saps the foundation of religion; it makes your name a hissing, and a bye-word to a mocking earth. It is the antagonistic force in your government, the only thing that seriously disturbs and endangers your Union. It fetters your progress; it is the enemy of improvement, the deadly foe of education; it fosters pride; it breeds insolence; it promotes vice; it shelters crime; it is a curse to the earth that supports it; and yet, you cling to it, as if it were the sheet anchor of all your hopes. Oh! be warned! be warned! a horrible reptile is coiled up in your nation’s bosom; the venomous creature is nursing at the tender breast of your youthful republic; for the love of God, tear away, and fling from you the hideous monster, and let the weight of twenty millions crush and destroy it forever!

But it is answered in reply to all this, that precisely what I have now denounced is, in fact, guaranteed and sanctioned by the Constitution of the United States; that the right to hold and to hunt slaves is a part of that Constitution framed by the illustrious Fathers of this Republic. . . .

. . . But I differ from those who charge this baseness on the framers of the Constitution of the United States. It is a slander upon their memory, at least, so I believe. . . .
Fellow-citizens! there is no matter in respect to which, the people of the North have allowed themselves to be so ruinously imposed upon, as that of the pro-slavery character of the Constitution. In that instrument I hold there is neither warrant, license, nor sanction of the hateful thing; but, interpreted as it ought to be interpreted, the Constitution is a glorious liberty document. Read its preamble, consider its purposes. Is slavery among them? Is it at the gateway? or is it in the temple? It is neither. While I do not intend to argue this question on the present occasion, let me ask, if it be not somewhat singular that, if the Constitution were intended to be, by its framers and adopters, a slave-holding instrument, why neither slavery, slave-holding, nor slave can anywhere be found in it. What would be thought of an instrument, drawn up, legally drawn up, for the purpose of entitling the city of Rochester to a track of land, in which no mention of land was made? . . .

Now, take the Constitution according to its plain reading, and I defy the presentation of a single pro-slavery clause in it. On the other hand it will be found to contain principles and purposes, entirely hostile to the existence of slavery. . . .

. . . Allow me to say, in conclusion, notwithstanding the dark picture I have this day presented of the state of the nation, I do not despair of this country. There are forces in operation, which must inevitably work the downfall of slavery. “The arm of the Lord is not shortened,” and the doom of slavery is certain. I, therefore, leave off where I began, with hope. While drawing encouragement from the Declaration of Independence, the great principles it contains, and the genius of American Institutions, my spirit is also cheered by the obvious tendencies of the age. Nations do not now stand in the same relation to each other that they did ages ago. No nation can now shut itself up from the surrounding world, and trot round in the same old path of its fathers without interference. The time was when such could be done. Long established customs of hurtful character could formerly fence themselves in, and do their evil work with social impunity. Knowledge was then confined and enjoyed by the privileged few, and the multitude walked on in mental darkness. But a change has now come over the affairs of mankind. Walled cities and empires have become unfashionable. The arm of commerce has borne away the gates of the strong city. Intelligence is penetrating the darkest corners of the globe. It makes its pathway over and under
the sea, as well as on the earth. Wind, steam, and lightning are its chartered agents. Oceans
no longer divide, but link nations together. From Boston to London is now a holiday ex-
cursion. Space is comparatively annihilated. Thoughts expressed on one side of the Atlan-
tic, are distinctly heard on the other. The far off and almost fabulous Pacific rolls in gran-
deur at our feet. The Celestial Empire, the mystery of ages, is being solved. The fiat of the
Almighty, “Let there be Light,” has not yet spent its force. No abuse, no outrage whether in
taste, sport or avarice, can now hide itself from the all-pervading light. The iron shoe, and
crippled foot of China must be seen, in contrast with nature. Africa must rise and put on
her yet unwoven garment. “Ethiopia shall stretch out her hand unto God.” In the fervent
aspirations of William Lloyd Garrison, I say, and let every heart join in saying it:

God speed the year of jubilee

The wide world o’er

When from their galling chains set free,

Th’ oppress’d shall vilely bend the knee,

And wear the yoke of tyranny

Like brutes no more.

That year will come, and freedom’s reign,

To man his plundered rights again

Restore. . .
FREDERICK DOUGLASS
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I proceed to the discussion. And first a word about the question. Much will be gained at the outset if we fully and clearly understand the real question under discussion. Indeed, nothing is or can be understood. This are often confounded and treated as the same, for no better reason than that they resemble each other, even while they are in their nature and character totally distinct and even directly opposed to each other. This jumbling up things is a sort of dust-throwing which is often indulged in by small men who argue for victory rather than for truth.

Thus, for instance, the American Government and the American Constitution are spoken of in a manner which would naturally lead the hearer to believe that one is identical with the other; when the truth is, they are distinct in character as is a ship and a compass. The one may point right and the other steer wrong. A chart is one thing, the course of the vessel is another. The Constitution may be right, the Government is wrong. If the Government has been governed by mean, sordid, and wicked passions, it does not follow that the Constitution is mean, sordid, and wicked.

What, then, is the question? I will state it. But first let me state what is not the question. It is not whether slavery existed in the United States at the time of the adoption of the Constitution; it is not whether slaveholders took part in the framing of the Constitution; it is not whether those slaveholders, in their hearts, intended to secure certain advantages in that instrument for slavery; it is not whether the American Government has been wielded during seventy-two years in favour of the propagation and permanence of slavery; it is not whether a pro-slavery interpretation has been put upon the Constitution by the American Courts — all these points may be true or they may be false, they may be accepted or they may be rejected, without in any wise affecting the real question in debate.

The real and exact question between myself and the class of persons represented by the speech at the City Hall may be fairly stated thus: — 1st, Does the United States Constitution guarantee to any class or description of people in that country the right to enslave, or hold as property, any other class or description of people in that country? 2nd, Is the dissolution of the union between the slave and free States required by fidelity to the slaves, or by the
just demands of conscience? Or, in other words, is the refusal to exercise the elective franchise, and to hold office in America, the surest, wisest, and best way to abolish slavery in America?

To these questions the Garrisonians say Yes. They hold the Constitution to be a slaveholding instrument, and will not cast a vote or hold office, and denounce all who vote or hold office, no matter how faithfully such persons labour to promote the abolition of slavery. I, on the other hand, deny that the Constitution guarantees the right to hold property in man, and believe that the way to abolish slavery in America is to vote such men into power as well use their powers for the abolition of slavery. This is the issue plainly stated, and you shall judge between us. Before we examine into the disposition, tendency, and character of the Constitution, I think we had better ascertain what the Constitution itself is. Before looking for what it means, let us see what it is. Here, too, there is much dust to be cleared away. What, then, is the Constitution? I will tell you. It is not even like the British Constitution, which is made up of enactments of Parliament, decisions of Courts, and the established usages of the Government. The American Constitution is a written instrument full and complete in itself. No Court in America, no Congress, no President, can add a single word thereto, or take a single word therefrom. It is a great national enactment done by the people, and can only be altered, amended, or added to by the people. I am careful to make this statement here; in America it would not be necessary. It would not be necessary here if my assailant had shown the same desire to be set before you the simple truth, which he manifested to make out a good case for himself and friends. Again, it should be borne in mind that the mere text, and only the text, and not any commentaries or creeds written by those who wished to give the text a meaning apart from its plain reading, was adopted as the Constitution of the United States. It should also be borne in mind that the intentions of those who framed the Constitution, be they good or bad, for slavery or against slavery, are so respected so far, and so far only, as we find those intentions plainly stated in the Constitution. It would be the wildest of absurdities, and lead to endless confusion and mischiefs, if, instead of looking to the written paper itself, for its meaning, it were attempted to make us search it out, in the secret motives, and dishonest intentions, of some of the men who
took part in writing it. It was what they said that was adopted by the people, not what they were ashamed or afraid to say, and really omitted to say. Bear in mind, also, and the fact is an important one, that the framers of the Constitution sat with doors closed, and that this was done purposely, that nothing but the result of their labours should be seen, and that that result should be judged of by the people free from any of the bias shown in the debates. It should also be borne in mind, and the fact is still more important, that the debates in the convention that framed the Constitution, and by means of which a pro-slavery interpretation is now attempted to be forced upon that instrument, were not published till more than a quarter of a century after the presentation and the adoption of the Constitution.

These debates were purposely kept out of view, in order that the people should adopt, not the secret motives or unexpressed intentions of any body, but the simple text of the paper itself. Those debates form no part of the original agreement. I repeat, the paper itself, and only the paper itself, with its own plainly written purposes, is the Constitution. It must stand or fall, flourish or fade, on its own individual and self-declared character and objects. Again, where would be the advantage of a written Constitution, if, instead of seeking its meaning in its words, we had to seek them in the secret intentions of individuals who may have had something to do with writing the paper? What will the people of America a hundred years hence care about the intentions of the scriveners who wrote the Constitution? These men are already gone from us, and in the course of nature were expected to go from us. They were for a generation, but the Constitution is for ages. Whatever we may owe to them, we certainly owe it to ourselves, and to mankind, and to God, to maintain the truth of our own language, and to allow no villainy, not even the villainy of holding men as slaves — which Wesley says is the sum of all villainies — to shelter itself under a fair-seeming and virtuous language. We owe it to ourselves to compel the devil to wear his own garments, and to make wicked laws speak out their wicked intentions. Common sense, and common justice, and sound rules of interpretation all drive us to the words of the law for the meaning of the law. The practice of the Government is dwelt upon with much fervour and eloquence as conclusive as to the slaveholding character of the Constitution. This is really the strong
point and the only strong point, made in the speech in the City Hall. But good as this argu-
ment is, it is not conclusive. A wise man has said that few people have been found better
than their laws, but many have been found worse. To this last rule America is no exception.
Her laws are one thing, her practice is another thing. We read that the Jews made void the
law by their tradition, that Moses permitted men to put away their wives because of the
hardness of their hearts, but that this was not so at the beginning. While good laws will
always be found where good practice prevails, the reverse does not always hold true. Far
from it. The very opposite is often the case. What then? Shall we condemn the righteous
law because wicked men twist it to the support of wickedness? Is that the way to deal with
good and evil? Shall we blot out all distinction between them, and hand over to slavery all
that slavery may claim on the score of long practice? Such is the course commended to us
in the City Hall speech. After all, the fact that men go out of the Constitution to prove it
pro-slavery, whether that going out is to the practice of the Government, or to the secret
intentions of the writers of the paper, the fact that they do go out is very significant. It is a
powerful argument on my side. It is an admission that the thing for which they are looking
is not to be found where only it ought to be found, and that is in the Constitution itself. If
it is not there, it is nothing to the purpose, be it wheresoever else it may be. But I shall have
no more to say on this point hereafter.

The very eloquent lecturer at the City Hall doubtless felt some embarrassment from the
fact that he had literally to give the Constitution a pro-slavery interpretation; because upon
its face it of itself conveys no such meaning, but a very opposite meaning. He thus sums up
what he calls the slaveholding provisions of the Constitution. I quote his own words: —
“Article 1, section 9, provides for the continuance of the African slave trade for the 20 years,
after the adoption of the Constitution. Art. 4, section 9, provides for the recovery from the
other States of fugitive slaves. Art. 1, section 2, gives the slave States a representation of the
three-fifths of all the slave population; and Art. 1, section 8, requires the President to use
the military, naval, ordnance, and militia resources of the entire country for the suppres-
sion of slave insurrection, in the same manner as he would employ them to repel invasion.”
Now any man reading this statement, or hearing it made with such a show of exactness,
would unquestionably suppose that he speaker or writer had given the plain written text of
the Constitution itself. I can hardly believe that the intended to make any such impression.
It would be a scandalous imputation to say he did. Any yet what are we to make of it? How
can we regard it? How can he be screened from the charge of having perpetrated a deliber-
ate and point-blank misrepresentation? That individual has seen fit to place himself before
the public as my opponent, and yet I would gladly find some excuse for him. I do not wish
to think as badly of him as this trick of his would naturally lead me to think. Why did he
not read the Constitution? Why did he read that which was not the Constitution? He pre-
tended to be giving chapter and verse, section and clause, paragraph and provision. The
words of the Constitution were before him. Why then did he not give you the plain words
of the Constitution? Oh, sir, I fear that the gentleman knows too well why he did not. It so
happens that no such words as “African slave trade,” no such words as “slave insurrec-
tions,” are anywhere used in that instrument. These are the words of that orator, and not
the words of the Constitution of the United States. Now you shall see a slight difference
between my manner of treating this subject and what which my opponent has seen fit, for
reasons satisfactory to himself, to pursue. What he withheld, that I will spread before you:
what he suppressed, I will bring to light: and what he passed over in silence, I will proclaim:
that you may have the whole case before you, and not be left to depend upon either his, or
upon my inferences or testimony. Here then are several provisions of the Constitution to
which reference has been made. I read them word for word just as they stand in the paper,
called the United States Constitution, Art. I, sec. 2. “Representatives and direct taxes shall
be apportioned among the several States which may be included in this Union, according
to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of
free persons, including those bound to service for a term years, and excluding Indians not
taxed, three-fifths of all other persons; Art. I, sec. 9. The migration or importation of such
persons as any of the States now existing shall think fit to admit, shall not be prohibited by
the Congress prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a tax or duty may
be imposed on such importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each person; Art. 4, sec. 2.
No person held to service or labour in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into an-
other shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from service or
labour; but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labour may be due; Art. I, sec. 8. To provide for calling for the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions.” Here then, are those provisions of the Constitution, which the most extravagant defenders of slavery can claim to guarantee a right of property in man. These are the provisions which have been pressed into the service of the human fleshmongers of America. Let us look at them just as they stand, one by one. Let us grant, for the sake of the argument, that the first of these provisions, referring to the basis of representation and taxation, does refer to slaves. We are not compelled to make that admission, for it might fairly apply to aliens — persons living in the country, but not naturalized. But giving the provisions the very worse construction, what does it amount to? I answer — It is a downright disability laid upon the slaveholding States; one which deprives those States of two-fifths of their natural basis of representation. A black man in a free State is worth just two-fifths more than a black man in a slave State, as a basis of political power under the Constitution. Therefore, instead of encouraging slavery, the Constitution encourages freedom by giving an increase of “two-fifths” of political power to free over slave States. So much for the three-fifths clause; taking it at is worst, it still leans to freedom, not slavery; for, be it remembered that the Constitution nowhere forbids a coloured man to vote. I come to the next, that which it is said guaranteed the continuance of the African slave trade for twenty years. I will also take that for just what my opponent alleges it to have been, although the Constitution does not warrant any such conclusion. But, to be liberal, let us suppose it did, and what follows? Why, this — that this part of the Constitution, so far as the slave trade is concerned, became a dead letter more than 50 years ago, and now binds no man’s conscience for the continuance of any slave trade whatsoever. Mr. Thomp-son is just 52 years too late in dissolving the Union on account of this clause. He might as well dissolve the British Government, because Queen Elizabeth granted to Sir John Haw-kins to import Africans into the West Indies 300 years ago! But there is still more to be said about this abolition of the slave trade. Men, at that time, both in England and in America, looked upon the slave trade as the life of slavery. The abolition of the slave trade was supposed to be the certain death of slavery. Cut off the stream, and the pond will dry up, was the common notion at the time.
Wilberforce and Clarkson, clear-sighted as they were, took this view; and the American statesmen, in providing for the abolition of the slave trade, thought they were providing for the abolition of the slavery. This view is quite consistent with the history of the times. All regarded slavery as an expiring and doomed system, destined to speedily disappear from the country. But, again, it should be remembered that this very provision, if made to refer to the African slave trade at all, makes the Constitution anti-slavery rather than for slavery; for it says to the slave States, the price you will have to pay for coming into the American Union is, that the slave trade, which you would carry on indefinitely out of the Union, shall be put an end to in twenty years if you come into the Union. Secondly, if it does apply, it expired by its own limitation more than fifty years ago. Thirdly, it is anti-slavery, because it looked to the abolition of slavery rather than to its perpetuity. Fourthly, it showed that the intentions of the framers of the Constitution were good, not bad. I think this is quite enough for this point.

I go to the “slave insurrection” clause, though, in truth, there is no such clause. The one which is called so has nothing whatever to do with slaves or slaveholders any more than your laws for suppression of popular outbreaks has to do with making slaves of you and your children. It is only a law for suppression of riots or insurrections. But I will be generous here, as well as elsewhere, and grant that it applies to slave insurrections. Let us suppose that an anti-slavery man is President of the United States (and the day that shall see this the case is not distant) and this very power of suppressing slave insurrections would put an end to slavery. The right to put down an insurrection carries with it the right to determine the means by which it shall be put down. If it should turn out that slavery is a source of insurrection, that there is no security from insurrection while slavery lasts, why, the Constitution would be best obeyed by putting an end to slavery, and an anti-slavery Congress would do the very same thing. Thus, you see, the so-called slave-holding provisions of the American Constitution, which a little while ago looked so formidable, are, after all, no defence or guarantee for slavery whatever. But there is one other provision. This is called the “Fugitive Slave Provision.” It is called so by those who wish to make it subserve the interest of slavery in America, and the same by those who wish to uphold the views of a party in this country.
It is put thus in the speech at the City Hall: — “Let us go back to 1787, and enter Liberty Hall, Philadelphia, where sat in convention the illustrious men who framed the Constitution — with George Washington in the chair. On the 27th of September, Mr. Butler and Mr. Pinckney, two delegates from the State of South Carolina, moved that the Constitution should require that fugitive slaves and servants should be delivered up like criminals, and after a discussion on the subject, the clause, as it stands in the Constitution, was adopted. After this, in the conventions held in the several States to ratify the Constitution, the same meaning was attached to the words. For example, Mr. Madison (afterwards President), when recommending the Constitution to his constituents, told them that the clause would secure them their property in slaves.” I must ask you to look well to this statement. Upon its face, it would seem a full and fair statement of the history of the transaction it professes to describe and yet I declare unto you, knowing as I do the facts in the case, my utter amazement at the downright untruth conveyed under the fair seeming words now quoted. The man who could make such a statement may have all the craftiness of a lawyer, but who can accord to him the candour of an honest debater? What could more completely destroy all confidence in his statements? Mark you, the orator had not allowed his audience to hear read the provision of the Constitution to which he referred. He merely characterized it as one to “deliver up fugitive slaves and servants like criminals,” and tells you that this was done “after discussion.” But he took good care not to tell you what was the nature of that discussion. He have would have spoiled the whole effect of his statement had he told you the whole truth. Now, what are the facts connected with this provision of the Constitution? You shall have them. It seems to take two men to tell the truth. It is quite true that Mr. Butler and Mr. Pinckney introduced a provision expressly with a view to the recapture of fugitive slaves: it is quite true also that there was some discussion on the subject — and just here the truth shall come out. These illustrious kidnappers were told promptly in that discussion that no such idea as property in man should be admitted into the Constitution. The speaker in question might have told you, and he would have told you but the simple truth, if he had told you that he proposition of Mr. Butler and Mr. Pinckney — which he leads you to infer was adopted by the convention that from the Constitution — was, in fact, promptly and indignantly rejected by that convention. He might have told you, had it
suited his purpose to do so, that the words employed in the first draft of the fugitive slave clause were such as applied to the condition of slaves, and expressly declared that persons held to “servitude” should be given up; but that the word “servitude” was struck from the provision, for the very reason that it applied to slaves. He might have told you that the same Mr. Madison declared that the word was struck out because the convention would not consent that the idea of property in men should be admitted into the Constitution. The fact that Mr. Madison can be cited on both sides of this question is another evidence of the folly and absurdity of making the secret intentions of the framers the criterion by which the Constitution is to be construed. But it may be asked — if this clause does not apply to slaves, to whom does it apply?

I answer, that when adopted, it applies to a very large class of persons — namely, redemptioners — persons who had come to America from Holland, from Ireland, and other quarters of the globe — like the Coolies to the West Indies — and had, for a consideration duly paid, become bound to “serve and labour” for the parties two whom their service and labour was due. It applies to indentured apprentices and others who have become bound for a consideration, under contract duly made, to serve and labour, to such persons this provision applies, and only to such persons. The plain reading of this provision shows that it applies, and that it can only properly and legally apply, to persons “bound to service.” Its object plainly is, to secure the fulfillment of contracts for “service and labour.” It applies to indentured apprentices, and any other persons from whom service and labour may be due. The legal condition of the slave puts him beyond the operation of this provision. He is not described in it. He is a simple article of property. He does not owe and cannot owe service. He cannot even make a contract. It is impossible for him to do so. He can no more make such a contract than a horse or an ox can make one. This provision, then, only respects persons who owe service, and they only can owe service who can receive an equivalent and make a bargain. The slave cannot do that, and is therefore exempted from the operation of this fugitive provision. In all matters where laws are taught to be made the means of oppression, cruelty, and wickedness, I am for strict construction. I will concede nothing. It must be shown that it is so nominated in the bond. The pound of flesh, but not one drop
of blood. The very nature of law is opposed to all such wickedness, and makes it difficult to accomplish such objects under the forms of law. Law is not merely an arbitrary enactment with regard to justice, reason, or humanity. Blackstone defines it to be a rule prescribed by the supreme power of the State commanding what is right and forbidding what is wrong.

The speaker at the City Hall laid down some rules of legal interpretation. These rules send us to the history of the law for its meaning. I have no objection to such a course in ordinary cases of doubt. But where human liberty and justice are at stake, the case falls under an entirely different class of rules. There must be something more than history — something more than tradition. The Supreme Court of the United States lays down this rule, and it meets the case exactly — “Where rights are infringed — where the fundamental principles of the law are overthrown — where the general system of the law is departed from, the legislative intention must be expressed with irresistible clearness.” The same court says that the language of the law must be construed strictly in favour of justice and liberty. Again, there is another rule of law. It is — Where a law is susceptible of two meanings, the one making it accomplish an innocent purpose, and the other making it accomplish a wicked purpose, we must in all cases adopt that which makes it accomplish an innocent purpose. Again, the details of a law are to be interpreted in the light of the declared objects sought by the law. I set these rules down against those employed at the City Hall. To me they seem just and rational. I only ask you to look at the American Constitution in the light of them, and you will see with me that no man is guaranteed a right of property in man, under the provisions of that instrument. If there are two ideas more distinct in their character and essence than another, those ideas are “persons” and “property,” “men” and “things.” Now, when it is proposed to transform persons into “property” and men into beasts of burden, I demand that the law that completes such a purpose shall be expressed with irresistible clearness. The thing must not be left to inference, but must be done in plain English. I know how this view of the subject is treated by the class represented at the City Hall. They are in the habit of treating the Negro as an exception to general rules. When their own liberty is in question they will avail themselves of all rules of law which protect and defend their freedom; but when the black man’s rights are in question they concede everything, admit everything for slavery, and put liberty to the proof. They reserve the common law usage,
and presume the Negro a slave unless he can prove himself free. I, on the other hand, presume him free unless he is proved to be otherwise. Let us look at the objects for which the Constitution was framed and adopted, and see if slavery is one of them. Here are its own objects as set forth by itself: — “We, the people of these United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America.”

The objects here set forth are six in number: union, defence, welfare, tranquility, justice, and liberty. These are all good objects, and slavery, so far from being among them, is a foe of them all. But it has been said that Negroes are not included within the benefits sought under this declaration. This is said by the slaveholders in America — it is said by the City Hall orator — but it is not said by the Constitution itself. Its language is “we the people;” not we the white people, not even we the citizens, not we the privileged class, not we the high, not we the low, but we the people; not we the horses, sheep, and swine, and wheelbarrows, but we the people, we the human inhabitants; and, if Negroes are people, they are included in the benefits for which the Constitution of America was ordained and established. But how dare any man who pretends to be a friend to the Negro thus gratuitously concede away what the Negro has a right to claim under the Constitution? Why should such friends invent new arguments to increase the hopelessness of his bondage? This, I undertake to say, as the conclusion of the whole matter, that the constitutionality of slavery can be made out only by disregarding the plain and common-sense reading of the Constitution itself; by discrediting and casting away as worthless the most beneficent rules of legal interpretation; by ruling the Negro outside of these beneficent rules; by claiming that the Constitution does not mean what it says, and that it says what it does not mean; by disregarding the written Constitution, and interpreting it in the light of a secret understanding.

It is in this mean, contemptible, and underhand method that the American Constitution is pressed into the service of slavery. They go everywhere else for proof that the Constitution declares that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; it secures to every man the right of trial by jury, the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus — the great writ that put an end to slavery and slave-hunting in England — and it
securities to every State a republican form of government. Anyone of these provisions in the hands of abolition statesmen, and backed up by a right moral sentiment, would put an end to slavery in America. The Constitution forbids the passing of a bill of attainder: that is, a law entailing upon the child the disabilities and hardships imposed upon the parent. Every slave law in America might be repealed on this very ground. The slave is made a slave because his mother is a slave. But to all this it is said that the practice of the American people is against my view. I admit it. They have given the Constitution a slaveholding interpretation. I admit it. Thy have committed innumerable wrongs against the Negro in the name of the Constitution. Yes, I admit it all; and I go with him who goes farthest in denouncing these wrongs. But it does not follow that the Constitution is in favour of these wrongs because the slaveholders have given it that interpretation. To be consistent in his logic, the City Hall speaker must follow the example of some of his brothers in America — he must not only fling away the Constitution, but the Bible. The Bible must follow the Constitution, for that, too, has been interpreted for slavery by American divines. Nay, more, he must not stop with the Constitution of America, but make war with the British Constitution, for, if I mistake not, the gentleman is opposed to the union of Church and State. In America he called himself a Republican. Yet he does not go for breaking down the British Constitution, although you have a Queen on the throne, and bishops in the House of Lords.

My argument against the dissolution of the American Union is this: It would place the slave system more exclusively under the control of the slaveholding States, and withdraw it from the power in the Northern States which is opposed to slavery. Slavery is essentially barbarous in its character. It, above all things else, dreads the presence of an advanced civilization. It flourishes best where it meets no reproving frowns, and hears no condemning voices. While in the Union it will meet with both. Its hope of life, in the last resort, is to get out of the Union. I am, therefore, for drawing the bond of the Union more completely under the power of the Free States. What they most dread, that I most desire. I have much confidence in the instincts of the slaveholders. They see that the Constitution will afford slavery no protection when it shall cease to be administered by slaveholders. They see, moreover, that if there is once a will in the people of America to abolish slavery, this is no
word, no syllable in the Constitution to forbid that result. They see that the Constitution has not saved slavery in Rhode Island, in Connecticut, in New York, or Pennsylvannia; that the Free States have only added three to their original number. There were twelve Slave States at the beginning of the Government: there are fifteen now. They dissolution of the Union would not give the North a single advantage over slavery, but would take from it many. Within the Union we have a firm basis of opposition to slavery. It is opposed to all the great objects of the Constitution. The dissolution of the Union is not only an unwise but a cowardly measure — 15 millions running away from three hundred and fifty thousand slaveholders. Mr. Garrison and his friends tell us that while in the Union we are responsible for slavery. He and they sing out “No Union with slaveholders,” and refuse to vote. I admit our responsibility for slavery while in the Union but I deny that going out of the Union would free us from that responsibility. There now clearly is no freedom from responsibility for slavery to any American citizen short to the abolition of slavery. The American people have gone quite too far in this slaveholding business now to sum up their whole business of slavery by singing out the cant phrase, “No union with slaveholders.” To desert the family hearth may place the recreant husband out of the presence of his starving children, but this does not free him from responsibility. If a man were on board of a pirate ship, and in company with others had robbed and plundered, his whole duty would not be preformed simply by taking the longboat and singing out, “No union with pirates.” His duty would be to restore the stolen property. The American people in the Northern States have helped to enslave the black people. Their duty will not have been done till they give them back their plundered rights. Reference was made at the City Hall to my having once held other opinions, and very different opinions to those I have now expressed. An old speech of mine delivered fourteen years ago was read to show — I know not what. Perhaps it was to show that I am not infallible. If so, I have to say in defence, that I never pretended to be. Although I cannot accuse myself of being remarkably unstable, I do not pretend that I have never altered my opinion both in respect to men and things. Indeed, I have been very much modified both in feeling and opinion within the last fourteen years. When I escaped from slavery, and was introduced to the Garrisonians, I adopted very many of their opinions, and defended them just as long as I deemed them true. I was young, had read but
little, and naturally took some things on trust. Subsequent experience and reading have led me to examine for myself. This had brought me to other conclusions. When I was a child, I thought and spoke as a child. But the question is not as to what were my opinions fourteen years ago, but what they are now. If I am right now, it really does not matter what I was fourteen years ago. My position now is one of reform, not of revolution. I would act for the abolition of slavery through the Government — not over its ruins. If slaveholders have ruled the American Government for the last fifty years, let the anti-slavery men rule the nation for the next fifty years. If the South has made the Constitution bend to the purposes of slavery, let the North now make that instrument bend to the cause of freedom and justice. If 350,000 slaveholders have, by devoting their energies to that single end, been able to make slavery the vital and animating spirit of the American Confederacy for the last 72 years, now let the freemen of the North, who have the power in their own hands, and who can make the American Government just what they think fit, resolve to blot out for ever the foul and haggard crime, which is the blight and mildew, the curse and the disgrace of the whole United States.
SEN. JOHN C. CALHOUN (D-SC)

On the Reception of Abolition Petitions
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BACKGROUND

John C. Calhoun delivered this speech in the U.S. Senate in response to petitions submitted by abolitionists demanding an end to slavery in the District of Columbia and the abolition of the slave trade across state lines.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What does Calhoun argue to be the effect of enslavement in America on African Americans? Why?

2. In which ways does Calhoun take exception to northern criticism of the effects of slavery on European Americans?

3. What does Calhoun mean by a “positive good”? What evidence does he claim to support his assertion?

4. How does Calhoun argue that slaves are treated better than laborers in the north?

5. If slavery were to be abolished, what is Calhoun’s fear?

6. What do Calhoun’s tone and words suggest about the changing stance of southerners on the issue of slavery, especially with respect to northern criticism and policies against it?

---

…Abolition and Union cannot co-exist. As the friend of the Union I openly proclaim it, and the sooner it is known the better. The former may now be controlled, but in a short time it will be beyond the power of man to arrest the course of events. We of the South will not, cannot, surrender our institutions. To maintain the existing relations between the two races, inhabiting that section of the Union, is indispensable to the peace and happiness of both. It cannot be subverted without drenching the country in blood, and extirpating one or the other of the races. Be it good or bad, it has grown up with out society and institutions, and is so interwoven with them, that to destroy it would be to destroy us as a people. But let me not be understood as admitting, even by implication, that the existing relations between the two races in slaveholding States is an evil—far otherwise; I hold it to be a good, as it has thus far proved itself to be to both, and will continue to prove so if not disturbed by the fell spirit of abolition. I appeal to facts. Never before has the black race of Central Africa, from the dawn of history to the present day, attained a condition so civilized and so improved, not only physically, but morally and intellectually. It came among us in a low, degraded, and savage condition, and in the course of a few generations it has grown up under the fostering care of our institutions, reviled as they have been to its present comparatively civilized condition. This, with the rapid increase of numbers, is conclusive proof of the general happiness of the race, in spite of all the exaggerated tales to the contrary. In the mean time, the white or European race has not degenerated. It has kept pace with its brethren in other sections of the Union where slavery does not exist. It is odious to make comparison; but I appeal to all sides whether the South is not equal in virtue, intelligence, patriotism, courage, disinterestedness, and all the high qualities which adorn our nature. I ask whether we have not contributed our full share of talents and political wisdom in forming and sustaining this political fabric; and whether we have not constantly inclined most strongly to the side of liberty, and been the first to see and first to resist the encroachments of power. In one thing only are we inferior—the arts of gain; we acknowledge that we are less wealthy than the Northern section of this Union, but I trace this mainly to the fiscal action of this Government, which has extracted much from and spent little among us. Had it been the reverse—if the exaction had been from the other section, and the expenditure with us, this point of superiority would not be against us now, as it was not at the formation
of this Government. But I take higher ground. I hold that in the present state of civilization, where two races of different origin, and distinguished by color, and other physical differences, as well as intellectual, are brought together, the relation now existing in the slaveholding States between the two, is, instead of an evil, a good—a positive good. I feel myself called upon to speak freely upon the subject where the honor and interests of those I represent are involved. I hold then that there never has yet existed a wealthy and civilized society in which one portion of the community did not, in point of fact, live on the labor of the other. Broad and general as is this assertion, it is fully borne out by history. This is not the proper occasion, but if it were, it would not be difficult to trace the various devices by which the wealth of all civilized communities has been so unequally divided, and to show by what means so small a share has been allotted to those by whose labor it was produced, and so large a share given to the non-producing classes. The devices are almost innumerable, from the brute force and gross superstition of ancient times, to the subtle and artful fiscal contrivances of modern. I might well challenge a comparison between them and the more direct, simple, and patriarchal mode by which the labor of the African race is, among us, commanded by the European. I may say with truth, that in few countries so much is left to the share of the laborer, and so little exacted from him, or where there is more kind attention paid to him in sickness or infirmities of age. Compare his condition with the tenants of the poor houses in the more civilized portions of Europe—look at the sick, and the old and infirm slave, on one hand, in the midst of his family and friends, under the kind superintending care of his master and mistress, and compare it with the forlorn and wretched condition of the pauper in the poor house. But I will not dwell on this aspect of the question; I turn to the political; and here I fearlessly assert that the existing relation between the two races in the South, against which these blind fanatics are waging war, forms the most solid and durable foundation on which to rear free and stable political institutions. It is useless to disguise the fact. There is and always has been in an advanced stage of wealth and civilization, a conflict between labor and capital. The condition of society in the South exempts us from the disorders and dangers resulting from this conflict; and which explains why it is that the political condition of the slaveholding States has been so much more stable and quiet than that of the North. The advantages of the former, in this
respect, will become more and more manifest if left undisturbed by interference from without, as the country advances in wealth and numbers. We have, in fact, but just entered that condition of society where the strength and durability of our political institutions are to be tested; and I venture nothing in predicting that the experience of the next generation will fully test how vastly more favorable our condition of society is to that of other sections for free and stable institutions, provided we are not disturbed by the interference of others, or shall have sufficient intelligence and spirit to resist promptly and successfully such interference. It rests with ourselves to meet and repel them. I look not for aid to this Government, or to the other States; not but there are kind feelings towards us on the part of the great body of the nonslaveholding States; but as kind as their feelings may be, we may rest assured that no political party in those States will risk their ascendency for our safety. If we do not defend ourselves none will defend us; if we yield we will be more and more pressed as we recede; and if we submit we will be trampled under foot. Be assured that emancipation itself would not satisfy these fanatics—that gained, the next step would be to raise the negroes to a social and political equality with the whites; and that being effected, we would soon find the present condition of the two races reversed. They and their northern allies would be the masters, and we the slaves; the condition of the white race in the British West India Islands, bad as it is, would be happiness to ours. There the mother country is interested in sustaining the supremacy of the European race. It is true that the authority of the former master is destroyed, but the African will there still be a slave, not to individuals but to the community,—forced to labor, not by the authority of the overseer, but by the bayonet of the soldiery and the rod of the civil magistrate. Surrounded as the slaveholding States are with such imminent perils, I rejoice to think that our means of defence are ample, if we shall prove to have the intelligence and spirit to see and apply them before it is too late. All we want is concert, to lay aside all party differences, and unite with zeal and energy in repelling approaching dangers. Let there be concert of action, and we shall find ample means of security without resorting to secession or disunion. I speak with full knowledge and a thorough examination of the subject, and for one, see my way clearly. One thing alarms me—the eager pursuit of gain which overspreads the land, and which absorbs every faculty of the mind and every feeling of the heart. Of all passions avarice is the most blind and
compromising—the last to see and the first to yield to danger. I dare not hope that any thing I can say will arouse the South to a due sense of danger; I fear it is beyond the power of mortal voice to awaken it in time from the fatal security into which it has fallen.
Senator John C. Calhoun (D-SC)

On the Oregon Bill

Speech Excerpt

June 27, 1848
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Background

Senator John C. Calhoun gave this speech in response to the Oregon Bill, which sought to organize the new territory along anti-slavery principles.

Guiding Questions

1. How does Calhoun portray the conflict between the North and the South?

2. How does Calhoun use the Constitution to justify his argument?

3. What theoretical proposition is the cause of the Union’s destruction, according to Calhoun?

4. According to Calhoun, what is the relationship between the government and individual liberty?

---

The first question which offers itself for consideration is — Have the Northern States the power which they claim, to prevent the Southern people from emigrating freely, with their property, into territories belonging to the United States, and to monopolize them for their exclusive benefit?...

Now, I put the question solemnly to the Senators from the North: Can you rightly and justly exclude the South from territories of the United States, and monopolize them for yourselves, even if, in your opinion, you should have the power? It is this question I wish to press on your attention with all due solemnity and decorum. The North and the South stand in the relation of partners in a common Union, with equal dignity and equal rights. We of the South have contributed our full share of funds, and shed our full share of blood for the acquisition of our territories. Can you, then, on any principle of equity and justice, deprive us of our full share in their benefit and advantage? Are you ready to affirm that a majority of the partners in a joint concern have the right to monopolize its benefits to the exclusion of the minority, even in cases where they have contributed their full share to the concern?...

I turn now to my friends of the South, and ask: What are you prepared to do? If neither the barriers of the constitution nor the high sense of right and justice should prove sufficient to protect you, are you prepared to sink down into a state of acknowledged inferiority; to be stripped of your dignity of equals among equals, and be deprived of your equality of rights in this federal partnership of States? If so, you are woefully degenerated from your sires, and will well deserve to change condition with your slaves;—but if not, prepare to meet the issue. The time is at hand, if the question should not be speedily settled, when the South must rise up, and bravely defend herself, or sink down into base and acknowledged inferiority; and it is because I clearly perceive that this period is favorable for settling it, if it is ever to be settled, that I am in favor of pressing the question now to a decision—not because I have any desire whatever to embarrass either party in reference to the Presidential election. At no other period could the two great parties into which the country is divided be made to see and feel so clearly and intensely the embarrassment and danger caused by the question. Indeed, they must be blind not to perceive that there is a power in action that
must burst asunder the ties that bind them together, strong as they are, unless it should be speedily settled. Now is the time, if ever. Cast your eyes to the North, and mark what is going on there; reflect on the tendency of events for the last three years in reference to this the most vital of all questions, and you must see that no time should be lost.

I am thus brought to the question, How can the question be settled? It can, in my opinion, be finally and permanently adjusted but one way,—and that is on the high principles of justice and the constitution. Fear not to leave it to them. The less you do the better. If the North and South cannot stand together on their broad and solid foundation, there is none other on which they can. If the obligations of the constitution and justice be too feeble to command the respect of the North, how can the South expect that she will regard the far more feeble obligations of an act of Congress? Nor should the North fear that, by leaving it where justice and the constitution leave it, she would be excluded from her full share of the territories. In my opinion, if it be left there, climate, soil, and other circumstances would fix the line between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States in about 36° 30'. It may zigzag a little, to accommodate itself to circumstances—sometimes passing to the north, and at others passing to the south of it; but that would matter little, and would be more satisfactory to all, and tend less to alienation between the two great sections, than a rigid, straight, artificial line, prescribed by an act of Congress.

And here, let me say to Senators from the North;—you make a great mistake in supposing that the portion which might fall to the south of whatever line might be drawn, if left to soil, and climate, and circumstances to determine, would be closed to the white labor of the North, because it could not mingle with slave labor without degradation. The fact is not so. There is no part of the world were agricultural, mechanical, and other descriptions of labor are more respected than in the South, with the exception of two descriptions of employment—that of menial and body servants. No Southern man—not the poorest or the lowest—will, under any circumstance, submit to perform either of them. He has too much pride for that, and I rejoice that he has. They are unsuited to the spirit of a freeman. But the man who would spurn them feels not the least degradation to work in the same field with his slave; or to be employed to work with them in the same field or in any mechanical
operation; and, when so employed, they claim the right,—and are admitted, in the country portion of the South—of sitting at the table of their employers. Can as much, on the score of equality, be said of the North? With us the two great divisions of society are not the rich and poor, but white and black; and all the former, the poor as well as the rich, belong to the upper class, and are respected and treated as equals, if honest and industrious; and hence have a position and pride of character of which neither poverty nor misfortune can deprive them.

But I go further, and hold that justice and the constitution are the easiest and safest guard on which the question can be settled, regarded in reference to party. It may be settled on that ground simply by non-action—by leaving the territories free and open to the emigration of all the world, so long as they continue so,—and when they become States, to adopt whatever constitution they please, with the single restriction, to be republican, in order to their admission into the Union. If a party cannot safely take this broad and solid position and successfully maintain it, what other can it take and maintain? If it cannot maintain itself by an appeal to the great principles of justice, the constitution, and self-government, to what other, sufficiently strong to uphold them in public opinion, can they appeal? I greatly mistake the character of the people of this Union, if such an appeal would not prove successful, if either party should have the magnanimity to step forward, and boldly make it. It would, in my opinion, be received with shouts of approbation by the patriotic and intelligent in every quarter. There is a deep feeling pervading the country that the Union and our political institutions are in danger, which such a course would dispel, and spread joy over the land.

Now is the time to take the step, and bring about a result so devoutly to be wished. I have believed, from the beginning, that this was the only question sufficiently potent to dissolve the Union, and subvert our system of government; and that the sooner it was met and settled, the safer and better for all. I have never doubted but that, if permitted to progress beyond a certain point, its settlement would become impossible, and am under deep conviction that it is now rapidly approaching it,—and that if it is ever to be averted, it must be done speedily. In uttering these opinions I look to the whole. If I speak earnestly, it is to
save and protect all. As deep as is the stake of the South in the Union and our political institutions, it is not deeper than that of the North. We shall be as well prepared and as capable of meeting whatever may come, as you.

Now, let me say, Senators, if our Union and system of government are doomed to perish, and we to share the fate of so many great people who have gone before us, the historian, who, in some future day, may record the events ending in so calamitous a result, will devote his first chapter to the ordinance of 1787, lauded as it and its authors have been, as the first of that series which led to it. His next chapter will be devoted to the Missouri compromise, and the next to the present agitation. Whether there will be another beyond, I know not. It will depend on what we may do.

If he should possess a philosophical turn of mind, and be disposed to look to more remote and recondite causes, he will trace it to a proposition which originated in a hypothetical truism, but which, as now expressed and now understood, is the most false and dangerous of all political errors. The proposition to which I allude, has become an axiom in the minds of a vast many on both sides of the Atlantic, and is repeated daily from tongue to tongue, as an established and incontrovertible truth; it is,—that “all men are born free and equal.” I am not afraid to attack error, however deeply it may be intrenched, or however widely extended, whenever it becomes my duty to do so, as I believe it to be on this subject and occasion.

Taking the proposition literally (it is in that sense it is understood), there is not a word of truth in it. It begins with “all men are born,” which is utterly untrue. Men are not born. Infants are born. They grow to be men. And concludes with asserting that they are born “free and equal,” which is not less false. They are not born free. While infants they are incapable of freedom, being destitute alike of the capacity of thinking and acting, without which there can be no freedom. Besides, they are necessarily born subject to their parents, and remain so among all people, savage and civilized, until the development of their intellect and physical capacity enables them to take care of themselves. They grow to all the freedom of which the condition in which they were born permits, by growing to be men.
Nor is it less false that they are born “equal.” They are not so in any sense in which it can be regarded; and thus, as I have asserted, there is not a word of truth in the whole proposition, as expressed and generally understood.

If we trace it back, we shall find the proposition differently expressed in the Declaration of Independence. That asserts that “all men are created equal.” The form of expression, though less dangerous, is not less erroneous. All men are not created. According to the Bible, only two—a man and a woman—ever were—and of these one was pronounced subordinate to the other. All others have come into the world by being born, and in no sense, as I have shown, either free or equal. But this form of expression being less striking and popular, has given way to the present, and under the authority of a document put forth on so great an occasion, and leading to such important consequences, has spread far and wide, and fixed itself deeply in the public mind. It was inserted in our Declaration of Independence without any necessity. It made no necessary part of our justification in separating from the parent country, and declaring ourselves independent. Breach of our chartered privileges, and lawless encroachment on our acknowledged and well-established rights by the parent country, were the real causes,—and of themselves sufficient, without resorting to any other, to justify the step. Nor had it any weight in constructing the governments which were substituted in the place of the colonial. They were formed of the old materials and on practical and well-established principles, borrowed for the most part from our own experience and that of the country from which we sprang.

If the proposition be traced still further back, it will be found to have been adopted from certain writers in government who had attained much celebrity in the early settlement of these States, and with whose writings all the prominent actors in our revolution were familiar. Among these, Locke and Sydney were prominent. But they expressed it very differently. According to their expression, “all men in the state of nature were free and equal.” From this the others were derived; and it was this to which I referred when I called it a hypothetical truism;—to understand why, will require some explanation.
Man, for the purpose of reasoning, may be regarded in three different states: in a state of individuality; that is, living by himself apart from the rest of his species. In the social; that is, living in society, associated with others of his species. And in the political; that is, living under government. We may reason as to what would be his rights and duties in either, without taking into consideration whether he could exist in it or not. It is certain, that in the first, the very supposition that he lived apart and separated from all others would make him free and equal. No one in such a state could have the right to command or control another. Every man would be his own master, and might do just as he pleased. But it is equally clear, that man cannot exist in such a state; that he is by nature social, and that society is necessary, not only to the proper development of all his faculties, moral and intellectual, but to the very existence of his race. Such being the case, the state is a purely hypothetical one; and when we say all men are free and equal in it, we announce a mere hypothetical truism; that is, a truism resting on a mere supposed stake that cannot exist, and of course one of little or no practical value.

But to call it a state of nature was a great misnomer, and has led to dangerous errors; for that cannot justly be called a state of nature which is so opposed to the constitution of man as to be inconsistent with the existence of his race and the development of the high faculties, mental and moral, with which he is endowed by his Creator.

Nor is the social state of itself his natural state; for society can no more exist without government, in one form or another, than man without society. It is the political, then, which includes the social, that is his natural state. It is the one for which his Creator formed him,—into which he is impelled irresistibly,—and in which only his race can exist and all its faculties be fully developed.

Such being the case, it follows that any, the worst form of government, is better than anarchy; and that individual liberty, or freedom, must be subordinate to whatever power may be necessary to protect society against anarchy within or destruction from without; for the safety and well-being of society is as paramount to individual liberty, as the safety and well-being of the race is to that of individuals; and in the same proportion the power necessary
for the safety of society is paramount to individual liberty. On the contrary, government has no right to control individual liberty beyond what is necessary to the safety and well-being of society. Such is the boundary which separates the power of government and the liberty of the citizen or subject in the political state, which, as I have shown, is the natural state of man—the only one in which his race can exist, and the one in which he is born, lives, and dies.

It follows from this that all the quantum of power on the part of the government, and of liberty on that of individuals, instead of being equal in all cases, must necessarily be very unequal among different people, according to their different conditions. For just in proportion as a people are ignorant, stupid, debased, corrupt, exposed to violence within, and danger from without, the power necessary for government to possess, in order to preserve society against anarchy and destruction, becomes greater and greater, and individual liberty less and less, until the lowest condition is reached,—when absolute and despotic power becomes necessary on the part of the government, and individual liberty extinct. So, on the contrary, just as a people rise in the scale of intelligence, virtue, and patriotism, and the more perfectly they become acquainted with the nature of government, the ends for which it was ordered, and how it ought to be administered, and the less the tendency to violence and disorder within, and danger from abroad,—the power necessary for government becomes less and less, and individual liberty greater and greater. Instead, then, of all men having the same right to liberty and equality, as is claimed by those who hold that they are all born free and equal, liberty is the noble and highest reward bestowed on mental and moral development, combined with favorable circumstances. Instead, then, of liberty and equality being born with men,—instead of all men and all classes and descriptions being equally entitled to them, they are high prizes to be won, and are in their most perfect state, not only the highest reward that can be bestowed on our race, but the most difficult to be won,—and when won, the most difficult to be preserved.

They have been made vastly more so by the dangerous error I have attempted to expose,—that all men are born free and equal,—as if those high qualities belonged to man without effort to acquire them, and to all equally alike, regardless of their intellectual and moral
condition. The attempt to carry into practice this, the most dangerous of all political errors, and to bestow on all,—without regard to their fitness either to acquire or maintain liberty,—that unbounded and individual liberty supposed to belong to man in the hypothetical and misnamed state of nature, has done more to retard the cause of liberty and civilization, and is doing more at present, than all other causes combined. While it is powerful to pull down governments, it is still more powerful to prevent their construction on proper principles. It is the leading cause among those which have placed Europe in its present anarchical condition, and which mainly stands in the way of reconstructing good governments in the place of those which have been overthrown,—threatening thereby the quarter of the globe most advanced in progress and civilization with hopeless anarchy,—to be followed by military despotism. Nor are we exempt from its disorganizing effects. We now begin to experience the danger of admitting so great an error to have a place in the declaration of our independence. For a long time it lay dormant; but in the process of time it began to germinate, and produce its poisonous fruits. It had strong hold on the mind of Mr. Jefferson, the author of that document, which caused him to take an utterly false view of the subordinate relation of the black to the white race in the South; and to hold, in consequence, that the latter, though utterly unqualified to possess liberty, were as fully entitled to both liberty and equality as the former; and that to deprive them of it was unjust and immoral. To this error, his proposition to exclude slavery from the territory northwest of the Ohio may be traced,—and to that of the ordinance of 1787,—and through it the deep and dangerous agitation which now threatens to engulf, and will certainly engulf, if not speedily settled, our political institutions, and involve the country in countless woes.
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The Perpetuation of Our Political Institutions

SPEECH

January 27, 1838
Young Men's Lyceum | Springfield, Illinois

BACKGROUND

Abraham Lincoln offered this address to the Young Men's Lyceum of Springfield early in his career as a Whig in the Illinois state legislature.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What examples does Lincoln give of the increasing disregard for law in the U.S.?
2. Why does Lincoln see mob rule and vigilantism as problematic?
3. What does Lincoln see as the long-term effect of continually disregarding the law?
4. Why does Lincoln think that Americans should obey bad laws?
5. What is the consequence of the fading memories of the Revolution?

As a subject for the remarks of the evening, the perpetuation of our political institutions, is selected.

In the great journal of things happening under the sun, we, the American People, find our account running, under date of the nineteenth century of the Christian era. We find ourselves in the peaceful possession, of the fairest portion of the earth, as regards extent of territory, fertility of soil, and salubrity of climate. We find ourselves under the government of a system of political institutions, conducing more essentially to the ends of civil and religious liberty, than any of which the history of former times tells us. We, when mounting the stage of existence, found ourselves the legal inheritors of these fundamental blessings.

We toiled not in the acquirement or establishment of them — they are a legacy bequeathed us, by a once hardy, brave, and patriotic, but now lamented and departed race of ancestors. Their’s was the task (and nobly they performed it) to possess themselves, and through themselves, us, of this goodly land; and to uprear upon its hills and its valleys, a political edifice of liberty and equal rights; ’tis ours only, to transmit these, the former, unprofaned by the foot of an invader; the latter, undecayed by the lapse of time, and untorn by [usurpation — to the latest generation that fate shall permit the world to know. This task of gratitude to our fathers, justice to] ourselves, duty to posterity, and love for our species in general, all imperatively require us faithfully to perform.

How, then, shall we perform it? At what point shall we expect the approach of danger? By what means shall we fortify against it? Shall we expect some transatlantic military giant, to step the Ocean, and crush us at a blow? Never! All the armies of Europe, Asia and Africa combined, with all the treasure of the earth (our own excepted) in their military chest; with a Buonaparte for a commander, could not by force, take a drink from the Ohio, or make a track on the Blue Ridge, in a trial of a thousand years.

At what point then is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reach us, it must spring up amongst us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen, we must live through all time, or die by suicide.
I hope I am over wary; but if I am not, there is, even now, something of ill-omen amongst us. I mean the increasing disregard for law which pervades the country; the growing disposition to substitute the wild and furious passions, in lieu of the sober judgement of Courts; and the worse than savage mobs, for the executive ministers of justice. This disposition is awfully fearful in any community; and that it now exists in ours, though grating to our feelings to admit, it would be a violation of truth, and an insult to our intelligence, to deny. Accounts of outrages committed by mobs, form the every-day news of the times. They have pervaded the country, from New England to Louisiana; — they are neither peculiar to the eternal snows of the former, nor the burning suns of the latter; — they are not the creature of climate — neither are they confined to the slaveholding, or the non-slaveholding States. Alike, they spring up among the pleasure hunting masters of Southern slaves, and the order loving citizens of the land of steady habits. Whatever then, their cause may be, it is common to the whole country.

It would be tedious, as well as useless, to recount the horrors of all of them. Those happening in the State of Mississippi, and at St. Louis, are, perhaps, the most dangerous in example, and revolting to humanity. In the Mississippi case, they first commenced by hanging the regular gamblers: a set of men, certainly not following for a livelihood, a very useful, or very honest occupation; but one which, so far from being forbidden by the laws, was actually licensed by an act of the Legislature, passed but a single year before. Next, negroes, suspected of conspiring to raise an insurrection, were caught up and hanged in all parts of the State: then, white men, supposed to be leagued with the negroes; and finally, strangers, from neighboring States, going thither on business, were, in many instances, subjected to the same fate. Thus went on this process of hanging, from gamblers to negroes, from negroes to white citizens, and from these to strangers; till, dead men were seen literally dangling from the boughs of trees upon every road side; and in numbers almost sufficient, to rival the native Spanish moss of the country, as a drapery of the forest.

Turn, then, to that horror-striking scene at St. Louis. A single victim was only sacrificed there. His story is very short; and is, perhaps, the most highly tragic, of any thing of its length, that has ever been witnessed in real life. A mulatto man, by the name of McIntosh,
was seized in the street, dragged to the suburbs of the city, chained to a tree, and actually burned to death; and all within a single hour from the time he had been a freeman, attending to his own business, and at peace with the world.

Such are the effects of mob law; and such are the scenes, becoming more and more frequent in this land so lately famed for love of law and order; and the stories of which, have even now grown too familiar, to attract any thing more, than an idle remark.

But you are, perhaps, ready to ask, "What has this to do with the perpetuation of our political institutions?" I answer, it has much to do with it. Its direct consequences are, comparatively speaking, but a small evil; and much of its danger consists, in the proneness of our minds, to regard its direct, as its only consequences. Abstractly considered, the hanging of the gamblers at Vicksburg, was of but little consequence. They constitute a portion of population that is worse than useless in any community; and their death, if no pernicious example be set by it, is never matter of reasonable regret with any one. If they were annually swept, from the stage of existence, by the plague or small pox, honest men would, perhaps, be much profited, by the operation. Similar too, is the correct reasoning, in regard to the burning of the negro at St. Louis. He had forfeited his life, by the perpetration of an outrageous murder, upon one of the most worthy and respectable citizens of the city; and had he not died as he did, he must have died by the sentence of the law, in a very short time afterwards. As to him alone, it was as well the way it was, as it could otherwise have been.

But the example in either case, was fearful. When men take it in their heads to day, to hang gamblers, or burn murderers, they should recollect, that, in the confusion usually attending such transactions, they will be as likely to hang or burn some one, who is neither a gambler nor a murderer [as] one who is; and that, acting upon the [example] they set, the mob of to-morrow, may, an[d] probably will, hang or burn some of them, [by th]e very same mistake. And not only so; the innocent, those who have ever set their faces against violations of law in every shape, alike with the guilty, fall victims to the ravages of mob law; and thus it goes on, step by step, till all the walls erected for the defence of the persons and property of individuals, are trodden down, and disregarded. But all this even, is not the full extent of the evil. By such examples, by instances of the perpetrators of such acts going unpunished,
the lawless in spirit, are encouraged to become lawless in practice; and having been used to no restraint, but dread of punishment, they thus become, absolutely unrestrained. Having ever regarded Government as their deadliest bane, they make a jubilee of the suspension of its operations; and pray for nothing so much, as its total annihilation. While, on the other hand, good men, men who love tranquility, who desire to abide by the laws, and enjoy their benefits, who would gladly spill their blood in the defence of their country; seeing their property destroyed; their families insulted, and their lives endangered; their persons injured; and seeing nothing in prospect that forebodes a change for the better; become tired of, and disgusted with, a Government that offers them no protection; and are not much averse to a change in which they imagine they have nothing to lose. Thus, then, by the operation of this mobocratic spirit, which all must admit, is now abroad in the land, the strongest bulwark of any Government, and particularly of those constituted like ours, may effectually be broken down and destroyed — I mean the attachment of the People. Whenever this effect shall be produced among us; whenever the vicious portion of population shall be permitted to gather in bands of hundreds and thousands, and burn churches, ravage and rob provision stores, throw printing presses into rivers, shoot editors and hang and burn obnoxious persons at pleasure, and with impunity; depend on it, this Government cannot last. By such things, the feelings of the best citizens will become more or less alienated from it; and thus it will be left without friends, or with too few, and those few too weak, to make their friendship effectual. At such a time and under such circumstances, men of sufficient talent and ambition will not be wanting to seize [the opportunity, strike the blow, and overturn that fair fabric], which for the last half century, has been the fondest hope, of the lovers of freedom, throughout the world.

I know the American People are much attached to their Government; — I know they would suffer much for its sake; — I know they would endure evils long and patiently, before they would ever think of exchanging it for another. Yet, notwithstanding all this, if the laws be continually despised and disregarded, if their rights to be secure in their persons and property, are held by no better tenure than the caprice of a mob, the alienation of their affections from the Government is the natural consequence; and to that, sooner or later, it must come.
Here then, is one point at which danger may be expected.

The question recurs "how shall we fortify against it?" The answer is simple. Let every American, every lover of liberty, every well wisher to his posterity, swear by the blood of the Revolution, never to violate in the least particular, the laws of the country; and never to tolerate their violation by others. As the patriots of seventy-six did to the support of the Declaration of Independence, so to the support of the Constitution and Laws, let every American pledge his life, his property, and his sacred honor; — let every man remember that to violate the law, is to trample on the blood of his father, and to tear the character of his own, and his children's liberty. Let reverence for the laws, be breathed by every American mother, to the lisping babe, that prattles on her lap — let it be taught in schools, in seminaries, and in colleges; — let it be written in Primmers, spelling books, and in Almanacs; — let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice. And, in short, let it become the political religion of the nation; and let the old and the young, the rich and the poor, the grave and the gay, of all sexes and tongues, and colors and conditions, sacrifice unceasingly upon its altars.

While ever a state of feeling, such as this, shall universally, or even, very generally prevail throughout the nation, vain will be every effort, and fruitless every attempt, to subvert our national freedom.

When I so pressingly urge a strict observance of all the laws, let me not be understood as saying there are no bad laws, nor that grievances may not arise, for the redress of which, no legal provisions have been made. I mean to say no such thing. But I do mean to say, that, although bad laws, if they exist, should be repealed as soon as possible, still while they continue in force, for the sake of example, they should be religiously observed. So also in unprovided cases. If such arise, let proper legal provisions be made for them with the least possible delay; but, till then, let them if not too intolerable, be borne with.

There is no grievance that is a fit object of redress by mob law. In any case that arises, as for instance, the promulgation of abolitionism, one of two positions is necessarily true; that is, the thing is right within itself, and therefore deserves the protection of all law and all good
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We hope there is no sufficient reason. We hope all dangers may be overcome; but to conclude that no danger may ever arise, would itself be extremely dangerous. There are now, and will hereafter be, many causes, dangerous in their tendency, which have not existed heretofore; and which are not too insignificant to merit attention. That our government should have been maintained in its original form from its establishment until now, is not much to be wondered at. It had many props to support it through that period, which now are decayed, and crumbled away. Through that period, it was felt by all, to be an undecided experiment; now, it is understood to be a successful one. Then, all that sought celebrity and fame, and distinction, expected to find them in the success of that experiment. Their all was staked upon it: — their destiny was inseparably linked with it. Their ambition aspired to display before an admiring world, a practical demonstration of the truth of a proposition, which had hitherto been considered, at best no better, than problematical; namely, the capability of a people to govern themselves. If they succeeded, they were to be immortalized; their names were to be transferred to counties and cities, and rivers and mountains; and to be revered and sung, and toasted through all time. If they failed, they were to be called knaves and fools, and fanatics for a fleeting hour; then to sink and be forgotten. They succeeded. The experiment is successful; and thousands have won their deathless names in making it so. But the game is caught; and I believe it is true, that with the catching, end the pleasures of the chase. This field of glory is harvested, and the crop is already appropriated. But new reapers will arise, and they, too, will seek a field. It is to deny, what the history of the world tells us is true, to suppose that men of ambition and talents will not continue to spring up amongst us. And, when they do, they will as naturally seek the gratification of their ruling passion, as others have so done before them. The question then, is, can that gratification be found in supporting and maintaining an edifice that has been erected by others? Most certainly it cannot. Many great and good men sufficiently qualified for any
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task they should undertake, may ever be found, whose ambition would aspire to nothing beyond a seat in Congress, a gubernatorial or a presidential chair; but such belong not to the family of the lion, or the tribe of the eagle. What! think you these places would satisfy an Alexander, a Caesar, or a Napoleon? Never! Towering genius disdains a beaten path. It seeks regions hitherto unexplored. It sees no distinction in adding story to story, upon the monuments of fame, erected to the memory of others. It denies that it is glory enough to serve under any chief. It scorns to tread in the footsteps of any predecessor, however illustrious. It thirsts and burns for distinction; and, if possible, it will have it, whether at the expense of emancipating slaves, or enslaving freemen. Is it unreasonable then to expect, that some man possessed of the loftiest genius, coupled with ambition sufficient to push it to its utmost stretch, will at some time, spring up among us? And when such a one does, it will require the people to be united with each other, attached to the government and laws, and generally intelligent, to successfully frustrate his designs.

Distinction will be his paramount object; and although he would as willingly, perhaps more so, acquire it by doing good as harm; yet, that opportunity being past, and nothing left to be done in the way of building up, he would set boldly to the task of pulling down.

Here then, is a probable case, highly dangerous, and such a one as could not have well existed heretofore.

Another reason which once was; but which, to the same extent, is now no more, has done much in maintaining our institutions thus far. I mean the powerful influence which the interesting scenes of the revolution had upon the passions of the people as distinguished from their judgment. By this influence, the jealousy, envy, and avarice, incident to our nature, and so common to a state of peace, prosperity, and conscious strength, were, for the time, in a great measure smothered and rendered inactive; while the deep rooted principles of hate, and the powerful motive of revenge, instead of being turned against each other, were directed exclusively against the British nation. And thus, from the force of circumstances, the basest principles of our nature, were either made to lie dormant, or to become
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the active agents in the advancement of the noblest of cause[s?] — that of establishing and maintaining civil and religious liberty.

But this state of feeling must fade, is fading, has faded, with the circumstances that produced it.

I do not mean to say, that the scenes of the revolution are now or ever will be entirely forgotten; but that like every thing else, they must fade upon the memory of the world, and grow more and more dim by the lapse of time. In history, we hope, they will be read of, and recounted, so long as the bible shall be read; — but even granting that they will, their influence cannot be what it heretofore has been. Even then, they cannot be so universally known, nor so vividly felt, as they were by the generation just gone to rest. At the close of that struggle, nearly every adult male had been a participator in some of its scenes. The consequence was, that of those scenes, in the form of a husband, a father, a son or a brother, a living history was to be found in every family — a history bearing the indubitable testimonies of its own authenticity, in the limbs mangled, in the scars of wounds received, in the midst of the very scenes related — a history, too, that could be read and understood alike by all, the wise and the ignorant, the learned and the unlearned. But those histories are gone. They can be read no more forever. They were a fortress of strength; but, what invading foe-men could never do, the silent artillery of time has done; the levelling of its walls. They are gone. They were a forest of giant oaks; but the all-resistless hurricane has swept over them, and left only, here and there, a lonely trunk, despoiled of its verdure, shorn of its foliage; unshading and unshaded, to murmur in a few more gentle breezes, and to combat with its mutilated limbs, a few more ruder storms, then to sink, and be no more.

They were the pillars of the temple of liberty; and now, that they have crumbled away, that temple must fall, unless we, their descendants, supply their places with other pillars, hewn from the solid quarry of sober reason. Passion has helped us; but can do so no more. It will in future be our enemy. Reason, cold, calculating, unimpassioned reason, must furnish all the materials for our future support and defence. Let those [materials] be moulded into general intelligence, [sound] morality and, in particular, a reverence for the constitution.
and laws; and, that we improved to the last; that we remained free to the last; that we revered his name to the last; [tha]t, during his long sleep, we permitted no hostile foot to pass over or desecrate [his] resting place; shall be that which to le[arn the last] trump shall awaken our Wash[ington].

Upon these] let the proud fabric of freedom r[est, as the] rock of its basis; and as truly as has been said of the only greater institution, "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."
BACKGROUND

Abraham Lincoln responded to the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act and its principal proponent, Stephen A. Douglas, with this address at Peoria.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Is Lincoln in favor or against self-governance?
2. In what way can the right of self-governance be abused according to Lincoln?
3. What principles does Lincoln take to be more essential than the right to self-governance?
4. What are the results of the violation of the Missouri Compromise both in the north and in the south?
5. How does Lincoln think the founders viewed slavery?

...The repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and the propriety of its restoration, constitute the subject of what I am about to say....

I trust I understand, and truly estimate the right of self-government. My faith in the proposition that each man should do precisely as he pleases with all which is exclusively his own, lies at the foundation of the sense of justice there is in me. I extend the principles to communities of men, as well as to individuals. I so extend it, because it is politically wise, as well as naturally just; politically wise, in saving us from broils about matters which do not concern us. Here, or at Washington, I would not trouble myself with the oyster laws of Virginia, or the cranberry laws of Indiana.

The doctrine of self-government is right—absolutely and eternally right—but it has no just application, as here attempted. Or perhaps I should rather say that whether it has such just application depends upon whether a negro is not or is a man. If he is not a man, why in that case, he who is a man may, as a matter of self-government, do just as he pleases with him. But if the negro is a man, is it not to that extent, a total destruction of self-government, to say that he too shall not govern himself? When the white man governs himself that is self-government; but when he governs himself, and also governs another man, that is more than self-government—that is despotism. If the negro is a man, why then my ancient faith teaches me that “all men are created equal;” and that there can be no moral right in connection with one man’s making a slave of another....

What I do say is, that no man is good enough to govern another man, without that other’s consent. I say this is the leading principle—the sheet anchor of American republicanism. Our Declaration of Independence says:

“We hold these truths to be self evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.”
I have quoted so much at this time merely to show that according to our ancient faith, the just powers of governments are derived from the consent of the governed. Now the relation of masters and slaves is, *pro tanto*, a total violation of this principle. The master not only governs the slave without his consent; but he governs him by a set of rules altogether different from those which he prescribes for himself. Allow all the governed an equal voice in the government, and that, and that only is self-government....

This same generation of men, and mostly the same individuals of the generation, who declared this principle—who declared independence—who fought the war of the revolution through—who afterwards made the constitution under which we still live—these same men passed the ordinance of `87, declaring that slavery should never go to the north-west territory. I have no doubt Judge Douglas thinks they were very inconsistent in this. It is a question of discrimination between them and him. But there is not an inch of ground left for his claiming that their opinions—their example—their authority—are on his side in this controversy....

I have done with this mighty argument, of self-government. Go, sacred thing! Go in peace....

The Missouri Compromise ought to be restored. For the sake of the Union, it ought to be restored. We ought to elect a House of Representatives which will vote its restoration. If by any means, we omit to do this, what follows? Slavery may or may not be established in Nebraska. But whether it be or not, we shall have repudiated—discarded from the councils of the Nation—the spirit of compromise; for who after this will ever trust in a national compromise? The spirit of mutual concession—that spirit which first gave us the constitution, and which has thrice saved the Union—we shall have strangled and cast from us forever. And what shall we have in lieu of it? The South flushed with triumph and tempted to excesses; the North, betrayed, as they believe, brooding on wrong and burning for revenge. One side will provoke; the other resent. The one will taunt, the other defy; one agrees, the
other retaliates. Already a few in the North, defy all constitutional restraints, resist the execution of the fugitive slave law, and even menace the institution of slavery in the States where it exists.

Already a few in the South, claim the constitutional right to take to and hold slaves in the free states—demand the revival of the slave trade; and demand a treaty with Great Britain by which fugitive slaves may be reclaimed from Canada. As yet they are but few on either side. It is a grave question for the lovers of the Union, whether the final destruction of the Missouri Compromise, and with it the spirit of all compromise will or will not embolden and embitter each of these, and fatally increase the numbers of both....

I particularly object to the new position which the avowed principle of this Nebraska law gives to slavery in the body politic. I object to it because it assumes that there can be moral right in the enslaving of one man by another. I object to it as a dangerous dalliance for a few people—a sad evidence that, feeling prosperity we forget right—that liberty, as a principle, we have ceased to revere. I object to it because the fathers of the republic eschewed, and rejected it. The argument of “Necessity” was the only argument they ever admitted in favor of slavery; and so far, and so far only as it carried them, did they ever go. They found the institution existing among us, which they could not help; and they cast blame upon the British King for having permitted its introduction. Before the constitution, they prohibited its introduction into the north-western Territory—the only country we owned, then free from it. At the framing and adoption of the constitution, they forbore to so much as mention the word “slave” or “slavery” in the whole instrument. In the provision for the recovery of fugitives, the slave is spoken of as a “person held to service or labor.” In that prohibiting the abolition of the African slave trade for twenty years, that trade is spoken of as “The migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing, shall think proper to admit,” etc. These are the only provisions alluding to slavery. Thus, the thing is hid away, in the constitution, just as an afflicted man hides away a wen or a cancer, which he dares not cut out at once, lest he bleed to death; with the promise, nevertheless, that the cutting may begin at the end of a given time. Less than this our fathers could not do; and now they would not do. Necessity drove them so far, and farther, they would not go. But
this is not all. The earliest Congress, under the constitution, took the same view of slavery. They hedged and hemmed it in to the narrowest limits of necessity.

In 1794, they prohibited an out-going slave-trade—that is, the taking of slaves from the United States to sell.

In 1798, they prohibited the bringing of slaves from Africa, into the Mississippi Territory—this territory then comprising what are now the States of Mississippi and Alabama. This was ten years before they had the authority to do the same thing as to the States existing at the adoption of the constitution.

In 1800 they prohibited American citizens from trading in slaves between foreign countries—as, for instance, from Africa to Brazil.

In 1803 they passed a law in aid of one or two State laws, in restraint of the internal slave trade.

In 1807, in apparent hot haste, they passed the law, nearly a year in advance, to take effect the first day of 1808—the very first day the constitution would permit—prohibiting the African slave trade by heavy pecuniary and corporal penalties.

In 1820, finding these provisions ineffectual, they declared the trade piracy, and annexed to it, the extreme penalty of death. While all this was passing in the general government, five or six of the original slave States had adopted systems of gradual emancipation; and by which the institution was rapidly becoming extinct within these limits.

Thus we see, the plain unmistakable spirit of that age, towards slavery, was hostility to the principle, and toleration, only by necessity....

Our republican robe is soiled, and trailed in the dust. Let us repurify it. Let us turn and wash it white, in the spirit, if not the blood, of the Revolution. Let us turn slavery from its claims of “moral right,” back upon its existing legal rights, and its arguments of “necessity.”

Let us return it to the position our fathers gave it; and there let it rest in peace. Let us re-
adopt the Declaration of Independence, and with it, the practices, and policy, which harmonize with it. Let north and south—let all Americans—let all lovers of liberty everywhere—join in the great and good work. If we do this, we shall not only have saved the Union; but we shall have so saved it, as to make, and to keep it, forever worthy of the saving. We shall have so saved it, that the succeeding millions of free happy people, the world over, shall rise up, and call us blessed, to the latest generations...
CHIEF JUSTICE ROGER TANEY

Dred Scott v. Sandford
U.S. SUPREME COURT MAJORITY OPINION EXCERPTS

March 6, 1857
U.S. Supreme Court | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

Dred Scott was a slave who sued for his freedom after being taken by his owner into territory in which slavery was illegal. The Supreme Court rendered this decision on his case while also using the occasion to address other legalities concerning slavery.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. According to Taney's account, what was the status of African Americans at the time of the founding? Does he think they were included in the term "people of the United States"?

2. Which two clauses of the Constitution does Taney think declare African Americans to be a separate class of persons? What is his argument for his interpretation?

3. For what specific reason does Taney declare the Missouri Compromise unconstitutional?

_Dred Scott v. Sandford, 60 U.S. (19 How.) 393 (1857)._
Mr. Chief Justice Taney delivered the opinion of the court:

...The question is simply this: can a negro, whose ancestors were imported into this country and sold as slaves, become a member of the political community formed and brought into existence by the Constitution of the United States, and as such become entitled to all the rights, and privileges, and immunities, guaranteed by that instrument to the citizen. One of these rights is the privilege of suing in a court of the United States in the cases specified in the Constitution....

The words "people of the United States" and "citizens" are synonymous terms, and mean the same thing. They both describe the political body who, according to our republican institutions, form the sovereignty, and who hold the power and conduct the government through their representatives. They are what we familiarly call the "sovereign people," and every citizen is one of this people, and a constituent member of this sovereignty. The question before us is, whether the class of persons described in the plea in abatement compose a portion of this people, and are constituent members of this sovereignty. We think they are not, and that they are not included, and were not intended to be included, under the word "citizens" in the Constitution, and can, therefore, claim none of the rights and privileges which that instrument provides for and secures to citizens of the United States. On the contrary, they were at that time considered as a subordinate and inferior class of beings, who had been subjugated by the dominant race, and whether emancipated or not, yet remained subject to their authority, and had no rights or privileges but such as those who held the power and the government might choose to grant them.

It is not the province of the court to decide upon the justice or injustice, the policy or impolicy of these laws. The decision of that question belonged to the political or law-making power; to those who formed the sovereignty and framed the Constitution. The duty of the court is to interpret the instrument they have framed, with the best lights we can obtain on the subject, and to administer it as we find it, according to its true intent and meaning when it was adopted.
In discussing this question, we must not confound the rights of citizenship which a state may confer within its own limits, and the rights of citizenship as a member of the Union. It does not by any means follow, because he has all the rights and privileges of a citizen of a State, that he must be a citizen of the United States. He may have all of the rights and privileges of the citizen of a State, and yet not be entitled to the rights and privileges of a citizen in any other State. For, previous to the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, every State had the undoubted right to confer on whomsoever it pleased the character of a citizen, and to endow him with all its rights. But this character, of course, was confined to the boundaries of the State, and gave him no rights or privileges in other States beyond those secured to him by the laws of nations and the comity of States. Nor have the several States surrendered the power of conferring these rights and privileges by adopting the Constitution of the United States. Each State may still confer them upon an alien, or any one it thinks proper, or upon any class or description of persons; yet he would not be a citizen in the sense in which that word is used in the Constitution of the United States, nor entitled to sue as such in one of its courts, nor to the privileges and immunities of a citizen in the other States. The rights which he would acquire would be restricted to the State which gave them....

The question then arises, whether the provisions of the Constitution, in relation to the personal rights and privileges to which the citizen of a state should be entitled, embraced the negro African race, at that time in this country, or who might afterwards be imported, who had then or should afterwards be made free in any State; and to put it in the power of a single State to make him a citizen of the United States, and endue him with the full rights of citizenship in every other State without their consent. Does the Constitution of the United States act upon him whenever he shall be made free under the laws of a State, and raised there to the rank of a citizen, and immediately clothe him with all the privileges of a citizen in every other State, and in its own courts?

The court think the affirmative of these propositions cannot be maintained. And if it cannot, the plaintiff in error could not be a citizen of the State of Missouri, within the
meaning of the Constitution of the United States, and, consequently, was not entitled to sue in its courts....

It is difficult at this day to realize the state of public opinion in relation to that unfortunate race, which prevailed in the civilized and enlightened portions of the world at the time of the Declaration of Independence....

...[I]t is too clear for dispute, that the enslaved African race were not intended to be included, and formed no part of the people who framed and adopted this Declaration; for if the language, as understood in that day, would embrace them, the conduct of the distinguished men who framed the Declaration of Independence would have been utterly and flagrantly inconsistent with the principles they asserted....

But there are two clauses in the Constitution which point directly and specifically to the negro race as a separate class of persons, and show clearly that they were not regarded as a portion of the people or citizens of the government then formed.

One of these clauses reserves to each of the thirteen States the right to import slaves until the year 1808, if it thinks proper. And the importation which it thus sanctions was unquestionably of persons of the race of which we are speaking, as the traffic in slaves in the United States had always been confined to them. And by the other provision the States pledge themselves to each other to maintain the right of property of the master, by delivering up to him any slave who may have escaped from his service, and be found within their respective territories. By the first above-mentioned clause, therefore, the right to purchase and hold this property is directly sanctioned and authorized for twenty years by the people who framed the Constitution. And by the second, they pledge themselves to maintain and uphold the right of the master in the manner specified, as long as the government they then formed should endure. And these two provisions show, conclusively, that neither the description of persons therein referred to, nor their descendants, were embraced in any of the other provisions of the Constitution; for certainly these two clauses were not intended to confer on them or their posterity the blessings of liberty, or any of the personal rights so carefully provided for the citizen....
...[The Missouri Compromise] declares that slavery and involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, shall be forever prohibited in all that part of that territory ceded by France, under the name of Louisiana, which lies north of thirty-six degrees thirty minutes north latitude, and not included within the limits of Missouri. And the difficulty which meets us at the threshold of this part of the inquiry is, whether Congress was authorized to pass this law under any of the powers granted to it by the Constitution; for if the authority is not given by that instrument, it is the duty of this court to declare it void and inoperative, and incapable of conferring freedom upon one who is held as a slave under the laws of any one of the States.

The counsel for the plaintiff has laid much stress upon that article in the Constitution which confers on Congress the power "to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States," but, in the judgment of the court, that provision has no bearing on the present controversy, and the power there given, whatever it may be, is confined, and was intended to be confined, to the territory which at that time belonged to, or was claimed by, the United States, and was within their boundaries as settled by the Treaty with Great Britain, and can have no influence upon a territory afterwards acquired from a foreign government. It was a special provision for a known and particular Territory, and to meet a present emergency, and nothing more....

It seems, however, to be supposed, that there is a difference between property in a slave and other property, and that different rules may be applied to it in expounding the Constitution of the United States. And the laws and usages of nations, and the writings of eminent jurists upon the relation of master and slave and their mutual rights and duties, and the powers which governments may exercise over it, have been dwelt upon in the argument.

The powers of the government, and the rights of the citizen under it, are positive and practical regulations plainly written down. The people of the United States have delegated to it certain enumerated powers, and forbidden it to exercise others. It has no power over the person or property of a citizen but what the citizens of the United States have granted.
And no laws or usages of other nations, or reasoning of statesmen or jurists upon the relations of master and slave, can enlarge the powers of the government, or take from the citizens the rights they have reserved. And if the Constitution recognizes the right of property of the master in a slave, and makes no distinction between that description of property and other property owned by a citizen, no tribunal, acting under the authority of the United States, whether it be legislative, executive, or judicial, has a right to draw such a distinction, or deny to it the benefit of the provisions and guarantees which have been provided for the protection of private property against the encroachments of the government. …

The right of property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the Constitution. The right to traffic in it, like an ordinary article of merchandise and property, was guaranteed to the citizens of the United States, in every state that might desire it, for twenty years. And the government in express terms pledged to protect it in all future time if the slave escapes from his owner. This is done in plain words—too plain to be misunderstood….The only power conferred is the power coupled with the duty, of guarding and protecting the owner in his rights.

Upon these considerations, it is the opinion of the court that the Act of Congress which prohibited a citizen from holding and owning property of this kind in the territory of the United States north of the line therein mentioned, is not warranted by the Constitution, and is therefore void; and that neither Dred Scott himself, nor any of his family, were made free by being carried into this territory; even if they had been carried there by the owner, with the intention of becoming a permanent resident….

Upon the whole, therefore, it is the judgment of this court, that it appears by the record before us that the plaintiff in error is not a citizen of Missouri, in the sense in which that word is used in the Constitution; and that the Circuit Court of the United States, for that reason, had no jurisdiction in the case, and could give no judgment in it.

Its judgment for the defendant must, consequently, be reversed, and a mandate issued directing the suit to be dismissed for want of jurisdiction.
ABRAHAM LINCOLN

On the *Dred Scott* Decision

SPEECH EXCERPT

June 26, 1857
Springfield, Illinois

BACKGROUND

Abraham Lincoln offered this speech in response to Senator Stephen Douglas’s defense of the *Dred Scott* decision and his continued promotion of the Kansas-Nebraska Act.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Why does Lincoln argue that African Americans in the United States are worse off in his time than during the time of the founding?

2. How does the *Dred Scott* ruling undermine the principles of the founding in Lincoln’s opinion?

3. What is Lincoln’s position towards African Americans?

4. What does Lincoln find in common between the *Dred Scott* ruling and Stephen Douglas’ arguments?

…I have said, in substance, that the *Dred Scott* decision was, in part; based on assumed historical facts which were not really true; and I ought not to leave the subject without giving some reasons for saying this; I therefore give an instance or two, which I think fully sustain me. Chief Justice Taney, in delivering the opinion of the majority of the Court, insists at great length that negroes were no part of the people who made, or for whom was made, the Declaration of Independence, or the Constitution of the United States.

On the contrary, Judge Curtis, in his dissenting opinion, shows that in five of the then thirteen states, to wit, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey and North Carolina, free negroes were voters, and, in proportion to their numbers, had the same part in making the Constitution that the white people had. He shows this with so much particularity as to leave no doubt of its truth; and, as a sort of conclusion on that point, holds the following language:

"The Constitution was ordained and established by the people of the United States, through the action, in each State, of those persons who were qualified by its laws to act thereon in behalf of themselves and all other citizens of the State. In some of the States, as we have seen, colored persons were among those qualified by law to act on the subject. These colored persons were not only included in the body of 'the people of the United States,' by whom the Constitution was ordained and established; but in at least five of the States they had the power to act, and, doubtless, did act, by their suffrages, upon the question of its adoption."

Again, Chief Justice Taney says: "It is difficult, at this day to realize the state of public opinion in relation to that unfortunate race, which prevailed in the civilized and enlightened portions of the world at the time of the Declaration of Independence, and when the Constitution of the United States was framed and adopted." And again, after quoting from the Declaration, he says: "The general words above quoted would seem to include the whole human family, and if they were used in a similar instrument at this day, would be so understood."
In these the Chief Justice does not directly assert, but plainly assumes, as a fact, that the public estimate of the black man is more favorable *now* than it was in the days of the Revolution. This assumption is a mistake. In some trifling particulars, the condition of that race has been ameliorated; but, as a whole, in this country, the change between then and now is decidedly the other way; and their ultimate destiny has never appeared so hopeless as in the last three or four years. In two of the five States—New Jersey and North Carolina—that then gave the free negro the right of voting, the right has since been taken away; and in a third—New York—it has been greatly abridged; while it has not been extended, so far as I know, to a single additional State, though the number of the States has more than doubled. In those days, as I understand, masters could, at their own pleasure, emancipate their slaves; but since then, such legal restraints have been made upon emancipation, as to amount almost to prohibition. In those days, Legislatures held the unquestioned power to abolish slavery in their respective States; but now it is becoming quite fashionable for State Constitutions to withhold that power from the Legislatures. In those days, by common consent, the spread of the black man's bondage to new countries was prohibited; but now, Congress decides that it *will* not continue the prohibition, and the Supreme Court decides that it *could* not if it would. In those days, our Declaration of Independence was held sacred by all, and thought to include all; but now, to aid in making the bondage of the negro universal and eternal, it is assailed, and sneered at, and construed, and hawked at, and torn, till, if its framers could rise from their graves, they could not at all recognize it. All the powers of earth seem rapidly combining against him. Mammon is after him; ambition follows, and philosophy follows, and the Theology of the day is fast joining the cry. They have him in his prison house; they have searched his person, and left no prying instrument with him. One after another they have closed the heavy iron doors upon him, and now they have him, as it were, bolted in with a lock of a hundred keys, which can never be unlocked without the concurrence of every key; the keys in the hands of a hundred different men, and they scattered to a hundred different and distant places; and they stand musing as to what invention, in all the dominions of mind and matter, can be produced to make the impossibility of his escape more complete than it is.
It is grossly incorrect to say or assume, that the public estimate of the negro is more favorable now than it was at the origin of the government.

Three years and a half ago, Judge Douglas brought forward his famous Nebraska bill. The country was at once in a blaze. He scorned all opposition, and carried it through Congress. Since then he has seen himself superseded in a Presidential nomination, by one indorsing the general doctrine of his measure, but at the same time standing clear of the odium of its untimely agitation, and its gross breach of national faith; and he has seen that successful rival Constitutionally elected, not by the strength of friends, but by the division of adversaries, being in a popular minority of nearly four hundred thousand votes. He has seen his chief aids in his own State, Shields and Richardson, politically speaking, successively tried, convicted, and executed, for an offense not their own, but his. And now he sees his own case, standing next on the docket for trial.

There is a natural disgust in the minds of nearly all white people, to the idea of an indiscriminate amalgamation of the white and black races; and Judge Douglas evidently is basing his chief hope, upon the chances of being able to appropriate the benefit of this disgust to himself. If he can, by much drumming and repeating, fasten the odium of that idea upon his adversaries, he thinks he can struggle through the storm. He therefore clings to this hope, as a drowning man to the last plank. He makes an occasion for lugging it in from the opposition to the Dred Scott decision. He finds the Republicans insisting that the Declaration of Independence includes ALL men, black as well as white; and Judge Douglas boldly denies that it includes negroes at all, and proceeds to argue gravely that all who contend it does, do so only because they want to vote, and eat, and sleep, and marry with negroes! He will have it that they cannot be consistent else. Now I protest against that counterfeit logic which concludes that, because I do not want a black woman for a slave I must necessarily want her for a wife. I need not have her for either, I can just leave her alone. In some respects she certainly is not my equal; but in her natural right to eat the bread she earns with her own hands without asking leave of any one else, she is my equal, and the equal of all others.
Chief Justice Taney, in his opinion in the *Dred Scott* case, admits that the language of the Declaration is broad enough to include the whole human family, but he and Judge Douglas argue that the authors of that instrument did not intend to include negroes, by the fact that they did not at once, actually place them on an equality with the whites. Now this grave argument comes to just nothing at all, by the other fact, that they did not at once, or ever afterwards, actually place all white people on an equality with one or another. And this is the staple argument of both the Chief Justice and the Senator, for doing this obvious violence to the plain unmistakable language of the Declaration. I think the authors of that notable instrument intended to include *all* men, but they did not intend to declare all men equal in *all respects*. They did not mean to say all were equal in color, size, intellect, moral developments, or social capacity. They defined with tolerable distinctness, in what respects they did consider all men created equal—equal in "certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." This they said, and this meant. They did not mean to assert the obvious untruth, that all were then actually enjoying that equality, nor yet, that they were about to confer it immediately upon them. In fact they had no power to confer such a boon. They meant simply to declare the *right*, so that the *enforcement* of it might follow as fast as circumstances should permit. They meant to set up a standard maxim for free society, which should be familiar to all, and revered by all; constantly looked to, constantly labored for, and even though never perfectly attained, constantly approximated, and thereby constantly spreading and deepening its influence, and augmenting the happiness and value of life to all people of all colors everywhere. The assertion that "all men are created equal" was of no practical use in effecting our separation from Great Britain; and it was placed in the Declaration, not for that, but for future use. Its authors meant it to be, thank God, it is now proving itself, a stumbling block to those who in after times might seek to turn a free people back into the hateful paths of despotism. They knew the prone-ness of prosperity to breed tyrants, and they meant when such should re-appear in this fair land and commence their vocation they should find left for them at least one hard nut to crack.
I have now briefly expressed my view of the meaning and objects of that part of the Declaration of Independence which declares that "all men are created equal."

Now let us hear Judge Douglas' view of the same subject, as I find it in the printed report of his late speech. Here it is:

"No man can vindicate the character, motives and conduct of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, except upon the hypothesis that they referred to the white race alone, and not to the African, when they declared all men to have been created equal—that they were speaking of British subjects on this continent being equal to British subjects born and residing in Great Britain—that they were entitled to the same inalienable rights, and among them were enumerated life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The Declaration was adopted for the purpose of justifying the colonists in the eyes of the civilized world in withdrawing their allegiance from the British crown, and dissolving their connection with the mother country."

My good friends, read that carefully over some leisure hour, and ponder well upon it—see what a mere wreck—mangled ruin—it makes of our once glorious Declaration.

"They were speaking of British subjects on this continent being equal to British subjects born and residing in Great Britain!" Why, according to this, not only negroes but white people outside of Great Britain and America are not spoken of in that instrument. The English, Irish and Scotch, along with white Americans, were included to be sure, but the French, Germans and other white people of the world are all gone to pot along with the Judge's inferior races.

I had thought the Declaration promised something better than the condition of British subjects; but no, it only meant that we should be equal to them in their own oppressed and unequal condition. According to that, it gave no promise that having kicked off the King and Lords of Great Britain, we should not at once be saddled with a King and Lords of our own.
I had thought the Declaration contemplated the progressive improvement in the condition of all men everywhere; but no, it merely "was adopted for the purpose of justifying the colonists in the eyes of the civilized world in withdrawing their allegiance from the British crown, and dissolving their connection with the mother country." Why, that object having been effected some eighty years ago, the Declaration is of no practical use now—mere rubbish—old wadding left to rot on the battle-field after the victory is won.

I understand you are preparing to celebrate the "Fourth," tomorrow week. What for? The doings of that day had no reference to the present; and quite half of you are not even descendants of those who were referred to at that day. But I suppose you will celebrate; and will even go so far as to read the Declaration. Suppose after you read it once in the old fashioned way, you read it once more with Judge Douglas' version. It will then run thus: "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all British subjects who were on this continent eighty-one years ago, were created equal to all British subjects born and then residing in Great Britain."

And now I appeal to all—to Democrats as well as others,—are you really willing that the Declaration shall be thus frittered away?—thus left no more at most, than an interesting memorial of the dead past? thus shorn of its vitality, and practical value; and left without the germ or even the suggestion of the individual rights of man in it?…
ABRAHAM LINCOLN (R-IL)

To the Illinois Republican Party Convention

SPEECH

June 16, 1858

House of Representatives Chamber at the Illinois State Capitol | Springfield, Illinois

A House Divided

BACKGROUND

Abraham Lincoln delivered this speech upon his nomination by the Illinois Republican Party to be its candidate for U.S. Senate in Illinois.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. To what, in particular, is Lincoln referring when he quotes the Gospel of Matthew, "A house divided against itself cannot stand"?

2. What does Lincoln find problematic about the politics surrounding the Dred Scott v. Sandford case?

3. What was "squatter sovereignty," and what does Lincoln think happened to it?

4. What are the three "working points" of "machinery" resulting from Dred Scott and Stephen Douglas’s policy, and why does Lincoln think they are constitutionally problematic?

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Convention:

If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could then better judge what to do, and how to do it.

We are now far into the fifth year, since a policy was initiated, with the avowed object, and confident promise, of putting an end to slavery agitation.

Under the operation of that policy, that agitation has not only, not ceased, but has constantly augmented.

In my opinion, it will not cease, until a crisis shall have been reached, and passed.

"A house divided against itself cannot stand."

I believe this government cannot endure, permanently half slave and half free.

I do not expect the Union to be dissolved—I do not expect the house to fall—but I do expect it will cease to be divided.

It will become all one thing, or all the other.

Either the opponents of slavery, will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction; or its advocates will push it forward, till it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new—North as well as South.

Have we no tendency to the latter condition?

Let any one who doubts, carefully contemplate that now almost complete legal combination—piece of machinery so to speak—compounded of the Nebraska doctrine, and the Dred Scott decision. Let him consider not only what work the machinery is adapted to do, and how well adapted; but also, let him study the history of its construction, and trace, if he can, or rather fail, if he can, to trace the evidences of design, and concert of action, among its chief bosses, from the beginning.
But, so far, Congress only, had acted; and an endorsement by the people, real or apparent, was indispensable, to save the point already gained, and give chance for more.

The new year of 1854 found slavery excluded from more than half the States by State Constitutions, and from most of the national territory by Congressional prohibition.

Four days later, commenced the struggle, which ended in repealing that Congressional prohibition.

This opened all the national territory to slavery; and was the first point gained.

This necessity had not been overlooked; but had been provided for, as well as might be, in the notable argument of "squatter sovereignty," otherwise called "sacred right of self government," which latter phrase, though expressive of the only rightful basis of any government, was so perverted in this attempted use of it as to amount to just this: That if any one man, choose to enslave another, no third man shall be allowed to object.

That argument was incorporated into the Nebraska Bill itself, in the language which follows: "It being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any Territory or state, not to exclude it therefrom; but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States."

Then opened the roar of loose declamation in favor of "Squatter Sovereignty" and "Sacred right of self government."

"But," said opposition members, "let us be more specific—let us amend the bill so as to expressly declare that the people of the territory may exclude slavery." "Not we," said the friends of the measure; and down they voted the amendment.

While the Nebraska bill was passing through congress, a law case, involving the question of a negro’s freedom, by reason of his owner having voluntarily taken him first into a free state and then a territory covered by the congressional prohibition, and held him as a slave,
for a long time in each, was passing through the U. S. Circuit Court for the District of Missouri; and both Nebraska bill and law suit were brought to a decision in the same month of May, 1854. The negro’s name was "Dred Scott," which name now designates the decision finally made in the case.

5 Before the then next Presidential election, the law case came to, and was argued in the Supreme Court of the United States; but the decision of it was deferred until after the election. Still, before the election, Senator Trumbull, on the floor of the Senate, requests the leading advocate of the Nebraska Bill to state his opinion whether the people of a territory can constitutionally exclude slavery from their limits; and the latter answers, "That is a question for the Supreme Court."

The election came. Mr. Buchanan was elected, and the endorsement, such as it was, secured. That was the second point gained. The endorsement, however, fell short of a clear popular majority by nearly four hundred thousand votes, and so, perhaps, was not overwhelmingly reliable and satisfactory.

10 The outgoing President, in his last annual message, as impressively as possible echoed back upon the people the weight and authority of the endorsement.

The Supreme Court met again; did not announce their decision, but ordered a re-argument.

The Presidential inauguration came, and still no decision of the court; but the incoming President, in his inaugural address, fervently exhorted the people to abide by the forthcoming decision, whatever it might be.

Then, in a few days, came the decision.

The reputed author of the Nebraska bill finds an early occasion to make a speech at this capitol endorsing the Dred Scott Decision, and vehemently denouncing all opposition to it.
The new President, too, seizes the early occasion of the Silliman letter to endorse and strongly construe that decision, and to express his astonishment that any different view had ever been entertained.

At length a squabble springs up between the President and the author of the Nebraska bill, on the mere question of fact, whether the Lecompton constitution was or was not, in any just sense, made by the people of Kansas; and in that squabble the latter declares that all he wants is a fair vote for the people, and that he cares not whether slavery be voted down or voted up. I do not understand his declaration that he cares not whether slavery be voted down or voted up, to be intended by him other than as an apt definition of the policy he would impress upon the public mind—the principle for which he declares he has suffered much, and is ready to suffer to the end.

And well may he cling to that principle. If he has any parental feeling, well may he cling to it. That principle, is the only shred left of his original Nebraska doctrine. Under the Dred Scott decision, "squatter sovereignty" squatted out of existence, tumbled down like temporary scaffolding—like the mold at the foundry served through one blast and fell back into loose sand—helped to carry an election, and then was kicked to the winds. His late joint struggle with the Republicans, against the Lecompton Constitution, involves nothing of the original Nebraska doctrine. That struggle was made on a point, the right of a people to make their own constitution, upon which he and the Republicans have never differed.

The several points of the Dred Scott decision, in connection with Senator Douglas' "care not" policy, constitute the piece of machinery, in its present state of advancement. This was the third point gained.

The working points of that machinery are:

First, that no negro slave, imported as such from Africa, and no descendant of such slave can ever be a citizen of any State, in the sense of that term as used in the Constitution of the United States.
This point is made in order to deprive the negro, in every possible event, of the benefit of this provision of the United States Constitution, which declares that—

"The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States."

Secondly, that "subject to the Constitution of the United States," neither Congress nor a Territorial Legislature can exclude slavery from any United States territory.

This point is made in order that individual men may fill up the territories with slaves, without danger of losing them as property, and thus to enhance the chances of permanency to the institution through all the future.

Thirdly, that whether the holding a negro in actual slavery in a free State, makes him free, as against the holder, the United States courts will not decide, but will leave to be decided by the courts of any slave State the negro may be forced into by the master.

This point is made, not to be pressed immediately; but, if acquiesced in for a while, and apparently endorsed by the people at an election, then to sustain the logical conclusion that what Dred Scott’s master might lawfully do with Dred Scott, in the free State of Illinois, every other master may lawfully do with any other one, or one thousand slaves, in Illinois, or in any other free State.

Auxiliary to all this, and working hand in hand with it, the Nebraska doctrine, or what is left of it, is to educate and mold public opinion, at least Northern public opinion, not to care whether slavery is voted down or voted up.

This shows exactly where we now are; and partially also, whither we are tending.

It will throw additional light on the latter, to go back, and run the mind over the string of historical facts already stated. Several things will now appear less dark and mysterious than they did when they were transpiring. The people were to be left "perfectly free" "subject only to the Constitution." What the Constitution had to do with it, outsiders could not then see.
Plainly enough now, it was an exactly fitted niche, for the Dred Scott decision to afterwards come in, and declare the perfect freedom of the people, to be just no freedom at all.

Why was the amendment, expressly declaring the right of the people to exclude slavery, voted down? Plainly enough now, the adoption of it, would have spoiled the niche for the Dred Scott decision.

Why was the Court decision held up? Why, even a Senator’s individual opinion withheld, till after the Presidential election? Plainly enough now, the speaking out then would have damaged the “perfectly free” argument upon which the election was to be carried.

Why the outgoing President’s felicitation on the endorsement? Why the delay of a reargument? Why the incoming President’s advance exhortation in favor of the decision?

These things look like the cautious patting and petting of a spirited horse, preparatory to mounting him, when it is dreaded that he may give the rider a fall.

And why the hasty after endorsements of the decision by the President and others?

We can not absolutely know that all these exact adaptations are the result of preconcert. But when we see a lot of framed timbers, different portions of which we know have been gotten out at different times and places and by different workmen—Stephen, Franklin, Roger and James, for instance—and when we see these timbers joined together, and see they exactly make the frame of a house or a mill, all the tenons and mortices exactly fitting, and all the lengths and proportions of the different pieces exactly adapted to their respective places, and not a piece too many or too few—not omitting even scaffolding—or, if a single piece be lacking, we can see the place in the frame exactly fitted and prepared to yet bring such piece in—in such a case, we find it impossible to not believe that Stephen and Franklin and Roger and James all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked upon a common plan or draft drawn up before the first lick was struck....
**Sen. Stephen Douglas (D-IL)**

**Speech at Chicago**

*Speech Excerpt*

July 9, 1858

Chicago, Illinois

**BACKGROUND**

Democratic Illinois Senator Stephen Douglas traveled extensively to promote the concept of popular sovereignty while also defending the Kansas-Nebraska Act and the *Dred Scott* decision, offering these remarks while in Chicago.

**GUIDING QUESTIONS**

1. What is the principle of popular sovereignty, according to Douglas?

2. On what grounds does Douglas defend the Kansas-Nebraska Act?

3. What is his criticism of the Lecompton Constitution?

4. On what grounds does he defend the *Dred Scott* decision?

5. Why does he think that Lincoln is wrong to believe that "uniformity is either desirable or possible"?

6. For what reasons does Douglas oppose African American equality?

---

...Fellow-citizens, while I devoted my best energies—all my energies, mental and physical—to the vindication of the great principle, and whilst the result has been such as will enable the people of Kansas to come into the Union with such a constitution as they desire, yet the credit of this great moral victory is to be divided among a large number of men of various and different political creeds. I was rejoiced when I found in this great contest the Republican party coming up manfully and sustaining the principle that the people of each Territory, when coming into the Union, have the right to decide for themselves whether slavery shall or shall not exist within their limits. I have seen the time when that principle was controverted. I have seen the time when all parties did not recognize the right of a people to have slavery or freedom, to tolerate or prohibit slavery as they deemed best, but claimed that power for the Congress of the United States, regardless of the wishes of the people to be affected by it; and when I found upon the Crittenden-Montgomery bill the Republicans and Americans of the North, and I may say, too, some glorious Americans and old-line Whigs from the South, like Crittenden and his patriotic associates, joined with a portion of the Democracy to carry out and vindicate the right of the people to decide whether slavery should or should not exist within the limits of Kansas, I was rejoiced within my secret soul, for I saw an indication that the American people, when they came to understand the principle, would give it their cordial support....

I regard the great principle of popular sovereignty as having been vindicated and made triumphant in this land as a permanent rule of public policy in the organization of Territories and the admission of new States. Illinois took her position upon this principle many years ago. You all recollect that in 1850, after the passage of the Compromise measures of that year, when I returned to my home there was great dissatisfaction expressed at my course in supporting those measures. I appeared before the people of Chicago at a mass meeting, and vindicated each and every one of those measures; and by reference to my speech on that occasion, which was printed and circulated broadcast throughout the State at the time, you will find that I then and there said that those measures were all founded upon the great principle that every people ought to possess the right to form and regulate their own domestic institutions in their own way, and that, that right being possessed by
the people of the States, I saw no reason why the same principle should not be extended to all of the Territories of the United States. A general election was held in this State a few months afterwards, for members of the Legislature, pending which all these questions were thoroughly canvassed and discussed, and the nominees of the different parties instructed in regard to the wishes of their constituents upon them. When that election was over, and the Legislature assembled, they proceeded to consider the merits of those Compromise measures, and the principles upon which they were predicated. And what was the result of their action? They passed resolutions, first repealing the Wilmot Proviso instructions, and in lieu thereof adopted another resolution, in which they declared the great principle which asserts the right of the people to make their own form of government and establish their own institutions. That resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That our liberty and independence are based upon the right of the people to form for themselves such a government as they may choose; that this great principle, the birthright of freemen, the gift of Heaven, secured to us by the blood of our ancestors, ought to be secured to future generations, and no limitation ought to be applied to this power in the organization of any Territory of the United States, of either Territorial Government or State Constitution, provided the Government so established shall be republican, and in conformity with the Constitution of the United States.

That resolution, declaring the great principle of self-government as applicable to the Territories and new States, passed the House of Representatives of this State by a vote of sixty-one in the affirmative, to only four in the negative. Thus you find that an expression of public opinion—enlightened, educated, intelligent public opinion—on this question, by the representatives of Illinois in 1851, approaches nearer to unanimity than has ever been obtained on any controverted question. That resolution was entered on the journal of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, and it has remained there from that day to this, a standing instruction to her Senators, and a request to her Representatives, in Congress to carry out that principle in all future cases. Illinois, therefore, stands pre-eminent as the State which stepped forward early and established a platform applicable to this slavery question, concurred in alike by Whigs and Democrats, in which it was declared to be the wish of our
people that thereafter the people of the Territories should be left perfectly free to form and
regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, and that no limitation should be
placed upon that right in any form.

Hence what was my duty in 1854, when it became necessary to bring forward a bill for the
organization of the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska? Was it not my duty, in obedience
to the Illinois platform, to your standing instructions to your Senators, adopted with almost
entire unanimity, to incorporate in that bill the great principle of self-government, declar-
ing that it was "the true intent and meaning of the Act not to legislate slavery into any State
or Territory, or to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to
form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Consti-
tution of the United States?" I did incorporate that principle in the Kansas-Nebraska Bill,
and perhaps I did as much as any living man in the enactment of that bill, thus establishing
the doctrine in the public policy of the country. I then defended that principle against as-
saults from one section of the Union. During this last winter it became my duty to vindicate
it against assaults from the other section of the Union. I vindicated it boldly and fearlessly,
as the people of Chicago can bear witness, when it was assailed by Free-soilers; and during
this winter I vindicated and defended it as boldly and fearlessly when it was attempted to
be violated by the almost united South. I pledged myself to you on every stump in Illinois
in 1854, I pledged myself to the people of other States north and south, wherever I spoke;
and in the United States Senate and elsewhere, in every form in which I could reach the
public mind or the public ear, I gave the pledge that I, so far as the power should be in my
hands, would vindicate the principle of the right of the people to form their own institu-
tions, to establish free States or slave States as they chose, and that that principle should
never be violated either by fraud, by violence, by circumvention, or by any other means, if
it was in my power to prevent it. I now submit to you, my fellow-citizens, whether I have
not redeemed that pledge in good faith. Yes, my friends, I have redeemed it in good faith;
and it is a matter of heartfelt gratification to me to see these assembled thousands here
tonight bearing their testimony to the fidelity with which I have advocated that principle,
and redeemed my pledges in connection with it.
I will be entirely frank with you. My object was to secure the right of the people of each State and of each Territory, north or south, to decide the question for themselves, to have slavery or not, just as they chose; and my opposition to the Lecompton Constitution was not predicated upon the ground that it was a pro-slavery constitution, nor would my action have been different had it been a Free-soil constitution. My speech against the Lecompton fraud was made on the 9th of December, while the vote on the slavery clause in that constitution was not taken until the 21st of the same month, nearly two weeks after. I made my speech against the Lecompton monstrosity solely on the ground that it was a violation of the fundamental principles of free government; on the ground that it was not the act and deed of the people of Kansas; that it did not embody their will; that they were averse to it; and hence I denied the right of Congress to force it upon them, either as a free State or a slave State. I deny the right of Congress to force a slaveholding State upon an unwilling people. I deny their right to force a free State upon an unwilling people. I deny their right to force a good thing upon a people who are unwilling to receive it. The great principle is the right of every community to judge and decide for itself whether a thing is right or wrong, whether it would be good or evil for them to adopt it; and the right of free action, the right of free thought, the right of free judgment, upon the question is dearer to every true American than any other under a free government. My objection to the Lecompton contrivance was that it undertook to put a constitution on the people of Kansas against their will, in opposition to their wishes, and thus violated the great principle upon which all our institutions rest. It is no answer to this argument to say that slavery is an evil, and hence should not be tolerated. You must allow the people to decide for themselves whether it is a good or an evil. You allow them to decide for themselves whether they desire a Maine liquor law or not; you allow them to decide for themselves what kind of common schools they will have, what system of banking they will adopt, or whether they will adopt any at all; you allow them to decide for themselves the relations between husband and wife, parent and child, guardian and ward,—in fact, you allow them to decide for themselves all other questions; and why not upon this question? Whenever you put a limitation upon the right of any people to decide what laws they want, you have destroyed the fundamental principle of self-government....
But I am equally free to say that the reason assigned by Mr. Lincoln for resisting the decision of the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case does not in itself meet my approbation. He objects to it because that decision declared that a negro descended from African parents, who were brought here and sold as slaves, is not and cannot be a citizen of the United States. He says it is wrong because it deprives the negro of the benefits of that clause of the Constitution which says that citizens of one State shall enjoy all the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States; in other words, he thinks it wrong because it deprives the negro of the privileges, immunities, and rights of citizenship, which pertain, according to that decision, only to the white man. I am free to say to you that in my opinion this government of ours is founded on the white basis. It was made by the white man, for the benefit of the white man, to be administered by white men, in such manner as they should determine. It is also true that a negro, an Indian, or any other man of inferior race to a white man should be permitted to enjoy, and humanity requires that he should have, all the rights, privileges, and immunities which he is capable of exercising consistent with the safety of society. I would give him every right and every privilege which his capacity would enable him to enjoy, consistent with the good of the society in which he lived. But you ask me, What are these rights and these privileges? My answer is, that each State must decide for itself the nature and extent of these rights. Illinois has decided for herself. We have decided that the negro shall not be a slave, and we have at the same time decided that he shall not vote, or serve on juries, or enjoy political privileges. I am content with that system of policy which we have adopted for ourselves. I deny the right of any other State to complain of our policy in that respect, or to interfere with it, or to attempt to change it. On the other hand, the State of Maine has decided that in that State a negro man may vote on an equality with the white man. The sovereign power of Maine had the right to prescribe that rule for herself. Illinois has no right to complain of Maine for conferring the right of negro suffrage, nor has Maine any right to interfere with or complain of Illinois because she has denied negro suffrage.

The State of New York has decided by her constitution that a negro may vote, provided that he own $250 worth of property, but not otherwise. The rich negro can vote, but the
poor one cannot. Although that distinction does not commend itself to my judgment, yet
I assert that the sovereign power of New York had a right to prescribe that form of the
elective franchise. Kentucky, Virginia, and other States have provided that negroes, or a
certain class of them in those States, shall be slaves, having neither civil nor political rights.

Without endorsing the wisdom of that decision, I assert that Virginia has the same power,
by virtue of her sovereignty, to protect slavery within her limits as Illinois has to banish it
forever from our own borders. I assert the right of each State to decide for itself on all these
questions, and I do not subscribe to the doctrine of my friend Mr. Lincoln, that uniformity
is either desirable or possible. I do not acknowledge that the States must all be free or must
all be slave.

I do not acknowledge that the negro must have civil and political rights everywhere or no-
where. I do not acknowledge that the Chinese must have the same rights in California that
we would confer upon him here. I do not acknowledge that the coolie imported into this
country must necessarily be put upon an equality with the white race. I do not acknowledge
any of these doctrines of uniformity in the local and domestic regulations in the different
States.

Thus you see, my fellow-citizens, that the issues between Mr. Lincoln and myself, as re-
spective candidates for the United States Senate, as made up, are direct, unequivocal, and
irreconcilable. He goes for uniformity in our domestic institutions, for a war of sections,
until one or the other shall be subdued. I go for the great principle of the Kansas-Nebraska
Bill,—the right of the people to decide for themselves.

On the other point, Mr. Lincoln goes for a warfare upon the Supreme Court of the United
States because of their judicial decision in the Dred Scott case. I yield obedience to the de-
cisions in that court,—to the final determination of the highest judicial tribunal known to
our Constitution. He objects to the Dred Scott decision because it does not put the negro
in the possession of the rights of citizenship on an equality with the white man. I am op-
posed to negro equality. I repeat that this nation is a white people,—a people composed of
European descendants, a people that have established this government for themselves and
their posterity,—and I am in favor of preserving, not only the purity of the blood, but the
purity of the government from any mixture or amalgamation with inferior races. I have
seen the effects of this mixture of superior and inferior races, this amalgamation of white
men and Indians and negroes; we have seen it in Mexico, in Central America, in South
America, and in all the Spanish-American States; and its result has been degeneration, de-
moralization, and degradation below the capacity for self-government.

I am opposed to taking any step that recognizes the negro man or the Indian as the equal
of the white man. I am opposed to giving him a voice in the administration of the govern-
ment. I would extend to the negro and the Indian and to all dependent races every right,
every privilege, and every immunity consistent with the safety and welfare of the white
races; but equality they never should have, either political or social, or in any other respect
whatever.

My friends, you see that the issues are distinctly drawn. I stand by the same platform that I
have so often proclaimed to you and to the people of Illinois heretofore. I stand by the
Democratic organization, yield obedience to its usages, and support its regular nomina-
tions. I endorse and approve the Cincinnati platform, and I adhere to and intend to carry
out, as part of that platform, the great principle of self-government, which recognizes the
right of the people in each State and Territory to decide for themselves their domestic in-
tstitutions. In other words, if the Lecompton issue shall arise again, you have only to turn
back and see where you have found me during the last six months, and then rest assured
that you will find me in the same position, battling for the same principle, and vindicating
it from assault from whatever quarter it may come, so long as I have the power to do it....
ABRAHAM LINCOLN (R) & SENATOR STEPHEN DOUGLAS (D)

Seventh Debate in the 1858 Election Campaign

DEBATE EXCERPTS

October 15, 1858
Outside Alton City Hall | Alton, Illinois

BACKGROUND

Incumbent senator from Illinois, Democrat Stephen Douglas, debated Abraham Lincoln, the Republican candidate, for the seventh and final time in the 1858 election campaign. The candidates were not directly running for U.S. Senate, as senators were still appointed by the state legislature at the time, but their arguments were meant to bolster votes for their respective parties in the state legislature, which would then appoint one of them as U.S. Senator.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What are the three positions at issue in the debate?

2. What does Douglas think would have been the result had Lincoln delivered a version of his "A House Divided" speech at the Constitutional Convention?

3. How does Douglas interpret the meaning of “equality” in the Declaration of Independence?

4. In what sense does Douglas want each state to "mind its own business"?

5. Why does Lincoln think that history is on his side with respect to the meaning of “equality” in the Declaration of Independence?

6. According to Lincoln, how should one interpret the language of the Constitution with regard to slavery? What is the view of the founders on slavery, according to Lincoln?

7. What is the primary dividing line between Republicans and Democrats at this time, according to Lincoln?

8. In Lincoln's view, why is the existence of the Union threatened?

9. On what grounds does Lincoln base the struggle between him and Douglas as the struggle between right and wrong?
Senator Stephen Douglas’s Speech

...The issue thus being made up between Mr. Lincoln and myself on three points, we went before the people of the State. During the following seven weeks, between the Chicago speeches and our first meeting at Ottawa, he and I addressed large assemblages of the people in many of the central counties. In my speeches I confined myself closely to those three positions which he had taken controverting his proposition that this Union could not exist as our fathers made it, divided into free and slave States, controverting his proposition of a crusade against the Supreme Court because of the Dred Scott decision, and controverting his proposition that the Declaration of Independence included and meant the negroes as well as the white men, when it declared all men to be created equal. I supposed at that time that these propositions constituted a distinct issue between us, and that the opposite positions we had taken upon them we would be willing to be held to in every part of the State. I never intended to waver one hair’s breadth from that issue either in the north or the south, or wherever I should address the people of Illinois. I hold that when the time arrives that I cannot proclaim my political creed in the same terms not only in the northern but the southern part of Illinois, not only in the northern but the southern States, and wherever the American flag waves over American soil, that then there must be something wrong in that creed. So long as we live under a common constitution, so long as we live in a confederacy of sovereign and equal States, joined together as one for certain purposes, that any political creed is radically wrong which cannot be proclaimed in every State, and every section of that Union alike. I took up Mr. Lincoln’s three propositions in my several speeches, analyzed them, and pointed out what I believed to be the radical errors contained in them. First, in regard to his doctrine that this government was in violation of the law of God which says, that a house divided against itself cannot stand, I repudiated it as a slander upon the immortal framers of our constitution. I then said, have often repeated, and now again assert, that in my opinion this government can endure forever, divided into free and slave States as our fathers made it,—each State having the right to prohibit, abolish or sustain slavery just as it pleases. This government was made upon the great basis of the sovereignty of the States, the right of each State to regulate its own domestic institutions to suit itself, and that right was conferred with understanding and expectation that inasmuch as each
locality had separate interests, each locality must have different and distinct local and domestic institutions, corresponding to its wants and interests. Our fathers knew when they made the government, that the laws and institutions which were well adapted to the green mountains of Vermont, were unsuited to the rice plantations of South Carolina. They knew then, as well as we know now, that the laws and institutions which would be well adapted to the beautiful prairies of Illinois would not be suited to the mining regions of California. They knew that in a Republic as broad as this, having such a variety of soil, climate and interest, there must necessarily be a corresponding variety of local laws—the policy and institutions of each State adapted to its condition and wants. For this reason this Union was established on the right of each State to do as it pleased on the question of slavery, and every other question; and the various States were not allowed to complain of, much less interfere, with the policy of their neighbors.

Suppose the doctrine advocated by Mr. Lincoln and the abolitionists of this day had prevailed when the Constitution was made, what would have been the result? Imagine for a moment that Mr. Lincoln had been a member of the convention that framed the Constitution of the United States, and that when its members were about to sign that wonderful document, he had arisen in that convention as he did at Springfield this summer, and addressing himself to the President, had said, "a house divided against itself cannot stand; this government divided into free and slave States cannot endure, they must all be free or all be slave, they must all be one thing or all the other, otherwise, it is a violation of the law of God, and cannot continue to exist;"—suppose Mr. Lincoln had convinced that body of sages, that that doctrine was sound, what would have been the result? Remember that the Union was then composed of thirteen States, twelve of which were slaveholding and one free. Do you think that the one free State would have outvoted the twelve slaveholding States, and thus have secured the abolition of slavery? On the other hand, would not the twelve slaveholding States have outvoted the one free State, and thus have fastened slavery, by a Constitutional provision, on every foot of the American Republic forever? You see that if this abolition doctrine of Mr. Lincoln had prevailed when the government was made, it would have established slavery as a permanent institution, in all the States whether they wanted it or not, and the question for us to determine in Illinois now as one of the free
States is, whether or not we are willing, having become the majority section, to enforce a doctrine on the minority, which we would have resisted with our heart's blood had it been attempted on us when we were in a minority. How has the South lost her power as the majority section in this Union, and how have the free States gained it, except under the operation of that principle which declares the right of the people of each State and each territory to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way. It was under that principle that slavery was abolished in New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania; it was under that principle that one half of the slaveholding States became free; it was under that principle that the number of free States increased until from being one out of twelve States, we have grown to be the majority of States of the whole Union, with the power to control the House of Representatives and Senate, and the power, consequently, to elect a President by Northern votes without the aid of a Southern State. Having obtained this power under the operation of that great principle, are you now prepared to abandon the principle and declare that merely because we have the power you will wage a war against the Southern States and their institutions until you force them to abolish slavery everywhere....

But the Abolition party really think that under the Declaration of Independence the negro is equal to the white man, and that negro equality is an inalienable right conferred by the Almighty, and hence, that all human laws in violation of it are null and void. With such men it is no use for me to argue. I hold that the signers of the Declaration of Independence had no reference to negroes at all when they declared all men to be created equal. They did not mean negro, nor the savage Indians, nor the Fejee Islanders, nor any other barbarous race. They were speaking of white men. They alluded to men of European birth and European descent—to white men, and to none others, when they declared that doctrine. I hold that this Government was established on the white basis. It was established by white men for the benefit of white men and their posterity forever, and should be administered by white men, and none others. But it does not follow, by any means, that merely because the negro is not a citizen, and merely because he is not our equal, that, therefore, he should be a slave. On the contrary, it does follow, that we ought to extend to the negro race, and to all other dependent races all the rights, all the privileges, and all the immunities which they
can exercise consistently with the safety of society. Humanity requires that we should give them all these privileges; Christianity commands that we should extend those privileges to them. The question then arises what are those privileges, and what is the nature and extent of them. My answer is that that is a question which each State must answer for itself. We in Illinois have decided it for ourselves. We tried slavery, kept it up for twelve years, and finding that it was not profitable we abolished it for that reason, and became a free State. We adopted in its stead the policy that a negro in this State shall not be a slave and shall not be a citizen. We have a right to adopt that policy. For my part I think it is a wise and sound policy for us. You in Missouri must judge for yourselves whether it is a wise policy for you. If you choose to follow our example, very good; if you reject it, still well, it is your business, not ours. So with Kentucky. Let Kentucky adopt a policy to suit herself. If we do not like it we will keep away from it, and if she does not like ours let her stay at home, mind her own business and let us alone. If the people of all the States will act on that great principle, and each State mind its own business, attend to its own affairs, take care of its own negroes and not meddle with its neighbors, then there will be peace between the North and the South, the East and the West, throughout the whole Union. Why can we not thus have peace? Why should we thus allow a sectional party to agitate this country, to array the North against the South, and convert us into enemies instead of friends, merely that a few ambitious men may ride into power on a sectional hobby? How long is it since these ambitious Northern men wished for a sectional organization? Did any one of them dream of a sectional party as long as the North was the weaker section and the South the stronger? Then all were opposed to sectional parties; but the moment the North obtained the majority in the House and Senate by the admission of California, and could elect a President without the aid of Southern votes, that moment ambitious Northern men formed a scheme to excite the North against the South, and make the people be governed in their votes by geographical lines, thinking that the North, being the stronger section, would outvote the South, and consequently they, the leaders, would ride into office on a sectional hobby. I am told that my hour is out. It was very short.
Abraham Lincoln's Reply

...At Galesburg the other day, I said in answer to Judge Douglas, that three years ago there never had been a man, so far as I knew or believed, in the whole world, who had said that the Declaration of Independence did not include negroes in the term "all men." I reassert it today. I assert that Judge Douglas and all his friends may search the whole records of the country, and it will be a matter of great astonishment to me if they shall be able to find that one human being three years ago had ever uttered the astounding sentiment that the term "all men" in the Declaration did not include the negro. Do not let me be misunderstood. I know that more than three years ago there were men who, finding this assertion constantly in the way of their schemes to bring about the ascendency and perpetuation of slavery, denied the truth of it. I know that Mr. Calhoun and all the politicians of his school denied the truth of the Declaration. I know that it ran along in the mouths of some Southern men for a period of years, ending at last in that shameful though rather forcible declaration of Pettit of Indiana, upon the floor of the United States Senate, that the Declaration of Independence was in that respect "a self-evident lie," rather than a self-evident truth. But I say, with a perfect knowledge of all this hawking at the Declaration without directly attacking it, that three years ago there never had lived a man who had ventured to assail it in the sneaking way of pretending to believe it and then asserting it did not include the negro. I believe the first man who ever said it was Chief Justice Taney in the Dred Scott case, and the next to him was our friend Stephen A. Douglas. And now it has become the catch-word of the entire party. I would like to call upon his friends everywhere to consider how they have come in so short a time to view this matter in a way so entirely different from their former belief? to ask whether they are not being borne along by an irresistible current—whither, they know not?...

And when this new principle—this new proposition that no human being ever thought of three years ago,—is brought forward, I combat it as having an evil tendency, if not an evil design; I combat it as having a tendency to dehumanize the negro—to take away from him
the right of ever striving to be a man. I combat it as being one of the thousand things constantly done in these days to prepare the public mind to make property, and nothing but property of the negro in all the States of this Union....

Again; the institution of slavery is only mentioned in the Constitution of the United States two or three times, and in neither of these cases does the word "slavery" or "negro race" occur; but covert language is used each time, and for a purpose full of significance. What is the language in regard to the prohibition of the African slave trade? It runs in about this way: "The migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight."

The next allusion in the Constitution to the question of slavery and the black race, is on the subject of the basis of representation, and there the language used is, "Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed—three-fifths of all other persons."

It says "persons," not slaves, not negroes; but this "three-fifths" can be applied to no other class among us than the negroes.

Lastly, in the provision for the reclamation of fugitive slaves it is said: "No person held to service or labor in one State under the laws thereof escaping into another, shall in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up, on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due." There again there is no mention of the word "negro" or of slavery. In all three of these places, being the only allusions to slavery in the instrument, covert language is used. Language is used not suggesting that slavery existed or that the black race were among us. And I understand the contemporaneous history of those times to be that covert language was used with a purpose, and that purpose was that in our Constitution, which it was hoped and is still hoped will endure forever—when it should be read by intelligent and patriotic men, after
the institution of slavery had passed from among us—there should be nothing on the face of the great charter of liberty suggesting that such a thing as negro slavery had ever existed among us. This is part of the evidence that the fathers of the Government expected and intended the institution of slavery to come to an end. They expected and intended that it should be in the course of ultimate extinction. And when I say that I desire to see the further spread of it arrested I only say I desire to see that done which the fathers have first done. When I say I desire to see it placed where the public mind will rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction, I only say I desire to see it placed where they placed it. It is not true that our fathers, as Judge Douglas assumes, made this government part slave and part free. Understand the sense in which he puts it. He assumes that slavery is a rightful thing within itself,—was introduced by the framers of the Constitution. The exact truth is, that they found the institution existing among us, and they left it as they found it. But in making the government they left this institution with many clear marks of disapprobation upon it. They found slavery among them and they left it among them because of the difficulty—the absolute impossibility of its immediate removal. And when Judge Douglas asks me why we cannot let it remain part slave and part free as the fathers of the government made, he asks a question based upon an assumption which is itself a falsehood; and I turn upon him and ask him the question, when the policy that the fathers of the government had adopted in relation to this element among us was the best policy in the world—the only wise policy—the only policy that we can ever safely continue upon—that will ever give us peace unless this dangerous element masters us all and becomes a national institution—I turn upon him and ask him why he could not let it alone? I turn and ask him why he was driven to the necessity of introducing a new policy in regard to it? He has himself said he introduced a new policy. He said so in his speech on the 22nd of March of the present year, 1858. I ask him why he could not let it remain where our fathers placed it? I ask too of Judge Douglas and his friends why we shall not again place this institution upon the basis on which the fathers left it? I ask you when he infers that I am in favor of setting the free and slave States at war, when the institution was placed in that attitude by those who made the constitution, did they make any war? If we had no war out of it when thus placed, wherein is the ground of belief that we shall have war out of it if we return to that policy? Have we
had any peace upon this matter springing from any other basis? I maintain that we have not. I have proposed nothing more than a return to the policy of the fathers....

I have stated upon former occasions, and I may as well state again, what I understand to be the real issue in this controversy between Judge Douglas and myself. On the point of my wanting to make war between the free and the slave States, there has been no issue between us. So, too, when he assumes that I am in favor of introducing a perfect social and political equality between the white and black races. These are false issues, upon which Judge Douglas has tried to force the controversy. There is no foundation in truth for the charge that I maintain either of these propositions. The real issue in this controversy—the one pressing upon every mind—is the sentiment on the part of one class that looks upon the institution of slavery as a wrong, and of another class that does not look upon it as a wrong. The sentiment that contemplates the institution of slavery in this country as a wrong is the sentiment of the Republican party. It is the sentiment around which all their actions—all their arguments circle—from which all their propositions radiate. They look upon it as being a moral, social and political wrong; and while they contemplate it as such, they nevertheless have due regard for its actual existence among us, and the difficulties of getting rid of it in any satisfactory way and to all the constitutional obligations thrown about it. Yet having a due regard for these, they desire a policy in regard to it that looks to its not creating any more danger. They insist that it should as far as may be, be treated as a wrong, and one of the methods of treating it as a wrong is to make provision that it shall grow no larger. They also desire a policy that looks to a peaceful end of slavery at sometime, as being wrong. These are the views they entertain in regard to it as I understand them; and all their sentiments—all their arguments and propositions are brought within this range. I have said and I repeat it here, that if there be a man amongst us who does not think that the institution of slavery is wrong in any one of the aspects of which I have spoken, he is misplaced and ought not to be with us. And if there be a man amongst us who is so impatient of it as a wrong as to disregard its actual presence among us and the difficulty of getting rid of it suddenly in a satisfactory way, and to disregard the constitutional obligations thrown about it, that man is misplaced if he is on our platform. We disclaim sympathy with him in practical action. He is not placed properly with us.
On this subject of treating it as a wrong, and limiting its spread, let me say a word. Has anything ever threatened the existence of this Union save and except this very institution of Slavery? What is it that we hold most dear amongst us? Our own liberty and prosperity. What has ever threatened our liberty and prosperity save and except this institution of Slavery? If this is true, how do you propose to improve the condition of things by enlarging Slavery—by spreading it out and making it bigger? You may have a wen or a cancer upon your person and not be able to cut it out lest you bleed to death; but surely it is no way to cure it, to engraft it and spread it over your whole body. That is no proper way of treating what you regard a wrong. You see this peaceful way of dealing with it as a wrong—restricting the spread of it, and not allowing it to go into new countries where it has not already existed. That is the peaceful way, the old-fashioned way, the way in which the fathers themselves set us the example.

On the other hand, I have said there is a sentiment which treats it as not being wrong. That is the Democratic sentiment of this day. I do not mean to say that every man who stands within that range positively asserts that it is right. That class will include all who positively assert that it is right, and all who like Judge Douglas treat it as indifferent and do not say it is either right or wrong. These two classes of men fall within the general class of those who do not look upon it as a wrong. And if there be among you anybody who supposes that he as a Democrat, can consider himself "as much opposed to slavery as anybody," I would like to reason with him. You never treat it as a wrong. What other thing that you consider as a wrong, do you deal with as you deal with that? Perhaps you say it is wrong, but your leader never does, and you quarrel with anybody who says it is wrong. Although you pretend to say so yourself you can find no fit place to deal with it as a wrong. You must not say anything about it in the free States, because it is not here. You must not say anything about it in the slave States, because it is there. You must not say anything about it in the pulpit, because that is religion and has nothing to do with it. You must not say anything about it in politics, because that will disturb the security of "my place." There is no place to talk about it as being a wrong, although you say yourself it is a wrong. But finally you will screw yourself up to the belief that if the people of the slave States should adopt a system of gradual emancipation on the slavery question, you would be in favor of it. You would be in favor of it. You
say that is getting it in the right place, and you would be glad to see it succeed. But you are
deceiving yourself. You all know that Frank Blair and Gratz Brown, down there in St. Louis,
undertook to introduce that system in Missouri. They fought as valiantly as they could for
the system of gradual emancipation which you pretend you would be glad to see succeed.

Now I will bring you to the test. After a hard fight they were beaten, and when the news
came over here you threw up your hats and hurrahed for Democracy. More than that, take
all the argument made in favor of the system you have proposed, and it carefully excludes
the idea that there is anything wrong in the institution of slavery. The arguments to sustain
that policy carefully excluded it. Even here today you heard Judge Douglas quarrel with me
because I uttered a wish that it might sometime come to an end. Although Henry Clay
could say he wished every slave in the United States was in the country of his ancestors, I
am denounced by those pretending to respect Henry Clay for uttering a wish that it might
sometime, in some peaceful way, come to an end. The Democratic policy in regard to that
institution will not tolerate the merest breath, the slightest hint, of the least degree of wrong
about it. Try it by some of Judge Douglas' arguments. He says he "don't care whether it is
voted up or voted down" in the Territories. I do not care myself in dealing with that expres-
sion, whether it is intended to be expressive of his individual sentiments on the subject, or
only of the national policy he desires to have established. It is alike valuable for my purpose.
Any man can say that who does not see anything wrong in slavery, but no man can logically
say it who does see a wrong in it; because no man can logically say he don't care whether a
wrong is voted up or voted down. He may say he don't care whether an indifferent thing is
voted up or down, but he must logically have a choice between a right thing and a wrong
thing. He contends that whatever community wants slaves has a right to have them. So they
have if it is not a wrong. But if it is a wrong, he cannot say people have a right to do wrong.

He says that upon the score of equality, slaves should be allowed to go in a new Territory,
like other property. This is strictly logical if there is no difference between it and other
property. If it and other property are equal, his argument is entirely logical. But if you insist
that one is wrong and the other right, there is no use to institute a comparison between
right and wrong. You may turn over everything in the Democratic policy from beginning
to end, whether in the shape it takes on the statute book, in the shape it takes in the Dred
Scott decision, in the shape it takes in conversation or the shape it takes in short maxim-like arguments—it everywhere carefully excludes the idea that there is anything wrong in it.

That is the real issue. That is the issue that will continue in this country when these poor tongues of Judge Douglas and myself shall be silent. It is the eternal struggle between these two principles—right and wrong—throughout the world. They are the two principles that have stood face to face from the beginning of time; and will ever continue to struggle. The one is the common right of humanity and the other the divine right of kings. It is the same principle in whatever shape it develops itself. It is the same spirit that says, "You work and toil and earn bread, and I'll eat it." No matter in what shape it comes, whether from the mouth of a king who seeks to bestride the people of his own nation and live by the fruit of their labor, or from one race of men as an apology for enslaving another race, it is the same tyrannical principle. I was glad to express my gratitude at Quincy, and I re-express it here to Judge Douglas—that he looks to no end of the institution of slavery. That will help the people to see where the struggle really is. It will hereafter place with us all men who really do wish the wrong may have an end. And whenever we can get rid of the fog which obscures the real question—when we can get Judge Douglas and his friends to avow a policy looking to its perpetuation—we can get out from among them that class of men and bring them to the side of those who treat it as a wrong. Then there will soon be an end of it, and that end will be its "ultimate extinction." Whenever the issue can be distinctly made, and all extraneous matter thrown out so that men can fairly see the real difference between the parties, this controversy will soon be settled, and it will be done peaceably too. There will be no war, no violence. It will be placed again where the wisest and best men of the world, placed it. Brooks of South Carolina once declared that when this Constitution was framed, its framers did not look to the institution existing until this day. When he said this, I think he stated a fact that is fully borne out by the history of the times. But he also said they were better and wiser men than the men of these days; yet the men of these days had experience which they had not, and by the invention of the cotton gin it became a necessity in this country that slavery should be perpetual. I now say that willingly or unwillingly, purposely or without purpose, Judge Douglas has been the most prominent instrument in changing
the position of the institution of slavery which the fathers of the government expected to
come to an end ere this—and putting it upon Brooks’ cotton gin basis,—placing it where he
openly confesses he has no desire there shall ever be an end of it....

**Senator Stephen Douglas’s Reply**

5 Mr. Lincoln has concluded his remarks by saying that there is not such an Abolitionist as I
am in all America. If he could make the Abolitionists of Illinois believe that, he would not
have much show for the Senate. Let him make the Abolitionists believe the truth of that
statement and his political back is broken.

His first criticism upon me is the expression of his hope that the war of the administration
will be prosecuted against me and the Democratic party of his State with vigor. He wants
that war prosecuted with vigor; I have no doubt of it. His hopes of success, and the hopes
of his party depend solely upon it. They have no chance of destroying the Democracy of
this State except by the aid of federal patronage. He has all the federal office-holders here
as his allies, running separate tickets against the Democracy to divide the party although
the leaders all intend to vote directly the Abolition ticket, and only leave the green-horns
to vote this separate ticket who refuse to go into the Abolition camp. There is something
really refreshing in the thought that Mr. Lincoln is in favor of prosecuting one war vigor-
ously. It is the first war I ever knew him to be in favor of prosecuting. It is the first war that
I ever knew him to believe to be just or constitutional. When the Mexican war [was] being
waged, and the American army was surrounded by the enemy in Mexico, he thought that
war was unconstitutional, unnecessary and unjust. He thought it was not commenced on
the right **spot**.

When I made an incidental allusion of that kind in the joint discussion over at Charleston
some weeks ago, Lincoln, in replying, said that I, Douglas, had charged him with voting
against supplies for the Mexican war, and then he reared up, full length, and swore that he
never voted against the supplies—that it was a slander—and caught hold of Ficklin, who
sat on the stand, and said, "Here, Ficklin, tell the people that it is a lie." Well, Ficklin, who
had served in Congress with him, stood up and told them all that he recollected about it. It
was that when George Ashmun, of Massachusetts, brought forward a resolution declaring the war unconstitutional, unnecessary, and unjust, that Lincoln had voted for it. "Yes," said Lincoln, "I did." Thus he confessed that he voted that the war was wrong, that our country was in the wrong, and consequently that the Mexicans were in the right; but charged that I had slandered him by saying that he voted against the supplies. I never charged him with voting against the supplies in my life, because I knew that he was not in Congress when they were voted. The war was commenced on the 13th day of May, 1846, and on that day we appropriated in Congress ten millions of dollars and fifty thousand men to prosecute it. During the same session we voted more men and more money, and at the next session we voted more men and more money, so that by the time Mr. Lincoln entered Congress we had enough men and enough money to carry on the war, and had no occasion to vote any more. When he got into the House, being opposed to the war, and not being able to stop the supplies, because they had all gone forward, all he could do was to follow the lead of Corwin, and prove that the war was not begun on the right spot, and that it was unconstitutional, unnecessary, and wrong. Remember, too, that this he did after the war had been begun. It is one thing to be opposed to the declaration of a war, another and very different thing to take sides with the enemy against your own country after the war has been commenced. Our army was in Mexico at the time, many battles had been fought; our citizens, who were defending the honor of their country's flag, were surrounded by the daggers, the guns and the poison of the enemy. Then it was that Corwin made his speech in which he declared that the American soldiers ought to be welcomed by the Mexicans with bloody hands and hospitable graves; then it was that Ashmun and Lincoln voted in the House of Representatives that the war was unconstitutional and unjust; and Ashmun's resolution, Corwin's speech, and Lincoln's vote were sent to Mexico and read at the head of the Mexican army, to prove to them that there was a Mexican party in the Congress of the United States who were doing all in their power to aid them. That a man who takes sides with the common enemy against his own country in time of war should rejoice in a war being made on me now, is very natural. And in my opinion, no other kind of a man would rejoice in it....
Mr. Lincoln tries to avoid the main issue by attacking the truth of my proposition, that our fathers made this government divided into free and slave States, recognizing the right of each to decide all its local questions for itself. Did they not thus make it? It is true that they did not establish slavery in any of the States, or abolish it in any of them; but finding thirteen States twelve of which were slave and one free, they agreed to form a government uniting them together, as they stood divided into free and slave States, and to guarantee forever to each State the right to do as it pleased on the slavery question. Having thus made the government, and conferred this right upon each State forever, I assert that this government can exist as they made it, divided into free and slave States, if any one State chooses to retain slavery. He says that he looks forward to a time when slavery shall be abolished everywhere. I look forward to a time when each State shall be allowed to do as it pleases. If it chooses to keep slavery forever, it is not my business, but its own; if it chooses to abolish slavery, it is its own business—not mine. I care more for the great principle of self-government, the right of the people to rule, than I do for all the negroes in Christendom. I would not endanger the perpetuity of this Union. I would not blot out the great inalienable rights of the white men for all the negroes that ever existed. Hence, I say, let us maintain this government on the principles that our fathers made it, recognizing the right of each State to keep slavery as long as its people determine, or to abolish it when they please. But Mr. Lincoln says that when our fathers made this government they did not look forward to the state of things now existing; and therefore he thinks the doctrine was wrong; and he quotes Brooks, of South Carolina, to prove that our fathers then thought that probably slavery would be abolished, by each State acting for itself before this time. Suppose they did; suppose they did not foresee what has occurred,—does that change the principles of our government? They did not probably foresee the telegraph that transmits intelligence by lightning, nor did they foresee the railroads that now form the bonds of union between the different States, or the thousand mechanical inventions that have elevated mankind. But do these things change the principles of the government? Our fathers, I say, made this government on the principle of the right of each State to do as it pleases in its own domestic affairs, subject to the constitution, and allowed the people of each to apply to every new
change of circumstance such remedy as they may see fit to improve their condition. This right they have for all time to come....
ABRAHAM LINCOLN (R-IL)

At Cooper Institute

SPEECH EXCERPT

February 27, 1860

Cooper Union | New York City, New York

BACKGROUND

Sponsored by the Young Men’s Central Republican Union, Abraham Lincoln gave this speech reflecting on the Dred Scott decision in the months leading up to the Republican convention.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What problems does Lincoln identify with the Supreme Court's reasoning in Dred Scott?

2. What is his primary criticism of the strategy of the southern people?

3. What does he think should be the Republican strategy with respect to the territories?

4. What does Lincoln see as the future for slavery in the United States?

...But enough! Let all who believe that "our fathers, who framed the Government under which we live, understood this question just as well, and even better, than we do now," speak as they spoke, and act as they acted upon it. This is all Republicans ask—all Republicans desire—in relation to slavery. As those fathers marked it, so let it be again marked, as an evil not to be extended, but to be tolerated and protected only because of and so far as its actual presence among us makes that toleration and protection a necessity. Let all the guarantees those fathers gave it, be, not grudgingly, but fully and fairly maintained. For this Republicans contend, and with this, so far as I know or believe, they will be content.

And now, if they would listen—as I suppose they will not—I would address a few words to the Southern people....

Your purpose, then, plainly stated, is, that you will destroy the Government, unless you be allowed to construe and enforce the Constitution as you please, on all points in dispute between you and us. You will rule or ruin in all events.

This, plainly stated, is your language. Perhaps you will say the Supreme Court has decided the disputed Constitutional question in your favor. Not quite so. But waiving the lawyer's distinction between dictum and decision, the Court have decided the question for you in a sort of way. The Court have substantially said, it is your Constitutional right to take slaves into the federal territories, and to hold them there as property. When I say the decision was made in a sort of way, I mean it was made in a divided Court, by a bare majority of the Judges, and they not quite agreeing with one another in the reasons for making it; that it is so made as that its avowed supporters disagree with one another about its meaning, and that it was mainly based upon a mistaken statement of fact—the statement in the opinion that "the right of property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the Constitution."

An inspection of the Constitution will show that the right of property in a slave is not "distinctly and expressly affirmed" in it. Bear in mind, the Judges do not pledge their judicial opinion that such right is impliedly affirmed in the Constitution; but they pledge their veracity that it is "distinctly and expressly" affirmed there—"distinctly," that is, not mingled
with anything else—"expressly," that is, in words meaning just that, without the aid of any inference, and susceptible of no other meaning.

If they had only pledged their judicial opinion that such right is affirmed in the instrument by implication, it would be open to others to show that neither the word "slave" nor "slavery" is to be found in the Constitution, nor the word "property" even, in any connection with language alluding to the things slave, or slavery, and that wherever in that instrument the slave is alluded to, he is called a "person;”—and wherever his master's legal right in relation to him is alluded to, it is spoken of as "service or labor which may be due,"—as a debt payable in service or labor. Also, it would be open to show, by contemporaneous history, that this mode of alluding to slaves and slavery, instead of speaking of them, was employed on purpose to exclude from the Constitution the idea that there could be property in man.

To show all this, is easy and certain.

When this obvious mistake of the Judges shall be brought to their notice, is it not reasonable to expect that they will withdraw the mistaken statement, and reconsider the conclusion based upon it?

And then it is to be remembered that "our fathers, who framed the Government under which we live"—the men who made the Constitution—decided this same Constitutional question in our favor, long ago—decided it without division among themselves, when making the decision; without division among themselves about the meaning of it after it was made, and, so far as any evidence is left, without basing it upon any mistaken statement of facts.

Under all these circumstances, do you really feel yourselves justified to break up this Government, unless such a court decision as yours is, shall be at once submitted to as a conclusive and final rule of political action? But you will not abide the election of a Republican President! In that supposed event, you say, you will destroy the Union; and then, you say, the great crime of having destroyed it will be upon us! That is cool. A highwayman holds a
pistol to my ear, and mutters through his teeth, "Stand and deliver, or I shall kill you, and then you will be a murderer!"

To be sure, what the robber demanded of me—my money—was my own; and I had a clear right to keep it; but it was no more my own than my vote is my own; and the threat of death to me, to extort my money, and the threat of destruction to the Union, to extort my vote, can scarcely be distinguished in principle.

A few words now to Republicans. *It is exceedingly desirable that all parts of this great Confederacy shall be at peace, and in harmony, one with another. Let us Republicans do our part to have it so. Even though much provoked, let us do nothing through passion and ill temper.*

Even though the southern people will not so much as listen to us, let us calmly consider their demands, and yield to them if, in our deliberate view of our duty, we possibly can. Judging by all they say and do, and by the subject and nature of their controversy with us, let us determine, if we can, what will satisfy them.

Will they be satisfied if the Territories be unconditionally surrendered to them? We know they will not. In all their present complaints against us, the Territories are scarcely mentioned. Invasions and insurrections are the rage now. Will it satisfy them, if, in the future, we have nothing to do with invasions and insurrections? We know it will not. We so know, because we know we never had anything to do with invasions and insurrections; and yet this total abstaining does not exempt us from the charge and the denunciation.

The question recurs, what will satisfy them? Simply this: We must not only let them alone, but we must, somehow, convince them that we do let them alone. This, we know by experience, is no easy task. We have been so trying to convince them from the very beginning of our organization, but with no success. In all our platforms and speeches we have constantly protested our purpose to let them alone; but this has had no tendency to convince them. Alike unavailing to convince them, is the fact that they have never detected a man of us in any attempt to disturb them.
These natural, and apparently adequate means all failing, what will convince them? This, and this only: cease to call slavery wrong, and join them in calling it right. And this must be done thoroughly—done in acts as well as in words. Silence will not be tolerated—we must place ourselves avowedly with them. Senator Douglas's new sedition law must be enacted and enforced, suppressing all declarations that slavery is wrong, whether made in politics, in presses, in pulpits, or in private. We must arrest and return their fugitive slaves with greedy pleasure. We must pull down our Free State constitutions. The whole atmosphere must be disinfected from all taint of opposition to slavery, before they will cease to believe that all their troubles proceed from us.

I am quite aware they do not state their case precisely in this way. Most of them would probably say to us, "Let us alone, do nothing to us, and say what you please about slavery." But we do let them alone—have never disturbed them—so that, after all, it is what we say, which dissatisfies them. They will continue to accuse us of doing, until we cease saying.

I am also aware they have not, as yet, in terms, demanded the overthrow of our Free-State Constitutions. Yet those Constitutions declare the wrong of slavery, with more solemn emphasis, than do all other sayings against it; and when all these other sayings shall have been silenced, the overthrow of these Constitutions will be demanded, and nothing be left to resist the demand. It is nothing to the contrary, that they do not demand the whole of this just now. Demanding what they do, and for the reason they do, they can voluntarily stop nowhere short of this consummation. Holding, as they do, that slavery is morally right, and socially elevating, they cannot cease to demand a full national recognition of it, as a legal right, and a social blessing.

Nor can we justifiably withhold this, on any ground save our conviction that slavery is wrong. If slavery is right, all words, acts, laws, and constitutions against it, are themselves wrong, and should be silenced, and swept away. If it is right, we cannot justly object to its nationality—its universality; if it is wrong, they cannot justly insist upon its extension—its enlargement. All they ask, we could readily grant, if we thought slavery right; all we ask,
they could as readily grant, if they thought it wrong. Their thinking it right, and our think-
ing it wrong, is the precise fact upon which depends the whole controversy. Thinking it
right, as they do, they are not to blame for desiring its full recognition, as being right; but,
thinking it wrong, as we do, can we yield to them? Can we cast our votes with their view,
and against our own? In view of our moral, social, and political responsibilities, can we do
this?

Wrong as we think slavery is, we can yet afford to let it alone where it is, because that much
is due to the necessity arising from its actual presence in the nation; but can we, while our
votes will prevent it, allow it to spread into the National Territories, and to overrun us here
in these Free States? If our sense of duty forbids this, then let us stand by our duty, fearlessly
and effectively. Let us be diverted by none of those sophistical contrivances wherewith we
are so industriously plied and belabored—contrivances such as groping for some middle
ground between the right and the wrong, vain as the search for a man who should be nei-
ther a living man nor a dead man—such as a policy of "don't care" on a question about
which all true men do care—such as Union appeals beseeching true Union men to yield to
Disunionists, reversing the divine rule, and calling, not the sinners, but the righteous to
repentance—such as invocations to Washington, imploring men to unsay what Washing-
ton said, and undo what Washington did.

Neither let us be slandered from our duty by false accusations against us, nor frightened
from it by menaces of destruction to the Government nor of dungeons to ourselves. Let us
have faith that right makes might, and in that faith, let us, to the end, dare to do our duty
as we understand it.
CONFEDERATE VICE-PRESIDENT ALEXANDER STEPHENS

Cornerstone Speech
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BACKGROUND

Three weeks after Abraham Lincoln’s inauguration, the new vice president of the Confederate States of America was invited to address the people of Savannah and the Confederacy on the state of public affairs.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. According to Stephens, what does the "new constitution" of the Confederacy preserve from the "old constitution"?

2. What key improvement does he say have been made as a result of the "new constitution"?

3. Upon what principle does he say the "corner-stone" of the new government rests, and why did the "old constitution" reject it?

4. In what sense does Stephens assert that the principle of equality is preserved in the "new constitution"?

...[W]e are passing through one of the greatest revolutions in the annals of the world. Seven States have within the last three months thrown off an old government and formed a new. This revolution has been signally marked, up to this time, by the fact of its having been accomplished without the loss of a single drop of blood.

This new constitution, or form of government, constitutes the subject to which your attention will be partly invited. In reference to it, I make this first general remark. It amply secures all our ancient rights, franchises, and liberties. All the great principles of Magna Charta are retained in it. No citizen is deprived of life, liberty, or property, but by the judgment of his peers under the laws of the land. The great principle of religious liberty, which was the honor and pride of the old constitution, is still maintained and secured. All the essentials of the old constitution, which have endeared it to the hearts of the American people, have been preserved and perpetuated. Some changes have been made.... Some of these I should have preferred not to have seen made; but these, perhaps, meet the cordial approbation of a majority of this audience, if not an overwhelming majority of the people of the Confederacy. Of them, therefore, I will not speak. But other important changes do meet my cordial approbation. They form great improvements upon the old constitution. So, taking the whole new constitution, I have no hesitancy in giving it as my judgment that it is decidedly better than the old.

Allow me briefly to allude to some of these improvements. The question of building up class interests, or fostering one branch of industry to the prejudice of another under the exercise of the revenue power, which gave us so much trouble under the old constitution, is put at rest forever under the new. We allow the imposition of no duty with a view of giving advantage to one class of persons, in any trade or business, over those of another. All, under our system, stand upon the same broad principles of perfect equality. Honest labor and enterprise are left free and unrestricted in whatever pursuit they may be engaged.... This old thorn of the tariff, which was the cause of so much irritation in the old body politic, is removed forever from the new.
Again, the subject of internal improvements, under the power of Congress to regulate com-
merce, is put at rest under our system. The power claimed by construction under the old
constitution, was at least a doubtful one— it rested solely upon construction. We of the
South, generally apart from considerations of constitutional principles, opposed its exercise
upon grounds of its inexpediency and injustice. Notwithstanding this opposition, millions
of money, from the common treasury had been drawn for such purposes. Our opposition
sprang from no hostility to commerce, or all necessary aids for facilitating it. With us it was
simply a question, upon whom the burden should fall. In Georgia, for instance, we have
done as much for the cause of internal improvements as any other portion of the country
according to population and means.... All this was done to open an outlet for our products
of the interior, and those to the west of us, to reach the marts of the world. No State was in
greater need of such facilities than Georgia, but we did not ask that these works should be
made by appropriations out of the common treasury. The cost of the grading, the super-
structure, and equipments of our roads, was borne by those who entered on the enter-
prise.... What justice was there in taking this money, which our people paid into the com-
mon treasury on the importation of our iron, and applying it to the improvement of rivers
and harbors elsewhere?

The true principle is to subject the commerce of every locality, to whatever burdens may
be necessary to facilitate it. If Charleston harbor needs improvement, let the commerce of
Charleston bear the burden. If the mouth of the Savannah river has to be cleared out, let
the seagoing navigation which is benefitted by it, bear the burden. So with the mouths of
the Alabama and Mississippi river. Just as the products of the interior, our cotton, wheat,
corn, and other articles, have to bear the necessary rates of freight over our railroads to
reach the seas. This is again the broad principle of perfect equality and justice. And it is
especially set forth and established in our new constitution...

But not to be tedious in enumerating the numerous changes for the better, allow me to
allude to one other—though last, not least. The new constitution has put at rest, forever, all
the agitating questions relating to our peculiar institution—African slavery as it exists
amongst us—the proper status of the negro in our form of civilization. This was the immediate cause of the late rupture and present revolution. Jefferson in his forecast, had anticipated this, as the "rock upon which the old Union would split." He was right. What was conjecture with him, is now a realized fact. But whether he fully comprehended the great truth upon which that rock stood and stands, may be doubted. The prevailing ideas entertained by him and most of the leading statesmen at the time of the formation of the old constitution, were that the enslavement of the African was in violation of the laws of nature; that it was wrong in principle, socially, morally, and politically. It was an evil they knew not well how to deal with, but the general opinion of the men of that day was that, somehow or other in the order of Providence, the institution would be evanescent and pass away. This idea, though not incorporated in the constitution, was the prevailing idea at that time. The constitution, it is true, secured every essential guarantee to the institution while it should last, and hence no argument can be justly urged against the constitutional guarantees thus secured, because of the common sentiment of the day. Those ideas, however, were fundamentally wrong. They rested upon the assumption of the equality of races. This was an error. It was a sandy foundation, and the government built upon it fell when the "storm came and the wind blew."

Our new government is founded upon exactly the opposite idea; its foundations are laid, its corner-stone rests upon the great truth, that the negro is not equal to the white man; that slavery—subordination to the superior race—is his natural and normal condition.

This, our new government, is the first, in the history of the world, based upon this great physical, philosophical, and moral truth. This truth has been slow in the process of its development, like all other truths in the various departments of science. It has been so even amongst us. Many who hear me, perhaps, can recollect well, that this truth was not generally admitted, even within their day. The errors of the past generation still clung to many as late as twenty years ago. Those at the North, who still cling to these errors, with a zeal above knowledge, we justly denominate fanatics. All fanaticism springs from an aberration of the mind—from a defect in reasoning. It is a species of insanity. One of the most striking characteristics of insanity, in many instances, is forming correct conclusions from fancied
or erroneous premises; so with the anti-slavery fanatics; their conclusions are right if their premises were. They assume that the negro is equal, and hence conclude that he is entitled to equal privileges and rights with the white man. If their premises were correct, their conclusions would be logical and just—but their premise being wrong, their whole argument fails. I recollect once of having heard a gentleman from one of the northern States, of great power and ability, announce in the House of Representatives, with imposing effect, that we of the South would be compelled, ultimately, to yield upon this subject of slavery, that it was as impossible to war successfully against a principle in politics, as it was in physics or mechanics. That the principle would ultimately prevail. That we, in maintaining slavery as it exists with us, were warring against a principle, a principle founded in nature, the principle of the equality of men. The reply I made to him was, that upon his own grounds, we should, ultimately, succeed, and that he and his associates, in this crusade against our institutions, would ultimately fail. The truth announced, that it was as impossible to war successfully against a principle in politics as it was in physics and mechanics, I admitted; but told him that it was he, and those acting with him, who were warring against a principle. They were attempting to make things equal which the Creator had made unequal.

In the conflict thus far, success has been on our side, complete throughout the length and breadth of the Confederate States. It is upon this, as I have stated, our social fabric is firmly planted; and I cannot permit myself to doubt the ultimate success of a full recognition of this principle throughout the civilized and enlightened world.

As I have stated, the truth of this principle may be slow in development, as all truths are and ever have been, in the various branches of science. It was so with the principles announced by Galileo—it was so with Adam Smith and his principles of political economy. It was so with Harvey, and his theory of the circulation of the blood. It is stated that not a single one of the medical profession, living at the time of the announcement of the truths made by him, admitted them. Now, they are universally acknowledged. May we not, therefore, look with confidence to the ultimate universal acknowledgment of the truths upon which our system rests? It is the first government ever instituted upon the principles in strict conformity to nature, and the ordination of Providence, in furnishing the materials
of human society. Many governments have been founded upon the principle of the subor-
dination and serfdom of certain classes of the same race; such were and are in violation of
the laws of nature. Our system commits no such violation of nature's laws. With us, all of
the white race, however high or low, rich or poor, are equal in the eye of the law. Not so
with the negro. Subordination is his place. He, by nature, or by the curse against Canaan,
is fitted for that condition which he occupies in our system. The architect in the construc-
tion of buildings, lays the foundation with the proper material—the granite; then comes
the brick or the marble. The substratum of our society is made of the material fitted by
nature for it, and by experience we know, that it is best, not only for the superior, but for
the inferior race, that it should be so. It is, indeed, in conformity with the ordinance of the
Creator. It is not for us to inquire into the wisdom of his ordinances, or to question them.
For his own purposes, he has made one race to differ from another, as he has made "one
star to differ from another star in glory."

The great objects of humanity are best attained when there is conformity to his laws and
decrees, in the formation of governments as well as in all things else. Our confederacy is
founded upon principles in strict conformity with these laws. This stone which was rejected
by the first builders "is become the chief of the corner"—the real "corner-stone"—in our
new edifice.

I have been asked, what of the future? It has been apprehended by some that we would have
arrayed against us the civilized world. I care not who or how many they may be against us,
when we stand upon the eternal principles of truth, if we are true to ourselves and the prin-
ciples for which we contend, we are obliged to, and must triumph.

Thousands of people who begin to understand these truths are not yet completely out of
the shell; they do not see them in their length and breadth. We hear much of the civilization
and christianization of the barbarous tribes of Africa. In my judgment, those ends will
never be attained, but by first teaching them the lesson taught to Adam, that "in the sweat
of his brow he should eat his bread," and teaching them to work, and feed, and clothe them-
selves....
Looking to the distant future, and, perhaps, not very far distant either, it is not beyond the range of possibility, and even probability, that all the great States of the north-west will gravitate this way, as well as Tennessee, Kentucky, Missouri, Arkansas, etc. Should they do so, our doors are wide enough to receive them, but not until they are ready to assimilate with us in principle.

The process of disintegration in the old Union may be expected to go on with almost absolute certainty if we pursue the right course. We are now the nucleus of a growing power which, if we are true to ourselves, our destiny, and high mission, will become the controlling power on this continent. To what extent accessions will go on in the process of time, or where it will end, the future will determine... Such are some of the glimpses of the future as I catch them....

In olden times the olive branch was considered the emblem of peace; we will send to the nations of the earth another and far more potential emblem of the same, the cotton plant. The present duties were levied with a view of meeting the present necessities and exigencies, in preparation for war, if need be; but if we have peace, and he hoped we might, and trade should resume its proper course, a duty of ten per cent. upon foreign importations it was thought might be sufficient to meet the expenditures of the government. If some articles should be left on the free list, as they now are, such as breadstuffs, etc., then, of course, duties upon others would have to be higher—but in no event to an extent to embarrass trade and commerce. He concluded in an earnest appeal for union and harmony, on part of all the people in support of the common cause, in which we were all enlisted, and upon the issues of which such great consequences depend.

If, said he, we are true to ourselves, true to our cause, true to our destiny, true to our high mission, in presenting to the world the highest type of civilization ever exhibited by man—there will be found in our lexicon no such word as fail.

Mr. Stephens took his seat, amid a burst of enthusiasm and applause, such as the Athenaeum has never had displayed within its walls, within "the recollection of the oldest inhabitant."
PRESIDENT ABRAHAM LINCOLN (R)
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BACKGROUND

Abraham Lincoln delivered this speech at his inauguration amidst declarations of secession by southern states.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. How does Lincoln try to assuage the fears of Southerners?

2. Why does Lincoln believe that the Union is perpetual?

3. What is Lincoln’s understanding of the purpose of the executive power now confided in him?

4. On constitutional questions, what role does the Supreme Court have with respect to the other branches, in Lincoln’s understanding?

5. What is “the only substantial dispute,” and what are its possible resolutions as Lincoln sees them?

Fellow citizens of the United States:

In compliance with a custom as old as the government itself, I appear before you to address you briefly, and to take, in your presence, the oath prescribed by the Constitution of the United States, to be taken by the President "before he enters on the execution of his office."

I do not consider it necessary, at present for me to discuss those matters of administration about which there is no special anxiety, or excitement.

Apprehension seems to exist among the people of the Southern States, that by the accession of a Republican Administration, their property, and their peace, and personal security, are to be endangered. There has never been any reasonable cause for such apprehension. Indeed, the most ample evidence to the contrary has all the while existed, and been open to their inspection. It is found in nearly all the published speeches of him who now addresses you. I do but quote from one of those speeches when I declare that "I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so." Those who nominated and elected me did so with full knowledge that I had made this, and many similar declarations, and had never recanted them. And more than this, they placed in the platform, for my acceptance, and as a law to themselves, and to me, the clear and emphatic resolution which I now read:

"Resolved, That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depend; and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force of the soil of any State or Territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes."
I now reiterate these sentiments: and in doing so, I only press upon the public attention the most conclusive evidence of which the case is susceptible, that the property, peace and security of no section are to be in anywise endangered by the now incoming Administration. I add too, that all the protection which, consistently with the Constitution and the laws, can be given, will be cheerfully given to all the States when lawfully demanded, for whatever cause—as cheerfully to one section, as to another.

There is much controversy about the delivering up of fugitives from service or labor. The clause I now read is as plainly written in the Constitution as any other of its provisions:

"No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."

It is scarcely questioned that this provision was intended by those who made it, for the reclaiming of what we call fugitive slaves; and the intention of the law-giver is the law. All members of Congress swear their support to the whole Constitution—to this provision as much as to any other. To the proposition, then, that slaves whose cases come within the terms of this clause, "shall be delivered up," their oaths are unanimous. Now, if they would make the effort in good temper, could they not, with nearly equal unanimity, frame and pass a law, by means of which to keep good that unanimous oath?

There is some difference of opinion whether this clause should be enforced by national or by state authority; but surely that difference is not a very material one. If the slave is to be surrendered, it can be of but little consequence to him, or to others, by which authority it is done. And should any one, in any case, be content that his oath shall go unkept, on a merely unsubstantial controversy as to how it shall be kept?

Again, in any law upon this subject, ought not all the safeguards of liberty known in civilized and humane jurisprudence to be introduced, so that a free man be not, in any case,
surrendered as a slave? And might it not be well, at the same time, to provide by law for the enforcement of that clause in the Constitution which guarantees that "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States?"

I take the official oath today, with no mental reservations, and with no purpose to construe the Constitution or laws, by any hypercritical rules. And while I do not choose now to specify particular acts of Congress as proper to be enforced, I do suggest, that it will be much safer for all, both in official and private stations, to conform to, and abide by, all those acts which stand unrepealed, than to violate any of them, trusting to find impunity in having them held to be unconstitutional.

It is seventy-two years since the first inauguration of a President under our national Constitution. During that period fifteen different and greatly distinguished citizens, have, in succession, administered the executive branch of the government. They have conducted it through many perils; and, generally, with great success. Yet, with all this scope for precedent, I now enter upon the same task for the brief constitutional term of four years, under great and peculiar difficulty. A disruption of the Federal Union heretofore only menaced, is now formidably attempted.

I hold, that in contemplation of universal law, and of the Constitution, the Union of these States is perpetual. Perpetuity is implied, if not expressed, in the fundamental law of all national governments. It is safe to assert that no government proper, ever had a provision in its organic law for its own termination. Continue to execute all the express provisions of our national Constitution, and the Union will endure forever—it being impossible to destroy it, except by some action not provided for in the instrument itself.

Again, if the United States be not a government proper, but an association of States in the nature of contract merely, can it, as a contract, be peaceably unmade, by less than all the parties who made it? One party to a contract may violate it—break it, so to speak; but does it not require all to lawfully rescind it?
Descending from these general principles, we find the proposition that, in legal contemplation, the Union is perpetual, confirmed by the history of the Union itself. The Union is much older than the Constitution. It was formed in fact, by the Articles of Association in 1774. It was matured and continued by the Declaration of Independence in 1776. It was further matured and the faith of all the then thirteen States expressly plighted and engaged that it should be perpetual, by the Articles of Confederation in 1778. And finally, in 1787, one of the declared objects for ordaining and establishing the Constitution, was "to form a more perfect union."

But if destruction of the Union, by one, or by a part only, of the States, be lawfully possible, the Union is less perfect than before the Constitution, having lost the vital element of perpetuity.

It follows from these views that no State, upon its own mere motion, can lawfully get out of the Union,—that resolves and ordinances to that effect are legally void; and that acts of violence, within any State or States, against the authority of the United States, are insurrectionary or revolutionary, according to circumstances.

I therefore consider that, in view of the Constitution and the laws, the Union is unbroken; and, to the extent of my ability, I shall take care, as the Constitution itself expressly enjoins upon me, that the laws of the Union be faithfully executed in all the States. Doing this I deem to be only a simple duty on my part; and I shall perform it, so far as practicable, unless my rightful masters, the American people, shall withhold the requisite means, or, in some authoritative manner, direct the contrary. I trust this will not be regarded as a menace, but only as the declared purpose of the Union that it will constitutionally defend, and maintain itself.

In doing this there needs to be no bloodshed or violence; and there shall be none, unless it be forced upon the national authority. The power confided to me, will be used to hold, occupy, and possess the property, and places belonging to the government, and to collect
the duties and imposts; but beyond what may be necessary for these objects, there will be no invasion—no using of force against, or among the people anywhere. Where hostility to the United States, in any interior locality, shall be so great and so universal, as to prevent competent resident citizens from holding the Federal offices, there will be no attempt to force obnoxious strangers among the people for that object. While the strict legal right may exist in the government to enforce the exercise of these offices, the attempt to do so would be so irritating, and so nearly impracticable with all, that I deem it better to forego, for the time, the uses of such offices.

The mails, unless repelled, will continue to be furnished in all parts of the Union. So far as possible, the people everywhere shall have that sense of perfect security which is most favorable to calm thought and reflection. The course here indicated will be followed, unless current events, and experience, shall show a modification, or change, to be proper; and in every case and exigency, my best discretion will be exercised, according to circumstances actually existing, and with a view and a hope of a peaceful solution of the national troubles, and the restoration of fraternal sympathies and affections.

That there are persons in one section, or another who seek to destroy the Union at all events, and are glad of any pretext to do it, I will neither affirm or deny; but if there be such, I need address no word to them. To those, however, who really love the Union, may I not speak?

Before entering upon so grave a matter as the destruction of our national fabric, with all its benefits, its memories, and its hopes, would it not be wise to ascertain precisely why we do it? Will you hazard so desperate a step, while there is any possibility that any portion of the ills you fly from, have no real existence? Will you, while the certain ills you fly to, are greater than all the real ones you fly from? Will you risk the commission of so fearful a mistake? All profess to be content in the Union, if all constitutional rights can be maintained. Is it true, then, that any right, plainly written in the Constitution, has been denied? I think not.
Happily the human mind is so constituted, that no party can reach to the audacity of doing this. Think, if you can, of a single instance in which a plainly written provision of the Constitution has ever been denied. If, by the mere force of numbers, a majority should deprive a minority of any clearly written constitutional right, it might, in a moral point of view, justify revolution—certainly would, if such right were a vital one. But such is not our case. All the vital rights of minorities, and of individuals, are so plainly assured to them, by affirmations and negations, guaranties and prohibitions, in the Constitution, that controversies never arise concerning them. But no organic law can ever be framed with a provision specifically applicable to every question which may occur in practical administration.

No foresight can anticipate, nor any document of reasonable length contain express provisions for all possible questions. Shall fugitives from labor be surrendered by national or by State authority? The Constitution does not expressly say. May Congress prohibit slavery in the territories? The Constitution does not expressly say. Must Congress protect slavery in the territories? The Constitution does not expressly say.

From questions of this class spring all our constitutional controversies, and we divide upon them into majorities and minorities. If the minority will not acquiesce, the majority must, or the government must cease. There is no other alternative; for continuing the government, is acquiescence on one side or the other. If a minority, in such case, will secede rather than acquiesce, they make a precedent which, in turn, will divide and ruin them; for a minority of their own will secede from them, whenever a majority refuses to be controlled by such minority. For instance, why may not any portion of a new confederacy, a year or two hence, arbitrarily secede again, precisely as portions of the present Union now claim to secede from it. All who cherish disunion sentiments, are now being educated to the exact temper of doing this. Is there such perfect identity of interests among the States to compose a new Union, as to produce harmony only, and prevent renewed secession?

Plainly, the central idea of secession, is the essence of anarchy. A majority, held in restraint by constitutional checks, and limitations, and always changing easily, with deliberate changes of popular opinions and sentiments, is the only true sovereign of a free people.
Whoever rejects it, does, of necessity, fly to anarchy or to despotism. Unanimity is impossible; the rule of a minority, as a permanent arrangement, is wholly inadmissible; so that, rejecting the majority principle, anarchy, or despotism in some form, is all that is left.

I do not forget the position assumed by some, that constitutional questions are to be decided by the Supreme Court; nor do I deny that such decisions must be binding in any case, upon the parties to a suit, as to the object of that suit, while they are also entitled to very high respect and consideration, in all parallel cases, by all other departments of the government. And while it is obviously possible that such decision may be erroneous in any given case, still the evil effect following it, being limited to that particular case, with the chance that it may be over-ruled, and never become a precedent for other cases, can better be borne than could the evils of a different practice. At the same time the candid citizen must confess that if the policy of the government, upon vital questions, affecting the whole people, is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the instant they are made, in ordinary litigation between parties, in personal actions, the people will have ceased, to be their own rulers, having, to that extent, practically resigned their government, into the hands of that eminent tribunal. Nor is there, in this view, any assault upon the court, or the judges. It is a duty, from which they may not shrink, to decide cases properly brought before them; and it is no fault of theirs, if others seek to turn their decisions to political purposes.

One section of our country believes slavery is right, and ought to be extended, while the other believes it is wrong, and ought not to be extended. This is the only substantial dispute. The fugitive slave clause of the Constitution, and the law for the suppression of the foreign slave trade, are each as well enforced, perhaps, as any law can ever be in a community where the moral sense of the people imperfectly supports the law itself. The great body of the people abide by the dry legal obligation in both cases, and a few break over in each. This, I think, cannot be perfectly cured; and it would be worse in both cases after the separation of the sections, than before. The foreign slave trade, now imperfectly suppressed, would be ultimately revived without restriction, in one section; while fugitive slaves, now only partially surrendered, would not be surrendered at all, by the other.
Physically speaking, we cannot separate. We cannot remove our respective sections from each other, nor build an impassable wall between them. A husband and wife may be divorced, and go out of the presence, and beyond the reach of each other; but the different parts of our country cannot do this. They cannot but remain face to face; and intercourse, either amicable or hostile, must continue between them. Is it possible then to make that intercourse more advantageous, or more satisfactory, after separation than before? Can aliens make treaties easier than friends can make laws? Can treaties be more faithfully enforced between aliens, than laws can among friends? Suppose you go to war, you cannot fight always; and when, after much loss on both sides, and no gain on either, you cease fighting, the identical old questions, as to terms of intercourse, are again upon you.

This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember, or overthrow it. I can not be ignorant of the fact that many worthy, and patriotic citizens are desirous of having the national constitution amended. While I make no recommendation of amendments, I fully recognize the rightful authority of the people over the whole subject, to be exercised in either of the modes prescribed in the instrument itself; and I should, under existing circumstances, favor, rather than oppose, a fair opportunity being afforded the people to act upon it.

I will venture to add that, to me, the convention mode seems preferable, in that it allows amendments to originate with the people themselves, instead of only permitting them to take, or reject, propositions, originated by others, not especially chosen for the purpose, and which might not be precisely such, as they would wish to either accept or refuse. I understand a proposed amendment to the Constitution—which amendment, however, I have not seen, has passed Congress, to the effect that the federal government, shall never interfere with the domestic institutions of the States, including that of persons held to service. To avoid misconstruction of what I have said, I depart from my purpose not to speak of particular amendments, so far as to say that, holding such a provision to now be implied constitutional law, I have no objection to its being made express, and irrevocable.
The Chief Magistrate derives all his authority from the people, and they have referred none upon him to fix terms for the separation of the States. The people themselves can do this also if they choose; but the executive, as such, has nothing to do with it. His duty is to administer the present government, as it came to his hands, and to transmit it, unimpaired by him, to his successor.

Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people? Is there any better, or equal hope, in the world? In our present differences, is either party without faith of being in the right? If the Almighty Ruler of nations, with his eternal truth and justice, be on your side of the North, or on yours of the South, that truth, and that justice, will surely prevail, by the judgment of this great tribunal, the American people.

By the frame of the government under which we live, this same people have wisely given their public servants but little power for mischief; and have, with equal wisdom, provided for the return of that little to their own hands at very short intervals.

While the people retain their virtue, and vigilance, no administration, by any extreme of wickedness or folly, can very seriously injure the government, in the short space of four years.

My countrymen, one and all, think calmly and well, upon this whole subject. Nothing valuable can be lost by taking time. If there be an object to hurry any of you, in hot haste, to a step which you would never take deliberately, that object will be frustrated by taking time; but no good object can be frustrated by it. Such of you as are now dissatisfied, still have the old Constitution unimpaired, and, on the sensitive point, the laws of your own framing under it; while the new administration will have no immediate power, if it would, to change either. If it were admitted that you who are dissatisfied, hold the right side in the dispute, there still is no single good reason for precipitate action. Intelligence, patriotism, Christianity, and a firm reliance on Him, who has never yet forsaken this favored land, are still competent to adjust, in the best way, all our present difficulty.
In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The government will not assail you. You can have no conflict, without being yourselves the aggressors. You have no oath registered in Heaven to destroy the government, while I shall have the most solemn one to "preserve, protect and defend it."

I am loath to close. We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battle-field, and patriot grave, to every living heart and hearthstone, all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.
PRESIDENT ABRAHAM LINCOLN (R)
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BACKGROUND

President Abraham Lincoln delivered this speech to Congress after the first three months of the Civil War.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. As Lincoln summarizes, what was the policy his administration adopted at the outset of his presidency?

2. According to Lincoln’s account, why was Fort Sumter attacked, and why did it fall?

3. In the aftermath of the Battle of Fort Sumter, what does Lincoln believe the conflict puts at stake?

4. What is the policy of "armed neutrality," and what does Lincoln think will be its consequences?

5. How does Lincoln justify authorizing the Commanding General to suspend the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus?

6. What is the "ingenious sophism" to which Lincoln refers, and why does Lincoln think that it is inconsistent with the Constitution?

7. What gives Lincoln confidence in the people of the Union, and what does he say is the "patriotic instinct of the plain people"?

Fellow-citizens of the Senate and House of Representatives:

Having been convened on an extraordinary occasion, as authorized by the Constitution, your attention is not called to any ordinary subject of legislation.

At the beginning of the present Presidential term, four months ago, the functions of the Federal Government were found to be generally suspended within the several States of South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Florida, excepting only those of the Post Office Department.

Within these States, all the Forts, Arsenals, Dock-yards, Custom-houses, and the like, including the movable and stationary property in, and about them, had been seized, and were held in open hostility to this Government, excepting only Forts Pickens, Taylor, and Jefferson, on, and near the Florida coast, and Fort Sumter, in Charleston harbor, South Carolina. The Forts thus seized had been put in improved condition; new ones had been built; and armed forces had been organized, and were organizing, all avowedly with the same hostile purpose.

The Forts remaining in the possession of the Federal government, in, and near, these States, were either besieged or menaced by warlike preparations; and especially Fort Sumter was nearly surrounded by well-protected hostile batteries, with guns equal in quality to the best of its own, and outnumbering the latter as perhaps ten to one. A disproportionate share, of the Federal muskets and rifles, had somehow found their way into these States, and had been seized, to be used against the government. Accumulations of the public revenue, lying within them, had been seized for the same object. The Navy was scattered in distant seas; leaving but a very small part of it within the immediate reach of the government. Officers of the Federal Army and Navy, had resigned in great numbers; and, of those resigning, a large proportion had taken up arms against the government. Simultaneously, and in connection, with all this, the purpose to sever the Federal Union, was openly avowed. In accordance with this purpose, an ordinance had been adopted in each of these States, declaring the States, respectively, to be separated from the National Union. A formula for insti-
Substituting a combined government of these states had been promulgated; and this illegal organization, in the character of confederate States was already invoking recognition, aid, and intervention, from Foreign Powers.

Finding this condition of things, and believing it to be an imperative duty upon the incoming Executive, to prevent, if possible, the consummation of such attempt to destroy the Federal Union, a choice of means to that end became indispensable. This choice was made; and was declared in the Inaugural address. The policy chosen looked to the exhaustion of all peaceful measures, before a resort to any stronger ones. It sought only to hold the public places and property, not already wrested from the Government, and to collect the revenue; relying for the rest, on time, discussion, and the ballot-box. It promised a continuance of the mails, at government expense, to the very people who were resisting the government; and it gave repeated pledges against any disturbance to any of the people, or any of their rights. Of all that which a president might constitutionally, and justifiably, do in such a case, everything was foreborne, without which, it was believed possible to keep the government on foot.

On the 5th of March, (the present incumbent’s first full day in office) a letter of Major Anderson, commanding at Fort Sumter, written on the 28th of February, and received at the War Department on the 4th of March, was, by that Department, placed in his hands. This letter expressed the professional opinion of the writer, that reinforcements could not be thrown into that Fort within the time for his relief, rendered necessary by the limited supply of provisions, and with a view of holding possession of the same, with a force of less than twenty thousand good, and well-disciplined men. This opinion was concurred in by all the officers of his command; and their memoranda on the subject, were made enclosures of Major Anderson’s letter. The whole was immediately laid before Lieutenant General Scott, who at once concurred with Major Anderson in opinion. On reflection, however, he took full time, consulting with other officers, both of the Army and the Navy; and, at the end of four days, came reluctantly, but decidedly, to the same conclusion as before. He also stated at the same time that no such sufficient force was then at the control of the Government, or could be raised, and brought to the ground, within the time when the provisions in the
Fort would be exhausted. In a purely military point of view, this reduced the duty of the administration, in the case, to the mere matter of getting the garrison safely out of the Fort.

It was believed, however, that to so abandon that position, under the circumstances, would be utterly ruinous; that the necessity under which it was to be done, would not be fully understood—that, by many, it would be construed as a part of a voluntary policy—that, at home, it would discourage the friends of the Union, embolden its adversaries, and go far to insure to the latter, a recognition abroad—that, in fact, it would be our national destruction consummated. This could not be allowed. Starvation was not yet upon the garrison; and ere it would be reached, Fort Pickens might be reinforced. This last, would be a clear indication of policy, and would better enable the country to accept the evacuation of Fort Sumter, as a military necessity. An order was at once directed to be sent for the landing of the troops from the Steamship Brooklyn, into Fort Pickens. This order could not go by land, but must take the longer, and slower route by sea. The first return news from the order was received just one week before the fall of Fort Sumter. The news itself was, that the officer commanding the Sabine, to which vessel the troops had been transferred from the Brooklyn, acting upon some quasi armistice of the late administration, (and of the existence of which, the present administration, up to the time the order was despatched, had only too vague and uncertain rumors, to fix attention) had refused to land the troops. To now reinforce Fort Pickens, before a crisis would be reached at Fort Sumter was impossible—rendered so by the near exhaustion of provisions in the latter-named Fort. In precaution against such a conjuncture, the government had, a few days before, commenced preparing an expedition, as well adapted as might be, to relieve Fort Sumter, which expedition was intended to be ultimately used, or not, according to circumstances. The strongest anticipated case, for using it, was now presented; and it was resolved to send it forward. As had been intended, in this contingency, it was also resolved to notify the Governor of South Carolina, that he might expect an attempt would be made to provision the Fort; and that, if the attempt should not be resisted, there would be no effort to throw in men, arms, or ammunition, without further notice, or in case of an attack upon the Fort. This notice was
accordingly given; whereupon the Fort was attacked, and bombarded to its fall, without even awaiting the arrival of the provisioning expedition.

It is thus seen that the assault upon, and reduction of, Fort Sumter, was, in no sense, a matter of self-defense on the part of the assailants. They well knew that the garrison in the Fort could, by no possibility, commit aggression upon them. They knew—they were expressly notified—that the giving of bread to the few brave and hungry men of the garrison, was all which would on that occasion be attempted, unless themselves, by resisting so much, should provoke more. They knew that this Government desired to keep the garrison in the Fort, not to assail them, but merely to maintain visible possession, and thus to preserve the Union from actual, and immediate dissolution—trusting, as herein-before stated, to time, discussion, and the ballot-box, for final adjustment; and they assailed, and reduced the Fort, for precisely the reverse object—to drive out the visible authority of the Federal Union, and thus force it to immediate dissolution.

That this was their object, the Executive well understood; and having said to them in the inaugural address, "You can have no conflict without being yourselves the aggressors," he took pains, not only to keep this declaration good, but also to keep the case so free from the power of ingenious sophistry, as that the world should not be able to misunderstand it. By the affair at Fort Sumter, with its surrounding circumstances, that point was reached. Then, and thereby, the assailants of the Government, began the conflict of arms, without a gun in sight, or in expectancy, to return their fire, save only the few in the Fort, sent to that harbor, years before, for their own protection, and still ready to give that protection, in whatever was lawful. In this act, discarding all else, they have forced upon the country, the distinct issue: "Immediate dissolution, or blood."

And this issue embraces more than the fate of these United States. It presents to the whole family of man, the question, whether a constitutional republic, or a democracy—a government of the people, by the same people—can, or cannot, maintain its territorial integrity, against its own domestic foes. It presents the question, whether discontented individuals, too few in numbers to control administration, according to organic law, in any case, can
always, upon the pretences made in this case, or on any other pretences, or arbitrarily, without any pretence, break up their Government, and thus practically put an end to free government upon the earth. It forces us to ask: "Is there, in all republics, this inherent, and fatal weakness?" "Must a government, of necessity, be too strong for the liberties of its own people, or too weak to maintain its own existence?"

So viewing the issue, no choice was left but to call out the war power of the Government; and so to resist force, employed for its destruction, by force, for its preservation.

The call was made; and the response of the country was most gratifying; surpassing, in unanimity and spirit, the most sanguine expectation. Yet none of the States commonly called Slave-states, except Delaware, gave a Regiment through regular State organization. A few regiments have been organized within some others of those states, by individual enterprise, and received into the government service. Of course the seceded States, so called, (and to which Texas had been joined about the time of the inauguration), gave no troops to the cause of the Union. The border States, so called, were not uniform in their actions; some of them being almost for the Union, while in others—as Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Arkansas—the Union sentiment was nearly repressed, and silenced. The course taken in Virginia was the most remarkable—perhaps the most important. A convention, elected by the people of that State, to consider this very question of disrupting the Federal Union, was in session at the capital of Virginia when Fort Sumter fell. To this body the people had chosen a large majority of professed Union men. Almost immediately after the fall of Sumter, many members of that majority went over to the original disunion minority, and, with them, adopted an ordinance for withdrawing the State from the Union. Whether this change was wrought by their great approval of the assault upon Sumter, or their great resentment at the government’s resistance to that assault, is not definitely known. Although they submitted the ordinance, for ratification, to a vote of the people, to be taken on a day then somewhat more than a month distant, the convention, and the Legislature, (which was also in session at the same time and place) with leading men of the State, not members of either, immediately commenced acting, as if the State were already out of the Union. They pushed military preparations vigorously forward all over the state.
They seized the United States Armory at Harper’s Ferry, and the Navy-yard at Gosport, near Norfolk. They received—perhaps invited—into their state, large bodies of troops, with their warlike appointments, from the so-called seceded States. They formally entered into a treaty of temporary alliance, and co-operation with the so-called “Confederate States,” and sent members to their Congress at Montgomery. And, finally, they permitted the insurrectionary government to be transferred to their capital at Richmond.

The people of Virginia have thus allowed this giant insurrection to make its nest within her borders; and this government has no choice left but to deal with it, where it finds it. And it has the less regret, as the loyal citizens have, in due form, claimed its protection. Those loyal citizens, this government is bound to recognize, and protect, as being Virginia.

In the border States, so called—in fact, the middle states—there are those who favor a policy which they call "armed neutrality"—that is, an arming of those states to prevent the Union forces passing one way, or the disunion, the other, over their soil. This would be disunion completed. Figuratively speaking, it would be the building of an impassable wall along the line of separation. And yet, not quite an impassable one; for, under the guise of neutrality, it would tie the hands of the Union men, and freely pass supplies from among them, to the insurrectionists, which it could not do as an open enemy. At a stroke, it would take all the trouble off the hands of secession, except only what proceeds from the external blockade. It would do for the disunionists that which, of all things, they most desire—feed them well, and give them disunion without a struggle of their own. It recognizes no fidelity to the Constitution, no obligation to maintain the Union; and while very many who have favored it are, doubtless, loyal citizens, it is, nevertheless, treason in effect.

Recurring to the action of the government, it may be stated that, at first, a call was made for seventy-five thousand militia; and rapidly following this, a proclamation was issued for closing the ports of the insurrectionary districts by proceedings in the nature of Blockade. So far all was believed to be strictly legal. At this point the insurrectionists announced their purpose to enter upon the practice of privateering.
Other calls were made for volunteers, to serve three years, unless sooner discharged; and also for large additions to the regular Army and Navy. These measures, whether strictly legal or not, were ventured upon, under what appeared to be a popular demand, and a public necessity; trusting, then as now, that Congress would readily ratify them. It is believed that nothing has been done beyond the constitutional competency of Congress.

Soon after the first call for militia, it was considered a duty to authorize the Commanding General, in proper cases, according to his discretion, to suspend the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus; or, in other words, to arrest, and detain, without resort to the ordinary processes and forms of law, such individuals as he might deem dangerous to the public safety. This authority has purposely been exercised but very sparingly. Nevertheless, the legality and propriety of what has been done under it, are questioned; and the attention of the country has been called to the proposition that one who is sworn to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed," should not himself violate them. Of course some consideration was given to the questions of power, and propriety, before this matter was acted upon. The whole of the laws which were required to be faithfully executed, were being resisted, and failing of execution, in nearly one-third of the States. Must they be allowed to finally fail of execution, even had it been perfectly clear, that by the use of the means necessary to their execution, some single law, made in such extreme tenderness of the citizen’s liberty, that practically, it relieves more of the guilty, than of the innocent, should, to a very limited extent, be violated? To state the question more directly, are all the laws, but one, to go unexecuted, and the government itself go to pieces, lest that one be violated? Even in such a case, would not the official oath be broken, if the government should be overthrown, when it was believed that disregarding the single law, would tend to preserve it? But it was not believed that this question was presented. It was not believed that any law was violated. The provision of the Constitution that "The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus, shall not be suspended unless when, in cases of rebellion or invasion, the public safety may require it," is equivalent to a provision—that such privilege may be suspended when, in cases of rebellion, or invasion, the public safety does require it. It was decided that we have a case of rebellion, and that the public safety does require the qualified suspension of
the privilege of the writ which was authorized to be made. Now it is insisted that Congress, and not the Executive, is vested with this power. But the Constitution itself, is silent as to which, or who, is to exercise the power; and as the provision was plainly made for a dangerous emergency, it cannot be believed the framers of the instrument intended, that in every case, the danger should run its course, until Congress could be called together; the very assembling of which might be prevented, as was intended in this case, by the rebellion.

No more extended argument is now offered; as an opinion, at some length, will probably be presented by the Attorney General. Whether there shall be any legislation upon the subject, and if any, what, is submitted entirely to the better judgment of Congress.

The forbearance of this government had been so extraordinary, and so long continued, as to lead some foreign nations to shape their action as if they supposed the early destruction of our national Union was probable. While this, on discovery, gave the Executive some concern, he is now happy to say that the sovereignty, and rights of the United States, are now everywhere practically respected by foreign powers; and a general sympathy with the country is manifested throughout the world.

The reports of the Secretaries of the Treasury, War, and the Navy, will give the information in detail deemed necessary, and convenient for your deliberation, and action; while the Executive, and all the Departments, will stand ready to supply omissions, or to communicate new facts, considered important for you to know.

It is now recommended that you give the legal means for making this contest a short, and a decisive one; that you place at the control of the government, for the work, at least four hundred thousand men, and four hundred millions of dollars. That number of men is about one tenth of those of proper ages within the regions where, apparently, all are willing to engage; and the sum is less than a twenty-third part of the money value owned by the men who seem ready to devote the whole. A debt of six hundred millions of dollars now, is a less sum per head, than was the debt of our revolution, when we came out of that struggle; and the money value in the country, now bears even a greater proportion to what it was then,
than does the population. Surely each man has as strong a motive now, to preserve our liberties, as each had then, to establish them.

A right result, at this time, will be worth more to the world, than ten times the men, and ten times the money. The evidence reaching us from the country, leaves no doubt, that the material for the work is abundant; and that it needs only the hand of legislation to give it legal sanction, and the hand of the Executive to give it practical shape and efficiency. One of the greatest perplexities of the government, is to avoid receiving troops faster than it can provide for them. In a word, the people will save their government, if the government itself, will do its part, only indifferently well.

It might seem, at first thought, to be of little difference whether the present movement at the South be called "secession" or "rebellion." The movers, however, well understand the difference. At the beginning, they knew they could never raise their treason to any respectable magnitude, by any name which implies violation of law. They knew their people possessed as much of moral sense, as much of devotion to law and order, and as much pride in, and reverence for, the history, and government, of their common country, as any other civilized, and patriotic people. They knew they could make no advancement directly in the teeth of these strong and noble sentiments. Accordingly they commenced by an insidious debauching of the public mind. They invented an ingenious sophism, which, if conceded, was followed by perfectly logical steps, through all the incidents, to the complete destruction of the Union. The sophism itself is, that any state of the Union may, consistently with the national Constitution, and therefore lawfully, and peacefully, withdraw from the Union, without the consent of the Union, or of any other state. The little disguise that the supposed right is to be exercised only for just cause, themselves to be the sole judge of its justice, is too thin to merit any notice.

With rebellion thus sugar-coated, they have been drugging the public mind of their section for more than thirty years; and, until at length, they have brought many good men to a willingness to take up arms against the government the day after some assemblage of men
have enacted the farcical pretence of taking their State out of the Union, who could have been brought to no such thing the day before.

This sophism derives much—perhaps the whole—of its currency, from the assumption, that there is some omnipotent, and sacred supremacy, pertaining to a State—to each State of our Federal Union. Our States have neither more, nor less power, than that reserved to them, in the Union, by the Constitution—no one of them ever having been a State out of the Union. The original ones passed into the Union even before they cast off their British colonial dependence; and the new ones each came into the Union directly from a condition of dependence, excepting Texas. And even Texas, in its temporary independence, was never designated a State. The new ones only took the designation of States, on coming into the Union, while that name was first adopted for the old ones, in, and by, the Declaration of Independence. Therein the "United Colonies" were declared to be "Free and Independent States"; but, even then, the object plainly was not to declare their independence of one another, or of the Union; but directly the contrary, as their mutual pledge, and their mutual action, before, at the time, and afterwards, abundantly show. The express plighting of faith, by each and all of the original thirteen, in the Articles of Confederation, two years later, that the Union shall be perpetual, is most conclusive. Having never been States, either in substance, or in name, outside of the Union, whence this magical omnipotence of "State rights," asserting a claim of power to lawfully destroy the Union itself? Much is said about the "sovereignty" of the States; but the word, even, is not in the national Constitution; nor, as is believed, in any of the State constitutions. What is a "sovereignty," in the political sense of the term? Would it be far wrong to define it "A political community, without a political superior"? Tested by this, no one of our States, except Texas, ever was a sovereignty. And even Texas gave up the character on coming into the Union; by which act, she acknowledged the Constitution of the United States, and the laws and treaties of the United States made in pursuance of the Constitution, to be, for her, the supreme law of the land. The States have their status in the Union, and they have no other legal status. If they break from this, they can only do so against law, and by revolution. The Union, and not themselves separately, procured their independence, and their liberty. By conquest, or purchase, the
Union gave each of them, whatever of independence, and liberty, it has. The Union is older than any of the States; and, in fact, it created them as States. Originally, some dependent colonies made the Union; and, in turn, the Union threw off their old dependence, for them, and made them States, such as they are. Not one of them ever had a State constitution, independent of the Union. Of course, it is not forgotten that all the new States framed their constitutions, before they entered the Union; nevertheless, dependent upon, and preparatory to, coming into the Union.

Unquestionably the States have the powers, and rights, reserved to them in, and by the National Constitution; but among these, surely, are not included all conceivable powers, however mischievous, or destructive; but, at most, such only, as were known in the world, at the time, as governmental powers; and certainly, a power to destroy the government itself, had never been known as a governmental—as a merely administrative power. This relative matter of National power, and State rights, as a principle, is no other than the principle of generality, and locality. Whatever concerns the whole, should be confided to the whole—to the general government; while, whatever concerns only the State, should be left exclusively, to the State. This is all there is of original principle about it. Whether the National Constitution, in defining boundaries between the two, has applied the principle with exact accuracy, is not to be questioned. We are all bound by that defining, without question.

What is now combatted, is the position that secession is consistent with the Constitution—is lawful, and peaceful. It is not contended that there is any express law for it; and nothing should ever be implied as law, which leads to unjust, or absurd consequences. The nation purchased, with money, the countries out of which several of these States were formed. Is it just that they shall go off without leave, and without refunding? The nation paid very large sums, (in the aggregate, I believe, nearly a hundred millions) to relieve Florida of the aboriginal tribes. Is it just that she shall now be off without consent, or without making any return? The nation is now in debt for money applied to the benefit of these so-called seceding States, in common with the rest. Is it just, either that creditors shall go unpaid, or the remaining States pay the whole? A part of the present national debt was contracted to pay the old debts of Texas. Is it just that she shall leave, and pay no part of this herself?
Again, if one State may secede, so may another; and when all shall have seceded, none is left to pay the debts. Is this quite just to creditors? Did we notify them of this sage view of ours, when we borrowed their money? If we now recognize this doctrine, by allowing the seceders to go in peace, it is difficult to see what we can do, if others choose to go, or to extort terms upon which they will promise to remain.

The seceders insist that our Constitution admits of secession. They have assumed to make a National Constitution of their own, in which, of necessity, they have either discarded, or retained, the right of secession, as they insist, it exists in ours. If they have discarded it, they thereby admit that, on principle, it ought not to be in ours. If they have retained, it by their own construction of ours they show that to be consistent they must secede from one another, whenever they shall find it the easiest way of settling their debts, or effecting any other selfish, or unjust object. The principle itself is one of disintegration, and upon which no government can possibly endure.

If all the States, save one, should assert the power to drive that one out of the Union, it is presumed the whole class of seeder politicians would at once deny the power, and denounce the act as the greatest outrage upon State rights. But suppose that precisely the same act, instead of being called "driving the one out," should be called "the seceding of the others from that one," it would be exactly what the seceders claim to do; unless, indeed, they make the point, that the one, because it is a minority, may rightfully do, what the others, because they are a majority, may not rightfully do. These politicians are subtle, and profound, on the rights of minorities. They are not partial to that power which made the Constitution, and speaks from the preamble, calling itself "We, the People."

It may well be questioned whether there is, today, a majority of the legally qualified voters of any State, except perhaps South Carolina, in favor of disunion. There is much reason to believe that the Union men are the majority in many, if not in every other one, of the so-called seceded States. The contrary has not been demonstrated in any one of them. It is ventured to affirm this, even of Virginia and Tennessee; for the result of an election, held in military camps, where the bayonets are all on one side of the question voted upon, can
scarcely be considered as demonstrating popular sentiment. At such an election, all that large class who are, at once, for the Union, and against coercion, would be coerced to vote against the Union.

It may be affirmed, without extravagance, that the free institutions we enjoy, have developed the powers, and improved the condition, of our whole people, beyond any example in the world. Of this we now have a striking, and an impressive illustration. So large an army as the government has now on foot, was never before known, without a soldier in it, but who had taken his place there, of his own free choice. But more than this: there are many single Regiments whose members, one and another, possess full practical knowledge of all the arts, sciences, professions, and whatever else, whether useful or elegant, is known in the world; and there is scarcely one, from which there could not be selected, a President, a Cabinet, a Congress, and perhaps a Court, abundantly competent to administer the government itself. Nor do I say this is not true, also, in the army of our late friends, now adversaries, in this contest; but if it is, so much better the reason why the government, which has conferred such benefits on both them and us, should not be broken up. Whoever, in any section, proposes to abandon such a government, would do well to consider, in deference to what principle it is, that he does it—what better he is likely to get in its stead—whether the substitute will give, or be intended to give, so much of good to the people.

There are some foreshadowings on this subject. Our adversaries have adopted some Declarations of Independence, in which, unlike the good old one, penned by Jefferson, they omit the words "all men are created equal." Why? They have adopted a temporary national constitution, in the preamble of which, unlike our good old one, signed by Washington, they omit "We, the People," and substitute "We, the deputies of the sovereign and independent States." Why? Why this deliberate pressing out of view, the rights of men, and the authority of the people?

This is essentially a People’s contest. On the side of the Union, it is a struggle for maintaining in the world, that form, and substance of government, whose leading object is, to elevate the condition of men—to lift artificial weights from all shoulders—to clear the paths of laudable pursuit for all—to afford all, an unfettered start, and a fair chance, in the race of
life. Yielding to partial, and temporary departures, from necessity, this is the leading object of the government for whose existence we contend.

I am most happy to believe that the plain people understand, and appreciate this. It is worthy of note, that while in this, the government's hour of trial, large numbers of those in the Army and Navy, who have been favored with the offices, have resigned, and proved false to the hand which had pampered them, not one common soldier, or common sailor is known to have deserted his flag.

Great honor is due to those officers who remain true, despite the example of their treacherous associates; but the greatest honor, and most important fact of all, is the unanimous firmness of the common soldiers, and common sailors. To the last man, so far as known, they have successfully resisted the traitorous efforts of those, whose commands, but an hour before, they obeyed as absolute law. This is the patriotic instinct of the plain people. They understand, without an argument, that destroying the government, which was made by Washington, means no good to them.

Our popular government has often been called an experiment. Two points in it, our people have already settled—the successful establishing, and the successful administering of it. One still remains—its successful maintenance against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it. It is now for them to demonstrate to the world, that those who can fairly carry an election, can also suppress a rebellion—that ballots are the rightful, and peaceful, successors of bullets; and that when ballots have fairly, and constitutionally, decided, there can be no successful appeal, back to bullets; that there can be no successful appeal, except to ballots themselves, at succeeding elections. Such will be a great lesson of peace; teaching men that what they cannot take by an election, neither can they take it by a war—teaching all, the folly of being the beginners of a war.

Lest there be some uneasiness in the minds of candid men, as to what is to be the course of the government, towards the Southern States, after the rebellion shall have been suppressed, the Executive deems it proper to say, it will be his purpose then, as ever, to be
guided by the Constitution, and the laws; and that he probably will have no different understand-5
ing of the powers, and duties of the Federal government, relatively to the rights of the States, and the people, under the Constitution, than that expressed in the inaugural address.

He desires to preserve the government, that it may be administered for all, as it was administered by the men who made it. Loyal citizens everywhere, have the right to claim this of their government; and the government has no right to withhold, or neglect it. It is not perceived that, in giving it, there is any coercion, any conquest, or any subjugation, in any just sense of those terms.

The Constitution provides, and all the States have accepted the provision, that “The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government.” But, if a State may lawfully go out of the Union, having done so, it may also discard the republican form of government; so that to prevent its going out, is an indispensable means, to the end, of maintaining the guaranty mentioned; and when an end is lawful and obligatory, the indispensable means to it, are also lawful, and obligatory.

It was with the deepest regret that the Executive found the duty of employing the war-power, in defense of the government, forced upon him. He could but perform this duty, or surrender the existence of the government. No compromise, by public servants, could, in this case, be a cure; not that compromises are not often proper, but that no popular government can long survive a marked precedent, that those who carry an election, can only save the government from immediate destruction, by giving up the main point, upon which the people gave the election. The people themselves, and not their servants, can safely reverse their own deliberate decisions. As a private citizen, the Executive could not have consented that these institutions shall perish; much less could he, in betrayal of so vast, and so sacred a trust, as these free people had confided to him. He felt that he had no moral right to shrink; nor even to count the chances of his own life, in what might follow. In full view of his great responsibility, he has, so far, done what he has deemed his duty. You will now, according to your own judgment, perform yours. He sincerely hopes that your views, and
your action, may so accord with his, as to assure all faithful citizens, who have been disturbed in their rights, of a certain, and speedy restoration to them, under the Constitution, and the laws.

And having thus chosen our course, without guile, and with pure purpose, let us renew our trust in God, and go forward without fear, and with manly hearts.
PRESIDENT ABRAHAM LINCOLN (R-IL)

A Proclamation

AN ORDER

January 1, 1863
Executive Mansion | Washington, D.C.

Emancipation Proclamation

BACKGROUND

On September 22, 1862 after the Union victory in the Battle of Antietam, Abraham Lincoln announced this order concerning property in slaves in the rebelling states, which took effect January 1, 1863.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Whom did the proclamation free?

2. In which places did this order apply?

3. By what authority did Lincoln issue this order?

4. What military purpose did the order serve?

5. What did Lincoln implore of slaves freed by the order?

The Emancipation Proclamation
Abraham Lincoln

ANNOTATIONS

By the President of the United States of America: A Proclamation.

Whereas, on the twenty-second day of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-two, a proclamation was issued by the President of the United States, containing, among other things, the following, to wit:

"That on the first day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, all persons held as slaves within any State or designated part of a State, the people whereof shall then be in rebellion against the United States, shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free; and the Executive Government of the United States, including the military and naval authority thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of such persons, and will do no act or acts to repress such persons, or any of them, in any efforts they may make for their actual freedom.

"That the Executive will, on the first day of January aforesaid, by proclamation, designate the States and parts of States, if any, in which the people thereof, respectively, shall then be in rebellion against the United States; and the fact that any State, or the people thereof, shall on that day be, in good faith, represented in the Congress of the United States by members chosen thereto at elections wherein a majority of the qualified voters of such State shall have participated, shall, in the absence of strong countervailing testimony, be deemed conclusive evidence that such State, and the people thereof, are not then in rebellion against the United States."

Now, therefore I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, by virtue of the power in me vested as Commander-in-Chief, of the Army and Navy of the United States in time of actual armed rebellion against authority and government of the United States, and as a fit and necessary war measure for suppressing said rebellion, do, on this first day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, and in accordance with my purpose so to do publicly proclaimed for the full period of one hundred days, from the day first above mentioned, order and designate as the States and parts of States wherein
the people thereof respectively, are this day in rebellion against the United States, the follow-
ing, to wit:

Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana, (except the Parishes of St. Bernard, Plaquemines, Jefferson, St.
Johns, St. Charles, St. James, Ascension, Assumption, Terrebonne, Lafourche, St. Mary, St.
Martin, and Orleans, including the City of New Orleans) Mississippi, Alabama, Florida,
Georgia, South-Carolina, North-Carolina, and Virginia, (except the forty-eight counties
designated as West Virginia, and also the counties of Berkley, Accomac, Northampton,
Elizabeth-City, York, Princess Ann, and Norfolk, including the cities of Norfolk and Ports-
mouth); and which excepted parts are, for the present, left precisely as if this proclamation
were not issued.

And by virtue of the power, and for the purpose aforesaid, I do order and declare that all
persons held as slaves within said designated States, and parts of States, are, and hencefor-
ward shall be free; and that the Executive government of the United States, including the
military and naval authorities thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of said per-
sons.

And I hereby enjoin upon the people so declared to be free to abstain from all violence,
unless in necessary self-defense; and I recommend to them that, in all cases when allowed,
they labor faithfully for reasonable wages.

And I further declare and make known, that such persons of suitable condition, will be
received into the armed service of the United States to garrison forts, positions, stations,
and other places, and to man vessels of all sorts in said service.

And upon this act, sincerely believed to be an act of justice, warranted by the Constitution,
upon military necessity, I invoke the considerate judgment of mankind, and the gracious
favor of Almighty God.
In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington, this first day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the eighty-seventh.

By the President:

Abraham Lincoln

William H. Seward, Secretary of State.
PRESIDENT ABRAHAM LINCOLN (R)

On the Consecration of the Soldiers’ National Cemetery

SPEECH

November 19, 1863

Soldiers’ National Cemetery | Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

Gettysburg Address

BACKGROUND

Abraham Lincoln delivered these remarks at the dedication of the Union cemetery for those soldiers killed in the Battle of Gettysburg in the summer of 1863.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. For Lincoln, what is the central idea of the American Founding?
2. For what cause did the soldiers buried in Gettysburg give their lives?
3. What were they fighting to defend?
4. To what cause does Lincoln wish for listeners to dedicate themselves?

Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth, on this continent, a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived, and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battle-field of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting-place for those who here gave their lives, that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But, in a larger sense, we can not dedicate—we can not consecrate—we can not hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they here gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.
**President Abraham Lincoln (R)**

Second Inaugural Address

**SPEECH**

March 4, 1865

U.S. Capitol | Washington, D.C.

**BACKGROUND**

Having been reelected and with the end of the Civil War in sight, Abraham Lincoln delivered this speech at his inauguration to a second term as president.

**GUIDING QUESTIONS**

1. According to Lincoln, who caused the Civil War?

2. What role in the war does Lincoln ascribe to God?

3. How does Lincoln think the North should treat the South when the war ends?

---

Fellow Countrymen:

At this second appearing to take the oath of the presidential office, there is less occasion for 
an extended address than there was at the first. Then a statement, somewhat in detail, of a 
course to be pursued, seemed fitting and proper. Now, at the expiration of four years, dur-
ing which public declarations have been constantly called forth on every point and phase of the great contest which still absorbs the attention, and engrosses the energies of the na-
tion, little that is new could be presented. The progress of our arms, upon which all else chiefly depends, is as well known to the public as to myself; and it is, I trust, reasonably satisfactory and encouraging to all. With high hope for the future, no prediction in regard to it is ventured.

On the occasion corresponding to this four years ago, all thoughts were anxiously directed to an impending civil-war. All dreaded it—all sought to avert it. While the inaugural address was being delivered from this place, devoted altogether to saving the Union without war, insurgent agents were in the city seeking to destroy it without war—seeking to dissolve the Union, and divide effects, by negotiation. Both parties deprecated war; but one of them would make war rather than let the nation survive; and the other would accept war rather than let it perish. And the war came.

One eighth of the whole population were colored slaves, not distributed generally over the Union, but localized in the Southern part of it. These slaves constituted a peculiar and powerful interest. All knew that this interest was, somehow, the cause of the war. To strengthen, perpetuate, and extend this interest was the object for which the insurgents would rend the Union, even by war; while the government claimed no right to do more than to restrict the territorial enlargement of it. Neither party expected for the war, the magnitude, or the duration, which it has already attained. Neither anticipated that the cause of the conflict might cease with, or even before, the conflict itself should cease. Each looked for an easier triumph, and a result less fundamental and astounding. Both read the same Bible, and pray to the same God; and each invokes His aid against the other. It may seem strange that any men should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of
other men's faces; but let us judge not that we be not judged. The prayers of both could not be answered; that of neither has been answered fully. The Almighty has His own purposes. "Woe unto the world because of offenses! for it must needs be that offenses come; but woe to that man by whom the offense cometh!" If we shall suppose that American Slavery is one of those offenses which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which, having continued through His appointed time, He now wills to remove, and that He gives to both North and South, this terrible war, as the woe due to those by whom the offense came, shall we discern therein any departure from those divine attributes which the believers in a Living God always ascribe to Him? Fondly do we hope—fervently do we pray—that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue, until all the wealth piled by the bond-man's two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash, shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so still it must be said "the judgments of the Lord, are true and righteous altogether."

With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just, and a lasting peace, among ourselves, and with all nations.
UNITED STATES CONGRESS

Civil Rights Act

LAW

April 9, 1866

United States of America

BACKGROUND

Congress passed this Civil Rights Act of 1866 on the first anniversary of the end to the Civil War.

ANNOTATIONS

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all persons born in the United States and not subject to any foreign power, excluding Indians not taxed, are hereby declared to be citizens of the United States; and such citizens, of every race and color, without regard to any previous condition of slavery or involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall have the same right, in every State and Territory in the United States, to make and enforce contracts, to sue, be parties, and give evidence, to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold, and convey real and personal property, and to full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of person and property, as is enjoyed by white citizens, and shall be subject to like punishment, pains, and penalties, and to none other, any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, to the contrary notwithstanding.

Sec. 2. And be it further enacted, That any person who, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, shall subject, or cause to be subjected, any inhabitant of any State or Territory to the deprivation of any right secured or protected by this act, or to different punishment, pains, or penalties on account of such person having at any time...

been held in a condition of slavery or involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, or by reason of his color or race, than is prescribed for the punishment of white persons, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, on conviction, shall be punished by fine not exceeding one thousand dollars, or imprisonment not exceeding one year, or both.

5 Sec. 3. And be it further enacted, That the district courts of the United States . . . shall have, exclusively of the courts of the several States, cognizance of all crimes and offences committed against the provisions of this act, and also, concurrently with the circuit courts of the United States, of all causes, civil and criminal, affecting persons who are denied or cannot enforce in the courts or judicial tribunals of the State or locality where they may be any of the rights secured to them by the first section of this act.

10 Sec. 4. And be it further enacted, That the district attorneys, marshals, and deputy marshals of the United States, the commissioners appointed by the circuit and territorial courts of the United States, with powers of arresting, imprisoning, or bailing offenders against the laws of the United States . . . and every other officer who may be specially empowered by the President of the United States, shall be . . . specially authorized and required, at the expense of the United States, to institute proceedings against . . . every person who shall violate the provisions of this act, and cause him or them to be arrested and imprisoned, or bailed . . . for trial before such court of the United States or territorial court as by this act has cognizance of the offence.

15 Sec. 6. And be it further enacted, That any person who shall knowingly and willfully obstruct, hinder, or prevent any officer . . . charged with the execution of any warrant . . . or shall rescue or attempt to rescue such person from the custody of the officer . . . or shall aid, abet, or assist any person so arrested . . . to escape from the custody of the officer . . . or shall harbor or conceal any person for whose arrest a warrant or process shall have been issued . . . so as to prevent his discovery and arrest after notice or knowledge of the fact that a warrant has been issued for the apprehension of such person, shall . . . be subject to a fine . . . and imprisonment not exceeding six months.
Sec. 8. And be it further enacted, That whenever the President of the United States shall have reason to believe that offences have been or are likely to be committed against the provisions of this act . . . it shall be lawful for him . . . to direct the judge, marshal, and district attorney . . . to attend at such place . . . for the purpose of the more speedy arrest and trial of persons charged with a violation of this act; and it shall be the duty of every judge or other officer, when any such requisition shall be received by him, to attend at the place and for the time therein designated.

Sec. 9. And be it further enacted, That it shall be lawful for the President of the United States, or such person as he may empower for that purpose, to employ such part of the land or naval forces of the United States, or of the militia, as shall be necessary to prevent the violation and enforce the due execution of this act.

Sec. 10. And be it further enacted, That upon all questions of law arising in any cause under the provisions of this act a final appeal may be taken to the Supreme Court of the United States.
U.S. CONGRESS AND STATES

Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution

AMENDMENT

December 18, 1865
United States of America

BACKGROUND

The U.S. Congress passed and three-quarters of states ratified the Thirteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution by December 6, 1865, and the amendment was acknowledged as effective by Secretary of State William Seward on December 18, 1865.

ANNOTATIONS

Section 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

Section 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

U.S. Const. amend. XIII.
U.S. CONGRESS AND STATES

Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution

BACKGROUND

The U.S. Congress passed and three-quarters of states ratified the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution by July 21, 1868, and the amendment was acknowledged as effective by Secretary of State William Seward on July 28, 1868.

ANNOTATIONS

Section 1. All persons born ornaturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of

____________________________
U.S. Const. amend. XIV.
such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

Section 3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice-President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

Section 4. The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.

Section 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.
U.S. CONGRESS AND STATES

Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution

BACKGROUND

The U.S. Congress passed and three-quarters of states ratified the Fifteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution by February 3, 1870, and the amendment was acknowledged as effective by Secretary of State Hamilton Fish on March 30, 1870.

ANNOTATIONS

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

---

U.S. Const. amend. XV.
BOOKER T. WASHINGTON

To the Cotton States and International Exposition

SPEECH

September 18, 1895
Atlanta, Georgia

The Atlanta Exposition Address

BACKGROUND

Former slave and Tuskegee Institute founder Booker T. Washington delivered this address to attendees at the Cotton States and International Exposition in Atlanta, Georgia.

ANNOTATIONS

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Board of Directors and Citizens:

One-third of the population of the South is of the Negro race. No enterprise seeking the material, civil, or moral welfare of this section can disregard this element of our population and reach the highest success. I but convey to you, Mr. President and Directors, the sentiment of the masses of my race when I say that in no way have the value and manhood of the American Negro been more fittingly and generously recognized than by the managers of this magnificent Exposition at every stage of its progress. It is a recognition that will do more to cement the friendship of the two races than any occurrence since the dawn of our freedom.

Not only this, but the opportunity here afforded will awaken among us a new era of industrial progress. Ignorant and inexperienced, it is not strange that in the first years of our new life we began at the top instead of at the bottom; that a seat in Congress or the state legislature was more sought than real estate or industrial skill; that the political convention of stump speaking had more attraction than starting a dairy farm or truck garden.

A ship lost at sea for many days suddenly sighted a friendly vessel. From the mast of the unfortunate vessel was seen a signal, “Water, water; we die of thirst!” The answer from the friendly vessel at once came back, “Cast down your bucket where you are.” A second time the signal, “Water, water; send us water!” ran up from the distressed vessel, and was answered, “Cast down your bucket where you are.” And a third and fourth signal for water was answered, “Cast down your bucket where you are.” The captain of the distressed vessel, at last heeding the injunction, cast down his bucket, and it came up full of fresh, sparkling water from the mouth of the Amazon River. To those of my race who depend on bettering their condition in a foreign land or who underestimate the importance of cultivating friendly relations with the Southern white man, who is their next-door neighbour, I would say: “Cast down your bucket where you are”—cast it down in making friends in every manly way of the people of all races by whom we are surrounded.

Cast it down in agriculture, mechanics, in commerce, in domestic service, and in the professions. And in this connection it is well to bear in mind that whatever other sins the South may be called to bear, when it comes to business, pure and simple, it is in the South that the Negro is given a man’s chance in the commercial world, and in nothing is this Exposition more eloquent than in emphasizing this chance. Our greatest danger is that in the great leap from slavery to freedom we may overlook the fact that the masses of us are to live by the productions of our hands, and fail to keep in mind that we shall prosper in proportion as we learn to dignify and glorify common labour and put brains and skill into the common occupations of life; shall prosper in proportion as we learn to draw the line between the superficial and the substantial, the ornamental gewgaws of life and the useful. No race can prosper till it learns that there is as much dignity in tilling a field as in writing a poem. It is at the bottom of life we must begin, and not at the top. Nor should we permit our grievances to overshadow our opportunities.

To those of the white race who look to the incoming of those of foreign birth and strange tongue and habits for the prosperity of the South, were I permitted I would repeat what I say to my own race, “Cast down your bucket where you are.” Cast it down among the eight millions of Negroes whose habits you know, whose fidelity and love you have tested in days.
when to have proved treacherous meant the ruin of your firesides. Cast down your bucket among these people who have, without strikes and labour wars, tilled your fields, cleared your forests, builded your railroads and cities, and brought forth treasures from the bowels of the earth, and helped make possible this magnificent representation of the progress of the South. Casting down your bucket among my people, helping and encouraging them as you are doing on these grounds, and to education of head, hand, and heart, you will find that they will buy your surplus land, make blossom the waste places in your fields, and run your factories. While doing this, you can be sure in the future, as in the past, that you and your families will be surrounded by the most patient, faithful, law-abiding, and unresentful people that the world has seen. As we have proved our loyalty to you in the past, in nursing your children, watching by the sick-bed of your mothers and fathers, and often following them with tear-dimmed eyes to their graves, so in the future, in our humble way, we shall stand by you with a devotion that no foreigner can approach, ready to lay down our lives, if need be, in defence of yours, interlacing our industrial, commercial, civil, and religious life with yours in a way that shall make the interests of both races one. In all things that are purely social we can be as separate as the fingers, yet one as the hand in all things essential to mutual progress.

There is no defence or security for any of us except in the highest intelligence and development of all. If anywhere there are efforts tending to curtail the fullest growth of the Negro, let these efforts be turned into stimulating, encouraging, and making him the most useful and intelligent citizen. Effort or means so invested will pay a thousand per cent. interest. These efforts will be twice blessed—“blessing him that gives and him that takes.”

There is no escape through law of man or God from the inevitable:

The laws of changeless justice bind

Oppressor with oppressed;

And close as sin and suffering joined

We march to fate abreast.
Nearly sixteen millions of hands will aid you in pulling the load upward, or they will pull against you the load downward. We shall constitute one-third and more of the ignorance and crime of the South, or one-third its intelligence and progress; we shall contribute one-third to the business and industrial prosperity of the South, or we shall prove a veritable body of death, stagnating, depressing, retarding every effort to advance the body politic.

Gentlemen of the Exposition, as we present to you our humble effort at an exhibition of our progress, you must not expect overmuch. Starting thirty years ago with ownership here and there in a few quilts and pumpkins and chickens (gathered from miscellaneous sources), remember the path that has led from these to the inventions and production of agricultural implements, buggies, steam-engines, newspapers, books, statuary, carving, paintings, the management of drug-stores and banks, has not been trodden without contact with thorns and thistles. While we take pride in what we exhibit as a result of our independent efforts, we do not for a moment forget that our part in this exhibition would fall far short of your expectations but for the constant help that has come to our educational life, not only from the Southern states, but especially from Northern philanthropists, who have made their gifts a constant stream of blessing and encouragement.

The wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremest folly, and that progress in the enjoyment of all the privileges that will come to us must be the result of severe and constant struggle rather than of artificial forcing. No race that has anything to contribute to the markets of the world is long in any degree ostracized. It is important and right that all privileges of the law be ours, but it is vastly more important that we be prepared for the exercises of these privileges. The opportunity to earn a dollar in a factory just now is worth infinitely more than the opportunity to spend a dollar in an opera-house.

In conclusion, may I repeat that nothing in thirty years has given us more hope and encouragement, and drawn us so near to you of the white race, as this opportunity offered by the Exposition; and here bending, as it were, over the altar that represents the results of the struggles of your race and mine, both starting practically empty-handed three decades ago,
I pledge that in your effort to work out the great and intricate problem which God has laid at the doors of the South, you shall have at all times the patient, sympathetic help of my race; only let this be constantly in mind, that, while from representations in these buildings of the product of field, of forest, of mine, of factory, letters, and art, much good will come, yet far above and beyond material benefits will be that higher good, that, let us pray God, will come, in a blotting out of sectional differences and racial animosities and suspicions, in a determination to administer absolute justice, in a willing obedience among all classes to the mandates of law. This, this, coupled with our material prosperity, will bring into our beloved South a new heaven and a new earth.
W.E.B. DuBois
“The Talented Tenth”
ESSAY EXCERPTS

BACKGROUND

Atlanta University professor W.E.B. DuBois published this essay in the book *The Negro Problem* alongside contributions from other African American leaders, including Booker T. Washington, who edited the book.

ANNOTATIONS

The Negro race, like all races, is going to be saved by its exceptional men. The problem of education, then, among Negroes must first of all deal with the Talented Tenth; it is the problem of developing the Best of this race that they may guide the Mass away from the contamination and death of the Worst, in their own and other races. Now the training of men is a difficult and intricate task. Its technique is a matter for educational experts, but its object is for the vision of seers. If we make money the object of man-training, we shall develop money-makers but not necessarily men; if we make technical skill the object of education, we may possess artisans but not, in nature, men. Men we shall have only as we make manhood the object of the work of the schools—intelligence, broad sympathy, knowledge of the world that was and is, and of the relation of men to it—this is the curriculum of that Higher Education which must underlie true life. On this foundation we may build bread winning, skill of hand and quickness of brain, with never a fear lest the child and man mistake the means of living for the object of life….

Can the masses of the Negro people be in any possible way more quickly raised than by the effort and example of this aristocracy of talent and character? Was there ever a nation on

---

God’s fair earth civilized from the bottom upward? Never; it is, ever was and ever will be from the top downward that culture filters. The Talented Tenth rises and pulls all that are-worth the saving up to their vantage ground. This is the history of human progress; and the two historic mistakes which have hindered that progress were the thinking first that no more could ever rise save the few already risen; or second, that it would better the uprisen to pull the risen down.

How then shall the leaders of a struggling people be trained and the hands of the risen few strengthened? There can be but one answer: The best and most capable of their youth must be schooled in the colleges and universities of the land. We will not quarrel as to just what the university of the Negro should teach or how it should teach it–I willingly admit that each soul and each race-soul needs its own peculiar curriculum. But this is true: A university is a human invention for the transmission of knowledge and culture from generation to generation, through the training of quick minds and pure hearts, and for this work no other human invention will suffice, not even trade and industrial schools.

All men cannot go to college but some men must; every isolated group or nation must have its yeast, must have for the talented few centers of training where men are not so mystified and befuddled by the hard and necessary toil of earning a living, as to have no aims higher than their bellies, and no God greater than Gold. This is true training, and thus in the beginning were the favored sons of the freedmen trained. Out of the colleges of the North came, after the blood of war, Ware, Cravath, Chase, Andrews, Bumstead and Spence to build the foundations of knowledge and civilization in the black South. Where ought they to have begun to build? At the bottom, of course, quibbles the mole with his eyes in the earth. Aye! truly at the bottom, at the very bottom; at the bottom of knowledge, down in the very depths of knowledge there where the roots of justice strike into the lowest soil of Truth. And so they did begin; they founded colleges, and up from the colleges shot normal schools, and out from the normal schools went teachers, and around the normal teachers clustered other teachers to teach the public schools; the college trained in Greek and Latin and mathematics, 2,000 men; and these men trained full 50,000 others in morals and manners, and they in turn taught thrift and the alphabet to nine millions of men, who to-day
hold $300,000,000 of property. It was a miracle – the most wonderful peace-battle of the 19th century, and yet to-day men smile at it, and in fine superiority tell us that it was all a strange mistake; that a proper way to found a system of education is first to gather the children and buy them spelling books and hoes; afterward men may look about for teachers, if haply they may find them; or again they would teach men Work, but as for Life–why, what has Work to do with Life, they ask vacantly.…

The problem of training the Negro is to-day immensely complicated by the fact that the whole question of the efficiency and appropriateness of our present systems of education, for any kind of child, is a matter of active debate, in which final settlement seems still afar off. Consequently it often happens that persons arguing for or against certain systems of education for Negroes, have these controversies in mind and miss the real question at issue. The main question, so far as the Southern Negro is concerned, is: What under the present circumstance, must a system of education do in order to raise the Negro as quickly as possible in the scale of civilization? The answer to this question seems to me clear: It must strengthen the Negro’s character, increase his knowledge and teach him to earn a living. Now it goes without saying that it is hard to do all these things simultaneously or suddenly and that at the same time it will not do to give all the attention to one and neglect the others; we could give black boys trades, but that alone will not civilize a race of ex-slaves; we might simply increase their knowledge of the world, but this would not necessarily make them wish to use this knowledge honestly; we might seek to strengthen character and purpose, but to what end if this people have nothing to eat or to wear? A system of education is not one thing, nor does it have a single definite object, nor is it a mere matter of schools. Education is that whole system of human training within and without the school house walls, which molds and develops men. If then we start out to train an ignorant and unskilled people with a heritage of bad habits, our system of training must set before itself two great aims—the one dealing with knowledge and character, the other part seeking to give the child the technical knowledge necessary for him to earn a living under the present circumstances. These objects are accomplished in part by the opening of the common schools on the one, and of the industrial schools on the other. But only in part, for there must also be trained
those who are to teach these schools—men and women of knowledge and culture and technical skill who understand modern civilization, and have the training and aptitude to impart it to the children under them. There must be teachers, and teachers of teachers, and to attempt to establish any sort of a system of common and industrial school training, without first (and I say first advisedly) without first providing for the higher training of the very best teachers, is simply throwing your money to the winds. School houses do not teach themselves – piles of brick and mortar and machinery do not send out men. It is the trained, living human soul, cultivated and strengthened by long study and thought, that breathes the real breath of life into boys and girls and makes them human, whether they be black or white, Greek, Russian or American. Nothing, in these latter days, has so dampened the faith of thinking Negroes in recent educational movements, as the fact that such movements have been accompanied by ridicule and denouncement and decrying of those very institutions of higher training which made the Negro public school possible, and make Negro industrial schools thinkable. It was: Fisk, Atlanta, Howard and Straight, those colleges born of the faith and sacrifice of the abolitionists, that placed in the black schools of the South the 30,000 teachers and more, which some, who depreciate the work of these higher schools, are using to teach their own new experiments. If Hampton, Tuskegee and the hundred other industrial schools prove in the future to be as successful as they deserve to be, then their success in training black artisans for the South, will be due primarily to the white colleges of the North and the black colleges of the South, which trained the teachers who to-day conduct these institutions. There was a time when the American people believed pretty devoutly that a log of wood with a boyat one end and Mark Hopkins at the other, represented the highest ideal of human training. But in these eager days it would seem that we have changed all that and think it necessary to add a couple of saw-mills and a hammer to this outfit, and, at a pinch, to dispense with the services of Mark Hopkins.

I would not deny, or for a moment seem to deny, the paramount necessity of teaching the Negro to work, and to work steadily and skillfully; or seem to depreciate in the slightest degree the important part industrial schools must play in the accomplishment of these ends, but I do say, and insist upon it, that it is industrialism drunk with its vision of success,
to imagine that its own work can be accomplished without providing for the training of broadly cultured men and women to teach its own teachers, and to teach the teachers of the public schools.

But I have already said that human education is not simply a matter of schools; it is much more a matter of family and group life – the training of one’s home, of one’s daily companions, of one’s social class. Now the black boy of the South moves in a black world – a world with its own leaders, its own thoughts, its own ideals. In this world he gets by far the larger part of his life training, and through the eyes of this dark world he peers into the veiled world beyond. Who guides and determines the education which he receives in his world?

His teachers here are the group-leaders of the Negro people—the physicians and clergymen, the trained fathers and mothers, the influential and forceful men about him of all kinds; here it is, if at all, that the culture of the surrounding world trickles through and is handed on by the graduates of the higher schools. Can such culture training of group leaders be neglected? Can we afford to ignore it? Do you think that if the leaders of thought among Negroes are not trained and educated thinkers, that they will have no leaders? On the contrary a hundred half-trained demagogues will still hold the places they so largely occupy now, and hundreds of vociferous busy-bodies will multiply. You have no choice; either you must help furnish this race from within its own ranks with thoughtful men of trained leadership, or you must suffer the evil consequences of a headless misguided rabble.

I am an earnest advocate of manual training and trade teaching for black boys, and for white boys, too. I believe that next to the founding of Negro colleges the most valuable addition to Negro education since the war, has been industrial training for black boys. Nevertheless, I insist that the object of all true education is not to make men carpenters, it is to make carpenters men; there are two means of making the carpenter a man, each equally important: the first is to give the group and community in which he works, liberally trained teachers and leaders to teach him and his family what life means; the second is to give him sufficient intelligence and technical skill to make him an efficient workman; the first object demands the Negro college and college-bred men—not a quantity of such colleges, but a few of excellent quality; not too many college-bred men, but enough to leaven the lump, to
inspire the masses, to raise the Talented Tenth to leadership; the second object demands a good system of common schools, well-taught, conveniently located and properly equipped....

Men of America, the problem is plain before you. Here is a race transplanted through the criminal foolishness of your fathers. Whether you like it or not the millions are here, and here they will remain. If you do not lift them up, they will pull you down. Education and work are the levers to uplift a people. Work alone will not do it unless inspired by the right ideals and guided by intelligence. Education must not simply teach work—it must teach Life. The Talented Tenth of the Negro race must be made leaders of thought and missionaries of culture among their people. No others can do this work and Negro colleges must train men for it. The Negro race, like all other races, is going to be saved by its exceptional men.
UNIT 5

Progressivism and the State

UNIT PREVIEW

Structure

| LESSON 1 | Critiques of the Declaration of Independence | 3-4 classes | p. 7 |
| LESSON 2 | Politics, Leadership, and the Administrative State | 3-4 classes | p. 11 |
| LESSON 3 | The New Deal and the Great Society | 3-4 classes | p. 17 |
| LESSON 4 | Constitutionalist Responses to Progressivism | 2-3 classes | p. 20 |
| APPENDIX A | Study Guide, Test, and Writing Assignment | p. 23 |
| APPENDIX B | Primary Sources | p. 35 |

Why Teach Progressivism and the State

In many respects, the United States government today looks the same as that which our forefathers drafted. Many of its principles and structures have endured, to the benefit of all mankind. But in many other ways American government, at least in how it works, has changed significantly from the American founding. The Progressive movement accounts for a substantial portion of that change as progressives altered many pieces of the original Constitution to reshape how American government functions. Before these changes were wrought in government, however, Progressivism put forward a different understanding of the very principles on which that Constitutional order was based. Progressivism strongly critiqued the principles of the Declaration of Independence as well as the form of the Constitution. Young American citizens must understand why and how the government of the country they now live in was changed from what their country’s Founders originally intended, for better or for worse.
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What Teachers Should Consider

The industrialization and urbanization that followed the Civil War in America brought a dramatic transformation to American life, business, and politics. New ideas about the role of government in light of many of these changes were imported from German philosophers and models of government. This movement known as Progressivism asserted that the economic changes since the American founding necessitated new functions by government. Moreover, the Progressive belief that human knowledge and morality had progressed since the founding generation meant that government could take on new purposes and powers as well.

The Progressives generally denied, therefore, an objective standard for truth, asserting that truth was relative to one’s time and place. This view applied to rights as well. Rights were not “natural” but were granted by the government based on the needs of the time. Equality, moreover, was seen in terms of groups, usually economic, rather than individuals.

This philosophical shift resulted in a different view of government itself. Government could not merely secure rights. Instead, the government had to become more active to bring about equal results in wealth, health, peace, and overall wellbeing. This would, in some circumstances, require the removal or curtailment of rights among some groups compared to others.

The new end of government also involved the government in more facets of human life and society. This expansion in the number and complexity of tasks the government had to accomplish necessitated removing most decision-making from the hands of elected officials and concentrating it in the hands of experts in each field. This bureaucracy or administrative state burgeoned the size of government and expanded its control over many areas of American life, even while becoming increasingly independent from the will of the people through the electoral process.

How Teachers Can Learn More

**TEXTS**

*The U.S. Constitution: A Reader*, ed. Hillsdale College Politics Faculty  
Chapters 10–11

*The State*, Woodrow Wilson  
“Socialism and Democracy,” Woodrow Wilson

“Ethics and Economics,” Richard Ely  
*Ethics*, John Dewey and James Tufts  
*The New State*, Mary Parker Follett

**ONLINE COURSES** | Online.Hillsdale.edu

*Introduction to the Constitution*  
*Constitution 101*  
*Constitution 201*  
*Civil Rights in American History*
Primary Sources Studied in This Unit

“What Is Progress?” Woodrow Wilson
“Recent Tendencies,” Charles Merriam
“Natural Law,” Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr.
*Liberalism and Social Action*, John Dewey
“The New Nationalism,” Theodore Roosevelt
War Message to Congress, Woodrow Wilson
Fourteen Points, Woodrow Wilson
“Leaders of Men,” Woodrow Wilson
“The Presidency,” Theodore Roosevelt
“The Study of Administration,” Woodrow Wilson
Commonwealth Club Address, Franklin Delano Roosevelt
Democratic Convention Address, 1936, Franklin Delano Roosevelt
Annual Message to Congress, 1941, Franklin Delano Roosevelt
Annual Message to Congress, 1944, Franklin Delano Roosevelt
Commencement Address at the University of Michigan, Lyndon Johnson
“The Inspiration of the Declaration,” Calvin Coolidge
“A Time for Choosing,” Ronald Reagan
First Inaugural Address, Ronald Reagan
LESSON PLANS, ASSIGNMENTS,
AND FORMATIVE QUIZ
Lesson 1 — Critiques of the Declaration of Independence

LESSON PREVIEW

Students learn about Progressives’ evolving view of human nature, relativism concerning truth and morals, and expanding government, their assertion of group instead of individual rights, and their critique of the philosophical principles of the American founding.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

- Introduction to the Constitution
- Constitution 101
- Constitution 201
- Lecture 12
- Lecture 8
- Lectures 1, 2, 4

PRIMARY SOURCES

Students are to read or, if they have previously read, review the following primary sources. While reading, students should annotate these sources. For particularly challenging texts or if the class is offered earlier in high school, the teacher may wish to provide students with guided reading questions to assist with comprehension, clarity, and direction. Using their annotations and any guided reading questions, students should come to class prepared to participate in a seminar conversation on each text.

- “What Is Progress?” Woodrow Wilson
- “Recent Tendencies,” Charles Merriam
- “Natural Law,” Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr.
- Liberalism and Social Action, John Dewey

TERMS AND TOPICS

- Progressivism
- Special interests
- Relativism
- Monopolies
- Government activism

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- How did Progressives explain their argument that human nature, truth, and politics were inevitably evolving and improving over the course of history?
- How and why did the Progressives critique the Declaration of Independence, natural rights, and social contract theory?
- What were the Progressives’ conceptions of freedom, equality, and justice?
- Why and in what ways did Progressives claim that the individual person’s identity and will are bound up with the State?
What did Progressives mean by equality? Why did they believe that creating equality of opportunity and treating everyone with equal dignity necessitated greater activism from government?  
How did Progressives critique individualism and the power of special interests, monopolies, and the wealthy in politics?  
What social reforms did Progressives pursue to deal with problems of urbanization and industrialization?  
Why did Progressives approach foreign affairs with the expectation that the world would become freer and more peaceful with the spread of democracy and international institutions?

**KEYS TO THE LESSON**

Students should come to understand how Progressivism, while intending to bring progress and improvement, offered one of the more robust and effective critiques of the founding in American history, beginning with and especially concerning the philosophical and moral principles on which America was based. While the Progressives mostly shared the Founders’ conceptions of moral conduct, they largely discarded the Founders’ views of human nature, individual rights, equality, moral formation, and the pursuit of happiness. Students should see how these views are born partly of the changes from first generations of industrialization but especially from new philosophical ideas that fundamentally questioned the basis of the Founders’ ideas.

Teachers might best plan and teach Critiques of the Declaration of Independence with emphasis on the following approaches:

- While scheduling may limit the study of other thinkers related the American founding and Progressivism, it would be good for teachers to familiarize themselves with those thinkers who informed many of the earliest Progressives and Progressive thought, such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Georg Hegel, Karl Marx, and Charles Darwin. Spending some time to review these figures, ideas, and histories with students or at least to refer to them where appropriate may be helpful in teaching this unit as well as Unit 8.
- Students should understand the Progressive critique of the American founding. Begin with practical considerations in which the Progressives juxtapose life and society at the founding to that of the Gilded Age. Then proceed to consider the theoretical differences between the Founders and the Progressives on the question of rights.
- On the practical side, lead students through considerations of how the Progressives judged the Founders to have been too focused on the individual and the value of private property ownership. As a nation without titles of nobility and class distinctions, the founders understood the great importance of the ability of all Americans to acquire and hold private property. But that was by no means the sole or primary objective of the American founding. The Progressives, however, argued that the founding (and the Constitution in particular) was designed solely to protect private property. The great changes in industry and the accumulation of capital had since then made the founding problematic by allowing too much power to become concentrated in the hands of wealthy industrialists and large businesses.
Help students understand that the presence of large corporations may not have been an issue in and of itself so long as individuals were still free to seek their own material prosperity. The reason it was an issue for the Progressives was due to their second critique of the Founders, one that was more theoretical concerning the idea of rights. The Progressives rejected the Founders’ insistence that rights were natural, that they were part of what made one human, and that they existed only at the individual level. Instead, they maintained that rights were conditioned on social circumstances and belong to groups of people, usually organized by class. The problem with the Founders’ system of equal natural rights was that the equal protection of those rights now favored the wealthy and powerful. Progressives believed government should redefine rights according to class and group, and that government should not protect rights equally when it came to the wealthy and other “special interests.” Indeed, since rights were not based on natural personhood, they were derived instead from some other source as determined by government. This means that the possession of rights is controlled by government: they can be given but also taken away by government. Rejecting the Founders’ understanding of equal and unalienable rights grounded in human nature, the Progressive’s argued for changing rights that were controlled by government.

Review with students the American Founders’ understanding of human nature. They understood human nature to be fixed and unchanging, good but also flawed and tending toward corrupting power. In response to human nature, government must guard against the opposite dangers of lawlessness and tyranny, accounting for the realities of human nature and rejecting the possibility of utopia. The Constitution, therefore, did not deny, demonize, or elevate human nature, but rather tried to channel the powers of human beings into constructive institutions while mitigating man’s baser tendencies. In brief, the Constitution was constructed on an understanding of fixed human nature born of the Founders’ knowledge of history, their own experience, and their prudence.

Share with students that while both the Founders and Progressives believed in a moral foundation to politics, Progressives critiqued the above-mentioned view of human nature and government as too pessimistic and too simplistic. Progressives instead generally believed history to be evolving and automatically moving forward. That is, when looking on the technological gains, improvements in the standard of living, and the general pace of scientific discovery, Progressives believed that human beings, even human nature itself, would also improve and would be more likely to do what is right and good automatically. At the societal level, therefore, government ought to bring about that improvement and even aim to perfect human nature. Progressives disagreed with the Founders’ argument that government’s primary purpose was to secure unchanging rights and maintain a framework for self-government. Instead, they held that the purpose of government was to keep up with evolving rights and constant social change, what they called “progress.”

Explain to students how the Progressives departed from what they considered the meager understanding of rights and equality, i.e., that justice and morality require that the natural rights of individuals be equally protected. Instead, the Progressives saw government as a force not to protect rights but to grant groups of people special advantages in order to fulfill the potential outcomes of having certain rights. It was not enough, for example, to be free to earn a living if
there was no job by which to earn it. It is the role of government not only to preserve the right to have a job but also perhaps to supply the job itself.

- Clarify with students that studying the philosophical, institutional, and political break that the Progressives made with the Founders does not mean that Progressives were wrong to highlight issues such as child labor, workplace and consumer safety, conservation, and monopolies, as the Founders also did. These are serious problems that ought to have been and should continue to be addressed. But students should consider the arguments surrounding the appropriate response, namely, whether it is the role of government to address these issues, or if private individuals, charities, businesses, consumers, churches, civic associations, and state and local governments are the proper entities to answer these problems, especially in light of students’ understanding of both the American founding and Progressivism.

- Emphasize for students how such an idealistic philosophy (and idealistic view of human nature) would lead one to assume that the bad qualities of human nature (such as a desire for political power or human fallibility) are no longer a problem and that one need not worry (as the Founders did) about the distribution and separation of power within government, or about the accumulation of power in any one place. What James Madison considered “the very definition of tyranny” is thus less of a concern.

- Make sure students appreciate the shift in the purpose and operation of government under such a view: government is no longer the defender of certain fundamental rights but otherwise limited to the basic functions (lawmaking, executing law, and adjudicating law) and core responsibilities (such as maintaining courts of law and the nation’s security) of government. Rather, government is to be the active force for change in America, bringing about personal fulfilment of individuals and progress for society. Moreover, these ends were not limited to merely domestic policies but were attainable also on the world stage in foreign affairs. Woodrow Wilson’s “War Message to Congress” articulates the spirit of Progressivism in foreign policy.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

**Assignment:** Explain how the Progressives critiqued America’s principles and the Founders’ understandings of rights, equality, human nature, and the purpose of government (3–4 paragraphs).
Lesson 2 — Politics, Leadership, and the Administrative State

LESSON PREVIEW

Students learn how Progressives reimagined the roles of elected officials and political parties to inform and lead the people toward certain Progressive goals instead of governing as representatives of the people, while leaving governance to the federal bureaucracy, what some called a new fourth branch of government with considerable powers in its possession.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

Introduction to the Constitution  Lecture 12
Constitution 101  Lecture 8
Constitution 201  Lectures 1, 3, 4

PRIMARY SOURCES

Students are to read or, if they have previously read, review the following primary sources. While reading, students should annotate these sources. For particularly challenging texts or if the class is offered earlier in high school, the teacher may wish to provide students with guided reading questions to assist with comprehension, clarity, and direction. Using their annotations and any guided reading questions, students should come to class prepared to participate in a seminar conversation on each text.

“’The New Nationalism,” Theodore Roosevelt
War Message to Congress, Woodrow Wilson
Fourteen Points, Woodrow Wilson
“’Leaders of Men,” Woodrow Wilson
“The Presidency,” Theodore Roosevelt
“The Study of Administration,” Woodrow Wilson

TERMS AND TOPICS

direct democracy  bureaucracy
politics  delegation
living Constitution  16th Amendment
expertise  17th Amendment
administration  18th Amendment
administrative state
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- In what ways did Progressives critique the Constitution as being too slow, mechanical, and at odds with itself?
- For what reasons did Progressives insist upon an “organic” constitutional arrangement?
- What were Progressives’ early arguments for a “living Constitution”?
- Why did the Progressives critique the separation of powers and checks and balances?
- Why did Progressives believe that many of the Founders’ worries over the dangers of tyranny, and majority tyranny, were outdated, and thus that limits and checks on the government’s power were outdated?
- In what ways did Progressives promote direct democracy?
- What was government by expertise, and why did the Progressives insist upon it?
- In what sense did Progressives argue that many political questions were essentially noncontroversial and which called for technical, nonpartisan guidance?
- In what sense did Progressives believe that the main problems in politics stemmed from special interests and the prejudices of the people?
- How could these interests and prejudices be overcome by an administrative state insulated from the sway of politics and capable of enacting the true will of the people?
- How did Progressives try to replace partisan competition, political deliberation, and interest group bargaining with good management?
- How does the administrative bureaucracy often claim the formerly separated legislative, executive, and judicial branches all for itself?
- How has Congress delegated its legislative power to the administrative state?
- How have independent regulatory agencies gained and wielded power largely outside the direct control of the executive branch?
- How did Progressives reframe the president as a visionary, rhetorical, and partisan leader who sets the legislative agenda and guides general legislation through Congress—legislation that usually delegates legislative, executive, and judicial power to bureaucratic agencies?

Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
- Question 5: How are changes made to the U.S. Constitution?
- Question 32: Who elects U.S. senators?
- Question 63: There are four amendments to the U.S. Constitution about who can vote. Describe one of them.
- Question 71: Why is it important to pay federal taxes?

KEYS TO THE LESSON

The philosophical differences between Progressivism and the founding had many practical consequences in actual governance, both for the institutions of government and government employees. Progressivism established an unofficial dividing line between those who represented the people and those who made, enforced, and judged the laws. They labeled this distinction “politics” on the one hand and “administration” on the other. Politics included those who ran for and were elected to office. Their purpose, once elected, was not actually to govern or to represent the will of the people per se, but rather to lead the people to desire and demand certain policy outcomes. Once such a mandate for government activity was secured through the passage of general laws that stated an overall goal, the detailed tasks of the actual creation, enforcement, and judging violations of law was left to government employees known as administrative experts or
bureaucrats. Insulated from the people and from politics by not being subject to election, these experts were then to govern to bring about the grand objectives defined in general terms by politics.

Teachers might best plan and teach Politics, Leadership, and the Administrative State with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Review with students the philosophical departure the Progressives made from the Founders’ understanding of human nature. The Founders recognized and accounted for a permanent and unchanging human nature, and the Progressives posited an evolving and changing human nature.
- Walk students through what this new view of human nature means for the purpose of government and for practical politics and the activities of government. For Progressives, a more optimistic view of human nature made them supportive of direct democratic rule. A prime example of this change was the 17th Amendment, which required the direct election of U.S. senators. The use of initiative, referendum, and recall at the state level are other examples.
- Help students to understand the role of elected officials in this new paradigm. Elected officials are not merely to reflect consent and refine the views of the people but rather to show or convince the people of what they should truly want. Rhetoric was the main mechanism for doing so, especially through the office of the presidency and, as Theodore Roosevelt popularized, the bully pulpit. Progressives saw the presidency as the national leader of popular opinion.
- Consider with students how this emphasis on direct democracy was to a certain extent not as meaningful as it seemed. The democratic push may have worked around the power of powerful but narrow interests, at least at the time, but it certainly did not mean that more laws would be enacted through the popular institutions of government. Instead, this democratic push was mainly aimed at ascertaining the “general will” of the people through democratic processes shaping opinion to follow progressive leadership. That is, the Progressives emphasized more direct democracy to determine the general aspiration of what most people think “sounds good,” and even this was up to elected officials to show the people what that ought to be. For example, suppose most people want a general outcome (such as clean air and clean water) but powerful interests may not care as much about clean air and clean water. Expanded democratic processes make it easier and more immediate for the people to express their will about the general outcome they want. Politics is about expressing general ideas and establishing popular support to get those ideas expressed in law. Separate from this more democratic process is the difficult and less democratic task of turning general ideas into actual governance. The Progressives called this task “administration.”
- The Progressives argued that the technical and time-consuming work of actually carrying out the broad, general ideas of the law—detailing how it is to be done, implementing the laws, and making sure they are enforced to achieve their objectives—is not the work of Congress or even the President but requires a new body of experts and bureaucrats to do the real work of governing (administration) outside of and not subject to politics. Congress would delegate some of its lawmaking power to these bureaucrats, most of whom would exist under the executive branch and so could also execute the “laws” or regulations they make (in this example, the clean air and water experts would make the specific details of the law). The president can delegate his power to enforce it. They often also are given judicial powers, and have their own courts to adjudicate claims against their own laws and regulations. This shift of legislative, executive, and judicial powers away from the branches in which these powers had been separately vested by the people through the Constitution, and its accumulation under various departments and agencies,
amounts to the second great shift in the Progressive worldview: government needed to be rearranged through the creation of the administrative state to circumvent the processes of the Constitution and bring about “progress.”

- Ask students about the importance of this shift away from government by representatives of the people to government by bureaucratic expertise, including whether or not it stands against the principle of representative self-government on which the Founders established the United States. Other words to characterize this view is “government by bureaucracy” or “the administrative state.”
- Emphasize how the advent of the administrative state changed the Founders’ careful insistence that powers be separated and dispersed through the separation of powers, checks and balances, and federalism, not to mention government by elected representatives. All three types of government power (legislative, executive, and judicial) are instead consolidated into bureaucratic agencies that are, moreover, highly autonomous from the people. And all of this is in the name of efficiency: trusting in improved human nature and scientific expertise to achieve higher aims via government than the founding generation ever thought possible.
- It is worth asking students about the role of such experts in making political decisions. For example, in the Founders’ view the role of statesmen was to consider all the various factors and people that a certain policy would affect and make the decision that best preserves the rights, freedom, and safety of the most people and the common good. That was a political decision (that is, it falls to someone controlled by the people through elections) which required prudence or practical wisdom, not merely expertise or technical knowledge.
- Remind students of the different ends that the Progressives had in mind when it came to the role of government. Instead of protecting, permitting, and encouraging individuals to pursue moral ends by exercising their liberty under a limited government, progressivism saw government as a social mechanism for achieving moral ends. That is, instead of assuring self-government so that a diverse people could pursue different vocations and seek different opportunities under the rule a law (meant to check the baser aspects of human nature and the desire for power), Progressivism saw government as a moral force that should organize and regulate public action in order to bring about social progress.
- Help students to understand the various changes the Progressives made to the functioning of the government. Include in this treatment the 16th, 17th, and 18th amendments.
- In looking ahead, note how the Progressive expansion in government activity might appear to be less of a departure from the Founders, since many Progressives sometimes shared a similar moral outlook as the Founders. But this is the crucial difference: the Founders understood and appreciated that man’s flawed human nature meant that government should remain limited and powers should not be consolidated, and that the ends of man are better served by constitutional self-government rather than government regulation of more and more aspects of society. This divide would become more apparent as the inheritors of Progressive ideas ceased to believe in the moral or civic principles that had defined America and American life.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**
Assignment: Explain the relationship between politics and administration in Progressive government and how this arrangement and these roles different from the American founding (2–3 paragraphs).
Unit 5 — Formative Quiz

Covering Lessons 1-2
10-15 minutes

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. How did Progressives explain their argument that human nature, truth, and politics were inevitably evolving and improving over the course of history?

2. What did Progressives mean by equality? Why did they believe that creating equality of opportunity and treating everyone with equal dignity necessitated greater activism from government?

3. Why did the Progressives critique the separation of powers and checks and balances?

4. What was government by expertise, and why did the Progressives insist upon it?

5. How has Congress delegated its legislative power to the administrative state?
Lesson 3 — The New Deal and the Great Society

LESSON PREVIEW

Students learn about the Progressive tenets and effects of Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s New Deal program amidst the Great Depression and of Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

Constitution 101 Lecture 9
Constitution 201 Lecture 6

PRIMARY SOURCES

Students are to read or, if they have previously read, review the following primary sources. While reading, students should annotate these sources. For particularly challenging texts or if the class is offered earlier in high school, the teacher may wish to provide students with guided reading questions to assist with comprehension, clarity, and direction. Using their annotations and any guided reading questions, students should come to class prepared to participate in a seminar conversation on each text.

Commonwealth Club Address, Franklin Delano Roosevelt
Democratic Convention Address, 1936, Franklin Delano Roosevelt
Annual Message to Congress, 1941, Franklin Delano Roosevelt
Annual Message to Congress, 1944, Franklin Delano Roosevelt
Commencement Address at the University of Michigan, Lyndon Johnson

TERMS AND TOPICS

The New Deal Great Society
Second Bill of Rights war on poverty
commerce power welfare
Japanese internment welfare state

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What was Franklin Roosevelt’s new conception of the social contract?
- Why did Franklin Roosevelt argue that rights are to be granted by the government according to the social conditions of the historical moment?
- How does this view of rights and their origin contrast with the Founders’ understanding of rights?
- What risks might accompany such a view of rights?
- What was Franklin Roosevelt’s Second Bill of Rights? How did these rights differ from the Founders’ original Bill of Rights?
- What is the theoretical foundation for entitlement programs and viewing them as rights?
- What is the argument that real freedom requires material security?
During the New Deal, what was the new understanding of the Commerce Power?

How did the New Deal and Progressivism in general weaken federalism?

What were the ideological and practical components of Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society?

What was the war on poverty?

What is the welfare state? What are the advantages and disadvantages of its programs?

**KEYS TO THE LESSON**

Early Progressivism made important changes to the American constitutional order. More importantly, it established precedents for rearranging American institutions and increasing government activity in American life in a way very different from the founding principles of basic equality, liberty, and limited constitutional government. World War I put a pause on the Progressives’ optimistic view of human nature and enlightened government. Calvin Coolidge’s limited government policies of the 1920s and the buoyed economic opportunity that associated them partly undercut the Progressives’ claims for federal government activity to address economic issues. The Great Depression, however, allowed a second generation of Progressives to expand and cement the Progressive view of government in the American order. Students should understand how the New Deal addressed the crises of the Great Depression while expanding the size and power of the federal government. Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society in the 1960s expanded further on the New Deal and World War II’s growth in government administration and regulation by establishing larger welfare and other social programs. Johnson, moreover, attempted to expand once more the purposes of government, this time beyond the equal protection of rights of the founding and beyond the economic concerns of the early Progressives and the New Deal. For the Great Society, personal human fulfillment through government and social action was introduced as the new end of government.

Teachers might best plan and teach the New Deal and the Great Society with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Clarify for students that the chief long-term consequence of the New Deal was the expansion and formalization of the administrative state, its bureaucratic agencies and employees, and its extensive role in American life. Students should understand that Roosevelt justified such an aggressive political shift as a response to the Great Depression. By greatly expanding and centrally organizing many new aspects of government, the New Deal cemented the idea of government as expert administration. As Roosevelt said in his “Commonwealth Club Address,” the day of “enlightened administration” had arrived.

- Emphasize that Roosevelt saw the power of government not merely as a guarantor of the freedom to exercise natural rights but as actually guaranteeing economic conditions and assuring new economic rights. New entitlement programs guaranteed certain benefits to groups or segments of the population, and implied that individuals have a right to such government entitlements just as or even more important than their natural rights. Roosevelt argued (in his “Second Bill of Rights” speech) that the old rights guaranteed in the Constitution were inadequate and that America required a new economic bill of rights to guarantee employment, housing, medical care, social security, education, and even recreation. These ideas would inform future political debates over several decades.

- Note for students the effect that the New Deal had on federalism and the separation of powers. While the courts at first attempted to uphold limits on the powers of the federal government (by rejecting, for instance, attempts to delegate power to the bureaucracy), by the end of the New Deal
the Supreme Court had abandoned attempts to restrict such limits, granting Congress vast authority to legislate about anything that pertained to economic activity. And in expanding its delegations of power to the bureaucracy, Congress in turn expanded the federal government’s power to regulate those activities.

- Introduce the Great Society as the third phase of Progressivism, and the bridge to contemporary political movements. Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society sought to broaden the focus of Progressivism while maintaining its views on rights and the purpose and methods of government. Government was not merely meant to preserve rights (as the Founders asserted), or even to achieve economic equality and fulfillment (as in early Progressivism and the New Deal). Taking Progressivism a step further, the Great Society sought to use government to achieve a kind of human fulfillment for groups of people. And it sought to bring government action to areas previously not the realm of the federal government, such as public education.

- It is worth noting for students that although Johnson’s rhetoric hinted at a spiritual nature and spiritual ends to the political body and government, his actions stayed for the most part in the realm of economics, for example in the great expansions of welfare programs such as Medicare and Medicaid. Johnson’s rhetoric did attempt, however, to tap into and give voice to the cultural changes that would overtake the progressive movement in the 1960s and subsequent decades. The Great Society launched the federal government’s expanded involvement in race relations, education, and the environment.

- While worth mentioning the role of the judiciary, especially the Warren Court, in facilitating the Great Society, a closer study of some key cases related to the Great Society and underlying cultural changes is reserved for Unit 8.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

**Assignment:** Explain the ways in which the New Deal and the Great Society each expanded the administrative state and the philosophical and moral precepts Franklin Roosevelt and Lyndon Johnson cited in doing so (3–4 paragraphs).
Lesson 4 — Constitutionalist Reponses to Progressivism

LESSON PREVIEW

Students learn about the various ways that advocates for the old constitutional order—who employed what came to be called an originalist interpretation of the Constitution—responded to the various arguments and policies of Progressivism, especially since the New Deal and the Great Society.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

Constitution 201 Lecture 10

PRIMARY SOURCES

Students are to read or, if they have previously read, review the following primary sources. While reading, students should annotate these sources. For particularly challenging texts or if the class is offered earlier in high school, the teacher may wish to provide students with guided reading questions to assist with comprehension, clarity, and direction. Using their annotations and any guided reading questions, students should come to class prepared to participate in a seminar conversation on each text.

“The Inspiration of the Declaration,” Calvin Coolidge
“A Time for Choosing,” Ronald Reagan
First Inaugural Address, Ronald Reagan

TERMS AND TOPICS

- traditionalism
- libertarianism
- the conservative movement
- neoconservatism
- Reaganism
- constitutional conservatism
- populism
- nationalism

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- For all of the following: what were their origins, how do they attempt to answer Progressivism, how are they distinct from one another, how might the Founders respond to them, what are their shortcomings?
  - originalism
  - traditionalism
  - libertarianism
  - the conservative movement
  - neoconservatism
  - Reaganism
  - constitutional conservatism
  - populism
  - nationalism
KEYS TO THE LESSON

Help students to understand the multifaceted and varied responses to Progressivism by constitutionalists and those who later came to be called conservatives. Students do not need to spend very much time with each of the various types of conservatism, but students should be asked how each kind of conservatism compares to America’s founding principles, both philosophically and in government, as well as to Progressivism. Since many of these responses claim to “conserve” the American founding and seek the original meaning of the Constitution, as opposed to a “living” Constitution, this is an appropriate question to consider when studying these ideas.

Teachers might best plan and teach Constitutionalist Responses to Progressivism with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Share with students the extent to which each constitutionalist or conservative movement claimed to adhere to all or specific parts of the American founding, particularly through appeals to the Declaration of Independence and an originalist reading of the Constitution.
- Read with students Calvin Coolidge’s “The Inspiration of the Declaration” speech on the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, and consider his description of the moral and intellectual grounding of the Declaration, in particular his statement that “If all men are created equal, that is final. If they are endowed with inalienable rights, that is final. If governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, that is final. No advance, no progress can be made beyond these propositions.”
- Explain to students that the general tension within conservatism tend to concern the degree to which government is used to secure, encourage, or achieve constitutional principles, economic liberty, and the common good.
- Help students understand that libertarians view the purpose of government in the most limited sense: to securing the rule of law and economic contracts while permitting most other activities, regardless of their morality, so long as they do not immediately harm another.
- Explain how the modern conservative movement had its origins in the thought and work of William F. Buckley, who was critical of the New Deal and of modern liberalism in general as being secular and destructive of the non-governmental intermediary institutions of society, such as churches, fraternal organizations, and the family. After the Great Society, new groups of conservatives expanded these ideas in to a broader movement. One group called neoconservatives, who had previously been progressive or liberals, emerged as critics of the welfare state and the liberalization of social policy, and advocates of a strong American foreign policy. Another group of more religious conservatives, referred to as the New Right, were especially concerned about social issues arising out of government policies (particularly as driven by the Supreme Court) regarding abortion and the rise of secularism.
- Consider with students Ronald Reagan’s ability to combine free-market economic concerns, the new concerns of the social effects of modern liberalism on American society, and concerns about America’s national security (especially in the midst of the Cold War). This new consensus about conservatism sought to decrease the size of government (especially the federal government and its role in America’s economy) and reestablish Constitutional limits (especially to revive federalism) while asserting American principles and national strength on the world stage.
- A particular interest of conservatism was to return the country to a proper understanding of American constitutionalism, which meant in general a respect and appreciation for the
accomplishments of the American founding, its grounding in the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and its establishment of the rule of law and the forms of constitutional government. There was a particular emphasis on abiding by the Constitution as a ruling expression of the consent of the governed, and this brought prominence to the appointment of judges and how they should be guided by the original meaning of the Constitution rather than reading the Constitution as a “living” document that evolves with time.

- Over several decades, constitutionalism and conservatism have debated how core principles apply to contemporary political circumstances and more recently have begun to emphasize secure borders, economic nationalism, a moral outlook reflective of the founding generation, and an American-centric foreign policy as policy manifestations of those principles.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

**Assignment:** Outline the major constitutionalist or conservative positions and how they attempt to answer Progressivism and claim to adhere to the American founding (2–3 paragraphs).
APPENDIX A

Study Guide

Test

Writing Assignment
### TERMS AND TOPICS

*Explain each of the following and the context in which it was discussed during this unit’s lessons.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progressivism</th>
<th>delegation</th>
<th>welfare state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>relativism</td>
<td>16th Amendment</td>
<td>traditionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government activism</td>
<td>17th Amendment</td>
<td>libertarianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>special interests</td>
<td>18th Amendment</td>
<td>fusionism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monopolies</td>
<td>The New Deal</td>
<td>the conservative movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>direct democracy</td>
<td>Second Bill of Rights</td>
<td>neoconservatism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>living Constitution</td>
<td>Commerce Power</td>
<td>Reaganism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expertise</td>
<td>Japanese internment</td>
<td>constitutional conservatism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administration</td>
<td>Great Society</td>
<td>populism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrative state</td>
<td>war on poverty</td>
<td>nationalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bureaucracy</td>
<td>welfare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.

Lesson 1 | Criticism of the Declaration of Independence

☐ How did Progressives explain their argument that human nature, truth, and politics were inevitably evolving and improving over the course of history?
☐ How and why did the Progressives reject the Declaration of Independence, natural rights, and social contract theory?
☐ What were the Progressives’ conceptions of freedom, equality, and justice?
☐ Why and in what ways did Progressives claim that the individual person’s identity and will are bound up with the State?
☐ What did Progressives mean by equality? Why did they believe that creating equality of opportunity and treating everyone with equal dignity necessitated greater activism from government?
☐ How did Progressives critique individualism and the power of special interests, monopolies, and the wealthy in politics?
☐ What social reforms did Progressives pursue to deal with problems of urbanization and industrialization?
☐ Why did Progressives approach foreign affairs with the expectation that the world would become freer and more peaceful with the spread of democracy and international institutions?

Lesson 2 | Politics, Leadership, and the Administrative State

☐ In what ways did Progressives critique the Constitution as being too slow, mechanical, and at odds with itself?
☐ For what reasons did Progressives insist upon an “organic” constitutional arrangement that more easily allows the government to carry out the general will of the people?
☐ What were Progressives’ early arguments for a “living Constitution”?
☐ Why did the Progressives critique the separation of powers and checks and balances?
☐ Why did Progressives believe that many of the Founders’ worries over the dangers of tyranny, and majority tyranny, were outdated and thus that limits and checks on the government’s power were outdated?
☐ In what ways did Progressives promote direct democracy?
☐ What was government by expertise and why did the Progressives insist upon it?
☐ In what sense did Progressives argue that many political questions were essentially noncontroversial and called for technical, nonpartisan guidance?
☐ In what sense did Progressives believe that the main problems in politics stemmed from special interests and the prejudices of the people?
☐ How could these interests and prejudices be overcome by an administrative state insulated from the sway of politics that could enact the people’s true will?
☐ How did Progressives try to replace partisan competition, political deliberation, and interest group bargaining with good management?
☐ How does the administrative bureaucracy often claim the formerly separated legislative, executive, and judicial branches all for itself?
☐ How has Congress delegated its legislative power to the administrative state?
How have independent regulatory agencies gained and wielded unchecked power outside the direct control of the executive branch?

How did Progressives reframe the president as a visionary, rhetorical, and partisan leader who sets the legislative agenda and guides general legislation through Congress—legislation that usually delegates legislative, executive, and even judicial power to bureaucratic agencies?

Lesson 3 | The New Deal and the Great Society

What was Franklin Roosevelt’s new conception of the social contract?

Why did Franklin Roosevelt argue that rights are to be granted by the government according to the social conditions of the historical moment?

How does this view of rights and their origin differ from the Founders’ understanding of rights?

Beyond whether this is true, what great risk does such a view of rights imply (consider the case of Japanese internment)?

What was Franklin Roosevelt’s Second Bill of Rights? How did those rights differ from the Founders’ original Bill of Rights?

What is the theoretical foundation for entitlements and viewing them as rights?

What is the argument that real freedom requires material security?

During the New Deal, what was the new understanding of the Commerce Power?

How did the New Deal and Progressivism in general weaken federalism?

What were the ideological and practical components of Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society?

What was the war on poverty?

What is the welfare state?

Lesson 4 | Constitutionalist Responses to Progressivism

For all of the following, what were their origins, how do they attempt to answer Progressivism, and how are they distinct from one another:

- traditionalism
- libertarianism
- the conservative movement
- neoconservatism
- Reaganism
- constitutional conservatism
- populism
- nationalism
Test — Progressivism and the State

TERMS AND TOPICS

Explain each of the following and the context in which it was discussed during this unit’s lessons.

1. government activism

2. special interests

3. direct democracy

4. expertise

5. administration

6. bureaucracy

7. delegation

8. 17th Amendment

9. Second Bill of Rights

10. Commerce Power

11. Great Society

12. welfare state
13. libertarianism

14. constitutional conservatism

15. populism

**PRIMARY SOURCES**

Explain the main arguments in each of the following sources and the significance of each to understanding Progressivism.


17. “Commonwealth Club Address,” Franklin Delano Roosevelt

18. Annual Message to Congress, 1944, Franklin Delano Roosevelt

19. Commencement Address at the University of Michigan, Lyndon Johnson

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and writing should be employed, and responses must fully answer each question.

21. How did Progressives explain their argument that human nature, truth, and politics were inevitably evolving and improving over the course of history?

22. How and why did the Progressives reject the Declaration of Independence, natural rights, and social contract theory?

23. Why and in what ways did Progressives claim that the individual person’s identity and will are bound up with the State?

24. What did Progressives mean by equality? Why did they believe that creating equality of opportunity and treating everyone with equal dignity necessitated greater activism from government?

25. How did Progressives critique individualism and the power of special interests, monopolies, and the wealthy in politics?

26. Why did Progressives approach foreign affairs with the expectation that the world would become freer and more peaceful with the spread of democracy and international institutions?
27. What were Progressives’ early arguments for a “living Constitution”?

28. Why did the Progressives critique the separation of powers and checks and balances?

29. Why did Progressives believe that many of the Founders’ worries over the dangers of tyranny, and majority tyranny, were outdated and thus that limits and checks on the government’s power were outdated?

30. What was government by expertise, and why did the Progressives insist upon it?

31. How has Congress delegated its legislative power to the administrative state?

32. Why did Franklin Roosevelt argue that rights are to be granted by the government according to the social conditions of the historical moment?

33. How did the New Deal and Progressivism in general weaken federalism?

34. What were the ideological and practical components of Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society?

35. What were the origins of Reaganism, and how did it attempt to answer Progressivism?
Writing Assignment — Progressivism and the State

DIRECTIONS

Citing primary sources and conversations from class in your argument, write a 500–800-word essay answering the question:

Citing primary sources and changes in policies and institutions, how did the early Progressives, the New Deal, and the Great Society each critique the principles and governing structures established at the American founding?*

*A previous version presumed that students would cite sources. This is now explicit.
APPENDIX B

Primary Sources

Woodrow Wilson
Charles Merriam
Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr.
John Dewey
Theodore Roosevelt
Franklin Delano Roosevelt
Lyndon Johnson
Calvin Coolidge
Ronald Reagan
GOVERNOR WOODROW WILSON (D-NJ)

What is Progress?

SPEECH

1912

BACKGROUND

Woodrow Wilson delivered versions of this speech on several occasions during his campaign for the presidency in 1912.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What conditions does Wilson say compel him to be a progressive?

2. According to Wilson, what is "change," and when is it worthwhile?

3. Why does Wilson prefer that young men be unlike their fathers, and what does this have to do with his notions of patriotism and progress?

4. What value does Wilson place upon the past and traditions, and what happens to them as progress is made?

5. What is the Newtonian Theory with respect to the Constitution, and why does Wilson say that the Darwinian Theory is preferable?

6. According to Wilson, what does the Declaration of Independence have to say about questions at the time of the Founding and about questions of today?

In that sage and veracious chronicle, "Alice Through the Looking-Glass," it is recounted how, on a noteworthy occasion, the little heroine is seized by the Red Chess Queen, who races her off at a terrific pace. They run until both of them are out of breath; then they stop, and Alice looks around her and says, "Why, we are just where we were when we started!"

"Oh, yes," says the Red Queen; "you have to run twice as fast as that to get anywhere else."

That is a parable of progress. The laws of this country have not kept up with the change of economic circumstances in this country; they have not kept up with the change of political circumstances; and therefore we are not even where we were when we started. We shall have to run, not until we are out of breath, but until we have caught up with our own conditions, before we shall be where we were when we started; when we started this great experiment which has been the hope and the beacon of the world. And we should have to run twice as fast as any rational program I have seen in order to get anywhere else.

I am, therefore, forced to be a progressive, if for no other reason, because we have not kept up with our changes of conditions, either in the economic field or in the political field. We have not kept up as well as other nations have. We have not kept our practices adjusted to the facts of the case, and until we do, and unless we do, the facts of the case will always have the better of the argument; because if you do not adjust your laws to the facts, so much the worse for the laws, not for the facts, because law trails along after the facts. Only that law is unsafe which runs ahead of the facts and beckons to it and makes it follow the will-o’-the-wisps of imaginative projects.

Business is in a situation in America which it was never in before; it is in a situation to which we have not adjusted our laws. Our laws are still meant for business done by individuals; they have not been satisfactorily adjusted to business done by great combinations, and we have got to adjust them. I do not say we may or may not; I say we must; there is no choice. If your laws do not fit your facts, the facts are not injured, the law is damaged; because the law, unless I have studied it amiss, is the expression of the facts in legal relationships. Laws have never altered the facts; laws have always necessarily expressed the facts; adjusted interests as they have arisen and have changed toward one another.
Politics in America is in a case which sadly requires attention. The system set up by our law and our usage doesn’t work,—or at least it can’t be depended on; it is made to work only by a most unreasonable expenditure of labor and pains. The government, which was designed for the people, has got into the hands of bosses and their employers, the special interests. An invisible empire has been set up above the forms of democracy.

There are serious things to do. Does any man doubt the great discontent in this country? Does any man doubt that there are grounds and justifications for discontent? Do we dare stand still? Within the past few months we have witnessed (along with other strange political phenomena, eloquently significant of popular uneasiness) on one side a doubling of the Socialist vote and on the other the posting on dead walls and hoardings all over the country of certain very attractive and diverting bills warning citizens that it was "better to be safe than sorry" and advising them to "let well enough alone." Apparently a good many citizens doubted whether the situation they were advised to let alone was really well enough, and concluded that they would take a chance of being sorry. To me, these counsels of do-nothingism, these counsels of sitting still for fear something would happen, these counsels addressed to the hopeful, energetic people of the United States, telling them that they are not wise enough to touch their own affairs without marring them, constitute the most extraordinary argument of fatuous ignorance I ever heard. Americans are not yet cowards. True, their self-reliance has been sapped by years of submission to the doctrine that prosperity is something that benevolent magnates provide for them with the aid of the government; their self-reliance has been weakened, but not so utterly destroyed that you can twit them about it. The American people are not naturally stand-patters. Progress is the word that charms their ears and stirs their hearts.

There are, of course, Americans who have not yet heard that anything is going on. The circus might come to town, have the big parade and go, without their catching a sight of the camels or a note of the calliope. There are people, even Americans, who never move themselves or know that anything else is moving.
A friend of mine who had heard of the Florida "cracker," as they call a certain ne'er-do-well portion of the population down there, when passing through the State in a train, asked some one to point out a "cracker" to him. The man asked replied, "Well, if you see something off in the woods that looks brown, like a stump, you will know it is either a stump or a cracker; if it moves, it is a stump."

Now, movement has no virtue in itself. Change is not worth while for its own sake. I am not one of those who love variety for its own sake. If a thing is good today, I should like to have it stay that way tomorrow. Most of our calculations in life are dependent upon things staying the way they are. For example, if, when you got up this morning, you had forgotten how to dress, if you had forgotten all about those ordinary things which you do almost automatically, which you can almost do half awake, you would have to find out what you did yesterday. I am told by the psychologists that if I did not remember who I was yesterday, I should not know who I am today, and that, therefore, my very identity depends upon my being able to tally today with yesterday. If they do not tally, then I am confused; I do not know who I am, and I have to go around and ask somebody to tell me my name and where I came from.

I am not one of those who wish to break connection with the past; I am not one of those who wish to change for the mere sake of variety. The only men who do that are the men who want to forget something, the men who filled yesterday with something they would rather not recollect today, and so go about seeking diversion, seeking abstraction in something that will blot out recollection, or seeking to put something into them which will blot out all recollection. Change is not worth while unless it is improvement. If I move out of my present house because I do not like it, then I have got to choose a better house, or build a better house, to justify the change.

It would seem a waste of time to point out that ancient distinction,—between mere change and improvement. Yet there is a class of mind that is prone to confuse them. We have had political leaders whose conception of greatness was to be forever frantically doing some-
thing,—it mattered little what; restless, vociferous men, without sense of the energy of concentration, knowing only the energy of succession. Now, life does not consist of eternally running to a fire. There is no virtue in going anywhere unless you will gain something by being there. The direction is just as important as the impetus of motion.

All progress depends on how fast you are going, and where you are going, and I fear there has been too much of this thing of knowing neither how fast we were going or where we were going. I have my private belief that we have been doing most of our progressiveness after the fashion of those things that in my boyhood days we called "treadmills,"—a treadmill being a moving platform, with cleats on it, on which some poor devil of a mule was forced to walk forever without getting anywhere. Elephants and even other animals have been known to turn treadmills, making a good deal of noise, and causing certain wheels to go round, and I daresay grinding out some sort of product for somebody, but without achieving much progress. Lately, in an effort to persuade the elephant to move, really, his friends tried dynamite. It moved,—in separate and scattered parts, but it moved.

A cynical but witty Englishman said, in a book, not long ago, that it was a mistake to say of a conspicuously successful man, eminent in his line of business, that you could not bribe a man like that, because, he said, the point about such men is that they have been bribed—not in the ordinary meaning of that word, not in any gross, corrupt sense, but they have achieved their great success by means of the existing order of things and therefore they have been put under bonds to see that that existing order of things is not changed; they are bribed to maintain the status quo.

It was for that reason that I used to say, when I had to do with the administration of an educational institution, that I should like to make the young gentlemen of the rising generation as unlike their fathers as possible. Not because their fathers lacked character or intelligence or knowledge or patriotism, but because their fathers, by reason of their advancing years and their established position in society, had lost touch with the processes of life; they had forgotten what it was to begin; they had forgotten what it was to rise; they had forgotten what it was to be dominated by the circumstances of their life on their way up
from the bottom to the top, and, therefore, they were out of sympathy with the creative,
formative and progressive forces of society.

Progress! Did you ever reflect that that word is almost a new one? No word comes more
often or more naturally to the lips of modern man, as if the thing it stands for were almost
synonymous with life itself, and yet men through many thousand years never talked or
thought of progress. They thought in the other direction. Their stories of heroisms and
glory were tales of the past. The ancestor wore the heavier armor and carried the larger
spear. "There were giants in those days." Now all that has altered. We think of the future,
not the past, as the more glorious time in comparison with which the present is nothing.
Progress, development,—those are modern words. The modern idea is to leave the past and
press onward to something new.

But what is progress going to do with the past, and with the present? How is it going to
treat them? With ignominy, or respect? Should it break with them altogether, or rise out of
them, with its roots still deep in the older time? What attitude shall progressives take to-
ward the existing order, toward those institutions of conservatism, the Constitution, the
laws, and the courts?

Are those thoughtful men who fear that we are now about to disturb the ancient founda-
tions of our institutions justified in their fear? If they are, we ought to go very slowly about
the processes of change. If it is indeed true that we have grown tired of the institutions
which we have so carefully and sedulously built up, then we ought to go very slowly and
very carefully about the very dangerous task of altering them. We ought, therefore, to ask
ourselves, first of all, whether thought in this country is tending to do anything by which
we shall retrace our steps, or by which we shall change the whole direction of our develop-
ment?

I believe, for one, that you cannot tear up ancient rootages and safely plant the tree of liberty
in soil which is not native to it. I believe that the ancient traditions of a people are its ballast;
you cannot make a tabula rasa upon which to write a political program. You cannot take a
new sheet of paper and determine what your life shall be tomorrow. You must knit the new
into the old. You cannot put a new patch on an old garment without ruining it; it must be not a patch, but something woven into the old fabric, of practically the same pattern, of the same texture and intention. If I did not believe that to be progressive was to preserve the essentials of our institutions, I for one could not be a progressive.

One of the chief benefits I used to derive from being president of a university was that I had the pleasure of entertaining thoughtful men from all over the world. I cannot tell you how much has dropped into my granary by their presence. I had been casting around in my mind for something by which to draw several parts of my political thought together when it was my good fortune to entertain a very interesting Scotsman who had been devoting himself to the philosophical thought of the seventeenth century. His talk was so engaging that it was delightful to hear him speak of anything, and presently there came out of the unexpected region of his thought the thing I had been waiting for. He called my attention to the fact that in every generation all sorts of speculation and thinking tend to fall under the formula of the dominant thought of the age. For example, after the Newtonian Theory of the universe had been developed, almost all thinking tended to express itself in the analogies of the Newtonian Theory, and since the Darwinian Theory has reigned amongst us, everybody is likely to express whatever he wishes to expound in terms of development and accommodation to environment.

Now, it came to me, as this interesting man talked, that the Constitution of the United States had been made under the dominion of the Newtonian Theory. You have only to read the papers of The Federalist to see that fact written on every page. They speak of the "checks and balances" of the Constitution, and use to express their idea the simile of the organization of the universe, and particularly of the solar system,—how by the attraction of gravitation the various parts are held in their orbits; and then they proceed to represent Congress, the Judiciary, and the President as a sort of imitation of the solar system.
They were only following the English Whigs, who gave Great Britain its modern constitution. Not that those Englishmen analyzed the matter, or had any theory about it; Englishmen care little for theories. It was a Frenchman, Montesquieu, who pointed out to them how faithfully they had copied Newton's description of the mechanism of the heavens.

The makers of our Federal Constitution read Montesquieu with true scientific enthusiasm. They were scientists in their way,—the best way of their age,—those fathers of the nation. Jefferson wrote of "the laws of Nature,"—and then by way of afterthought,—"and of Nature's God." And they constructed a government as they would have constructed an orrery,—to display the laws of nature. Politics in their thought was a variety of mechanics.

The Constitution was founded on the law of gravitation. The government was to exist and move by virtue of the efficacy of "checks and balances."

The trouble with the theory is that government is not a machine, but a living thing. It falls, not under the theory of the universe, but under the theory of organic life. It is accountable to Darwin, not to Newton. It is modified by its environment, necessitated by its tasks, shaped to its functions by the sheer pressure of life. No living thing can have its organs offset against each other, as checks, and live. On the contrary, its life is dependent upon their quick cooperation, their ready response to the commands of instinct or intelligence, their amicable community of purpose. Government is not a body of blind forces; it is a body of men, with highly differentiated functions, no doubt, in our modern day, of specialization, with a common task and purpose. Their cooperation is indispensable, their warfare fatal. There can be no successful government without the intimate, instinctive coordination of the organs of life and action. This is not theory, but fact, and displays its force as fact, whatever theories may be thrown across its track. Living political constitutions must be Darwinian in structure and in practice. Society is a living organism and must obey the laws of life, not of mechanics; it must develop.

All that progressives ask or desire is permission—in an era when "development," "evolution," is the scientific word—to interpret the Constitution according to the Darwinian principle; all they ask is recognition of the fact that a nation is a living thing and not a machine.
Some citizens of this country have never got beyond the Declaration of Independence, signed in Philadelphia, July 4th, 1776. Their bosoms swell against George III, but they have no consciousness of the war for freedom that is going on today.

The Declaration of Independence did not mention the questions of our day. It is of no consequence to us unless we can translate its general terms into examples of the present day and substitute them in some vital way for the examples it itself gives, so concrete, so intimately involved in the circumstances of the day in which it was conceived and written. It is an eminently practical document, meant for the use of practical men; not a thesis for philosophers, but a whip for tyrants; not a theory of government, but a program of action.

Unless we can translate it into the questions of our own day, we are not worthy of it, we are not the sons of the sires who acted in response to its challenge.

What form does the contest between tyranny and freedom take today? What is the special form of tyranny we now fight? How does it endanger the rights of the people, and what do we mean to do in order to make our contest against it effectual? What are to be the items of our new declaration of independence?

By tyranny, as we now fight it, we mean control of the law, of legislation and adjudication, by organizations which do not represent the people, by means which are private and selfish. We mean, specifically, the conduct of our affairs and the shaping of our legislation in the interest of special bodies of capital and those who organize their use. We mean the alliance, for this purpose, of political machines with selfish business. We mean the exploitation of the people by legal and political means. We have seen many of our governments under these influences cease to be representative governments, cease to be governments representative of the people, and become governments representative of special interests, controlled by machines, which in their turn are not controlled by the people.

Sometimes, when I think of the growth of our economic system, it seems to me as if, leaving our law just about where it was before any of the modern inventions or developments took place, we had simply at haphazard extended the family residence, added an office here and
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a workroom there, and a new set of sleeping rooms there, built up higher on our founda-
tions, and put out little lean-tos on the side, until we have a structure that has no character
whatever. Now, the problem is to continue to live in the house and yet change it.

Well, we are architects in our time, and our architects are also engineers. We don't have to
stop using a railroad terminal because a new station is being built. We don't have to stop
any of the processes of our lives because we are rearranging the structures in which we
conduct those processes. What we have to undertake is to systematize the foundations of
the house, then to thread all the old parts of the structure with the steel which will be laced
together in modern fashion, accommodated to all the modern knowledge of structural
strength and elasticity, and then slowly change the partitions, relay the walls, let in the light
through new apertures, improve the ventilation; until finally, a generation or two from
now, the scaffolding will be taken away, and there will be the family in a great building
whose noble architecture will at last be disclosed, where men can live as a single commu-
nity, cooperative as in a perfected, coordinated beehive, not afraid of any storm of nature,
not afraid of any artificial storm, any imitation of thunder and lightning, knowing that the
foundations go down to the bedrock of principle, and knowing that whenever they please
they can change that plan again and accommodate it as they please to the altering necessi-
ties of their lives.

But there are a great many men who don't like the idea. Some wit recently said, in view of
the fact that most of our American architects are trained in a certain École in Paris, that all
American architecture in recent years was either bizarre or "Beaux Arts." I think that our
economic architecture is decidedly bizarre; and I am afraid that there is a good deal to learn
about matters other than architecture from the same source from which our architects have
learned a great many things. I don't mean the School of Fine Arts at Paris, but the experi-
ence of France; for from the other side of the water men can now hold up against us the
reproach that we have not adjusted our lives to modern conditions to the same extent that
they have adjusted theirs. I was very much interested in some of the reasons given by our
friends across the Canadian border for being very shy about the reciprocity arrangements.
They said: "We are not sure whither these arrangements will lead, and we don't care to
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associate too closely with the economic conditions of the United States until those conditions are as modern as ours." And when I resented it, and asked for particulars, I had, in regard to many matters, to retire from the debate. Because I found that they had adjusted their regulations of economic development to conditions we had not yet found a way to meet in the United States.

Well, we have started now at all events. The procession is under way. The stand-patter doesn't know there is a procession. He is asleep in the back part of his house. He doesn't know that the road is resounding with the tramp of men going to the front. And when he wakes up, the country will be empty. He will be deserted, and he will wonder what has happened. Nothing has happened. The world has been going on. The world has a habit of going on. The world has a habit of leaving those behind who won't go with it. The world has always neglected stand-patters. And, therefore, the stand-patter does not excite my indignation; he excites my sympathy. He is going to be so lonely before it is all over. And we are good fellows, we are good company; why doesn't he come along? We are not going to do him any harm. We are going to show him a good time. We are going to climb the slow road until it reaches some upland where the air is fresher, where the whole talk of mere politicians is stilled, where men can look in each other's faces and see that there is nothing to conceal, that all they have to talk about they are willing to talk about in the open and talk about with each other; and whence, looking back over the road, we shall see at last that we have fulfilled our promise to mankind. We had said to all the world, "America was created to break every kind of monopoly, and to set men free, upon a footing of equality, upon a footing of opportunity, to match their brains and their energies." and now we have proved that we meant it.
CHARLES MERRIAM
“Recent Tendencies”
CHAPTER EXCERPTS FROM A HISTORY OF AMERICAN POLITICAL THEORIES
1903

BACKGROUND

University of Chicago political science professor Charles Merriam surveyed the historical development of American political principles and the new progressive ideas in his 1903 book A History of American Political Theories.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. How does Merriam characterize the new group of political theorists that appeared in the last half of the 19th century?
2. Why did Francis Lieber claim that the "state of nature" had no basis in fact?
3. Why was John Burgess strongly opposed to the idea of the social contract?
4. What is the origin of the state according to these new political theorists?
5. What is the new idea of liberty formulated by these new political theorists?
6. What is the purpose of the state according to these new political theorists?
7. What are the ends of the state according to Burgess, and how are they to be achieved?

In the last half of the nineteenth century there appeared in the United States a group of political theorists differing from the earlier thinkers in respect to method and upon many important doctrines of political science. The new method was more systematic and scientific than that which preceded it, while the results reached showed a pronounced reaction from the individualistic philosophy of the early years of the century.

Much of the credit of the establishment of this new school belongs to Francis Lieber, a German scientist who came to this country in 1827 and, as an educator and author, left a deep impress on the political thought of America. His Manual of Political Ethics (1838–39) and Civil Liberty and Self-Government (1853) were the first systematic treatises on political science that appeared in the United States, and their influence was widespread. Following Lieber came a line of American political scientists, many of whom were trained in German schools, and all of whom had acquired a scientific method of discussing political phenomena. Among the most conspicuous figures in the new school are Theodore Woolsey, whose Political Science appeared in 1877, and John W. Burgess, who wrote, in 1890, Political Science and Comparative Constitutional Law, and a number of others who have contributed materially to the development of the subject....

The doctrines of these men differ in many important respects from those earlier entertained. The individualistic ideas of the “natural right” school of political theory, endorsed in the [American] Revolution, are discredited and repudiated. The notion that political society and government are based upon a contract between independent individuals and that such a contract is the sole source of political obligation, is regarded as no longer tenable. Calhoun and his school had already abandoned this doctrine, while such men as Story had seen the need of extensive qualification of it. Objections to the social contract were strongly urged by Lieber, and were later more fully and clearly stated by others. In Lieber’s opinion, the “state of nature” has no basis in fact. Man is essentially a social creature, and hence no artificial means for bringing him into society need be devised. Lieber condemned the contract theory as generally held, on the ground that it was both artificial and inadequate. Such an explanation of the origin of the state can be regarded as true only in the sense that every political society is composed of individuals who recognize the existence of mutual rights...
and duties. Only in the sense that there is a general recognition of these reciprocal claims can we say that the state is founded on contract; and this, of course, is far from what the doctrine is ordinarily taken to mean. As a matter of fact, the state may originate, and has originated, Lieber said, in a variety of ways, as, for example, through force, fraud, consent, religion.

Still more strongly is the opposition to the social-contract theory stated by Burgess. The hypothesis of an original contract to form the state is, as he reasons, wholly contrary to our knowledge of the historical development of political institutions. The social-contract theory assumes that “the idea of the state with all its attributes is consciously present in the minds of the individuals proposing to constitute the state, and that the disposition to obey law is universally established.” These conditions, history shows, are not present at the beginning of the political development of a people, but are the result of long growth and experience. This theory therefore cannot account for the origin of the state. Its only possible application is in changing the form of the state, or in the cases when a state is planted upon new territory by a population already politically educated.

In the refusal to accept the contract theory as the basis for government, practically all the political scientists of note agree. The old explanation no longer seems sufficient, and is with practical unanimity discarded. The doctrines of natural law and natural rights have met a similar fate....

By the later thinkers the idea that men possess inherent and inalienable rights of a political or quasi-political character which are independent of the state, has been generally given up. It is held that these natural rights can have no other than an ethical value, and have no proper place in politics. “There never was, and there never can be,” says Burgess, “any liberty upon this earth and among human beings, outside of state organization.” In speaking of natural rights, therefore, it is essential to remember that these alleged rights have no political force whatever, unless recognized and enforced by the state. It is asserted by Willoughby that “natural rights” could not have even a moral value in the supposed “state
of nature”; they would really be equivalent to force and hence have no ethical significance.…

The present tendency, then, in American political theory is to disregard the once dominant ideas of natural rights and the social contract, although it must be admitted that the political scientists are more agreed upon this point than is the general public. The origin of the state is regarded, not as the result of a deliberate agreement among men, but as the result of historical development, instinctive rather than conscious; and rights are considered to have their source not in nature, but in law. This new point of view involves no disregard of or contempt for human liberty, but only a belief that the earlier explanation and philosophy of the state was not only false but dangerous and misleading.

The modern school has, indeed, formulated a new idea of liberty, widely different from that taught in the early years of the Republic. The “Fathers” believed that in the original state of nature all men enjoy perfect liberty, that they surrender a part of this liberty in order that a government may be organized, and that therefore the stronger the government, the less the liberty remaining to the individual. Liberty is, in short, the natural and inherent right of all men; government the necessary limitation of this liberty. Calhoun and his school, as it has been shown, repudiated this idea, and maintained that liberty is not the natural right of all men, but only the reward of the races or individuals properly qualified for its possession. Upon this basis, slavery was defended against the charge that it was inconsistent with human freedom, and in this sense and so applied, the theory was not accepted outside the South. The mistaken application of the idea had the effect of delaying recognition of the truth in what had been said until the controversy over slavery was at an end.

The Revolutionary idea of the nature of liberty was never realized in actual practice, and recent political events and political philosophy have combined to show that another theory of liberty has been generally accepted. The new doctrine is best stated by Burgess. By liberty he understands “a domain in which the individual is referred to his own will, and upon which government shall neither encroach itself nor permit encroachments from any other quarter.” Such a sphere of action is necessary for the welfare and progress both of state and
of individual. It is of vital importance to notice, however, that liberty is not a natural right which belongs to every human being without regard to the state or society under which he lives. On the contrary, it is logically true and may be historically demonstrated that “the state is the source of individual liberty.” It is the state that makes liberty possible, determines what its limits shall be, guarantees and protects it. In Burgess’s view, then, men do not begin with complete liberty and organize government by sacrificing certain parts of this liberty, but on the contrary they obtain liberty only through the organization of political institutions. The state does not take away from civil liberty, but is the creator of liberty—the power that makes it possible.

Liberty, moreover, is not a right equally enjoyed by all. It is dependent upon the degree of civilization reached by the given people, and increases as this advances. The idea that liberty is a natural right is abandoned, and the inseparable connection between political liberty and political capacity is strongly emphasized. After an examination of the principle of nationality, and the characteristic qualities of various nations or races, the conclusion is drawn that the Teutonic nations are particularly endowed with political capacity. Their mission in the world is the political civilization of mankind.

From this as a premise are deduced further conclusions of the utmost importance. The first of these is that in a state composed of several nationalities, the Teutonic element should never surrender the balance of power to the others. Another is that the Teutonic race can never regard the exercise of political power as a right of man, but it must always be their policy to condition the exercise of political rights on the possession of political capacity. A final conclusion is that the Teutonic races must civilize the politically uncivilized. They must have a colonial policy. Barbaric races, if incapable, may be swept away; and such action “violates no rights of these populations which are not petty and trifling in comparison with its transcendent right and duty to establish political and legal order everywhere.” On the same principle, interference with the affairs of states not wholly barbaric, but nevertheless incapable of effecting political organization for themselves, is fully justified. Jurisdiction may be assumed over such a state, and political civilization worked out for those who
are unable to accomplish this unaided. This propaganda of political civilization, it is as-
serted, is not only the right and privilege, but the mission and duty, the very highest obli-
gation incumbent on the Teutonic races, including the United States. Such action is not
unwarrantable or unjustifiable interference with the affairs of those who should rightly be
left unmolested, but is the performance of the part marked out for the Teutonic nations in
the world’s development.

Closely related to the theory of liberty is the doctrine as to the purpose or function of the
state. In the days of the Revolution, it was thought that the end of the political society is to
protect the life, liberty, and property of its citizens, and beyond this nothing more. The duty
of the state was summed up in the protection of individual rights, in harmony with the
individualistic character of the philosophy of that day. In the theory of Lieber, this idea was
broadened out, and, as he phrased it, the duty of the state is to do for man: first, what he
cannot do alone; second, what he ought not to do alone; and third, what he will not do
alone. In more recent times there has been in America a decided tendency to react against
the early “protection theory” of government, and to consider that the aim of the state is not
limited to the maintenance of law and order in the community and defense against foreign
foes. In the new view, the state acts not only for the individual as such, but in the interests
of the community as a whole. It is not limited to the negative function of preventing certain
kinds of action, but may positively advance the general welfare by means and measures
expressly directed to that end. This opinion is shared by such authorities as Woolsey, Bur-
gess, Wilson, Willoughby, and others. To these thinkers it appears that the duty of the state
is not and cannot be limited to the protection of individual interests, but must be regarded
as extending to acts for the advancement of the general welfare in all cases where it can
safely act, and that the only limitations on governmental action are those dictated by expe-
rience or the needs of the time.

Woolsey took the position that the state cannot be limited to restraining individuals from
injuring each other, but may justly act positively for the general welfare. “The sphere of the
state,” he said, “may reach as far as the nature and needs of man and of men reach”; and
this each people decides for itself in accordance with its own peculiar conditions. In general
the actions of the state fall under four groups: (1) the redress of wrongs; (2) the prevention of wrongs; (3) a degree of care for the outward welfare of the community, as in respect to industry, roads, and health; (4) the cultivation of the spiritual nature, “by educating the religious nature, the moral sense, the taste, the intellect.” The general limitation on the power of the state is that there shall be no act in restraint of the individual, except where there is imperative reason for such restriction. He also enumerates a series of individual rights which no just government ought to take away.

Woodrow Wilson asserts that the objects of government are the objects of organized society. The great end for which society exists is “mutual aid to self-development,” and this purpose, therefore, is the proper function of government. With particular reference to modern industrial conditions, a distinction is drawn between what is termed “interference” on the part of the state, and what is called “regulation,” by which is meant an “equalization of conditions in all branches of endeavor.” The limit of state activity is that of “necessary cooperation”—the point at which such enforced cooperation becomes a convenience rather than an imperative necessity. This line is difficult to draw, but may nevertheless be drawn. In general, we may lay down the rule that “the state should do nothing which is equally possible under equitable conditions to optional associations.”

A still broader view is that taken by Burgess in his discussion of the ends of the state. These may be considered, he says, under three heads: the primary, the secondary, and the ultimate. The ultimate end of the state is defined as the “perfection of humanity, the civilization of the world; the perfect development of the human reason and its attainment to universal command over individualism; the apotheosis of man.” This end can be realized, however, only when a world-state is organized, and for this, mankind is not yet ready. Men must first be organized into national states, based on the principle of nationality. The proximate ends of the state are the establishment of government and liberty. The state must first of all establish peace and order; and in the next place mark out a sphere of liberty for the individual and later for associations. These are then the great ends of the state; the establishment of government and liberty, so that the national genius may find proper expression; and finally,
the perfection of humanity. These objects must be followed, moreover, in an historical or-der which cannot be successfully reversed. Government must precede liberty, government and liberty must precede the final purpose for which the state exists. In the present stage of development, only the realization of government and liberty through the national state are proper objects of state activity. Beyond this broad outline Burgess makes no other attempt to mark out the limits of the operation either of state or of government….
SUPREME COURT JUSTICE OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES, JR.
“Natural Law”
ESSAY

BACKGROUND
Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr. offers a critique of the idea of natural law espoused by the Founders.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What does Holmes say motivates the philosopher’s search for truth?

2. Does Holmes believe there is a moral foundation for rights?

It is not enough for the knight of romance that you agree that his lady is a very nice girl—if you do not admit that she is the best that God ever made or will make, you must fight. There is in all men a demand for the superlative, so much so that the poor devil who has no other way of reaching it attains it by getting drunk. It seems to me that this demand is at the bottom of the philosopher’s effort to prove that truth is absolute and of the jurist’s search for criteria of universal validity which he collects under the head of natural law.

I used to say when I was young, that truth was the majority vote of that nation that could lick all others. Certainly we may expect that the received opinion about the present war will depend a good deal upon which side wins (I hope with all my soul it will be mine), and I think that the statement was correct insofar as it implied that our test of truth is a reference to either a present or an imagined future majority in favor of our view. If … the truth may be defined as the system of my (intellectual) limitations, what gives it objectivity is the fact that I find my fellow man to a greater or less extent (never wholly) subject to the same Can’t Helps. If I think that I am sitting at a table I find that the other persons present agree with me; so if I say that the sum of the angles of a triangle is equal to two right angles. If I am in a minority of one they send for a doctor or lock me up; and I am so far able to transcend the to me convincing testimony of my sense or my reason as to recognize that if I am alone probably something is wrong with my works.

Certitude is not the test of certainty. We have been cocksure of many things that were not so. If I may quote myself again, property, friendship, and truth have a common root in time. One cannot be wrenched from the rocky crevices into which one has grown for many years without feeling that one is attacked in one’s life. What we most love and revere generally is determined by early associations. I love granite rocks and barberry bushes, no doubt because with them were my earliest joys that reach back through the past eternity of my life. But while one’s experience thus makes certain preferences dogmatic for oneself, recognition of how they came to be so leaves one able to see that others, poor souls, may be equally dogmatic about something else. And this again means skepticism. Not that one’s belief or love does not remain. Not that we would not fight and die for it if important—we all, whether we know it or not, are fighting to make the kind of a world that we should
like—but that we have learned to recognize that others will fight and die to make a different world, with equal sincerity or belief. Deep-seated preferences cannot be argued about—you cannot argue a man into liking a glass of beer—and therefore, when differences are sufficiently far reaching, we try to kill the other man rather than let him have his way. But that is perfectly consistent with admitting that, so far as appears, his grounds are just as good as ours.

The jurists who believe in natural law seem to me to be in that naïve state of mind that accepts what has been familiar and accepted by all men everywhere. No doubt it is true that, so far as we can see ahead, some arrangements and the rudiments of familiar institutions seem to be necessary elements in any society that may spring from our own and that would seem to us to be civilized—some form of permanent association between the sexes—some residue of property individually owned—some mode of binding oneself to specified future conduct—at the bottom of all, some protection for the person. But without speculating whether a group is imaginable in which all but the last of these might disappear and the last be subject to qualifications that most of us would abhor, the question remains as to the Ought of natural law.

It is true that beliefs and wishes have a transcendental basis in the sense that their foundation is arbitrary. You cannot help entertaining and feeling them, and there is an end of it. As an arbitrary fact people wish to live, and we say with various degrees of certainty that they can do so only on certain conditions. To do it they must eat and drink. That necessity is absolute. It is a necessity of less degree but practically general that they should live in society. If they live in society, so far as we can see, there are further conditions. Reason working on experience does tell us, no doubt, that if our wish to live continues, we can do it only on those terms. But that seems to me the whole of the matter. I see no a priori duty to live with others and in that way, but simply a statement of what I must do if I wish to remain alive. If I do live with others they tell me that I must do and abstain from doing various things or they will put the screws on to me. I believe that they will, and being of the same mind as to their conduct I not only accept the rules but come in time to accept them with sympathy and emotional affirmation and begin to talk about duties and rights. But for
legal purposes a right is only the hypostasis of a prophecy—the imagination of a substance supporting the fact that the public force will be brought to bear upon those who do things said to contravene it—just as we talk of the force of gravitation accounting for the conduct of bodies in space. One phrase adds no more than the other to what we know without it.

No doubt behind these legal rights is the fighting will of the subject to maintain them, and the spread of his emotions to the general rules by which they are maintained; but that does not seem to me the same thing as the supposed a priori discernment of a duty or the assertion of a preexisting right. A dog will fight for his bone.

The most fundamental of the supposed preexisting rights—the right to life—is sacrificed without a scruple not only in war, but whenever the interest of society, that is, of the predominant power in the community, is thought to demand it. Whether that interest is the interest of mankind in the long run no one can tell, and as, in any event, to those who do not think with Kant and Hegel it is only an interest, the sanctity disappears. I remember a very tender-hearted judge being of opinion that closing a hatch to stop a fire and the destruction of a cargo was justified even if it was known that doing so would stifle a man below. It is idle to illustrate further, because to those who agree with me I am uttering commonplaces and to those who disagree I am ignoring the necessary foundations of thought. The a priori men generally call the dissentients superficial. But I do agree with them in believing that one's attitude on these matters is closely connected with one's general attitude toward the universe. Proximately, as has been suggested, it is determined largely by early associations and temperament, coupled with the desire to have an absolute guide. Men to a great extent believe what they want to—although I see in that no basis for a philosophy that tells us what we should want to want.

Now when we come to our attitude toward the universe I do not see any rational ground for demanding the superlative—for being dissatisfied unless we are assured that our truth is cosmic truth, if there is such a thing—that the ultimates of a little creature on this little earth are the last word of the unimaginable whole. If a man sees no reason for believing that significance, consciousness and ideals are more than marks of the finite, that does not justify what has been familiar in French skeptics; getting upon a pedestal and professing to
look with haughty scorn upon a world in ruins. The real conclusion is that the part cannot swallow the whole—that our categories are not, or may not be, adequate to formulate what we cannot know. If we believe that we come out of the universe, not it out of us, we must admit that we do not know what we are talking about when we speak of brute matter. We do know that a certain complex of energies can wag its tail and another can make syllogisms. These are among the powers of the unknown, and if, as may be, it has still greater powers that we cannot understand, as Fabre in his studies of instinct would have us believe, studies that gave Bergson one of the strongest strands for his philosophy and enabled Maeterlinck to make us fancy for a moment that we heard a clang from behind phenomena—if this be true, why should we not be content? Why should we employ the energy that is furnished to us by the cosmos to defy it and shake our fist at the sky? It seems to me silly. That the universe has in it more than we understand, that the private soldiers have not been told the plan of campaign, or even that there is one, rather than some vaster unthinkable to which every predicate is an impertinence, has no bearing upon our conduct. We still shall fight—all of us because we want to live, some, at least, because we want to realize our spontaneity and prove our powers, for the joy of it, and we may leave to the unknown the supposed final valuation of that which in any event has value to us. It is enough for us that the universe has produced us and has within it, as less than it, all that we believe and love. If we think of our existence not as that of a little god outside, but as that of a ganglion within, we have the infinite behind us. It gives us our only but our adequate significance. A grain of sand has the same, but what competent person supposes that he understands a grain of sand? That is as much beyond our grasp as man. If our imagination is strong enough to accept the vision of ourselves as parts inseverable from the rest, and to extend our final interest beyond the boundary of our skins, it justifies the sacrifice even of our lives for ends outside of ourselves. The motive, to be sure, is the common wants and ideals that we find in man. Philosophy does not furnish motives, but it shows men that they are not fools for doing what they already want to do. It opens to the forlorn hopes on which we throw ourselves away, the vista of the farthest stretch of human thought, the chords of a harmony that breathes from the unknown.
JOHN DEWEY

*Liberalism and Social Action*

**Book Excerpts**

**BACKGROUND**

Retired Columbia University professor John Dewey wrote *Liberalism and Social Action*, outlining his views on liberalism and what he considered to be the crises challenging liberalism in the early 20th century.

**GUIDING QUESTIONS**

1. With whom does liberalism begin?

2. How does Dewey characterize political liberalism?

3. How does Dewey characterize the split within liberalism?

4. What was the problem with the earlier liberalism, according to Dewey?

---

1. The History of Liberalism

The use of the words liberal and liberalism to denote a particular social philosophy does not appear to occur earlier than the first decade of the nineteenth century. But the thing to which the words are applied is older. It might be traced back to Greek thought; some of its ideas, especially as to the importance of the free play of intelligence, may be found notably expressed in the funeral oration attributed to Pericles. But for the present purpose it is not necessary to go back of John Locke, the philosopher of the “glorious revolution” of 1688. The outstanding points of Locke’s version of liberalism are that governments are instituted to protect the rights that belong to individuals prior to political organization of social relations. These rights are those summed up a century later in the American Declaration of Independence: the rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Among the “natural” rights especially emphasized by Locke is that of property, originating, according to him, in the fact that an individual has “mixed” himself, through his labor, with some natural hitherto unappropriated object. This view was directed against levies on property made by rulers without authorization from the representatives of the people. The theory culminated in justifying the right of revolution. Since governments are instituted to protect the natural rights of individuals, they lose claim to obedience when they invade and destroy these rights instead of safeguarding them: a doctrine that well served the aims of our forefathers in their revolt against British rule, and that also found an extended application in the French Revolution of 1789.

The impact of this earlier liberalism is evidently political. Yet one of Locke’s greatest interests was to uphold toleration in an age when intolerance was rife, persecution of dissenters in faith almost the rule, and when wars, civil and between nations, had a religious color. In serving the immediate needs of England—and then those of other countries in which it was desired to substitute representative for arbitrary government—it bequeathed to later social thought a rigid doctrine of natural rights inherent in individuals independent of social organization. It gave a directly practical import to the older semi-theological and semi-metaphysical conception of natural law as supreme over positive law and gave a new version
of the old idea that natural law is the counterpart of reason, being disclosed by the natural light with which man is endowed.

The whole temper of this philosophy is individualistic in the sense in which individualism is opposed to organized social action. It held to the primacy of the individual over the state not only in time but in moral authority. It defined the individual in terms of liberties of thought and action already possessed by him in some mysterious ready-made fashion, and which it was the sole business of the state to safeguard. Reason was also made an inherent endowment of the individual, expressed in men’s moral relations to one another, but not sustained and developed because of these relations. It followed that the great enemy of individual liberty was thought to be government because of its tendency to encroach upon the innate liberties of individuals. Later liberalism inherited this conception of a natural antagonism between ruler and ruled, interpreted as a natural opposition between the individual and organized society. There still lingers in the minds of some the notion that there are two different “spheres” of action and of rightful claims; that of political society and that of the individual, and that in the interest of the latter the former must be as contracted as possible. Not till the second half of the nineteenth century did the idea arise that government might and should be an instrument for securing and extending the liberties of individuals. This later aspect of liberalism is perhaps foreshadowed in the clauses of our Constitution that confer upon Congress power to provide for “public welfare” as well as for public safety....

Because the liberalism of the economists and the Benthamites was adapted to contemporary conditions in Great Britain, the influence of the liberalism of the school of Locke waned. By 1820 it was practically extinct. Its influence lasted much longer in the United States. We had no Bentham and it is doubtful whether he would have had much influence if he had appeared. Except for movements in codification of law, it is hard to find traces of the influence of Bentham in this country. As was intimated earlier, the philosophy of Locke bore much the same relation to the American revolt of the colonies that it had to the British revolution of almost a century earlier. Up to, say, the time of the Civil War, the United
States were predominantly agrarian. As they became industrialized, the philosophy of liberty of individuals, expressed especially in freedom of contract, provided the doctrine needed by those who controlled the economic system. It was freely employed by the courts in declaring unconstitutional legislation that limited this freedom. The ideas of Locke embodied in the Declaration of Independence were congenial to our pioneer conditions that gave individuals the opportunity to carve their own careers. Political action was lightly thought of by those who lived in frontier conditions. A political career was very largely annexed as an adjunct to the action of individuals in carving their own careers. The gospel of self-help and private initiative was practiced so spontaneously that it needed no special intellectual support....

Thus from various sources and under various influences there developed an inner split in liberalism. This cleft is one cause of the ambiguity from which liberalism still suffers and which explains a growing impotency. These are still those who call themselves liberals who define liberalism in terms of the old opposition between the province of organized social action and the province of purely individual initiative and effort. In the name of liberalism they are jealous of every extension of governmental activity. They may grudgingly concede the need of special measures of protection and alleviation undertaken by the state at times of great social stress, but they are the confirmed enemies of social legislation (even prohibition of child labor), as standing measures of political policy. Wittingly or unwittingly, they still provide the intellectual system of apologetics for the existing economic régime, which they strangely, it would seem ironically, uphold as a régime of individual liberty for all.

But the majority who call themselves liberals today are committed to the principle that organized society must use its powers to establish the conditions under which the mass of individuals can possess actual as distinct from merely legal liberty. They define their liberalism in the concrete in terms of a program of measures moving toward this end. They believe that the conception of the state which limits the activities of the latter to keeping order as between individuals and to securing redress for one person when another person
infringes the liberty existing law has given him, is in effect simply a justification of the brutalities and inequities of the existing order. Because of this internal division within liberalism its later history is wavering and confused. The inheritance of the past still causes many liberals, who believe in a generous use of the powers of organized society to change the terms on which human beings associate together, to stop short with merely protective and alleviatory measures—a fact that partly explains why another school always refers to “reform” with scorn. It will be the object of the next chapter to portray the crisis in liberalism, the impasse in which it now almost finds itself, and through criticism of the deficiencies of earlier liberalism to suggest the way in which liberalism may resolve the crisis, and emerge as a compact, aggressive force.

2. The Crisis in Liberalism

The net effect of the struggle of early liberals to emancipate individuals from restriction imposed upon them by the inherited type of social organization was to pose a problem, that of a new social organization. The ideas of liberals set forth in the first third of the nineteenth century were potent in criticism and in analysis. They released forces that had been held in check. But analysis is not construction, and release of force does not of itself give direction to the force that is set free. Victorian optimism concealed for a time the crisis at which liberalism had arrived. But when that optimism vanished amid the conflict of nations, classes and races characteristic of the latter part of the nineteenth century—a conflict that has grown more intense with the passing years—the crisis could no longer be covered up. The beliefs and methods of earlier liberalism were ineffective when faced with the problems of social organization and integration. Their inadequacy is a large part of belief now so current that all liberalism is an outmoded doctrine. At the same time, insecurity and uncertainty in belief and purpose are powerful factors in generating dogmatic faiths that are profoundly hostile to everything to which liberalism in any possible formulation is devoted.…. 

The earlier liberals lacked historic sense and interest. For a while this lack had an immediate pragmatic value. It gave liberals a powerful weapon in their fight with reactionaries. For it enabled them to undercut the appeal to origin, precedent and past history by which the
opponents of social change gave sacrosanct quality to existing inequities and abuses. But disregard of history took its revenge. It blinded the eyes of liberals to the fact that their own special interpretations of liberty, individuality and intelligence were themselves historically conditioned, and were relevant only to their own time. They put forward their ideas as immutable truths good at all times and places; they had no idea of historic relativity, either in general or in its application to themselves.

If the early liberals had put forth their special interpretation of liberty as something subject to historic relativity they would not have frozen it into a doctrine to be applied at all times under all social circumstances. Specifically, they would have recognized that effective liberty is a function of the social conditions existing at any time. If they had done this, they would have known that as economic relations became dominantly controlling forces in setting the pattern of human relations, the necessity of liberty for individuals which they proclaimed will require social control of economic forces in the interest of the great mass of individuals. Because the liberals failed to make a distinction between purely formal or legal liberty and effective liberty of thought and action, the history of the last one hundred years is the history of non-fulfillment of their predictions.
THEODORE ROOSEVELT (PROGRESSIVE)
The New Nationalism
SPEECH EXCERPTS

August 31, 1910
John Brown Memorial Park | Osawatomie, Kansas

BACKGROUND

Though delivered at the dedicatory ceremonies for the John Brown Memorial Park, this speech would form the basis of Theodore Roosevelt’s presidential campaign as the nominee of Progressive Party.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What political problem is Roosevelt speaking against?

2. What is Roosevelt’s New Nationalism? What is its purpose or end?

3. What political and institutional reforms does Roosevelt suggest are necessary?

Nothing is more true than that excess of every kind is followed by reaction; a fact which should be pondered by reformer and reactionary alike. We are face to face with new conceptions of the relations of property to human welfare, chiefly because certain advocates of the rights of property as against the rights of men have been pushing their claims too far.

The man who wrongly holds that every human right is secondary to his profit must now give way to the advocate of human welfare, who rightly maintains that every man holds his property subject to the general right of the community to regulate its use to whatever degree the public welfare may require it.

But I think we may go still further. The right to regulate the use of wealth in the public interest is universally admitted. Let us admit also the right to regulate the terms and conditions of labor, which is the chief element of wealth, directly in the interest of the common good. The fundamental thing to do for every man is to give him a chance to reach a place in which he will make the greatest possible contribution to the public welfare. Understand what I say there. Give him a chance, not push him up if he will not be pushed. Help any man who stumbles; if he lies down, it is a poor job to try to carry him; but if he is a worthy man, try your best to see that he gets a chance to show the worth that is in him. No man can be a good citizen unless he has a wage more than sufficient to cover the bare cost of living, and hours of labor short enough so after his day’s work is done he will have time and energy to bear his share in the management of the community, to help in carrying the general load. We keep countless men from being good citizens by the conditions of life by which we surround them. We need comprehensive workman’s compensation acts, both State and national laws to regulate child labor and work for women, and, especially, we need in our common schools not merely education in book-learning, but also practical training for daily life and work. We need to enforce better sanitary conditions for our workers and to extend the use of safety appliances for workers in industry and commerce, both within and between the States. Also, friends, in the interest of the working man himself, we need to set our faces like flint against mob-violence just as against corporate greed; against violence and injustice and lawlessness by wage-workers just as much as against lawless cunning and greed and selfish arrogance of employers. If I could ask but one thing of my fellow
countrymen, my request would be that, whenever they go in for reform, they remember
the two sides, and that they always exact justice from one side as much as from the other. I
have small use for the public servant who can always see and denounce the corruption of
the capitalist, but who cannot persuade himself, especially before election, to say a word
about lawless mob-violence. And I have equally small use for the man, be he a judge on the
bench or editor of a great paper, or wealthy and influential private citizen, who can see
clearly enough and denounce the lawlessness of mob-violence, but whose eyes are closed
so that he is blind when the question is one of corruption of business on a gigantic scale.
Also, remember what I said about excess in reformer and reactionary alike. If the reaction-
ary man, who thinks of nothing but the rights of property, could have his way, he would
bring about a revolution; and one of my chief fears in connection with progress comes
because I do not want to see our people, for lack of proper leadership, compelled to follow
men whose intentions are excellent, but whose eyes are a little too wild to make it really
safe to trust them. Here in Kansas there is one paper which habitually denounces me as the
tool of Wall Street, and at the same time frantically repudiates the statement that I am a
Socialist on the ground that that is an unwarranted slander of the Socialists.

The American people are right in demanding that New Nationalism, without which we
cannot hope to deal with new problems. The New Nationalism puts the national need be-
fore sectional or personal advantage. It is impatient of the utter confusion that results from
local legislatures attempting to treat national issues as local issues. It is still more impatient
of the impotence which springs from over division of governmental powers, the impotence
which makes it possible for local selfishness or for legal cunning, hired by wealthy special
interests, to bring national activities to a deadlock. This New Nationalism regards the ex-
ecutive power as the steward of the public welfare. It demands of the judiciary that it shall
be interested primarily in human welfare rather than in property, just as it demands that
the representative body shall represent all the people rather than any one class or section
of the people.

I believe in shaping the ends of government to protect property as well as human welfare.
Normally, and in the long run, the ends are the same; but whenever the alternative must be
faced, I am for men and not for property, as you were in the Civil War. I am far from underestimating the importance of dividends; but I rank dividends below human character. Again, I do not have any sympathy with the reformer who says he does not care for dividends. Of course, economic welfare is necessary, for a man must pull his own weight and be able to support his family. I know well that the reformers must not bring upon the people economic ruin, or the reforms themselves will go down in the ruin. But we must be ready to face temporary disaster, whether or not brought on by those who will war against us to the knife. Those who oppose reform will do well to remember that ruin in its worst form is inevitable if our national life brings us nothing better than swollen fortunes for the few and the triumph in both politics and business of a sordid and selfish materialism.

If our political institutions were perfect, they would absolutely prevent the political domination of money in any part of our affairs. We need to make our political representatives more quickly and sensitively responsive to the people whose servants they are. More direct action by the people in their own affairs under proper safeguards is vitally necessary. The direct primary is a step in this direction, if it is associated with a corrupt-services act effective to prevent the advantage of the man willing recklessly and unscrupulously to spend money over his more honest competitor. It is particularly important that all moneys received or expended for campaign purposes should be publicly accounted for, not only after election, but before election as well. Political action must be made simpler, easier, and freer from confusion for every citizen. I believe that the prompt removal of unfaithful or incompetent public servants should be made easy and sure in whatever way experience shall show to be most expedient in any given class of cases.

One of the fundamental necessities in a representative government such as ours is to make certain that the men to whom the people delegate their power shall serve the people by whom they are elected, and not the special interests. I believe that every national officer, elected or appointed, should be forbidden to perform any service or receive any compensation, directly or indirectly, from interstate corporations; and a similar provision could not fail to be useful within the States.
The object of government is the welfare of the people. The material progress and prosperity of a nation are desirable chiefly so long as they lead to the moral and material welfare of all good citizens. Just in proportion as the average man and woman are honest, capable of sound judgment and high ideals, active in public affairs, but, first of all, sound in their home, and the father and mother of healthy children whom they bring up well, just so far, and no farther, we may count our civilization a success. We must have—I believe we have already—a genuine and permanent moral awakening, without which no wisdom of legislation or administration really means anything; and, on the other hand, we must try to secure the social and economic legislation without which any improvement due to purely moral agitation is necessarily evanescent. Let me again illustrate by a reference to the Grand Army. You could not have won simply as a disorderly and disorganized mob. You needed generals; you needed careful administration of the most advanced type; and a good commissary—the cracker line. You well remember that success was necessary in many different lines in order to bring about general success. You had to have the administration at Washington good, just as you had to have the administration in the field; and you had to have the work of the generals good. You could not have triumphed without the administration and leadership; but it would all have been worthless if the average soldier had not had the right stuff in him. He had to have the right stuff in him, or you could not get it out of him. In the last analysis, therefore, vitally necessary though it was to have the right kind of organization and the right kind of generalship, it was even more vitally necessary that the average soldier should have the fighting edge, the right character. So it is in our civil life. No matter how honest and decent we are in our private lives, if we do not have the right kind of law and the right kind of administration of the law, we cannot go forward as a nation. That is imperative; but it must be an addition to, and not a substitute for, the qualities that make us good citizens. In the last analysis, the most important elements in any man’s career must be the sum of those qualities which, in the aggregate, we speak of as character. If he has not got it, then no law that the wit of man can devise, no administration of the law by the boldest and strongest executive, will avail to help him. We must have the right kind of character—character that makes a man, first of all, a good man in the home, a good father, and a good husband—that makes a man a good neighbor. You must have that,
and, then, in addition, you must have the kind of law and the kind of administration of the law which will give to those qualities in the private citizen the best possible chance for development. The prime problem of our nation is to get the right type of good citizenship, and, to get it, we must have progress, and our public men must be genuinely progressive.
PRESIDENT WOODROW WILSON (D)
War Message to Congress
SPEECH EXCERPTS

February 3, 1917
Congress | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

President Woodrow Wilson delivered this address to Congress regarding the relationship between the United States and Germany.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What is the cause of war with Germany?
2. What is the purpose of war with Germany?
3. Who does Wilson blame for this war?

Gentlemen of the Congress:

I have called the Congress into extraordinary session because there are serious, very serious, choices of policy to be made, and made immediately, which it was neither right nor constitutionally permissible that I should assume the responsibility of making.

On the third of February last I officially laid before you the extraordinary announcement of the Imperial German Government that on and after the first day of February it was its purpose to put aside all restraints of law or of humanity and use its submarines to sink every vessel that sought to approach either the ports of Great Britain and Ireland or the western coasts of Europe or any of the ports controlled by the enemies of Germany within the Mediterranean. That had seemed to be the object of the German submarine warfare earlier in the war, but since April of last year the Imperial Government had somewhat restrained the commanders of its undersea craft in conformity with its promise then given to us that passenger boats should not be sunk and that due warning would be given to all other vessels which its submarines might seek to destroy when no resistance was offered or escape attempted, and care taken that their crews were given at least a fair chance to save their lives in their open boats. The precautions taken were meager and haphazard enough, as was proved in distressing instance after instance in the progress of the cruel and unmanly business, but a certain degree of restraint was observed. The new policy has swept every restriction aside. Vessels of every kind, whatever their flag, their character, their cargo, their destination, their errand, have been ruthlessly sent to the bottom: without warning and without thought of help or mercy for those on board, the vessels of friendly neutrals along with those of belligerents. Even hospital ships and ships carrying relief to the sorely bereaved and stricken people of Belgium, though the latter were provided with safe conduct through the proscribed areas by the German Government itself and were distinguished by unmistakable marks of identity, have been sunk with the same reckless lack of compassion or of principle. I was for a little while unable to believe that such things would in fact be done by any government that had hitherto subscribed to the humane practices of civilized nations. International law had its origin in the attempt to set up some law which would be respected and observed upon the seas, where no nation had right of dominion and where
lay the free highways of the world…. This minimum of right the German Government has swept aside under the plea of retaliation and necessity and because it had no weapons which it could use at sea except these which it is impossible to employ as it is employing them without throwing to the winds all scruples of humanity or of respect for the understandings that were supposed to underlie the intercourse of the world. I am not now thinking of the loss of property involved, immense and serious as that is, but only of the wanton and wholesale destruction of the lives of noncombatants, men, women, and children, engaged in pursuits which have always, even in the darkest periods of modern history, been deemed innocent and legitimate. Property can be paid for; the lives of peaceful and innocent people cannot be. The present German submarine warfare against commerce is a warfare against mankind.

It is a war against all nations. American ships have been sunk, American lives taken, in ways which it has stirred us very deeply to learn of, but the ships and people of other neutral and friendly nations have been sunk and overwhelmed in the waters in the same way. There has been no discrimination. The challenge is to all mankind. Each nation must decide for itself how it will meet it. The choice we make for ourselves must be made with a moderation of counsel and a temperateness of judgment befitting our character and our motives as a nation. We must put excited feeling away. Our motive will not be revenge or the victorious assertion of the physical might of the nation, but only the vindication of right, of human right, of which we are only a single champion.

When I addressed the Congress on the twenty-sixth of February last I thought that it would suffice to assert our neutral rights with arms, our right to use the seas against unlawful interference, our right to keep our people safe against unlawful violence. But armed neutrality, it now appears, is impracticable. Because submarines are in effect outlaws when used as the German submarines have been used against merchant shipping, it is impossible to defend ships against their attacks as the law of nations has assumed that merchantmen would defend themselves against privateers or cruisers, visible craft giving chase upon the open sea. It is common prudence in such circumstances, grim necessity indeed, to endeavor to destroy them before they have shown their own intention. They must be dealt with upon
sight, if dealt with at all. The German Government denies the right of neutrals to use arms at all within the areas of the sea which it has proscribed, even in the defense of rights which no modern publicist has ever before questioned their right to defend. The intimation is conveyed that the armed guards which we have placed on our merchant ships will be treated as beyond the pale of law and subject to be dealt with as pirates would be. Armed neutrality is ineffectual enough at best; in such circumstances and in the face of such pretensions it is worse than ineffectual: it is likely only to produce what it was meant to prevent; it is practically certain to draw us into the war without either the rights or the effectiveness of belligerents. There is one choice we cannot make, we are incapable of making: we will not choose the path of submission and suffer the most sacred rights of our Nation and our people to be ignored or violated. The wrongs against which we now array ourselves are no common wrongs; they cut to the very roots of human life.

With a profound sense of the solemn and even tragical character of the step I am taking and of the grave responsibilities which it involves, but in unhesitating obedience to what I deem my constitutional duty, I advise that the Congress declare the recent course of the Imperial German Government to be in fact nothing less than war against the government and people of the United States; that it formally accept the status of belligerent which has thus been thrust upon it, and that it take immediate steps not only to put the country in a more thorough state of defense but also to exert all its power and employ all its resources to bring the Government of the German Empire to terms and end the war.

What this will involve is clear. It will involve the utmost practicable cooperation in counsel and action with the governments now at war with Germany, and, as incident to that, the extension to those governments of the most liberal financial credit, in order that our resources may so far as possible be added to theirs. It will involve the organization and mobilization of all the material resources of the country to supply the materials of war and serve the incidental needs of the Nation in the most abundant and yet the most economical and efficient way possible. It will involve the immediate full equipment of the navy in all respects but particularly in supplying it with the best means of dealing with the enemy's submarines. It will involve the immediate addition to the armed forces of the United States
already provided for by law in case of war at least five hundred thousand men, who should, in my opinion, be chosen upon the principle of universal liability to service, and also the authorization of subsequent additional increments of equal force so soon as they may be needed and can be handled in training. It will involve also, of course, the granting of adequate credits to the Government, sustained, I hope, so far as they can equitably be sustained by the present generation, by well conceived taxation. I say sustained so far as may be equitable by taxation because it seems to me that it would be most unwise to base the credits which will now be necessary entirely on money borrowed. It is our duty, I most respectfully urge, to protect our people so far as we may against the very serious hardships and evils which would be likely to arise out of the inflation which would be produced by vast loans.

In carrying out the measures by which these things are to be accomplished we should keep constantly in mind the wisdom of interfering as little as possible in our own preparation and in the equipment of our own military forces with the duty—for it will be a very practical duty—of supplying the nations already at war with Germany with the materials which they can obtain only from us or by our assistance. They are in the field and we should help them in every way to be effective there.

I shall take the liberty of suggesting, through the several executive departments of the Government, for the consideration of your committees, measures for the accomplishment of the several objects I have mentioned. I hope that it will be your pleasure to deal with them as having been framed after very careful thought by the branch of the Government upon which the responsibility of conducting the war and safeguarding the Nation will most directly fall.

While we do these things, these deeply momentous things, let us be very clear, and make very clear to all the world what our motives and our objects are. My own thought has not been driven from its habitual and normal course by the unhappy events of the last two months, and I do not believe that the thought of the Nation has been altered or clouded by them. I have exactly the same things in mind now that I had in mind when I addressed the Senate on the twenty—second of January last, the same that I had in mind when I addressed
the Congress on the third of February and on the twenty-sixth of February. Our object now, as then, is to vindicate the principles of peace and justice in the life of the world as against selfish and autocratic power and to set up amongst the really free and selfgoverned peoples of the world such a concert of purpose and of action as will henceforth insure the observance of those principles. Neutrality is no longer feasible or desirable where the peace of the world is involved and the freedom of its peoples, and the menace to that peace and freedom lies in the existence of autocratic governments backed by organized force which is controlled wholly by their will, not by the will of their people. We have seen the last of neutrality in such circumstances. We are at the beginning of an age in which it will be insisted that the same standards of conduct and of responsibility for wrong done shall be observed among nations and their governments that are observed among the individual citizens of civilized states.

We have no quarrel with the German people. We have no feeling towards them but one of sympathy and friendship. It was not upon their impulse that their government acted in entering this war. It was not with their previous knowledge or approval. It was a war determined upon as wars used to be determined upon in the old, unhappy days when peoples were nowhere consulted by their rulers and wars were provoked and waged in the interest of dynasties or of little groups of ambitious men who were accustomed to use their fellow men as pawns and tools.

Selfgoverned nations do not fill their neighbor states with spies or set the course of intrigue to bring about some critical posture of affairs which will give them an opportunity to strike and make conquest. Such designs can be successfully worked out only under cover and where no one has the right to ask questions. Cunningly contrived plans of deception or aggression, carried, it may be, from generation to generation, can be worked out and kept from the light only within the privacy of courts or behind the carefully guarded confidences of a narrow and privileged class. They are happily impossible where public opinion commands and insists upon full information concerning all the nation’s affairs.
A steadfast concert for peace can never be maintained except by a partnership of democratic nations. No autocratic government could be trusted to keep faith within it or observe its covenants. It must be a league of honor, a partnership of opinion. Intrigue would eat its vitals away; the plottings of inner circles who could plan what they would and render account to no one would be a corruption seated at its very heart. Only free peoples can hold their purpose and their honor steady to a common end and prefer the interests of mankind to any narrow interest of their own.

Does not every American feel that assurance has been added to our hope for the future peace of the world by the wonderful and heartening things that have been happening within the last few weeks in Russia? Russia was known by those who knew it best to have been always in fact democratic at heart, in all the vital habits of her thought, in all the intimate relationships of her people that spoke their natural instinct, their habitual attitude towards life. The autocracy that crowned the summit of her political structure, long as it had stood and terrible as was the reality of its power, was not in fact Russian in origin, character, or purpose; and now it has been shaken off and the great, generous Russian people have been added in all their naive majesty and might to the forces that are fighting for freedom in the world, for justice, and for peace. Here is a fit partner for a League of Honor.

One of the things that has served to convince us that the Prussian, autocracy was not and could never be our friend is that from the very outset of the present war it has filled our unsuspecting communities and even our offices of government with spies and set criminal intrigues everywhere afoot against our national unity of counsel, our peace Within and without, our industries and our commerce. Indeed it is now evident that its spies were here even before the war began; and it is unhappily not a matter of conjecture but a fact proved in our courts of justice that the intrigues which have more than once come perilously near to disturbing the peace and dislocating the industries of the country have been carried on at the instigation, with the support, and even under the personal direction of official agents of the Imperial Government accredited to the Government of the United States. Even in checking these things and trying to extirpate them we have sought to put the most generous interpretation possible upon them because we knew that their source lay, not in any hostile
feeling or purpose of the German people towards us (who were, no doubt, as ignorant of them as we ourselves were), but only in the selfish designs of a Government that did what it pleased and told its people nothing. But they have played their part in serving to convince us at last that that Government entertains no real friendship for us and means to act against our peace and security at its convenience. That it means to stir up enemies against us at our very doors the intercepted note to the German Minister at Mexico City is eloquent evidence.

We are accepting this challenge of hostile purpose because we know that in such a Government, following such methods, we can never have a friend; and that in the presence of its organized power, always lying in wait to accomplish we know not what purpose, there can be no assured security for the democratic Governments of the world. We are now about to accept gauge of battle with this natural foe to liberty and shall, if necessary, spend the whole force of the nation to check and nullify its pretensions and its power. We are glad, now that we see the facts with no veil of false pretense about them to fight thus for the ultimate peace of the world and for the liberation of its peoples, the German peoples included: for the rights of nations great and small and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of life and of obedience. The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty. We have no selfish ends to serve.

We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make. We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind. We shall be satisfied when those rights have been made as secure as the faith and the freedom of nations can make them. Just because we fight without rancor and without selfish object, seeking nothing for ourselves but what we shall wish to share with all free peoples, we shall, I feel confident, conduct our operations as belligerents without passion and ourselves observe with proud punctilio the principles of right and of fair play we profess to be fighting for.

I have said nothing of the Governments allied with the Imperial Government of Germany because they have not made war upon us or challenged us to defend our right and our
honor. The Austro—Hungarian Government has, indeed, avowed its unqualified endorse-
ment and acceptance of the reckless and lawless submarine warfare adopted now without
disguise by the Imperial German Government, and it has therefore not been possible for
this Government to receive Count Tarnowski, the Ambassador recently accredited to this
Government by the Imperial and Royal Government of Austria—Hungary; but that Gov-
ernment has not actually engaged in warfare against citizens of the United States on the
seas, and I take the liberty, for the present at least, of postponing a discussion of our rela-
tions with the authorities at Vienna. We enter this war only where we are clearly forced
into it because there are no other means of defending our rights.

It will be all the easier for us to conduct ourselves as belligerents in a high spirit of right and
fairness because we act without animus, not in enmity towards a people or with the desire
to bring any injury or disadvantage upon them, but only in armed opposition to an irre-
 sponsible government which has thrown aside all considerations of humanity and of right
and is running amuck. We are, let me say again, the sincere friends of the German people,
and shall desire nothing so much as the early reestablishment of intimate relations of mu-
tual advantage between us,— however hard it may be for them, for the time being, to believe
that this is spoken from our hearts. We have borne with their present Government through
all these bitter months because of that friendship,—exercising a patience and forbearance
which would otherwise have been impossible. We shall, happily, still have an opportunity
to prove that friendship in our daily attitude and actions towards the millions of men and
women of German birth and native sympathy who live amongst us and share our life, and
we shall be proud to prove it towards all who are in fact loyal to their neighbors and to the
Government in the hour of test. They are, most of them, as true and loyal Americans as if
they had never knew n any other fealty or allegiance. They will be prompt to stand with us
in rebuking and restraining the few who may be of a different mind and purpose. If there
should be disloyalty, it will be dealt with with a firm hand of stern repression; but, if it lifts
its head at all, it will lift it only here and there and without countenance except from a
lawless and malignant few.
It is a distressing and oppressive duty, Gentlemen of the Congress, which I have performed in thus addressing you. There are, it may be many months of fiery trial and sacrifice ahead of us. It is a fearful thing to lead this great peaceful people into war, into the most terrible and disastrous of all wars, civilization itself seeming to be in the balance.

But the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts,—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own Governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free. To such a task we can dedicate our lives and our fortunes, every thing that we are and everything that we have, with the pride of those who know that the day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace which she has treasured. God helping her, she can do no other.
**President Woodrow Wilson (D)**

To a Joint Session of Congress

**Speech**

January 8, 1918

Congress | Washington, D.C.

**Background**

President Woodrow Wilson gave this speech to Congress to outline the principles and policies he argued were necessary to negotiate an end to the Great War and a lasting peace afterwards.

**Guiding Questions**

1. Why does Wilson say he is delivering this speech?
2. How does Wilson suggest changing the political boundaries of Europe?
3. What kind of institution is needed to maintain international peace?

---

Gentlemen of the Congress:

Once more, as repeatedly before, the spokesmen of the Central Empires have indicated their desire to discuss the objects of the war and the possible basis of a general peace. Parleys have been in progress at Brest-Litovsk between Russian representatives and representatives of the Central Powers to which the attention of all the belligerents have been invited for the purpose of ascertaining whether it may be possible to extend these parleys into a general conference with regard to terms of peace and settlement.

The Russian representatives presented not only a perfectly definite statement of the principles upon which they would be willing to conclude peace but also an equally definite program of the concrete application of those principles. The representatives of the Central Powers, on their part, presented an outline of settlement which, if much less definite, seemed susceptible of liberal interpretation until their specific program of practical terms was added. That program proposed no concessions at all either to the sovereignty of Russia or to the preferences of the populations with whose fortunes it dealt, but meant, in a word, that the Central Empires were to keep every foot of territory their armed forces had occupied -- every province, every city, every point of vantage -- as a permanent addition to their territories and their power. It is a reasonable conjecture that the general principles of settlement which they at first suggested originated with the more liberal statesmen of Germany and Austria, the men who have begun to feel the force of their own people's thought and purpose, while the concrete terms of actual settlement came from the military leaders who have no thought but to keep what they have got. The negotiations have been broken off. The Russian representatives were sincere and in earnest. They cannot entertain such proposals of conquest and domination.

The whole incident is full of significances. It is also full of perplexity. With whom are the Russian representatives dealing? For whom are the representatives of the Central Empires speaking? Are they speaking for the majorities of their respective parliaments or for the minority parties, that military and imperialistic minority which has so far dominated their whole policy and controlled the affairs of Turkey and of the Balkan states which have felt
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obliged to become their associates in this war? The Russian representatives have insisted, very justly, very wisely, and in the true spirit of modern democracy, that the conferences they have been holding with the Teutonic and Turkish statesmen should be held within open, not closed, doors, and all the world has been audience, as was desired.

5 To whom have we been listening, then? To those who speak the spirit and intention of the resolutions of the German Reichstag of the 9th of July last, the spirit and intention of the Liberal leaders and parties of Germany, or to those who resist and defy that spirit and intention and insist upon conquest and subjugation? Or are we listening, in fact, to both, unreconciled and in open and hopeless contradiction? These are very serious and pregnant questions. Upon the answer to them depends the peace of the world.

But, whatever the results of the parleys at Brest-Litovsk, whatever the confusions of counsel and of purpose in the utterances of the spokesmen of the Central Empires, they have again attempted to acquaint the world with their objects in the war and have again challenged their adversaries to say what their objects are and what sort of settlement they would deem just and satisfactory. There is no good reason why that challenge should not be responded to, and responded to with the utmost candor. We did not wait for it. Not once, but again and again, we have laid our whole thought and purpose before the world, not in general terms only, but each time with sufficient definition to make it clear what sort of definite terms of settlement must necessarily spring out of them.

20 Within the last week Mr. Lloyd George has spoken with admirable candor and in admirable spirit for the people and Government of Great Britain. There is no confusion of counsel among the adversaries of the Central Powers, no uncertainty of principle, no vagueness of detail. The only secrecy of counsel, the only lack of fearless frankness, the only failure to make definite statement of the objects of the war, lies with Germany and her allies. The issues of life and death hang upon these definitions. No statesman who has the least conception of his responsibility ought for a moment to permit himself to continue this tragical and appalling outpouring of blood and treasure unless he is sure beyond a peradventure
that the objects of the vital sacrifice are part and parcel of the very life of Society and that the people for whom he speaks think them right and imperative as he does.

There is, moreover, a voice calling for these definitions of principle and of purpose which is, it seems to me, more thrilling and more compelling than any of the many moving voices with which the troubled air of the world is filled. It is the voice of the Russian people. They are prostrate and all but hopeless, it would seem, before the grim power of Germany, which has hitherto known no relenting and no pity. Their power, apparently, is shattered. And yet their soul is not subservient. They will not yield either in principle or in action. Their conception of what is right, of what is humane and honorable for them to accept, has been stated with a frankness, a largeness of view, a generosity of spirit, and a universal human sympathy which must challenge the admiration of every friend of mankind; and they have refused to compound their ideals or desert others that they themselves may be safe.

They call to us to say what it is that we desire, in what, if in anything, our purpose and our spirit differ from theirs; and I believe that the people of the United States would wish me to respond, with utter simplicity and frankness. Whether their present leaders believe it or not, it is our heartfelt desire and hope that some way may be opened whereby we may be privileged to assist the people of Russia to attain their utmost hope of liberty and ordered peace.

It will be our wish and purpose that the processes of peace, when they are begun, shall be absolutely open and that they shall involve and permit henceforth no secret understandings of any kind. The day of conquest and aggrandizement is gone by; so is also the day of secret covenants entered into in the interest of particular governments and likely at some unlooked-for moment to upset the peace of the world. It is this happy fact, now clear to the view of every public man whose thoughts do not still linger in an age that is dead and gone, which makes it possible for every nation whose purposes are consistent with justice and the peace of the world to avow nor or at any other time the objects it has in view.

We entered this war because violations of right had occurred which touched us to the quick and made the life of our own people impossible unless they were corrected and the world
secure once for all against their recurrence. What we demand in this war, therefore, is nothing peculiar to ourselves. It is that the world be made fit and safe to live in; and particularly that it be made safe for every peace-loving nation which, like our own, wishes to live its own life, determine its own institutions, be assured of justice and fair dealing by the other peoples of the world as against force and selfish aggression. All the peoples of the world are in effect partners in this interest, and for our own part we see very clearly that unless justice be done to others it will not be done to us.

The program of the world’s peace, therefore, is our program; and that program, the only possible program, as we see it, is this:

I. Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.

II. Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas, outside territorial waters, alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants.

III. The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance.

IV. Adequate guarantees given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety.

V. A free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims, based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty the interests of the populations concerned must have equal weight with the equitable claims of the government whose title is to be determined.

VI. The evacuation of all Russian territory and such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia as will secure the best and freest cooperation of the other nations of the world in
obtaining for her an unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for the independent de-
termination of her own political development and national policy and assure her of a sin-
cere welcome into the society of free nations under institutions of her own choosing; and, more than a welcome, assistance also of every kind that she may need and may herself de-
sire. The treatment accorded Russia by her sister nations in the months to come will be the acid test of their good will, of their comprehension of her needs as distinguished from their own interests, and of their intelligent and unselfish sympathy.

VII. Belgium, the whole world will agree, must be evacuated and restored, without any at-
tempt to limit the sovereignty which she enjoys in common with all other free nations. No other single act will serve as this will serve to restore confidence among the nations in the laws which they have themselves set and determined for the government of their relations with one another. Without this healing act the whole structure and validity of international law is forever impaired.

VIII. All French territory should be freed and the invaded portions restored, and the wrong done to France by Prussia in 1871 in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine, which has unsettled the peace of the world for nearly fifty years, should be righted, in order that peace may once more be made secure in the interest of all.

IX. A readjustment of the frontiers of Italy should be effected along clearly recognizable lines of nationality.

X. The peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safe-
guarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity to autonomous develop-
ment.

XI. Rumania, Serbia, and Montenegro should be evacuated; occupied territories restored; Serbia accorded free and secure access to the sea; and the relations of the several Balkan states to one another determined by friendly counsel along historically established lines of allegiance and nationality; and international guarantees of the political and economic in-
dependence and territorial integrity of the several Balkan states should be entered into.
The Fourteen Points
Woodrow Wilson

XII. The Turkish portion of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development, and the Dardanelles should be permanently opened as a free passage to the ships and commerce of all nations under international guarantees.

XIII. An independent Polish state should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations, which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant.

XIV. A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike.

In regard to these essential rectifications of wrong and assertions of right we feel ourselves to be intimate partners of all the governments and peoples associated together against the Imperialists. We cannot be separated in interest or divided in purpose. We stand together until the end.

For such arrangements and covenants we are willing to fight and to continue to fight until they are achieved; but only because we wish the right to prevail and desire a just and stable peace such as can be secured only by removing the chief provocations to war, which this program does remove. We have no jealousy of German greatness, and there is nothing in this program that impairs it. We grudge her no achievement or distinction of learning or of pacific enterprise such as have made her record very bright and very enviable. We do not wish to injure her or to block in any way her legitimate influence or power. We do not wish to fight her either with arms or with hostile arrangements of trade if she is willing to associate herself with us and the other peace-loving nations of the world in covenants of justice and law and fair dealing. We wish her only to accept a place of equality among the peoples of the world, -- the new world in which we now live, -- instead of a place of mastery.
Neither do we presume to suggest to her any alteration or modification of her institutions. But it is necessary, we must frankly say, and necessary as a preliminary to any intelligent dealings with her on our part, that we should know whom her spokesmen speak for when they speak to us, whether for the Reichstag majority or for the military party and the men whose creed is imperial domination.

We have spoken now, surely, in terms too concrete to admit of any further doubt or question. An evident principle runs through the whole program I have outlined. It is the principle of justice to all peoples and nationalities, and their right to live on equal terms of liberty and safety with one another, whether they be strong or weak. Unless this principle be made its foundation no part of the structure of international justice can stand. The people of the United States could act upon no other principle; and to the vindication of this principle they are ready to devote their lives, their honor, and everything they possess. The moral climax of this the culminating and final war for human liberty has come, and they are ready to put their own strength, their own highest purpose, their own integrity and devotion to the test.
WOODROW WILSON

Leaders of Men

SPEECH EXCERPTS

June 17, 1890

BACKGROUND

The political science professor Woodrow Wilson gave a version of this address several times in 1889 and 1890 while on the faculties of Wesleyan University and Princeton University.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What distinction does Wilson initially draw between men who write and men who act?

2. In what ways do men "in the mass" differ from men "as individuals"? How must a leader treat men in the mass, according to Wilson?

3. What essential qualities must a popular leader have?

4. What distinctions does Wilson draw between the statesman and the demagogue?

5. How does Wilson characterize political leadership in particular?

6. How does reform come about, according to Wilson?

Only those are 'leaders of men,' in the general eye, who lead in action. The title belongs, if the whole field of the world be justly viewed, no more rightfully to the men who lead in action than to those who lead in silent thought. A book is often quite as quickening a trumpet as any made of brass and sounded in the field. But it is the estimate of the world that bestows their meaning upon words: and that estimate is not often very far from the fact.

The men who act stand nearer to the mass of men than do the men who write; and it is at their hands that new thought gets its translation into the crude language of deeds. The very crudity of that language of deeds exasperates the sensibilities of the author; and his exasperation proves the world’s point. He may be back of the leaders, but he is not the leader.

In his thought there is due and studied proportion; all limiting considerations are set in their right places, as guards to ward off misapprehension. Every cadence of right utterance is made to sound in the careful phrases, in the perfect adjustments of sense. Translate the thought into action and all its shadings disappear. It stands out a naked, lusty thing, sure to rasp the sensibilities of every man of fastidious taste. Stripped for action, a thought must always shock those who cultivate the nice fashions of literary dress, as authors do. But it is only when thought does thus stand forth in unabashed force that it can perform deeds of strength in the arena round about which the great public sit as spectators, awarding the prizes by the suffrage of their applause.

Here, unquestionably, we come upon the heart of the perennial misunderstanding between the men who write and the men who act. The men who write love proportion; the men who act must strike out practicable lines of action, and neglect proportion. This would seem to explain the well-nigh universal repugnance felt by literary men towards Democracy. The arguments which induce popular action must always be broad and obvious arguments. Only a very gross substance of concrete conception can make any impression on the minds of the masses; they must get their ideas very absolutely put, and are much readier to receive a half-truth which they can promptly understand than a whole truth which has too many sides to be seen all at once. How can any man whose method is the method of artistic completeness of thought and expression, whose mood is the mood of contemplation, for a moment understand or tolerate the majority whose purpose and practice it is to strike out
broad, rough-hewn policies, whose mood is the mood of action? The great stream of freedom which “broadens down from precedent to precedent,” is not a clear mountain current such as the fastidious man of chastened taste likes to drink from: it is polluted with not a few of the coarse elements of the gross world on its banks; it is heavy with the drainage of a very material universe.…

The competent leader of men cares little for the interior niceties of other people’s characters: he cares much—everything for the external uses to which they may be put. His will seeks the lines of least resistance; but the whole question with him is a question of the application of force. There are men to be moved: how shall he move them? He supplies the power; others supply only the materials upon which that power operates. The power will fail if it be misapplied; it will be misapplied if it be not suitable both in kind and method to the nature of the materials upon which it is spent; but that nature is, after all, only its means. It is the power which dictates, dominates: the materials yield. Men are as clay in the hands of the consummate leader.

It often happens that the leader displays a sagacity and an insight in the handling of men in the mass which quite baffle the wits of the shrewdest analyst of individual character. Men in the mass differ from men as individuals. A man who knows, and keenly knows, every man in town may yet fail to understand a mob or a mass-meeting of his fellow-townsmen. Just as the whole tone and method suitable for a public speech are foreign to the tone and method proper in individual, face to face dealings with separate men, so is the art of leading different from the art of writing novels.

Some of the gifts and qualities which most commend the literary man to success would inevitably doom the would-be leader to failure.…

Men are not led by being told what they do not know. Persuasion is a force, but not information; and persuasion is accomplished by creeping into the confidence of those you would lead. Their confidence is not gained by preaching new thoughts to them. It is gained by qualities which they can recognize at first sight by arguments which they can assimilate at once: by the things which find easy and intermediate entrance into their minds, and which
are easily transmitted to the palms of their hands or to the ends of their walking-sticks in
the shape of applause. Burke’s thoughts penetrate the mind and possess the heart of the
quiet student. His style of saying things fills the attention as if it were finest music. But his
are not thoughts to be shouted over; his is not a style to ravish the ear of the voter at the
hustings. If you would be a leader of men, you must lead your own generation, not the next.
Your playing must be good now, while the play is on the boards and the audience in the
seats: it will not get you the repute of a great actor to have excellencies discovered in you
afterwards. Burke’s genius, besides, made conservative men uneasy. How could a man be
safe who had so many ideas?…..

The whole question of leadership receives sharp practical test in a popular legislative as-
sembly. The revolutions which have changed the whole principle and method of govern-
ment within the last hundred years have created a new kind of leadership in legislation: a
leadership which is not yet, perhaps, fully understood. It used to be thought that legislation
was an affair proper to be conducted only by the few who were instructed, for the benefit
of the many who were uninstructed: that statesmanship was a function of origination for
which only trained and instructed men were fit. Those who actually conducted legislation
and undertook affairs were rather whimsically chosen by Fortune to illustrate this theory,
but such was the ruling thought in politics. The Sovereignty of the People, however, that
great modern dogma of politics, has erected a different conception—or, if so be that, in the
slowness of our thought, we adhere to the old conception, has at least created a very different
practice. When we are angry with public men nowadays we charge them with subserving
instead of forming and directing public opinion. It is to be suspected that when we make
such charges we are suffering our standards of judgment to lag behind our politics…..

Pray do not misunderstand me. I am not radical. I would not for the world be instrumental
in discrediting the ancient and honorable pastime of abusing demagogues. Demagogues
were quite evidently, it seems to me, meant for abuse, if we are to argue by exclusion: for
assuredly they were never known to serve any other useful purpose. I will follow the hounds
any day in pursuit of one of the wily, doubling rascals, however rough the country to be
ridden over. But you must allow me to make my condemnations tally with my theory of
government. Is Irish opinion ripe for Home Rule, as the Liberals claim? Very well then: let it have Home Rule. Every community, says my political philosophy, should be governed for its own interests, as it understands them, and not for the satisfaction of any other community.

Still I seem radical, without in reality being so. I advance my explanation, therefore, another step. Society is not a crowd, but an organism; and, like every organism, it must grow as a whole or else be deformed. The world is agreed, too, that it is an organism also in this, that it will die unless it be vital in every part. That is the only line of reasoning by which we can really establish the majority in legitimate authority. This organic whole, Society, is made up, obviously, for the most part, of the majority. It grows by the development of its aptitudes and desires, and under their guidance. The evolution of its institutions must take place by slow modification and nice all-round adjustment. And all this is but a careful and abstract way of saying that no reform may succeed for which the major thought of the nation is not prepared: that the instructed few may not be safe leaders except in so far as they have communicated their instruction to the many -except in so far as they have transmuted their thought into a common, a popular thought.

Let us fairly distinguish, therefore, the peculiar and delicate duties of the popular leader from the not very peculiar or delicate misdemeanors of the demagogue. Leadership, for the statesman, is *interpretation*. He must read the common thought: he must test and calculate very circumspectly the *preparation* of the nation for the next move in the progress of politics. If he fairly hit the popular thought, when we have missed it, are we to say that he is a demagogue? The nice point is to distinguish the firm and progressive popular *thought* from the momentary and whimsical popular *mood*, the transitory or mistaken popular passion. But it is fatally easy to blame or misunderstand the statesman.

Our temperament is one of logic, let us say. We hold that one and one make two and we see no salvation for the people except they receive the truth. The statesman is of another opinion. ‘One and one doubtless make two’, he is ready to admit, ‘but the people think that one and one make more than two and until they see otherwise we shall have to legislate on
that supposition’. This is not to talk nonsense. The Roman augurs very soon discovered that sacred fowls drank water and pecked grain with no sage intent of prophecy, but from motives quite mundane and simple. But it would have been a revolution to say so in the face of a people who believed otherwise, and executive policy had to proceed on the theory of a divine method of fowl appetite and digestion. The divinity that once did hedge a king, grows not now very high about the latest Hohenzollern; but who that prefers growth to revolution would propose that legislation in Germany proceed independently of this accident of hereditary succession?…

This function of interpretation, this careful exclusion of individual origination it is that makes it difficult for the impatient original mind to distinguish the popular statesman from the demagogue. The demagogue sees and seeks self-interest in an acquiescent reading of that part of the public thought upon which he depends for votes; the statesman, also reading the common inclination, also, when he reads aright, obtains the votes that keep him in power. But if you will justly observe the two, you will find the one trimming to the inclinations of the moment, the other obedient only to the permanent purposes of the public mind. The one adjusts his sails to the breeze of the day; the other makes his plans to ripen with the slow progress of the years. While the one solicitously watches the capricious changes of the weather, the other diligently sows the grains in their seasons. The one ministers to himself, the other to the race.…

There is a familiar anecdote that belongs just here. The captain of a Mississippi steamboat had made fast to the shore because of a thick fog lying upon the river. The fog lay low and dense upon the surface of the water, but overhead all was clear. A cloudless sky showed a thousand points of starry light. An impatient passenger inquired the cause of the delay. “We can’t see to steer,” said the captain. “But all’s clear overhead,” suggested the passenger, “you can see the North Star.” “Yes,” replied the officer, “but we are not going that way.” Politics must follow the actual windings of the channel: if it steer by the stars it will run aground.
You may say that if all this be truth: if practical political thought may not run in straight lines, but must twist and turn through all the sinuous paths of various circumstance, then compromise is the true gospel of politics. I cannot wholly gainsay the proposition. But it depends almost altogether upon how you conceive and define compromise whether it seem hateful or not, -whether it be hateful or not. I understand the biologists to say that all growth is a process of compromise: a compromise of the vital forces within the organism with the physical forces without, which constitute the environment. Yet growth is not dishonest. Neither need compromise in politics be dishonest, -if only it be progressive. Is not compromise the law of society in all things? Do we not in all dealings adjust views, compound differences, placate antagonisms? Uncompromising thought is the luxury of the closeted recluse. Untrammelled reasoning is the indulgence of the philosopher, of the dreamer of sweet dreams. We make always a sharp distinction between the literature of conduct and the literature of the imagination. 'Poetic justice' we recognize as being quite out of the common run of experience.

Nevertheless, leadership does not always wear the harness of compromise. Once and again one of those great Influences which we call a Cause arises in the midst of a nation. Men of strenuous minds and high ideals come forward, with a sort of gentle majesty, as champions of a political or moral principle. They wear no armour; they bestride no chargers; they only speak their thought, in season and out of season. But the attacks they sustain are more cruel than the collisions of arms. Their souls are pierced with a thousand keen arrows of obloquy. Friends desert and despise them. They stand alone: and oftentimes are made bitter by their isolation. They are doing nothing less than defy public opinion, and shall they convert it by blows? Yes. Presently the forces of the popular thought hesitate, waver, seem to doubt their power to subdue a half score stubborn minds. Again a little while and those forces have actually yielded. Masses come over to the side of the reform. Resistance is left to the minority, and such as will not be convinced are crushed....

Our slow world spends its time catching up with the ideas of its best minds. It would seem that in almost every generation men are born who embody the projected consciousness of their time and people. Their thought runs forward apace into the regions whither the race
is advancing, but where it will not for many a weary day arrive. A few generations, and that point, thus early descried, is passed; the new thoughts of one age are the commonplaces of the next. Such is the literary function: it reads the present fragments of thought as completed wholes, and thus enables the fragments, no doubt, in due time to achieve their completion. There are, on the other hand, again, other periods which we call periods of critical thought, and these do not project their ideas as wholes, but speak them incomplete, as parts. Whoever can hit the latent conceptions of such a period will receive immediate recognition: he is simply the articulate utterance of itself.

Such a man, of such fortune, was Voltaire. No important distinction can be drawn between his mind and the mind of France in the period in which he lived, – except, no doubt, that the mind of France was diffused, Voltaire’s concentrated. It was an Englishman, doubtless who said he would like to slap Voltaire’s face, for then he could feel that he had given France the affront direct. I suppose we cannot imagine how happy it must have made a Frenchman of the last century to laugh with Voltaire. His hits are indeed palpable: no literary swordsman but must applaud them. The speed of his style, too, and the swift critical destructive-ness of it are in the highest degree exhilarating and admirable. It is capital sport to ride atilt with him against some belated superstition, to see him unseat priest and courtier alike in his dashing overthrow of shams. But for us it is not vital sport. The things that he killed are now long dead; the things he found it impossible to slay, still triumph over all opponents- are grown old in conquest. But for a Frenchman of the last century the thing was being done. To read Voltaire must have made him feel that he was reading his own thoughts; laughing his own laugh; speaking his own scorn; speeding his own present impulses. Voltaire shocked political and ecclesiastical magnates, but he rejoiced the general mind of France. The men whom he attacked felt at once and instinctively that this was not the mere premonitory flash from a distant storm, but a bolt from short range; that the danger was immediate, the need for some shelter of authority an instantaneous need. No wonder the people of Paris took the horses from Voltaire’s coach and themselves dragged him through the streets. The load ought to have been light, as light as the carriage, for they were pulling themselves. The old man inside the coach was presently to die and carry away with him the
spirit of the eighteenth century. If Voltaire seriously doubted the existence of a future life, we have no grounds for wonder. It is hard to think of him in any world but this. It is awkward to conceive the Eighteenth Century given a place in either of the realms of eternity. It would chill the one; it would surely liberalize the other. That singular century does not seem to belong in the line of succession to any immortality.

Men who hit the critical, floating thought of their age, seem to me leaders in all but initiative. They are not ahead of their age. They do not conceive its thoughts in future wholes. They gather to a head each characteristic sentiment of their day. They are at once listened to; they would be followed, if they would but lead….
THEODORE ROOSEVELT

“The Presidency”

CHAPTER EXCERPTS FROM THE ROUGH RIDERS: AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY

BACKGROUND

Former president Theodore Roosevelt shared his views on the office in his autobiography, The Rough Riders.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What are the limits on executive power under the Constitution, according to Roosevelt?

2. What does Roosevelt mean when he says that every executive officer must be a "steward of the people"?

3. What were Roosevelt’s "convictions” upon assuming the presidency?

...The most important factor in getting the right spirit in my Administration, next to the insistence upon courage, honesty, and a genuine democracy of desire to serve the plain people, was my insistence upon the theory that the executive power was limited only by specific restrictions and prohibitions appearing in the Constitution or imposed by the Congress under its Constitutional powers. My view was that every executive officer, and above all every executive officer in high position, was a steward of the people bound actively and affirmatively to do all he could for the people, and not to content himself with the negative merit of keeping his talents undamaged in a napkin. I declined to adopt the view that what was imperatively necessary for the Nation could not be done by the President unless he could find some specific authorization to do it. My belief was that it was not only his right but his duty to do anything that the needs of the Nation demanded unless such action was forbidden by the Constitution or by the laws. Under this interpretation of executive power I did and caused to be done many things not previously done by the President and the heads of the departments. I did not usurp power, but I did greatly broaden the use of executive power. In other words, I acted for the public welfare, I acted for the common well-being of all our people, whenever and in whatever manner was necessary, unless prevented by direct constitutional or legislative prohibition. I did not care a rap for the mere form and show of power; I cared immensely for the use that could be made of the substance....

In internal affairs I cannot say that I entered the Presidency with any deliberately planned and far-reaching scheme of social betterment. I had, however, certain strong convictions; and I was on the lookout for every opportunity of realizing those convictions. I was bent upon making the Government the most efficient possible instrument in helping the people of the United States to better themselves in every way, politically, socially, and industrially. I believed with all my heart in real and thoroughgoing democracy, and I wished to make this democracy industrial as well as political, although I had only partially formulated the methods I believed we should follow. I believed in the people's rights, and therefore in National rights and States' rights just exactly to the degree in which they severally secured popular rights. I believed in invoking the National power with absolute freedom for every
National need; and I believed that the Constitution should be treated as the greatest document ever devised by the wit of man to aid a people in exercising every power necessary for its own betterment, and not as a straitjacket cunningly fashioned to strangle growth. As for the particular methods of realizing these various beliefs, I was content to wait and see what method might be necessary in each given case as it arose; and I was certain that the cases would arise fast enough....
Woodrow Wilson

“The Study of Administration”

Essay Excerpts

November 2, 1886

Political Science Quarterly

Background

Bryn Mawr College political science professor Woodrow Wilson wrote this essay proposing independent regulatory agencies insulated from the political process.

Guiding Questions

1. Why is administrative progress more difficult in democracies?

2. What views does Wilson hold of the American people?

3. How does Wilson distinguish administration from politics? Why should the former be insulated from the latter?

4. What role, according to Wilson, should public opinion play in the administration of government?

5. What does Wilson mean when he says that “[w]e can borrow the science of administration”?

…It is harder for democracy to organize administration than for monarchy. The very completeness of our most cherished political successes in the past embarrasses us. We have enthroned public opinion; and it is forbidden us to hope during its reign for any quick schooling of the sovereign in executive expertness or in the conditions of perfect functional balance in government. The very fact that we have realized popular rule in its fulness has made the task of organizing that rule just so much the more difficult. In order to make any advance at all we must instruct and persuade a multitudinous monarch called public opinion,—a much less feasible undertaking than to influence a single monarch called a king. An individual sovereign will adopt a simple plan and carry it out directly; he will have but one opinion, and he will embody that one opinion in one command. But this other sovereign, the people, will have a score of differing opinions. They can agree upon nothing simple: advance must be made through compromise, by a compounding of differences, by a trimming of plans and a suppression of too straightforward principles. There will be a succession of resolves running through a course of years, a dropping fire of commands running through a whole gamut of modifications.

In government, as in virtue, the hardest of hard things is to make progress. Formerly the reason for this was that the single person who was sovereign was generally either selfish, ignorant, timid, or a fool,—albeit there was now and again one who was wise. Nowadays the reason is that the many, the people, who are sovereign have no single ear which one can approach, and are selfish, ignorant, timid, stubborn, or foolish with the selfishness, the ignorances, the stubbornnesses, the timidities, or the follies of several thousand persons,—albeit there are hundreds who are wise. Once the advantage of the reformer was that the sovereign’s mind had a definite locality, that it was contained in one man’s head, and that consequently it could be gotten at; though it was his disadvantage that the mind learned only reluctantly or only in small quantities, or was under the influence of some one who let it learn only the wrong things. Now, on the contrary, the reformer is bewildered by the fact that the sovereign’s mind has no definite locality, but is contained in a voting majority of several million heads; and embarrassed by the fact that the mind of this sovereign also is under the influence of favorites, who are none the less favorites in a good old-fashioned
sense of the word because they are not persons by preconceived opinions; i.e., prejudices which are not to be reasoned with because they are not the children of reason.…

Even if we had clear insight into all the political past, and could form out of perfectly instructed heads a few steady, infallible, placidly wise maxims of government into which all sound political doctrine would be ultimately resolvable, would the country act on them? That is the question. The bulk of mankind is rigidly unphilosophical, and nowadays the bulk of mankind votes. A truth must become not only plain but also commonplace before it will be seen by the people who go to their work very early in the morning; and not to act upon it must involve great and pinching inconveniences before these same people will make up their minds to act upon it.

And where is this unphilosophical bulk of mankind more multifarious in its composition than in the United States? To know the public mind of this country, one must know the mind, not of Americans of the older stocks only, but also of Irishmen, of Germans, of negroes. In order to get a footing for new doctrine, one must influence minds cast in every mold of race, minds inheriting every bias of environment, warped by the histories of a score of different nations, warmed or chilled, closed or expanded by almost every climate of the globe.

So much, then, for the history of the study of administration, and the peculiarly difficult conditions under which, entering upon it when we do, we must undertake it. What, now, is the subject-matter of this study, and what are its characteristic objects?

II.

The field of administration is a field of business. It is removed from the hurry and strife of politics; it at most points stands apart even from the debatable ground of constitutional study. It is a part of political life only as the methods of the counting-house are a part of the life of society; only as machinery is part of the manufactured product. But it is, at the same time, raised very far above the dull level of mere technical detail by the fact that through its
greater principles it is directly connected with the lasting maxims of political wisdom, the
permanent truths of political progress.

The object of administrative study is to rescue executive methods from the confusion and
costliness of empirical experiment and set them upon foundations laid deep in stable prin-
ciple.

It is for this reason that we must regard civil-service reform in its present stages as but a
prelude to a fuller administrative reform. We are now rectifying methods of appointment;
we must go on to adjust executive functions more fitly and to prescribe better methods of
executive organization and action. Civil-service reform is thus but a moral preparation for
what is to follow. It is clearing the moral atmosphere of official life by establishing the sanc-
tity of public office as a public trust, and, by making service unpartisan, it is opening the
way for making it businesslike. By sweetening its motives it is rendering it capable of im-
proving its methods of work.…

One cannot easily make clear to every one just where administration resides in the various
departments of any practicable government without entering upon particulars so numer-
ous as to confuse and distinctions so minute as to distract. No lines of demarcation, setting
apart administrative from non-administrative functions, can be run between this and that
department of government without being run up hill and down dale, over dizzy heights of
distinction and through dense jungles of statutory enactment, hither and thither around
"ifs" and "buts," "whens" and "howevers," until they become altogether lost to the common
eye not accustomed to this sort of surveying, and consequently not acquainted with the use
of the theodolite of logical discernment. A great deal of administration goes about incognito
to most of the world, being confounded now with political "management," and again with
constitutional principle.…

A clear view of the difference between the province of constitutional law and the province
of administrative function ought to leave no room for misconception; and it is possible to
name some roughly definite criteria upon which such a view can be built. Public admin-
istration is detailed and systematic execution of public law. Every particular application of
general law is an act of administration. The assessment and raising of taxes, for instance, the hanging of a criminal, the transportation and delivery of the mails, the equipment and recruiting of the army and navy, etc., are all obviously acts of administration; but the general laws which direct these things to be done are as obviously outside of and above administration. The broad plans of governmental action are not administrative; the detailed execution of such plans is administrative. Constitutions, therefore, properly concern themselves only with those instrumentalities of government which are to control general law. Our federal constitution observes this principle in saying nothing of even the greatest of the purely executive offices, and speaking only of that President of the Union who was to share the legislative and policy-making functions of government, only of those judges of highest jurisdiction who were to interpret and guard its principles, and not of those who were merely to give utterance to them.…

Just here we manifestly emerge upon the field of that still larger question,—the proper relations between public opinion and administration.

To whom is official trustworthiness to be disclosed, and by whom is it to be rewarded? Is the official to look to the public for his need of praise and his push of promotion, or only to his superior in office? Are the people to be called in to settle administrative discipline as they are called in to settle constitutional principles? These questions evidently find their root in what is undoubtedly the fundamental problem of this whole study. That problem is: What part shall public opinion take in the conduct of administration?

The right answer seems to be, that public opinion shall play the part of authoritative critic.

But the method by which its authority shall be made to tell? Our peculiar American difficulty in organizing administration is not the danger of losing liberty, but the danger of not being able or willing to separate its essentials from its accidents. Our success is made doubtful by that besetting error of ours, the error of trying to do too much by vote. Self-government does not consist in having a hand in everything, any more than housekeeping consists necessarily in cooking dinner with one's own hands. The cook must be trusted with a large discretion as to the management of the fires and the ovens.
In those countries in which public opinion has yet to be instructed in its privileges, yet to be accustomed to having its own way, this question as to the province of public opinion is much more readily soluble than in this country, where public opinion is wide awake and quite intent upon having its own way anyhow. It is pathetic to see a whole book written by a German professor of political science for the purpose of saying to his countrymen, "Please try to have an opinion about national affairs"; but a public which is so modest may at least be expected to be very docile and acquiescent in learning what things it has not a right to think and speak about imperatively. It may be sluggish, but it will not be meddlesome. It will submit to be instructed before it tries to instruct. Its political education will come before its political activity. In trying to instruct our own public opinion, we are dealing with a pupil apt to think itself quite sufficiently instructed beforehand.

The problem is to make public opinion efficient without suffering it to be meddlesome. Directly exercised, in the oversight of the daily details and in the choice of the daily means of government, public criticism is of course a clumsy nuisance, a rustic handling delicate machinery. But as superintending the greater forces of formative policy alike in politics and administration, public criticism is altogether safe and beneficent, altogether indispensable. Let administrative study find the best means for giving public criticism this control and for shutting it out from all other interference.

But is the whole duty of administrative study done when it has taught the people what sort of administration to desire and demand, and how to get what they demand? Ought it not to go on to drill candidates for the public service?

There is an admirable movement towards universal political education now afoot in this country. The time will soon come when no college of respectability can afford to do without a well-filled chair of political science. But the education thus imparted will go but a certain length. It will multiply the number of intelligent critics of government, but it will create no competent body of administrators. It will prepare the way for the development of a sure-footed understanding of the general principles of government, but it will not necessarily
foster skill in conducting government. It is an education which will equip legislators, perhaps, but not executive officials. If we are to improve public opinion, which is the motive power of government, we must prepare better officials as the *apparatus* of government. If we are to put in new boilers and to mend the fires which drive our governmental machinery, we must not leave the old wheels and joints and valves and bands to creak and buzz and clatter on as best they may at bidding of the new force. We must put in new running parts wherever there is the least lack of strength or adjustment. It will be necessary to organize democracy by sending up to the competitive examinations for the civil service men definitely prepared for standing liberal tests as to technical knowledge. A technically schooled civil service will presently have become indispensable.…

The ideal for us is a civil service cultured and self-sufficient enough to act with sense and vigor, and yet so intimately connected with the popular thought, by means of elections and constant public counsel, as to find arbitrariness of class spirit quite out of the question.

III.

Having thus viewed in some sort the subject-matter and the objects of this study of administration, what are we to conclude as to the methods best suited to it—the points of view most advantageous for it?

Government is so near us, so much a thing of our daily familiar handling, that we can with difficulty see the need of any philosophical study of it, or the exact point of such study, should it be undertaken. We have been on our feet too long to study now the art of walking. We are a practical people, made so apt, so adept in self-government by centuries of experimental drill, that we are scarcely any longer capable of perceiving the awkwardness of the particular system we may be using, just because it is so easy for us to use any system. We do not study the art of governing: we govern. But mere unschooled genius for affairs will not save us from sad blunders in administration. Though democrats by long inheritance and repeated choice, we are still rather crude democrats. Old as democracy is, its organization on a basis of modern ideas and conditions is still an unaccomplished work. The democratic state has yet to be equipped for carrying those enormous burdens of administration.
which the needs of this industrial and trading age are so fast accumulating. Without comparative studies in government we cannot rid ourselves of the misconception that administration stands upon an essentially different basis in a democratic state from that on which it stands in a non-democratic state.…

We can borrow the science of administration with safety and profit if only we read all fundamental differences of condition into its essential tenets. We have only to filter it through our constitutions, only to put it over a slow fire of criticism and distil away its foreign gases.

I know that there is a sneaking fear in some conscientiously patriotic minds that studies of European systems might signalize some foreign methods as better than some American methods; and the fear is easily to be understood. But it would scarcely be avowed in any just company….  

Let it be noted that it is the distinction, already drawn, between administration and politics which makes the comparative method so safe in the field of administration. When we study the administrative systems of France and Germany, knowing that we are not in search of political principles, we need not care a peppercorn for the constitutional or political reasons which Frenchmen or Germans give for their practices when explaining them to us. If I see a murderous fellow sharpening a knife cleverly, I can borrow his way of sharpening the knife without borrowing his probable intention to commit murder with it; and so, if I see a monarchist dyed in the wool managing a public bureau well, I can learn his business methods without changing one of my republican spots. He may serve his king; I will continue to serve the people; but I should like to serve my sovereign as well as he serves his. By keeping this distinction in view,—that is, by studying administration as a means of putting our own politics into convenient practice, as a means of making what is democratically politic towards all administratively possible towards each,—we are on perfectly safe ground, and can learn without error what foreign systems have to teach us. We thus devise an adjusting weight for our comparative method of study. We can thus scrutinize the anatomy of foreign governments without fear of getting any of their diseases into our veins; dissect alien systems without apprehension of blood-poisoning.
Our own politics must be the touchstone for all theories. The principles on which to base a science of administration for America must be principles which have democratic policy very much at heart. And, to suit American habit, all general theories must, as theories, keep modestly in the background, not in open argument only, but even in our own minds,—lest opinions satisfactory only to the standards of the library should be dogmatically used, as if they must be quite as satisfactory to the standards of practical politics as well. Doctrinaire devices must be postponed to tested practices. Arrangements not only sanctioned by conclusive experience elsewhere but also congenial to American habit must be preferred without hesitation to theoretical perfection. In a word, steady, practical statesmanship must come first, closet doctrine second. The cosmopolitan what-to-do must always be commanded by the American how-to-do-it.

Our duty is, to supply the best possible life to a federal organization, to systems within systems; to make town, city, county, state, and federal governments live with a like strength and an equally assured healthfulness, keeping each unquestionably its own master and yet making all interdependent and cooperative, combining independence with mutual helpfulness. The task is great and important enough to attract the best minds.

This interlacing of local self-government with federal self-government is quite a modern conception. It is not like the arrangements of imperial federation in Germany. There local government is not yet, fully, local self-government. The bureaucrat is everywhere busy. His efficiency springs out of esprit de corps, out of care to make ingratiating obeisance to the authority of a superior, or at best, out of the soil of a sensitive conscience. He serves, not the public, but an irresponsible minister. The question for us is, how shall our series of governments within governments be so administered that it shall always be to the interest of the public officer to serve, not his superior alone but the community also, with the best efforts of his talents and the soberest service of his conscience? How shall such service be made to his commonest interest by contributing abundantly to his sustenance, to his dearest interest by furthering his ambition, and to his highest interest by advancing his honor and establishing his character? And how shall this be done alike for the local part and for the national whole?
If we solve this problem we shall again pilot the world. There is a tendency—is there not?—
a tendency as yet dim, but already steadily impulsive and clearly destined to prevail, to-
wards, first the confederation of parts of empires like the British, and finally of great states
themselves. Instead of centralization of power, there is to be wide union with tolerated di-
visions of prerogative. This is a tendency towards the American type—of governments
joined with governments for the pursuit of common purposes, in honorary equality and
honorable subordination. Like principles of civil liberty are everywhere fostering like meth-
ods of government; and if comparative studies of the ways and means of government
should enable us to offer suggestions which will practicably combine openness and vigor
in the administration of such governments with ready docility to all serious, well-sustained
public criticism, they will have approved themselves worthy to be ranked among the high-
est and most fruitful of the great departments of political study. That they will issue in such
suggestions I confidently hope.
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…I want to speak not of politics but of Government. I want to speak not of parties, but of universal principles. They are not political, except in that larger sense in which a great American once expressed a definition of politics, that nothing in all of human life is foreign to the science of politics.

I do want to give you, however, a recollection of a long life spent for a large part in public office. Some of my conclusions and observations have been deeply accentuated in these past few weeks. I have traveled far—from Albany to the Golden Gate. I have seen many people, and heard many things, and today, when in a sense my journey has reached the half-way mark, I am glad of the opportunity to discuss with you what it all means to me.

Sometimes, my friends, particularly in years such as these, the hand of discouragement falls upon us. It seems that things are in a rut, fixed, settled, that the world has grown old and tired and very much out of joint. This is the mood of depression, of dire and weary depression. But then we look around us in America, and everything tells us that we are wrong. America is new. It is in the process of change and development. It has the great potentialities of youth, and particularly is this true of the great West, and of this coast, and of California.

I would not have you feel that I regard this as in any sense a new community. I have traveled in many parts of the world, but never have I felt the arresting thought of the change and development more than here, where the old, mystic East would seem to be near to us, where the currents of life and thought and commerce of the whole world meet us. This factor alone is sufficient to cause man to stop and think of the deeper meaning of things, when he stands in this community.

But more than that, I appreciate that the membership of this club consists of men who are thinking in terms beyond the immediate present, beyond their own immediate tasks, beyond their own individual interest. I want to invite you, therefore, to consider with me in the large, some of the relationships of Government and economic life that go deeply into our daily lives, our happiness, our future and our security.
The issue of Government has always been whether individual men and women will have to serve some system of Government or economics, or whether a system of Government and economics exists to serve individual men and women. This question has persistently dominated the discussion of Government for many generations. On questions relating to these things men have differed, and for time immemorial it is probable that honest men will continue to differ.

The final word belongs to no man; yet we can still believe in change and in progress. Democracy, as a dear old friend of mine in Indiana, Meredith Nicholson, has called it, is a quest, a never-ending seeking for better things, and in the seeking for these things and the striving for them, there are many roads to follow. But, if we map the course of these roads, we find that there are only two general directions.

When we look about us, we are likely to forget how hard people have worked to win the privilege of Government. The growth of the national Governments of Europe was a struggle for the development of a centralized force in the Nation, strong enough to impose peace upon ruling barons. In many instances the victory of the central Government, the creation of a strong central Government, was a haven of refuge to the individual. The people preferred the master far away to the exploitation and cruelty of the smaller master near at hand.

But the creators of national Government were perforce ruthless men. They were often cruel in their methods, but they did strive steadily toward something that society needed and very much wanted, a strong central State able to keep the peace, to stamp out civil war, to put the unruly nobleman in his place, and to permit the bulk of individuals to live safely. The man of ruthless force had his place in developing a pioneer country, just as he did in fixing the power of the central Government in the development of Nations. Society paid him well for his services and its development. When the development among the Nations of Europe, however, had been completed, ambition and ruthlessness, having served their term, tended to overstep their mark.
There came a growing feeling that Government was conducted for the benefit of a few who thrived unduly at the expense of all. The people sought a balancing—a limiting force. There came gradually, through town councils, trade guilds, national parliaments, by constitution and by popular participation and control, limitations on arbitrary power.

Another factor that tended to limit the power of those who ruled, was the rise of the ethical conception that a ruler bore a responsibility for the welfare of his subjects.

The American colonies were born in this struggle. The American Revolution was a turning point in it. After the Revolution the struggle continued and shaped itself in the public life of the country. There were those who because they had seen the confusion which attended the years of war for American independence surrendered to the belief that popular Government was essentially dangerous and essentially unworkable. They were honest people, my friends, and we cannot deny that their experience had warranted some measure of fear. The most brilliant, honest and able exponent of this point of view was Hamilton. He was too impatient of slow-moving methods. Fundamentally he believed that the safety of the republic lay in the autocratic strength of its Government, that the destiny of individuals was to serve that Government, and that fundamentally a great and strong group of central institutions, guided by a small group of able and public spirited citizens, could best direct all Government.

But Mr. Jefferson, in the summer of 1776, after drafting the Declaration of Independence turned his mind to the same problem and took a different view. He did not deceive himself with outward forms. Government to him was a means to an end, not an end in itself; it might be either a refuge and a help or a threat and a danger, depending on the circumstances. We find him carefully analyzing the society for which he was to organize a Government. "We have no paupers. The great mass of our population is of laborers, our rich who cannot live without labor, either manual or professional, being few and of moderate wealth. Most of the laboring class possess property, cultivate their own lands, have families and from the demand for their labor, are enabled to exact from the rich and the competent
such prices as enable them to feed abundantly, clothe above mere decency, to labor moder-
ately and raise their families."

These people, he considered, had two sets of rights, those of "personal competency" and
those involved in acquiring and possessing property. By "personal competency" he meant
the right of free thinking, freedom of forming and expressing opinions, and freedom of
personal living, each man according to his own lights. To insure the first set of rights, a
Government must so order its functions as not to interfere with the individual. But even
Jefferson realized that the exercise of the property rights might so interfere with the rights
of the individual that the Government, without whose assistance the property rights could
not exist, must intervene, not to destroy individualism, but to protect it.

You are familiar with the great political duel which followed; and how Hamilton, and his
friends, building toward a dominant centralized power were at length defeated in the great
election of 1800, by Mr. Jefferson's party. Out of that duel came the two parties, Republican
and Democratic, as we know them today.

So began, in American political life, the new day, the day of the individual against the sys-
tem, the day in which individualism was made the great watchword of American life. The
happiest of economic conditions made that day long and splendid. On the Western fron-
tier, land was substantially free. No one, who did not shirk the task of earning a living, was
entirely without opportunity to do so. Depressions could, and did, come and go; but they
could not alter the fundamental fact that most of the people lived partly by selling their
labor and partly by extracting their livelihood from the soil, so that starvation and disloca-
tion were practically impossible. At the very worst there was always the possibility of climb-
ing into a covered wagon and moving west where the untilled prairies afforded a haven for
men to whom the East did not provide a place. So great were our natural resources that we
could offer this relief not only to our own people, but to the distressed of all the world; we
could invite immigration from Europe, and welcome it with open arms.

Traditionally, when a depression came a new section of land was opened in the West; and
even our temporary misfortune served our manifest destiny.
It was in the middle of the nineteenth century that a new force was released and a new dream created. The force was what is called the industrial revolution, the advance of steam and machinery and the rise of the forerunners of the modern industrial plant. The dream was the dream of an economic machine, able to raise the standard of living for everyone; to bring luxury within the reach of the humblest; to annihilate distance by steam power and later by electricity, and to release everyone from the drudgery of the heaviest manual toil.

It was to be expected that this would necessarily affect Government. Heretofore, Government had merely been called upon to produce conditions within which people could live happily, labor peacefully, and rest secure. Now it was called upon to aid in the consummation of this new dream. There was, however, a shadow over the dream. To be made real, it required use of the talents of men of tremendous will and tremendous ambition, since by no other force could the problems of financing and engineering and new developments be brought to a consummation.

So manifest were the advantages of the machine age, however, that the United States fearlessly, cheerfully, and, I think, rightly, accepted the bitter with the sweet. It was thought that no price was too high to pay for the advantages which we could draw from a finished industrial system. The history of the last half century is accordingly in large measure a history of a group of financial Titans, whose methods were not scrutinized with too much care, and who were honored in proportion as they produced the results, irrespective of the means they used. The financiers who pushed the railroads to the Pacific were always ruthless, often wasteful, and frequently corrupt; but they did build railroads, and we have them today. It has been estimated that the American investor paid for the American railway system more than three times over in the process; but despite this fact the net advantage was to the United States. As long as we had free land; as long as population was growing by leaps and bounds; as long as our industrial plants were insufficient to supply our own needs, society chose to give the ambitious man free play and unlimited reward provided only that he produced the economic plant so much desired.

During this period of expansion, there was equal opportunity for all and the business of Government was not to interfere but to assist in the development of industry. This was
done at the request of business men themselves. The tariff was originally imposed for the purpose of "fostering our infant industry," a phrase I think the older among you will remember as a political issue not so long ago. The railroads were subsidized, sometimes by grants of money, oftener by grants of land; some of the most valuable oil lands in the United States were granted to assist the financing of the railroad which pushed through the Southwest. A nascent merchant marine was assisted by grants of money, or by mail subsidies, so that our steam shipping might ply the seven seas. Some of my friends tell me that they do not want the Government in business. With this I agree; but I wonder whether they realize the implications of the past. For while it has been American doctrine that the Government must not go into business in competition with private enterprises, still it has been traditional, particularly in Republican administrations, for business urgently to ask the Government to put at private disposal all kinds of Government assistance. The same man who tells you that he does not want to see the Government interfere in business—and he means it, and has plenty of good reasons for saying so—is the first to go to Washington and ask the Government for a prohibitory tariff on his product. When things get just bad enough, as they did two years ago, he will go with equal speed to the United States Government and ask for a loan; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is the outcome of it. Each group has sought protection from the Government for its own special interests, without realizing that the function of Government must be to favor no small group at the expense of its duty to protect the rights of personal freedom and of private property of all its citizens.

In retrospect we can now see that the turn of the tide came with the turn of the century. We were reaching our last frontier; there was no more free land and our industrial combinations had become great uncontrolled and irresponsible units of power within the State. Clear-sighted men saw with fear the danger that opportunity would no longer be equal; that the growing corporation, like the feudal baron of old, might threaten the economic freedom of individuals to earn a living. In that hour, our antitrust laws were born. The cry was raised against the great corporations. Theodore Roosevelt, the first great Republican Progressive, fought a Presidential campaign on the issue of "trust busting" and talked freely about malefactors of great wealth. If the Government had a policy it was rather
to turn the clock back, to destroy the large combinations and to return to the time when every man owned his individual small business.

This was impossible; Theodore Roosevelt, abandoning the idea of "trust busting," was forced to work out a difference between "good" trusts and "bad" trusts. The Supreme Court set forth the famous "rule of reason" by which it seems to have meant that a concentration of industrial power was permissible if the method by which it got its power, and the use it made of that power, were reasonable.

Woodrow Wilson, elected in 1912, saw the situation more clearly. Where Jefferson had feared the encroachment of political power on the lives of individuals, Wilson knew that the new power was financial. He saw, in the highly centralized economic system, the despot of the twentieth century, on whom great masses of individuals relied for their safety and their livelihood, and whose irresponsibility and greed (if they were not controlled) would reduce them to starvation and penury. The concentration of financial power had not proceeded so far in 1912 as it has today; but it had grown far enough for Mr. Wilson to realize fully its implications. It is interesting, now, to read his speeches. What is called "radical" today (and I have reason to know whereof I speak) is mild compared to the campaign of Mr. Wilson. "No man can deny," he said, "that the lines of endeavor have more and more narrowed and stiffened; no man who knows anything about the development of industry in this country can have failed to observe that the larger kinds of credit are more and more difficult to obtain unless you obtain them upon terms of uniting your efforts with those who already control the industry of the country, and nobody can fail to observe that every man who tries to set himself up in competition with any process of manufacture which has taken place under the control of large combinations of capital will presently find himself either squeezed out or obliged to sell and allow himself to be absorbed." Had there been no World War—had Mr. Wilson been able to devote eight years to domestic instead of to international affairs—we might have had a wholly different situation at the present time. However, the then distant roar of European cannon, growing ever louder, forced him to abandon the study of this issue. The problem he saw so clearly is left with us as a legacy;
and no one of us on either side of the political controversy can deny that it is a matter of grave concern to the Government.

A glance at the situation today only too clearly indicates that equality of opportunity as we have known it no longer exists. Our industrial plant is built; the problem just now is whether under existing conditions it is not overbuilt. Our last frontier has long since been reached, and there is practically no more free land. More than half of our people do not live on the farms or on lands and cannot derive a living by cultivating their own property. There is no safety valve in the form of a Western prairie to which those thrown out of work by the Eastern economic machines can go for a new start. We are not able to invite the immigration from Europe to share our endless plenty. We are now providing a drab living for our own people.

Our system of constantly rising tariffs has at last reacted against us to the point of closing our Canadian frontier on the north, our European markets on the east, many of our Latin-American markets to the south, and a goodly proportion of our Pacific markets on the west, through the retaliatory tariffs of those countries. It has forced many of our great industrial institutions which exported their surplus production to such countries, to establish plants in such countries, within the tariff walls. This has resulted in the reduction of the operation of their American plants, and opportunity for employment.

Just as freedom to farm has ceased, so also the opportunity in business has narrowed. It still is true that men can start small enterprises, trusting to native shrewdness and ability to keep abreast of competitors; but area after area has been preempted altogether by the great corporations, and even in the fields which still have no great concerns, the small man starts under a handicap. The unfeeling statistics of the past three decades show that the independent business man is running a losing race. Perhaps he is forced to the wall; perhaps he cannot command credit; perhaps he is "squeezed out," in Mr. Wilson's words, by highly organized corporate competitors, as your corner grocery man can tell you. Recently a careful study was made of the concentration of business in the United States. It showed that our economic life was dominated by some six hundred odd corporations who controlled
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two-thirds of American industry. Ten million small business men divided the other third. More striking still, it appeared that if the process of concentration goes on at the same rate, at the end of another century we shall have all American industry controlled by a dozen corporations, and run by perhaps a hundred men. Put plainly, we are steering a steady course toward economic oligarchy, if we are not there already.

Clearly, all this calls for a reappraisal of values. A mere builder of more industrial plants, a creator of more railroad systems, an organizer of m corporations, is as likely to be a danger as a help. The day of the great promoter or the financial Titan, to whom we granted anything if only he would build, or develop, is over. Our task now is not discovery or exploitation of natural resources, or necessarily producing more goods. It is the soberer, less dramatic business of administering resources and plants already in hand, of seeking to reestablish foreign markets for our surplus production, of meeting the problem of underconsumption, of adjusting production to consumption, of distributing wealth and products more equitably, of adapting existing economic organizations to the service of the people. The day of enlightened administration has come.

Just as in older times the central Government was first a haven of refuge, and then a threat, so now in a closer economic system the central and ambitious financial unit is no longer a servant of national desire, but a danger. I would draw the parallel one step farther. We did not think because national Government had become a threat in the 18th century that therefore we should abandon the principle of national Government. Nor today should we abandon the principle of strong economic units called corporations, merely because their power is susceptible of easy abuse. In other times we dealt with the problem of an unduly ambitious central Government by modifying it gradually into a constitutional democratic Government. So today we are modifying and controlling our economic units.

As I see it, the task of Government in its relation to business is to assist the development of an economic declaration of rights, an economic constitutional order. This is the common task of statesman and business man. It is the minimum requirement of a more permanently safe order of things.
Happily, the times indicate that to create such an order not only is the proper policy of Government, but it is the only line of safety for our economic structures as well. We know, now, that these economic units cannot exist unless prosperity is uniform, that is, unless purchasing power is well distributed throughout every group in the Nation. That is why even the most selfish of corporations for its own interest would be glad to see wages restored and unemployment ended and to bring the Western farmer back to his accustomed level of prosperity and to assure a permanent safety to both groups. That is why some enlightened industries themselves endeavor to limit the freedom of action of each man and business group within the industry in the common interest of all; why business men everywhere are asking a form of organization which will bring the scheme of things into balance, even though it may in some measure qualify the freedom of action of individual units within the business.

The exposition need not further be elaborated. It is brief and incomplete, but you will be able to expand it in terms of your own business or occupation without difficulty. I think everyone who has actually entered the economic struggle—which means everyone who was not born to safe wealth—knows in his own experience and his own life that we have now to apply the earlier concepts of American Government to the conditions of today.

The Declaration of Independence discusses the problem of Government in terms of a contract. Government is a relation of give and take, a contract, perforce, if we would follow the thinking out of which it grew. Under such a contract rulers were accorded power, and the people consented to that power on consideration that they be accorded certain rights. The task of statesmanship has always been the redefinition of these rights in terms of a changing and growing social order. New conditions impose new requirements upon Government and those who conduct government.

I held, for example, in proceedings before me as Governor, the purpose of which was the removal of the Sheriff of New York, that under modern conditions it was not enough for a public official merely to evade the legal terms of official wrongdoing. He owed a positive duty as well. I said in substance that if he had acquired large sums of money, he was when
accused required to explain the sources of such wealth. To that extent this wealth was colored with a public interest. I said that in financial matters public servants should, even beyond private citizens, be held to a stern and uncompromising rectitude.

I feel that we are coming to a view through the drift of our legislation and our public thinking in the past quarter century that private economic power is, to enlarge an old phrase, a public trust as well. I hold that continued enjoyment of that power by any individual or group must depend upon the fulfillment of that trust. The men who have reached the summit of American business life know this best; happily, many of these urge the binding quality of this greater social contract.

The terms of that contract are as old as the Republic, and as new as the new economic order.

Every man has a right to life; and this means that he has also a right to make a comfortable living. He may by sloth or crime decline to exercise that right; but it may not be denied him. We have no actual famine or dearth; our industrial and agricultural mechanism can produce enough and to spare. Our Government formal and informal, political and economic, owes to everyone an avenue to possess himself of a portion of that plenty sufficient for his needs, through his own work.

Every man has a right to his own property; which means a right to be assured, to the fullest extent attainable, in the safety of his savings. By no other means can men carry the burdens of those parts of life which, in the nature of things, afford no chance of labor: childhood, sickness, old age. In all thought of property, this right is paramount; all other property rights must yield to it. If, in accord with this principle, we must restrict the operations of the speculator, the manipulator, even the financier, I believe we must accept the restriction as needful, not to hamper individualism but to protect it.

These two requirements must be satisfied, in the main, by the individuals who claim and hold control of the great industrial and financial combinations which dominate so large a part of our industrial life. They have undertaken to be, not business men, but princes of property. I am not prepared to say that the system which produces them is wrong. I am
very clear that they must fearlessly and competently assume the responsibility which goes with the power. So many enlightened business men know this that the statement would be little more than a platitude, were it not for an added implication.

This implication is, briefly, that the responsible heads of finance and industry instead of acting each for himself, must work together to achieve the common end. They must, where necessary, sacrifice this or that private advantage; and in reciprocal self-denial must seek a general advantage. It is here that formal Government—political Government, if you chose—comes in. Whenever in the pursuit of this objective the lone wolf, the unethical competitor, the reckless promoter, the Ishmael or Insull whose hand is against every man's, declines to join in achieving an end recognized as being for the public welfare, and threatens to drag the industry back to a state of anarchy, the Government may properly be asked to apply restraint. Likewise, should the group ever use its collective power contrary to the public welfare, the Government must be swift to enter and protect the public interest.

The Government should assume the function of economic regulation only as a last resort, to be tried only when private initiative, inspired by high responsibility, with such assistance and balance as Government can give, has finally failed. As yet there has been no final failure, because there has been no attempt; and I decline to assume that this Nation is unable to meet the situation.

The final term of the high contract was for liberty and the pursuit of happiness. We have learned a great deal of both in the past century. We know that individual liberty and individual happiness mean nothing unless both are ordered in the sense that one man's meat is not another man's poison. We know that the old "rights of personal competency," the right to read, to think, to speak, to choose and live a mode of life, must be respected at all hazards. We know that liberty to do anything which deprives others of those elemental rights is outside the protection of any compact; and that Government in this regard is the maintenance of a balance, within which every individual may have a place if he will take it; in which every individual may find safety if he wishes it; in which every individual may attain
such power as his ability permits, consistent with his assuming the accompanying responsibility.

All this is a long, slow task. Nothing is more striking than the simple innocence of the men who insist, whenever an objective is present, on the prompt production of a patent scheme guaranteed to produce a result. Human endeavor is not so simple as that. Government includes the art of formulating a policy, and using the political technique to attain so much of that policy as will receive general support; persuading, leading, sacrificing, teaching always, because the greatest duty of a statesman is to educate. But in the matters of which I have spoken, we are learning rapidly, in a severe school. The lessons so learned must not be forgotten, even in the mental lethargy of a speculative upturn. We must build toward the time when a major depression cannot occur again; and if this means sacrificing the easy profits of inflationist booms, then let them go; and good riddance.

Faith in America, faith in our tradition of personal responsibility, faith in our institutions, faith in ourselves demand that we recognize the new terms of the old social contract. We shall fulfill them, as we fulfilled the obligation of the apparent Utopia which Jefferson imagined for us in 1776, and which Jefferson, Roosevelt and Wilson sought to bring to realization. We must do so, lest a rising tide of misery, engendered by our common failure, engulf us all. But failure is not an American habit; and in the strength of great hope we must all shoulder our common load.
PRESIDENT FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT (D)

To the Democratic National Convention

SPEECH

June 27, 1936

Franklin Field | Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

BACKGROUND

President Franklin Roosevelt delivered this speech beginning the 1936 election campaign and in light of recent Supreme Court rulings that cut against some of his New Deal programs.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What obstacle did the Founders face and overcome, according to Roosevelt?
2. What does Roosevelt point to as the newest form of tyranny?
3. What, according to Roosevelt, is flawed about the "economic royalists’" conception of government?
4. Why does Roosevelt feel an interventionist is more forgivable in its errors than a restrained one?

---

Senator Robinson, Members of the Democratic Convention, my friends:

Here, and in every community throughout the land, we are met at a time of great moment to the future of the Nation. It is an occasion to be dedicated to the simple and sincere expression of an attitude toward problems, the determination of which will profoundly affect America.

I come not only as a leader of a party, not only as a candidate for high office, but as one upon whom many critical hours have imposed and still impose a grave responsibility.

For the sympathy, help and confidence with which Americans have sustained me in my task I am grateful. For their loyalty I salute the members of our great party, in and out of political life in every part of the Union. I salute those of other parties, especially those in the Congress of the United States who on so many occasions have put partisanship aside. I thank the Governors of the several States, their Legislatures, their State and local officials who participated unselfishly and regardless of party in our efforts to achieve recovery and destroy abuses. Above all I thank the millions of Americans who have borne disaster bravely and have dared to smile through the storm.

America will not forget these recent years, will not forget that the rescue was not a mere party task. It was the concern of all of us. In our strength we rose together, rallied our energies together, applied the old rules of common sense, and together survived.

In those days we feared fear. That was why we fought fear. And today, my friends, we have won against the most dangerous of our foes. We have conquered fear.

But I cannot, with candor, tell you that all is well with the world. Clouds of suspicion, tides of ill-will and intolerance gather darkly in many places. In our own land we enjoy indeed a fullness of life greater than that of most Nations. But the rush of modern civilization itself has raised for us new difficulties, new problems which must be solved if we are to preserve to the United States the political and economic freedom for which Washington and Jefferson planned and fought.
Philadelphia is a good city in which to write American history. This is fitting ground on which to reaffirm the faith of our fathers; to pledge ourselves to restore to the people a wider freedom; to give to 1936 as the founders gave to 1776—an American way of life.

That very word freedom, in itself and of necessity, suggests freedom from some restraining power. In 1776 we sought freedom from the tyranny of a political autocracy—from the eighteenth century royalists who held special privileges from the crown. It was to perpetuate their privilege that they governed without the consent of the governed; that they denied the right of free assembly and free speech; that they restricted the worship of God; that they put the average man's property and the average man's life in pawn to the mercenaries of dynastic power; that they regimented the people.

And so it was to win freedom from the tyranny of political autocracy that the American Revolution was fought. That victory gave the business of governing into the hands of the average man, who won the right with his neighbors to make and order his own destiny through his own Government. Political tyranny was wiped out at Philadelphia on July 4, 1776.

Since that struggle, however, man's inventive genius released new forces in our land which reordered the lives of our people. The age of machinery, of railroads; of steam and electricity; the telegraph and the radio; mass production, mass distribution—all of these combined to bring forward a new civilization and with it a new problem for those who sought to remain free.

For out of this modern civilization economic royalists carved new dynasties. New kingdoms were built upon concentration of control over material things. Through new uses of corporations, banks and securities, new machinery of industry and agriculture, of labor and capital—all undreamed of by the fathers—the whole structure of modern life was impressed into this royal service.

There was no place among this royalty for our many thousands of small business men and merchants who sought to make a worthy use of the American system of initiative and
profit. They were no more free than the worker or the farmer. Even honest and progressive-minded men of wealth, aware of their obligation to their generation, could never know just where they fitted into this dynastic scheme of things.

It was natural and perhaps human that the privileged princes of these new economic dynasties, thirsting for power, reached out for control over Government itself. They created a new despotism and wrapped it in the robes of legal sanction. In its service new mercenaries sought to regiment the people, their labor, and their property. And as a result the average man once more confronts the problem that faced the Minute Man.

The hours men and women worked, the wages they received, the conditions of their labor—these had passed beyond the control of the people, and were imposed by this new industrial dictatorship. The savings of the average family, the capital of the small business man, the investments set aside for old age—other people's money—these were tools which the new economic royalty used to dig itself in.

Those who tilled the soil no longer reaped the rewards which were their right. The small measure of their gains was decreed by men in distant cities.

Throughout the Nation, opportunity was limited by monopoly. Individual initiative was crushed in the cogs of a great machine. The field open for free business was more and more restricted. Private enterprise, indeed, became too private. It became privileged enterprise, not free enterprise.

An old English judge once said: "Necessitous men are not free men." Liberty requires opportunity to make a living—a living decent according to the standard of the time, a living which gives man not only enough to live by, but something to live for.

For too many of us the political equality we once had won was meaningless in the face of economic inequality. A small group had concentrated into their own hands an almost complete control over other people's property, other people's money, other people's labor—other people's lives. For too many of us life was no longer free; liberty no longer real; men could no longer follow the pursuit of happiness.
Against economic tyranny such as this, the American citizen could appeal only to the organized power of Government. The collapse of 1929 showed up the despotism for what it was. The election of 1932 was the people’s mandate to end it. Under that mandate it is being ended.

The royalists of the economic order have conceded that political freedom was the business of the Government, but they have maintained that economic slavery was nobody’s business. They granted that the Government could protect the citizen in his right to vote, but they denied that the Government could do anything to protect the citizen in his right to work and his right to live.

Today we stand committed to the proposition that freedom is no half-and-half affair. If the average citizen is guaranteed equal opportunity in the polling place, he must have equal opportunity in the market place.

These economic royalists complain that we seek to overthrow the institutions of America. What they really complain of is that we seek to take away their power. Our allegiance to American institutions requires the overthrow of this kind of power. In vain they seek to hide behind the Flag and the Constitution. In their blindness they forget what the Flag and the Constitution stand for. Now, as always, they stand for democracy, not tyranny; for freedom, not subjection; and against a dictatorship by mob rule and the overprivileged alike.

The brave and clear platform adopted by this Convention, to which I heartily subscribe, sets forth that Government in a modern civilization has certain inescapable obligations to its citizens, among which are protection of the family and the home, the establishment of a democracy of opportunity, and aid to those overtaken by disaster.

But the resolute enemy within our gates is ever ready to beat down our words unless in greater courage we will fight for them.

For more than three years we have fought for them. This Convention, in every word and deed, has pledged that that fight will go on.
The defeats and victories of these years have given to us as a people a new understanding of our Government and of ourselves. Never since the early days of the New England town meeting have the affairs of Government been so widely discussed and so clearly appreciated. It has been brought home to us that the only effective guide for the safety of this most worldly of worlds, the greatest guide of all, is moral principle.

We do not see faith, hope and charity as unattainable ideals, but we use them as stout supports of a Nation fighting the fight for freedom in a modern civilization.

Faith—in the soundness of democracy in the midst of dictatorships.

Hope—renewed because we know so well the progress we have made.

Charity—in the true spirit of that grand old word. For charity literally translated from the original means love, the love that understands, that does not merely share the wealth of the giver, but in true sympathy and wisdom helps men to help themselves.

We seek not merely to make Government a mechanical implement, but to give it the vibrant personal character that is the very embodiment of human charity.

We are poor indeed if this Nation cannot afford to lift from every recess of American life the dread fear of the unemployed that they are not needed in the world. We cannot afford to accumulate a deficit in the books of human fortitude.

In the place of the palace of privilege we seek to build a temple out of faith and hope and charity.

It is a sobering thing, my friends, to be a servant of this great cause. We try in our daily work to remember that the cause belongs not to us, but to the people. The standard is not in the hands of you and me alone. It is carried by America. We seek daily to profit from experience, to learn to do better as our task proceeds.
Governments can err, Presidents do make mistakes, but the immortal Dante tells us that divine justice weighs the sins of the cold-blooded and the sins of the warm-hearted in different scales.

Better the occasional faults of a Government that lives in a spirit of charity than the consistent omissions of a Government frozen in the ice of its own indifference.

There is a mysterious cycle in human events. To some generations much is given. Of other generations much is expected. This generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny.

In this world of ours in other lands, there are some people, who, in times past, have lived and fought for freedom, and seem to have grown too weary to carry on the fight. They have sold their heritage of freedom for the illusion of a living. They have yielded their democracy.

I believe in my heart that only our success can stir their ancient hope. They begin to know that here in America we are waging a great and successful war. It is not alone a war against want and destitution and economic demoralization. It is more than that; it is a war for the survival of democracy. We are fighting to save a great and precious form of government for ourselves and for the world.

I accept the commission you have tendered me. I join with you. I am enlisted for the duration of the war.
PRESIDENT FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT (D)
Annual Message to Congress

SPEECH EXCERPTS

January 6, 1941
Congress | Washington, D.C.

Four Freedoms Speech

BACKGROUND

President Franklin Roosevelt delivered this state of the union speech to Congress in 1941, later known as the Four Freedoms Speech.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What are the three elements of Roosevelt's national policy at this time?

2. What sacrifices does Roosevelt call on Americans to make at this time?

3. What are the four essential freedoms that Roosevelt introduces?

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Seventy-seventh Congress:

I address you, the Members of the Seventy-seventh Congress, at a moment unprecedented in the history of the Union. I use the word “unprecedented,” because at no previous time has American security been as seriously threatened from without as it is today. . . .

Even when the World War broke out in 1914, it seemed to contain only small threat of danger to our own American future. But, as time went on, the American people began to visualize what the downfall of democratic nations might mean to our own democracy.

We need not overemphasize imperfections in the Peace of Versailles. We need not harp on failure of the democracies to deal with problems of world reconstruction. We should remember that the Peace of 1919 was far less unjust than the kind of “pacification” which began even before Munich, and which is being carried on under the new order of tyranny that seeks to spread over every continent today. The American people have unalterably set their faces against that tyranny.

Every realist knows that the democratic way of life is at this moment being directly assailed in every part of the world – assailed either by arms, or by secret spreading of poisonous propaganda by those who seek to destroy unity and promote discord in nations that are still at peace.

During sixteen long months this assault has blotted out the whole pattern of democratic life in an appalling number of independent nations, great and small. The assailants are still on the march, threatening other nations, great and small.

Therefore, as your President, performing my constitutional duty to “give to the Congress information of the state of the Union,” I find it, unhappily, necessary to report that the future and the safety of our country and of our democracy are overwhelmingly involved in events far beyond our borders.
Armed defense of democratic existence is now being gallantly waged in four continents. If that defense fails, all the population and all the resources of Europe, Asia, Africa and Australasia will be dominated by the conquerors. Let us remember that the total of those populations and their resources in those four continents greatly exceeds the sum total of the population and the resources of the whole of the Western Hemisphere – many times over.

In times like these it is immature – and incidentally, untrue – for anybody to brag that an unprepared America, single-handed, and with one hand tied behind its back, can hold off the whole world.

No realistic American can expect from a dictator’s peace international generosity, or return of true independence, or world disarmament, or freedom of expression, or freedom of religion – or even good business. . . .

The need of the moment is that our actions and our policy should be devoted primarily – almost exclusively – to meeting this foreign peril. For all our domestic problems are now a part of the great emergency.

Just as our national policy in internal affairs has been based upon a decent respect for the rights and the dignity of all our fellow men within our gates, so our national policy in foreign affairs has been based on a decent respect for the rights and dignity of all nations, large and small. And the justice of morality must and will win in the end. Our national policy is this:

First, by an impressive expression of the public will and without regard to partisanship, we are committed to all-inclusive national defense.

Second, by an impressive expression of the public will and without regard to partisanship, we are committed to full support of all those resolute peoples, everywhere, who are resisting aggression and are thereby keeping war away from our Hemisphere. By this support, we express our determination that the democratic cause shall prevail; and we strengthen the defense and the security of our own nation.
Third, by an impressive expression of the public will and without regard to partisanship, we are committed to the proposition that principles of morality and considerations for our own security will never permit us to acquiesce in a peace dictated by aggressors and sponsored by appeasers.

5 We know that enduring peace cannot be bought at the cost of other people’s freedom.

In the recent national election there was no substantial difference between the two great parties in respect to that national policy. No issue was fought out on this line before the American electorate. Today it is abundantly evident that American citizens everywhere are demanding and supporting speedy and complete action in recognition of obvious danger.

10 Therefore, the immediate need is a swift and driving increase in our armament production.

... 

A free nation has the right to expect full cooperation from all groups. A free nation has the right to look to the leaders of business, of labor, and of agriculture to take the lead in stimulating effort, not among other groups but within their own groups.

15 The best way of dealing with the few slackers or trouble makers in our midst is, first, to shame them by patriotic example, and, if that fails, to use the sovereignty of Government to save Government.

As men do not live by bread alone, they do not fight by armaments alone. Those who man our defenses, and those behind them who build our defenses, must have the stamina and the courage which come from unshakable belief in the manner of life which they are defending. The mighty action that we are calling for cannot be based on a disregard of all things worth fighting for.

The Nation takes great satisfaction and much strength from the things which have been done to make its people conscious of their individual stake in the preservation of democratic life in America. Those things have toughened the fiber of our people, have renewed their faith and strengthened their devotion to the institutions we make ready to protect.
Certainly this is no time for any of us to stop thinking about the social and economic problems which are the root cause of the social revolution which is today a supreme factor in the world.

For there is nothing mysterious about the foundations of a healthy and strong democracy. The basic things expected by our people of their political and economic systems are simple. They are:

Equality of opportunity for youth and for others.

Jobs for those who can work.

Security for those who need it.

The ending of special privilege for the few.

The preservation of civil liberties for all.

The enjoyment of the fruits of scientific progress in a wider and constantly rising standard of living.

These are the simple, basic things that must never be lost sight of in the turmoil and unbelievable complexity of our modern world. The inner and abiding strength of our economic and political systems is dependent upon the degree to which they fulfill these expectations.

Many subjects connected with our social economy call for immediate improvement. As examples:

We should bring more citizens under the coverage of old-age pensions and unemployment insurance.

We should widen the opportunities for adequate medical care.

We should plan a better system by which persons deserving or needing gainful employment may obtain it.
I have called for personal sacrifice. I am assured of the willingness of almost all Americans to respond to that call.

A part of the sacrifice means the payment of more money in taxes. In my Budget Message I shall recommend that a greater portion of this great defense program be paid for from taxation than we are paying today. No person should try, or be allowed, to get rich out of this program; and the principle of tax payments in accordance with ability to pay should be constantly before our eyes to guide our legislation.

If the Congress maintains these principles, the voters, putting patriotism ahead of pocket-books, will give you their applause.

In the future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms.

The first is freedom of speech and expression – everywhere in the world.

The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way – everywhere in the world.

The third is freedom from want – which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants – everywhere in the world.

The fourth is freedom from fear – which, translated into world terms, means a world-wide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor – anywhere in the world.

That is no vision of a distant millennium. It is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our own time and generation. That kind of world is the very antithesis of the so-called new order of tyranny which the dictators seek to create with the crash of a bomb.
To that new order we oppose the greater conception – the moral order. A good society is able to face schemes of world domination and foreign revolutions alike without fear.

Since the beginning of our American history, we have been engaged in change – in a perpetual peaceful revolution – a revolution which goes on steadily, quietly adjusting itself to changing conditions – without the concentration camp or the quick-lime in the ditch. The world order which we seek is the cooperation of free countries, working together in a friendly, civilized society.

This nation has placed its destiny in the hands and heads and hearts of its millions of free men and women; and its faith in freedom under the guidance of God. Freedom means the supremacy of human rights everywhere. Our support goes to those who struggle to gain those rights or keep them. Our strength is our unity of purpose. To that high concept there can be no end save victory.
**PRESIDENT FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT (D)**

**Message on the State of the Union**

**SPEECH**

January 11, 1944

Congress | Washington, D.C.

**BACKGROUND**

President Franklin Roosevelt outlined his second or “economic Bill of Rights” while delivering his state of the union address to Congress looking forward to post-war policies.

**GUIDING QUESTIONS**

1. What does Roosevelt consider our “political rights”?

2. Why are those political rights no longer adequate, according to Roosevelt?

3. How would the government go about securing things such as a right to a decent living or recreation?

4. What or who in America does Roosevelt label as Fascistic?

5. Who is the source for all these rights?

---

It is our duty now to begin to lay the plans and determine the strategy for the winning of a lasting peace and the establishment of an American standard of living higher than ever before known. We cannot be content, no matter how high that general standard of living may be, if some fraction of our people—whether it be one-third or one-fifth or one-tenth—is ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed, and insecure.

This Republic had its beginning, and grew to its present strength, under the protection of certain inalienable political rights—among them the right of free speech, free press, free worship, trial by jury, freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures. They were our rights to life and liberty.

As our Nation has grown in size and stature, however—as our industrial economy expanded—these political rights proved inadequate to assure us equality in the pursuit of happiness.

We have come to a clear realization of the fact that true individual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence. "Necessitous men are not free men." People who are hungry and out of a job are the stuff of which dictatorships are made.

In our day these economic truths have become accepted as self-evident. We have accepted, so to speak, a second Bill of Rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all—regardless of station, race, or creed.

Among these are:

The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the Nation;

The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation;

The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living;
The right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad;

The right of every family to a decent home;

The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;

The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment;

The right to a good education.

All of these rights spell security. And after this war is won we must be prepared to move forward, in the implementation of these rights, to new goals of human happiness and well-being.

America’s own rightful place in the world depends in large part upon how fully these and similar rights have been carried into practice for our citizens. For unless there is security here at home there cannot be lasting peace in the world.

One of the great American industrialists of our day—a man who has rendered yeoman service to his country in this crisis—recently emphasized the grave dangers of "rightist reaction" in this Nation. All clear-thinking businessmen share his concern. Indeed, if such reaction should develop—if history were to repeat itself and we were to return to the so-called "normalcy" of the 1920's—then it is certain that even though we shall have conquered our enemies on the battlefields abroad, we shall have yielded to the spirit of Fascism here at home.

I ask the Congress to explore the means for implementing this economic bill of rights—for it is definitely the responsibility of the Congress so to do. Many of these problems are already before committees of the Congress in the form of proposed legislation. I shall from time to time communicate with the Congress with respect to these and further proposals.
In the event that no adequate program of progress is evolved, I am certain that the Nation will be conscious of the fact.

Our fighting men abroad—and their families at home—expect such a program and have the right to insist upon it. It is to their demands that this Government should pay heed rather than the whining demands of selfish pressure groups who seek to feather their nests while young Americans are dying.

The foreign policy that we have been following—the policy that guided us at Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran—is based on the common sense principle which was best expressed by Benjamin Franklin on July 4, 1776: "We must all hang together, or assuredly we shall all hang separately."

I have often said that there are no two fronts for America in this war. There is only one front. There is one line of unity which extends from the hearts of the people at home to the men of our attacking forces in our farthest outposts. When we speak of our total effort, we speak of the factory and the field, and the mine as well as of the battleground—we speak of the soldier and the civilian, the citizen and his Government.

Each and every one of us has a solemn obligation under God to serve this Nation in its most critical hour—to keep this Nation great—to make this Nation greater in a better world.
PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON (D)

Remarks at the University of Michigan

SPEECH

May 22, 1964

Michigan Stadium | Ann Arbor, Michigan

BACKGROUND

President Lyndon Johnson delivered this address to the graduating class of 1964 at the University of Michigan.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What are the features of Johnson’s “Great Society”?

2. What ills does Johnson see in America that necessitate such a program?

President Hatcher, Governor Romney, Senators McNamara and Hart, Congressmen Meader and Staebler, and other members of the fine Michigan delegation, members of the graduating class, my fellow Americans:

It is a great pleasure to be here today. This university has been coeducational since 1870, but I do not believe it was on the basis of your accomplishments that a Detroit high school girl said, "In choosing a college, you first have to decide whether you want a coeducational school or an educational school."

Well, we can find both here at Michigan, although perhaps at different hours.

I came out here today very anxious to meet the Michigan student whose father told a friend of mine that his son’s education had been a real value. It stopped his mother from bragging about him.

I have come today from the turmoil of your Capital to the tranquility of your campus to speak about the future of your country.

The purpose of protecting the life of our Nation and preserving the liberty of our citizens is to pursue the happiness of our people. Our success in that pursuit is the test of our success as a Nation.

For a century we labored to settle and to subdue a continent. For half a century we called upon unbounded invention and untiring industry to create an order of plenty for all of our people.

The challenge of the next half century is whether we have the wisdom to use that wealth to enrich and elevate our national life, and to advance the quality of our American civilization.

Your imagination, your initiative, and your indignation will determine whether we build a society where progress is the servant of our needs, or a society where old values and new visions are buried under unbridled growth. For in your time we have the opportunity to
move not only toward the rich society and the powerful society, but upward to the Great Society.

The Great Society rests on abundance and liberty for all. It demands an end to poverty and racial injustice, to which we are totally committed in our time. But that is just the beginning.

The Great Society is a place where every child can find knowledge to enrich his mind and to enlarge his talents. It is a place where leisure is a welcome chance to build and reflect, not a feared cause of boredom and restlessness. It is a place where the city of man serves not only the needs of the body and the demands of commerce but the desire for beauty and the hunger for community.

It is a place where man can renew contact with nature. It is a place which honors creation for its own sake and for what it adds to the understanding of the race. It is a place where men are more concerned with the quality of their goals than the quantity of their goods.

But most of all, the Great Society is not a safe harbor, a resting place, a final objective, a finished work. It is a challenge constantly renewed, beckoning us toward a destiny where the meaning of our lives matches the marvelous products of our labor.

So I want to talk to you today about three places where we begin to build the Great Society—in our cities, in our countryside, and in our classrooms.

Many of you will live to see the day, perhaps 50 years from now, when there will be 400 million Americans four-fifths of them in urban areas. In the remainder of this century urban population will double, city land will double, and we will have to build homes, highways, and facilities equal to all those built since this country was first settled. So in the next 40 years we must rebuild the entire urban United States.

Aristotle said: "Men come together in cities in order to live, but they remain together in order to live the good life." It is harder and harder to live the good life in American cities today.
The catalog of ills is long: there is the decay of the centers and the despoiling of the suburbs. There is not enough housing for our people or transportation for our traffic. Open land is vanishing and old landmarks are violated.

Worst of all expansion is eroding the precious and time honored values of community with neighbors and communion with nature. The loss of these values breeds loneliness and boredom and indifference.

Our society will never be great until our cities are great. Today the frontier of imagination and innovation is inside those cities and not beyond their borders.

New experiments are already going on. It will be the task of your generation to make the American city a place where future generations will come, not only to live but to live the good life.

I understand that if I stayed here tonight I would see that Michigan students are really doing their best to live the good life.

This is the place where the Peace Corps was started. It is inspiring to see how all of you, while you are in this country, are trying so hard to live at the level of the people.

A second place where we begin to build the Great Society is in our countryside. We have always prided ourselves on being not only America the strong and America the free, but America the beautiful. Today that beauty is in danger. The water we drink, the food we eat, the very air that we breathe, are threatened with pollution. Our parks are overcrowded, our seashores overburdened. Green fields and dense forests are disappearing.

A few years ago we were greatly concerned about the "Ugly American." Today we must act to prevent an ugly America.

For once the battle is lost, once our natural splendor is destroyed, it can never be recaptured. And once man can no longer walk with beauty or wonder at nature his spirit will wither and his sustenance be wasted.
A third place to build the Great Society is in the classrooms of America. There your children’s lives will be shaped. Our society will not be great until every young mind is set free to scan the farthest reaches of thought and imagination. We are still far from that goal.

Today, 8 million adult Americans, more than the entire population of Michigan, have not finished 5 years of school. Nearly 20 million have not finished 8 years of school. Nearly 54 million--more than one-quarter of all America--have not even finished high school.

Each year more than 100,000 high school graduates, with proved ability, do not enter college because they cannot afford it. And if we cannot educate today’s youth, what will we do in 1970 when elementary school enrollment will be 5 million greater than 1960? And high school enrollment will rise by 5 million. College enrollment will increase by more than 3 million.

In many places, classrooms are overcrowded and curricula are outdated. Most of our qualified teachers are underpaid, and many of our paid teachers are unqualified. So we must give every child a place to sit and a teacher to learn from. Poverty must not be a bar to learning, and learning must offer an escape from poverty.

But more classrooms and more teachers are not enough. We must seek an educational system which grows in excellence as it grows in size. This means better training for our teachers. It means preparing youth to enjoy their hours of leisure as well as their hours of labor. It means exploring new techniques of teaching, to find new ways to stimulate the love of learning and the capacity for creation.

These are three of the central issues of the Great Society. While our Government has many programs directed at those issues, I do not pretend that we have the full answer to those problems.

But I do promise this: We are going to assemble the best thought and the broadest knowledge from all over the world to find those answers for America. I intend to establish working groups to prepare a series of White House conferences and meetings--on the cities, on natural beauty, on the quality of education, and on other emerging challenges. And from
these meetings and from this inspiration and from these studies we will begin to set our course toward the Great Society.

The solution to these problems does not rest on a massive program in Washington, nor can it rely solely on the strained resources of local authority. They require us to create new concepts of cooperation, a creative federalism, between the National Capital and the leaders of local communities.

Woodrow Wilson once wrote: "Every man sent out from his university should be a man of his Nation as well as a man of his time."

Within your lifetime powerful forces, already loosed, will take us toward a way of life beyond the realm of our experience, almost beyond the bounds of our imagination.

For better or for worse, your generation has been appointed by history to deal with those problems and to lead America toward a new age. You have the chance never before afforded to any people in any age. You can help build a society where the demands of morality, and the needs of the spirit, can be realized in the life of the Nation.

So, will you join in the battle to give every citizen the full equality which God enjoins and the law requires, whatever his belief, or race, or the color of his skin?

Will you join in the battle to give every citizen an escape from the crushing weight of poverty?

Will you join in the battle to make it possible for all nations to live in enduring peace--as neighbors and not as mortal enemies?

Will you join in the battle to build the Great Society, to prove that our material progress is only the foundation on which we will build a richer life of mind and spirit?

There are those timid souls who say this battle cannot be won; that we are condemned to a soulless wealth. I do not agree. We have the power to shape the civilization that we want.

But we need your will, your labor, your hearts, if we are to build that kind of society.
Those who came to this land sought to build more than just a new country. They sought a new world. So I have come here today to your campus to say that you can make their vision our reality. So let us from this moment begin our work so that in the future men will look back and say: It was then, after a long and weary way, that man turned the exploits of his genius to the full enrichment of his life.

Thank you. Goodbye.
PRESIDENT CALVIN COOLIDGE (R)

The Inspiration of the Declaration of Independence

SPEECH

July 5, 1926
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

BACKGROUND

President Calvin Coolidge delivered this speech at Philadelphia to celebrate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence and the founding of the United States.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What theories and principles does Coolidge say need to be reaffirmed and reestablished?
2. What kind of people were the American revolutionaries, according to Coolidge?
3. Who was the great apostle of the sovereignty of the people in the colonial clergy?
4. What is the relationship between government and ideals according to Coolidge?
5. According to Coolidge, why are Progressives not truly proponents of progress when they reject the principles of the American founding?

We meet to celebrate the birthday of America. The coming of a new life always excites our interest. Although we know in the case of the individual that it has been an infinite repetition reaching back beyond our vision, that only makes it the more wonderful. But how our interest and wonder increase when we behold the miracle of the birth of a new nation. It is to pay our tribute of reverence and respect to those who participated in such a mighty event that we annually observe the fourth day of July. Whatever may have been the impression created by the news which went out from this city on that summer day in 1776, there can be no doubt as to the estimate which is now placed upon it. At the end of 150 years the four corners of the earth unite in coming to Philadelphia as to a holy shrine in grateful acknowledgement of a service so great, which a few inspired men here rendered to humanity, that it is still the preeminent support of free government throughout the world.

Although a century and a half measured in comparison with the length of human experience is but a short time, yet measured in the life of governments and nations it ranks as a very respectable period. Certainly enough time has elapsed to demonstrate with a great deal of thoroughness the value of our institutions and their dependability as rules for the regulation of human conduct and the advancement of civilization. They have been in existence long enough to become very well seasoned. They have met, and met successfully, the test of experience.

It is not so much then for the purpose of undertaking to proclaim new theories and principles that this annual celebration is maintained, but rather to reaffirm and reestablish those old theories and principles which time and the unerring logic of events have demonstrated to be sound. Amid all the clash of conflicting interests, amid all the welter of partisan politics, every American can turn for solace and consolation to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States with the assurance and confidence that those two great charters of freedom and justice remain firm and unshaken. Whatever perils appear, whatever dangers threaten, the Nation remains secure in the knowledge that the ultimate application of the law of the land will provide an adequate defense and protection.
It is little wonder that people at home and abroad consider Independence Hall as hallowed ground and revere the Liberty Bell as a sacred relic. That pile of bricks and mortar, that mass of metal, might appear to the uninstructed as only the outgrown meeting place and the shattered bell of a former time, useless now because of more modern conveniences, but to those who know they have become consecrated by the use which men have made of them. They have long been identified with a great cause. They are the framework of a spiritual event. The world looks upon them, because of their associations of one hundred and fifty years ago, as it looks upon the Holy Land because of what took place there nineteen hundred years ago. Through use for a righteous purpose they have become sanctified.

It is not here necessary to examine in detail the causes which led to the American Revolution. In their immediate occasion they were largely economic. The colonists objected to the navigation laws which interfered with their trade, they denied the power of Parliament to impose taxes which they were obliged to pay, and they therefore resisted the royal governors and the royal forces which were sent to secure obedience to these laws. But the conviction is inescapable that a new civilization had come, a new spirit had arisen on this side of the Atlantic more advanced and more developed in its regard for the rights of the individual than that which characterized the Old World. Life in a new and open country had aspirations which could not be realized in any subordinate position. A separate establishment was ultimately inevitable. It had been decreed by the very laws of human nature. Man everywhere has an unconquerable desire to be the master of his own destiny.

We are obliged to conclude that the Declaration of Independence represented the movement of a people. It was not, of course, a movement from the top. Revolutions do not come from that direction. It was not without the support of many of the most respectable people in the Colonies, who were entitled to all the consideration that is given to breeding, education, and possessions. It had the support of another element of great significance and importance to which I shall later refer. But the preponderance of all those who occupied a position which took on the aspect of aristocracy did not approve of the Revolution and held toward it an attitude either of neutrality or open hostility. It was in no sense a rising of the oppressed and downtrodden. It brought no scum to the surface, for the reason that colonial
society had developed no scum. The great body of the people were accustomed to priva-
tions, but they were free from depravity. If they had poverty, it was not of the hopeless kind
that afflicts great cities, but the inspiring kind that marks the spirit of the pioneer. The
American Revolution represented the informed and mature convictions of a great mass of
independent, liberty-loving, God-fearing people who knew their rights, and possessed the
courage to dare to maintain them.

The Continental Congress was not only composed of great men, but it represented a great
people. While its members did not fail to exercise a remarkable leadership, they were
equally observant of their representative capacity. They were industrious in encouraging
their constituents to instruct them to support independence. But until such instructions
were given they were inclined to withhold action.

While North Carolina has the honor of first authorizing its delegates to concur with other
Colonies in declaring independence, it was quickly followed by South Carolina and Geor-
gia, which also gave general instructions broad enough to include such action. But the first
instructions which unconditionally directed its delegates to declare for independence came
from the great Commonwealth of Virginia. These were immediately followed by Rhode
Island and Massachusetts, while the other Colonies, with the exception of New York, soon
adopted a like course.

This obedience of the delegates to the wishes of their constituents, which in some cases
causèd them to modify their previous positions, is a matter of great significance. It reveals
an orderly process of government in the first place; but more than that, it demonstrates that
the Declaration of Independence was the result of the seasoned and deliberate thought of
the dominant portion of the people of the Colonies. Adopted after long discussion and as
the result of the duly authorized expression of the preponderance of public opinion, it did
not partake of dark intrigue or hidden conspiracy. It was well advised. It had about it noth-
ing of the lawless and disordered nature of a riotous insurrection. It was maintained on a
plane which rises above the ordinary conception of rebellion. It was in no sense a radical
movement but took on the dignity of a resistance to illegal usurpations. It was conservative
and represented the action of the colonists to maintain their constitutional rights which from time immemorial had been guaranteed to them under the law of the land.

When we come to examine the action of the Continental Congress in adopting the Declaration of Independence in the light of what was set out in that great document and in the light of succeeding events, we can not escape the conclusion that it had a much broader and deeper significance than a mere secession of territory and the establishment of a new nation. Events of that nature have been taking place since the dawn of history. One empire after another has arisen, only to crumble away as its constituent parts separated from each other and set up independent governments of their own. Such actions long ago became commonplace. They have occurred too often to hold the attention of the world and command the admiration and reverence of humanity. There is something beyond the establishment of a new nation, great as that event would be, in the Declaration of Independence which has ever since caused it to be regarded as one of the great charters that not only was to liberate America but was everywhere to ennoble humanity.

It was not because it was proposed to establish a new nation, but because it was proposed to establish a nation on new principles, that July 4, 1776, has come to be regarded as one of the greatest days in history. Great ideas do not burst upon the world unannounced. They are reached by a gradual development over a length of time usually proportionate to their importance. This is especially true of the principles laid down in the Declaration of Independence. Three very definite propositions were set out in its preamble regarding the nature of mankind and therefore of government. These were the doctrine that all men are created equal, that they are endowed with certain inalienable rights, and that therefore the source of the just powers of government must be derived from the consent of the governed.

If no one is to be accounted as born into a superior station, if there is to be no ruling class, and if all possess rights which can neither be bartered away nor taken from them by any earthly power, it follows as a matter of course that the practical authority of the Government has to rest on the consent of the governed. While these principles were not altogether new in political action, and were very far from new in political speculation, they had never
been assembled before and declared in such a combination. But remarkable as this may be, it is not the chief distinction of the Declaration of Independence. The importance of political speculation is not to be underestimated, as I shall presently disclose. Until the idea is developed and the plan made there can be no action.

It was the fact that our Declaration of Independence containing these immortal truths was the political action of a duly authorized and constituted representative public body in its sovereign capacity, supported by the force of general opinion and by the armies of Washington already in the field, which makes it the most important civil document in the world. It was not only the principles declared, but the fact that therewith a new nation was born which was to be founded upon those principles and which from that time forth in its development has actually maintained those principles, that makes this pronouncement an incomparable event in the history of government. It was an assertion that a people had arisen determined to make every necessary sacrifice for the support of these truths and by their practical application bring the War of Independence to a successful conclusion and adopt the Constitution of the United States with all that it has meant to civilization.

The idea that the people have a right to choose their own rulers was not new in political history. It was the foundation of every popular attempt to depose an undesirable king. This right was set out with a good deal of detail by the Dutch when as early as July 26, 1581, they declared their independence of Philip of Spain. In their long struggle with the Stuarts the British people asserted the same principles, which finally culminated in the Bill of Rights deposing the last of that house and placing William and Mary on the throne. In each of these cases sovereignty through divine right was displaced by sovereignty through the consent of the people. Running through the same documents, though expressed in different terms, is the clear inference of inalienable rights. But we should search these charters in vain for an assertion of the doctrine of equality. This principle had not before appeared as an official political declaration of any nation. It was profoundly revolutionary. It is one of the corner stones of American institutions.
But if these truths to which the declaration refers have not before been adopted in their combined entirety by national authority, it is a fact that they had been long pondered and often expressed in political speculation. It is generally assumed that French thought had some effect upon our public mind during Revolutionary days. This may have been true. But the principles of our declaration had been under discussion in the Colonies for nearly two generations before the advent of the French political philosophy that characterized the middle of the eighteenth century. In fact, they come from an earlier date. A very positive echo of what the Dutch had done in 1581, and what the English were preparing to do, appears in the assertion of the Reverend Thomas Hooker of Connecticut as early as 1638, when he said in a sermon before the General Court that—

“The foundation of authority is laid in the free consent of the people.

“The choice of public magistrates belongs unto the people by God’s own allowance.”

This doctrine found wide acceptance among the nonconformist clergy who later made up the Congregational Church. The great apostle of this movement was the Reverend John Wise, of Massachusetts. He was one of the leaders of the revolt against the royal governor Andros in 1687, for which he suffered imprisonment. He was a liberal in ecclesiastical controversies. He appears to have been familiar with the writings of the political scientist, Samuel Pufendorf, who was born in Saxony in 1632. Wise published a treatise, entitled “The Church’s Quarrel Espoused,” in 1710, which was amplified in another publication in 1717. In it he dealt with the principles of civil government. His works were reprinted in 1772 and have been declared to have been nothing less than a textbook of liberty for our Revolutionary fathers.

While the written word was the foundation, it is apparent that the spoken word was the vehicle for convincing the people. This came with great force and wide range from the successors of Hooker and Wise. It was carried on with a missionary spirit which did not fail to reach the Scotch-Irish of North Carolina, showing its influence by significantly making that
Colony the first to give instructions to its delegates looking to independence. This preaching reached the neighborhood of Thomas Jefferson, who acknowledged that his “best ideas of democracy” had been secured at church meetings.

That these ideas were prevalent in Virginia is further revealed by the Declaration of Rights, which was prepared by George Mason and presented to the general assembly on May 27, 1776. This document asserted popular sovereignty and inherent natural rights, but confined the doctrine of equality to the assertion that “All men are created equally free and independent.” It can scarcely be imagined that Jefferson was unacquainted with what had been done in his own Commonwealth of Virginia when he took up the task of drafting the Declaration of Independence. But these thoughts can very largely be traced back to what John Wise was writing in 1710. He said, “Every man must be acknowledged equal to every man.” Again, “The end of all good government is to cultivate humanity and promote the happiness of all and the good of every man in all his rights, his life, liberty, estate, honor, and so forth....”

And again, “For as they have a power every man in his natural state, so upon combination they can and do bequeath this power to others and settle it according as their united discretion shall determine.” And still again, “Democracy is Christ’s government in church and state.” Here was the doctrine of equality, popular sovereignty, and the substance of the theory of inalienable rights clearly asserted by Wise at the opening of the eighteenth century, just as we have the principle of the consent of the governed stated by Hooker as early as 1638.

When we take all these circumstances into consideration, it is but natural that the first paragraph of the Declaration of Independence should open with a reference to Nature’s God and should close in the final paragraphs with an appeal to the Supreme Judge of the world and an assertion of a firm reliance on Divine Providence. Coming from these sources, having as it did this background, it is no wonder that Samuel Adams could say “The people seem to recognize this resolution as though it were a decree promulgated from heaven.”
No one can examine this record and escape the conclusion that in the great outline of its principles the Declaration was the result of the religious teachings of the preceding period. The profound philosophy which Jonathan Edwards applied to theology, the popular preaching of George Whitefield, had aroused the thought and stirred the people of the Colonies in preparation for this great event. No doubt the speculations which had been going on in England, and especially on the Continent, lent their influence to the general sentiment of the times. Of course, the world is always influenced by all the experience and all the thought of the past. But when we come to a contemplation of the immediate conception of the principles of human relationship which went into the Declaration of Independence we are not required to extend our search beyond our own shores. They are found in the texts, the sermons, and the writings of the early colonial clergy who were earnestly undertaking to instruct their congregations in the great mystery of how to live. They preached equality because they believed in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. They justified freedom by the text that we are all created in the divine image, all partakers of the divine spirit.

Placing every man on a plane where he acknowledged no superiors, where no one possessed any right to rule over him, he must inevitably choose his own rulers through a system of self-government. This was their theory of democracy. In those days such doctrines would scarcely have been permitted to flourish and spread in any other country. This was the purpose which the fathers cherished. In order that they might have freedom to express these thoughts and opportunity to put them into action, whole congregations with their pastors had migrated to the colonies. These great truths were in the air that our people breathed. Whatever else we may say of it, the Declaration of Independence was profoundly American.

If this apprehension of the facts be correct, and the documentary evidence would appear to verify it, then certain conclusions are bound to follow. A spring will cease to flow if its source be dried up; a tree will wither if its roots be destroyed. In its main features the Declaration of Independence is a great spiritual document. It is a declaration not of material but of spiritual conceptions. Equality, liberty, popular sovereignty, the rights of man—these
are not elements which we can see and touch. They are ideals. They have their source and their roots in the religious convictions. They belong to the unseen world. Unless the faith of the American people in these religious convictions is to endure, the principles of our Declaration will perish. We can not continue to enjoy the result if we neglect and abandon the cause.

We are too prone to overlook another conclusion. Governments do not make ideals, but ideals make governments. This is both historically and logically true. Of course the government can help to sustain ideals and can create institutions through which they can be the better observed, but their source by their very nature is in the people. The people have to bear their own responsibilities. There is no method by which that burden can be shifted to the government. It is not the enactment, but the observance of laws, that creates the character of a nation.

About the Declaration there is a finality that is exceedingly restful. It is often asserted that the world has made a great deal of progress since 1776, that we have had new thoughts and new experiences which have given us a great advance over the people of that day, and that we may therefore very well discard their conclusions for something more modern. But that reasoning can not be applied to this great charter. If all men are created equal, that is final. If they are endowed with inalienable rights, that is final. If governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, that is final. No advance, no progress can be made beyond these propositions. If anyone wishes to deny their truth or their soundness, the only direction in which he can proceed historically is not forward, but backward toward the time when there was no equality, no rights of the individual, no rule of the people. Those who wish to proceed in that direction can not lay claim to progress. They are reactionary. Their ideas are not more modern, but more ancient, than those of the Revolutionary fathers.

In the development of its institutions America can fairly claim that it has remained true to the principles which were declared 150 years ago. In all the essentials we have achieved an equality which was never possessed by any other people. Even in the less important matter
It was in the contemplation of these truths that the fathers made their declaration and adopted their Constitution. It was to establish a free government, which must not be permitted to degenerate into the unrestrained authority of a mere majority or the unbridled weight of a mere influential few. They undertook the balance these interests against each other and provide the three separate independent branches, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial departments of the Government, with checks against each other in order that neither one might encroach upon the other. These are our guarantees of liberty. As a result of these methods enterprise has been duly protected from confiscation, the people have been free from oppression, and there has been an ever-broadening and deepening of the humanities of life.
Under a system of popular government there will always be those who will seek for political preferment by clamoring for reform. While there is very little of this which is not sincere, there is a large portion that is not well informed. In my opinion very little of just criticism can attach to the theories and principles of our institutions. There is far more danger of harm than there is hope of good in any radical changes. We do need a better understanding and comprehension of them and a better knowledge of the foundations of government in general. Our forefathers came to certain conclusions and decided upon certain courses of action which have been a great blessing to the world. Before we can understand their conclusions we must go back and review the course which they followed. We must think the thoughts which they thought. Their intellectual life centered around the meeting-house. They were intent upon religious worship. While there were always among them men of deep learning, and later those who had comparatively large possessions, the mind of the people was not so much engrossed in how much they knew, or how much they had, as in how they were going to live. While scantily provided with other literature, there was a wide acquaintance with the Scriptures. Over a period as great as that which measures the existence of our independence they were subject to this discipline not only in their religious life and educational training, but also in their political thought. They were a people who came under the influence of a great spiritual development and acquired a great moral power.

No other theory is adequate to explain or comprehend the Declaration of Independence. It is the product of the spiritual insight of the people. We live in an age of science and of abounding accumulation of material things. These did not create our Declaration. Our Declaration created them. The things of the spirit come first. Unless we cling to that, all our material prosperity, overwhelming though it may appear, will turn to a barren scepter in our grasp. If we are to maintain the great heritage which has been bequeathed to us, we must be like-minded as the fathers who created it. We must not sink into a pagan materialism. We must cultivate the reverence which they had for the things that are holy. We must follow the spiritual and moral leadership which they showed. We must keep replenished, that they may glow with a more compelling flame, the altar fires before which they worshipped.
RONALD REAGAN

A Time for Choosing

SPEECH

October 27, 1964

Television

BACKGROUND

Former actor and President of the Screen Actors Guild Ronald Reagan gave this television speech in support of Republican presidential candidate Barry Goldwater’s 1964 campaign a week before the election.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What are the freedoms intended by the Founding Fathers, according to Reagan?

2. Why does Reagan bring up the example of the divorced woman?

3. What is Reagan’s critique of the United Nations?

4. How have Americans lost many of their Constitutional freedoms, according to Reagan?

5. With what does Reagan contrast the policy of appeasement?

I am going to talk of controversial things. I make no apology for this. I have been talking on this subject for ten years, obviously under the administration of both parties. I mention this only because it seems impossible to legitimately debate the issues of the day without being subjected to name-calling and the application of labels. Those who deplore use of the terms “pink” and “leftist” are themselves guilty of branding all who oppose their liberalism as right wing extremists. How long can we afford the luxury of this family fight when we are at war with the most dangerous enemy ever known to man?

If we lose that war, and in so doing lose our freedom, it has been said history will record with the greatest astonishment that those who had the most to lose did the least to prevent its happening. The guns are silent in this war but frontiers fall while those who should be warriors prefer neutrality. Not too long ago two friends of mine were talking to a Cuban refugee. He was a businessman who had escaped from Castro. In the midst of his tale of horrible experiences, one of my friends turned to the other and said, “We don’t know how lucky we are.” The Cuban stopped and said, “How lucky you are? I had some place to escape to.” And in that sentence he told the entire story. If freedom is lost here there is no place to escape to.

It’s time we asked ourselves if we still know the freedoms intended for us by the Founding Fathers. James Madison said, “We base all our experiments on the capacity of mankind for self-government.” This idea that government was beholden to the people, that it had no other source of power except the sovereign people, is still the newest, most unique idea in all the long history of man’s relation to man. For almost two centuries we have proved man’s capacity for self-government, but today we are told we must choose between a left and a right or, as others suggest, a third alternative, a kind of safe middle ground. I suggest to you there is no left or right, only an up or down. Up to the maximum of individual freedom consistent with law and order, or down to the ant heap of totalitarianism; and regardless of their humanitarian purpose those who would sacrifice freedom for security have, whether they know it or not, chosen this downward path. Plutarch warned, “The real destroyer of the liberties of the people is he who spreads among them bounties, donations, and benefits.”
Today there is an increasing number who can’t see a fat man standing beside a thin one without automatically coming to the conclusion the fat man got that way by taking advantage of the thin one. So they would seek the answer to all the problems of human need through government. Howard K. Smith of television fame has written, “The profit motive is outmoded. It must be replaced by the incentives of the welfare state.” He says, “The distribution of goods must be effected by a planned economy.”

Another articulate spokesman for the welfare state defines liberalism as meeting the material needs of the masses through the full power of centralized government. I for one find it disturbing when a representative refers to the free men and women of this country as the masses, but beyond this the full power of centralized government was the very thing the Founding Fathers sought to minimize. They knew you don’t control things; you can’t control the economy without controlling people. So we have come to a time for choosing. Either we accept the responsibility for our own destiny, or we abandon the American Revolution and confess that an intellectual belief in a far-distant capitol can plan our lives for us better than we can plan them ourselves.

Already the hour is late. Government has laid its hand on health, housing, farming, industry, commerce, education, and, to an ever-increasing degree, interferes with the people’s right to know. Government tends to grow; government programs take on weight and momentum, as public servants say, always with the best of intentions, “What greater service we could render if only we had a little more money and a little more power.” But the truth is that outside of its legitimate function, government does nothing as well or as economically as the private sector of the economy. What better example do we have of this than government’s involvement in the farm economy over the last thirty years. One-fourth of farming has seen a steady decline in the per capita consumption of everything it produces. That one-fourth is regulated and subsidized by government.

In contrast, the three-fourths of farming unregulated and unsubsidized has seen a twenty-one percent increase in the per capita consumption of all its produce. Since 1955 the cost of the farm program has nearly doubled. Direct payment to farmers is eight times as great.
as it was nine years ago, but farm income remains unchanged while farm surplus is bigger. In that same period we have seen a decline of five million in the farm population, but an increase in the number of Department of Agriculture employees.

There is now one such employee for every thirty farms in the United States, and still they can’t figure how sixty-six shiploads of grain headed for Austria could disappear without a trace, and Billy Sol Estes never left shore. Three years ago the government put into effect a program to curb the over-production of feed grain. Now, two and a half billion dollars later, the corn crop is one hundred million bushels bigger than before the program started. And the cost of the program prorates out to forty-three dollars for every dollar bushel of corn we don’t grow. Nor is this the only example of the price we pay for government meddling. Some government programs with the passage of time take on a sacrosanct quality.

One such considered above criticism, sacred as motherhood, is TVA. This program started as a flood control project; the Tennessee Valley was periodically ravaged by destructive floods. The Army Engineers set out to solve this problem. They said that it was possible that once in 500 years there could be a total capacity flood that would inundate some six hundred thousand acres. Well, the engineers fixed that. They made a permanent lake which inundated a million acres. This solved the problem of floods, but the annual interest on the TVA debt is five times as great as the annual flood damage they sought to correct.

Of course, you will point out that TVA gets electric power from the impounded waters, and this is true, but today eighty-five percent of TVA’s electricity is generated in coal-burning steam plants. Now perhaps you’ll charge that I’m overlooking the navigable waterway that was created, providing cheap barge traffic, but the bulk of the freight barged on that waterway is coal being shipped to the TVA steam plants, and the cost of maintaining that channel each year would pay for shipping all of the coal by rail, and there would be money left over.

One last argument remains: the prosperity produced by such large programs of government spending. Certainly there are few areas where more spending has taken place. The Labor department lists fifty percent of the 169 counties in the Tennessee Valley as permanent areas of poverty, distress, and unemployment.
Meanwhile, back in the city, under Urban Renewal, the assault on freedom carries on. Private property rights have become so diluted that public interest is anything a few planners decide it should be. In Cleveland, Ohio, to get a project under way, city officials reclassified eighty-four buildings as substandard in spite of the fact their own inspectors had previously pronounced these buildings sound. The owners stood by and watched twenty-six million dollars worth of property as it was destroyed by the headache ball. Senate Bill 628 says: “Any property, be it home or commercial structure, can be declared slum or blighted and the owner has no recourse at law. The Law Division of the Library of Congress and the General Accounting Office have said that the Courts will have to rule against the owner.”

Housing. In one key Eastern city a man owning a blighted area sold his property to Urban Renewal for several million dollars. At the same time, he submitted his own plan for the rebuilding of this area and the government sold him back his own property for twenty-two percent of what they paid. Now the government announces, “We are going to build subsidized housing in the thousands where we have been building in the hundreds.” At the same time FHA and the Veterans Administration reveal they are holding 120 thousand housing units reclaimed from mortgage foreclosure, mostly because the low down payment and the easy terms brought the owners to a point where they realized the unpaid balance on the homes amounted to a sum greater than the homes were worth, so they just walked out the front door, possibly to take up residence in newer subsidized housing, again with little or no down payment and easy terms.

Some of the foreclosed homes have already been bulldozed into the earth, others, it has been announced, will be refurbished and put on sale for down payments as low as $100 and thirty-five years to pay. This will give the bulldozers a second crack. It is in the area of social welfare that government has found its most fertile growing bed. So many of us accept our responsibility for those less fortunate. We are susceptible to humanitarian appeals.

Federal welfare spending is today ten times greater than it was in the dark depths of the Depression. Federal, state, and local welfare combined spend forty-five billion dollars a
year. Now the government has announced that twenty percent, some 9.3 million families, are poverty-stricken on the basis that they have less than a $3,000 a year income.

If this present welfare spending was prorated equally among these poverty-stricken families, we could give each family more than $4,500 a year. Actually, direct aid to the poor averages less than $600 per family. There must be some administrative overhead somewhere. Now, are we to believe that another billion dollar program added to the half a hundred programs and the forty-five billion dollars, will, through some magic, end poverty? For three decades we have tried to solve unemployment by government planning, without success. The more the plans fail, the more the planners plan.

The latest is the Area Redevelopment Agency, and in two years less than one-half of one percent of the unemployed could attribute new jobs to this agency, and the cost to the taxpayer for each job found was $5,000. But beyond the great bureaucratic waste, what are we doing to the people we seek to help?

Recently a judge told me of an incident in his court. A fairly young woman with six children, pregnant with her seventh, came to him for a divorce. Under his questioning it became apparent her husband did not share this desire. Then the whole story came out. Her husband was a laborer earning $250 a month. By divorcing him she could get an eighty dollars raise. She was eligible for $350 a month from the Aid to Dependent Children Program. She had been talked into the divorce by two friends who had already done this very thing. But any time we question the schemes of the do-gooders, we are denounced as being opposed to their humanitarian goal. It seems impossible to legitimately debate their solutions with the assumption that all of us share the desire to help those less fortunate. They tell us we are always against, never for anything. Well, it isn’t so much that liberals are ignorant. It’s just that they know so much that isn’t so.

We are for a provision that destitution should not follow unemployment by reason of old age. For that reason we have accepted Social Security as a step toward meeting that problem. However, we are against the irresponsibility of those who charge that any criticism or
suggested improvement of the program means we want to end payment to those who de-
pend on Social Security for a livelihood.

Fiscal Irresponsibility. We have been told in millions of pieces of literature and press re-
leases that Social Security is an insurance program, but the executives of Social Security
5 appeared before the Supreme Court in the case of Nestor v. Fleming and proved to the
Court’s satisfaction that it is not insurance but is a welfare program, and Social Security
dues are a tax for the general use of the government. Well it can’t be both: insurance and
welfare. Later, appearing before a Congressional Committee, they admitted that Social Se-
curity is today 298 billion dollars in the red. This fiscal irresponsibility has already caught
up with us.

10 Faced with a bankruptcy, we find that today a young man in his early twenties, going to
work at less than an average salary, will, with his employer, pay into Social Security an
amount which could provide the young man with a retirement insurance policy guaran-
teeing $220 a month at age sixty-five, and the government promises him $127.

15 Now, are we so lacking in business sense that we cannot put this program on a sound ac-
tuarial basis, so that those who do depend on it won’t come to the cupboard and find it
bare, and at the same time can’t we introduce voluntary features so that those who can
make better provision for themselves are allowed to do so? Incidentally, we might also allow
participants in Social Security to name their own beneficiaries, which they cannot do in the
present program. These are not insurmountable problems.

20 Youth Aid Plans. We have today thirty million workers protected by industrial and union
pension funds that are soundly financed by some seventy billion dollars invested in corpo-
rate securities and income earning real estate. I think we are for telling our senior citizens
that no one in this country should be denied medical care for lack of funds, but we are
against forcing all citizens into a compulsory government program regardless of need. Now
the government has turned its attention to our young people, and suggests that it can solve
the problem of school dropouts and juvenile delinquency through some kind of revival of
the old C.C.C. camps. The suggested plan prorates out to a cost of $4,700 a year for each
young person we want to help. We can send them to Harvard for $2,700 a year. Of course, don’t get me wrong—I’m not suggesting Harvard as the answer to juvenile delinquency.

We are for an international organization where the nations of the world can legitimately seek peace. We are against subordinating American interests to an organization so structurally unsound that a two-thirds majority can be mustered in the U.N. General Assembly among nations representing less than ten percent of the world population.

Is there not something of hypocrisy in assailing our allies for so-called vestiges of colonialism while we engage in a conspiracy of silence about the peoples enslaved by the Soviet in the satellite nations? We are for aiding our allies by sharing our material blessings with those nations which share our fundamental beliefs. We are against doling out money, government to government, which ends up financing socialism all over the world.

We set out to help nineteen war-ravaged countries at the end of World War II. We are now helping 107. We have spent 146 billion dollars. Some of that money bought a two million dollar yacht for Haile Selassie. We bought dress suits for Greek undertakers. We bought one thousand TV sets with twenty-three-inch screens for a country where there is no electricity, and some of our foreign aid funds provided extra wives for Kenya government officials. When Congress moved to cut foreign aid they were told that if they cut it one dollar they endangered national security, and then Senator Harry Byrd revealed that since its inception foreign aid has rarely spent its allotted budget. It has today $21 billion in unexpended funds.

Some time ago Dr. Howard Kershner was speaking to the Prime Minister of Lebanon. The Prime Minister told him proudly that his little country balanced its budget each year. It had no public debt, no inflation, a modest tax rate, and had increased its gold holdings from seventy to 120 million dollars. When he finished, Dr. Kershner said, “Mr. Prime Minister, my country hasn’t balanced its budget twenty-eight out of the last forty years. My country’s debt is greater than the combined debt of all the nations of the world. We have inflation, we have a tax rate that takes from the private sector a percentage of income greater than any civilized nation has ever taken and survived. We have lost gold at such a rate that the
solvency of our currency is in danger. Do you think that my country should continue to
give your country millions of dollars each year?” The Prime Minister smiled and said, “No,
but if you are foolish enough to do it, we are going to keep on taking the money.”

Nine Stalls for One Bull. And so we built a model stock farm in Lebanon, and we built nine
stalls for each bull. I find something peculiarly appropriate in that. We have in our vaults
$15 billion in gold. We don’t own an ounce. Foreign dollar claims against that gold total
$27 billion. In the last six years, fifty-two nations have bought $7 billion worth of our gold
and all fifty-two are receiving foreign aid.

Because no government ever voluntarily reduces itself in size, government programs once
launched never go out of existence. A government agency is the nearest thing to eternal life
we’ll ever see on this earth. The United States Manual takes twenty-five pages to list by
name every Congressman and Senator, and all the agencies controlled by Congress. It then
lists the agencies coming under the Executive Branch, and this requires 520 pages.

Since the beginning of the century our gross national product has increased by thirty-three
times. In the same period the cost of federal government has increased 234 times, and while
the work force is only one and one-half times greater, federal employees number nine times
as many. There are now two and one-half million federal employees. No one knows what
they all do. One Congressman found out what one of them does. This man sits at a desk in
Washington. Documents come to him each morning. He reads them, initials them, and
passes them on to the proper agency. One day a document arrived he wasn’t supposed to
read, but he read it, initialled it and passed it on. Twenty four hours later it arrived back at
his desk with a memo attached that said, “You weren’t supposed to read this. Erase your
initials, and initial the erasure.”

While the federal government is the great offender, the idea filters down. During a period
in California when our population has increased ninety percent, the cost of state govern-
ment has gone up 862 percent and the number of employees 500 percent. Governments,
state and local, now employ one out of six of the nation’s work force. If the rate of increase
of the last three years continues, by 1970 one-fourth of the total work force will be employed by government. Already we have a permanent structure so big and complex it is virtually beyond the control of Congress and the comprehension of the people, and tyranny inevitable follows when this permanent structure usurps the policy-making function that belongs to elected officials.

One example of this occurred when Congress was debating whether to lend the United Nations $100 million. While they debated, the State Department gave the United Nations $217 million and the United Nations used part of that money to pay the delinquent dues of Castro’s Cuba.

Under bureaucratic regulations adopted with no regard to the wish of the people, we have lost much of our Constitutional freedom. For example, federal agents can invade a man’s property without a warrant, can impose a fine without a formal hearing, let alone a trial by jury, and can seize and sell his property at auction to enforce payment of that fine.

Rights by Dispensation. An Ohio deputy fire marshal sentenced a man to prison after a secret proceeding in which the accused was not allowed to have a lawyer present. The Supreme Court upheld that sentence, ruling that it was an administrative investigation of incidents damaging to the economy. Someplace a perversion has taken place. Our natural unalienable rights are now presumed to be a dispensation of government, divisible by a vote of the majority. The greatest good for the greatest number is a high-sounding phrase but contrary to the very basis of our nation, unless it is accompanied by recognition that we have certain rights which cannot be infringed upon, even if the individual stands outvoted by all of his fellow citizens. Without this recognition, majority rule is nothing more than mob rule.

It is time we realized that socialism can come without overt seizure of property or nationalization of private business. It matters little that you hold the title to your property or business if government can dictate policy and procedure and holds life and death power over your business. The machinery of this power already exists. Lowell Mason, former antitrust law enforcer for the Federal Trade Commission, has written “American business is
being harassed, bled and even blackjacked under a preposterous crazy quilt system of laws.”
There are so many that the government literally can find some charge to bring against any concern it chooses to prosecute. Are we safe in our books and records?

The natural gas producers have just been handed a 428-page questionnaire by the Federal Power Commission. It weights ten pounds. One firm has estimated it will take 70,000 accountant man-hours to fill out this questionnaire, and it must be done in quadruplicate. The Power Commission says it must have it to determine whether a proper price is being charged for gas. The National Labor Relations Board ruled that a business firm could not discontinue its shipping department even though it was more efficient and economical to subcontract this work out.

The Supreme Court has ruled the government has the right to tell a citizen what he can grow on his own land for his own use. The Secretary of Agriculture has asked for the right to imprison farmers who violate their planting quotas. One business firm has been informed by the Internal Revenue Service that it cannot take a tax deduction for its institutional advertising because this advertising espoused views not in the public interest.

A child’s prayer in a school cafeteria endangers religious freedom, but the people of the Amish religion in the State of Ohio, who cannot participate in Social Security because of their religious beliefs, have had their livestock seized and sold at auction to enforce payment of Social Security dues.

We approach a point of no return when government becomes so huge and entrenched that we fear the consequences of upheaval and just go along with it. The federal government accounts for one-fifth of the industrial capacity of the nation, one-fourth of all construction, holds or guarantees one-third of all mortgages, owns one-third of the land, and engages in some nineteen thousand businesses covering half a hundred different lines. The Defense Department runs 269 supermarkets. They do a gross business of $730 million a year, and lose $150 million. The government spends $11 million an hour every hour of the twenty-four and pretends we had a tax cut while it pursues a policy of planned inflation that will more than wipe out any benefit with depreciation of our purchasing power.
We need true tax reform that will at least make a start toward restoring for our children the American dream that wealth is denied to no one, that each individual has the right to fly as high as his strength and ability will take him. The economist Sumner Schlicter has said, “If a visitor from Mars looked at our tax policy, he would conclude it had been designed by a Communist spy to make free enterprise unworkable.” But we cannot have such reform while our tax policy is engineered by people who view the tax as a means of achieving changes in our social structure. Senator [Joseph S.] Clark (D.-Pa.) says the tax issue is a class issue, and the government must use the tax to redistribute the wealth and earnings downward.

Karl Marx. On January 15th in the White House, the President [Lyndon Johnson] told a group of citizens they were going to take all the money they thought was being unnecessarily spent, “take it from the haves and give it to the have-nots who need it so much.” When Karl Marx said this he put it:...“from each according to his ability, to each according to his need.”

Have we the courage and the will to face up to the immorality and discrimination of the progressive surtax, and demand a return to traditional proportionate taxation? Many decades ago the Scottish economist, John Ramsey McCulloch, said, “The moment you abandon the cardinal principle of exacting from all individuals the same proportion of their income or their property, you are at sea without a rudder or compass and there is no amount of injustice or folly you may not commit.”

No nation has survived the tax burden that reached one-third of its national income. Today in our country the tax collector’s share is thirty-seven cents of every dollar earned. Freedom has never been so fragile, so close to slipping from our grasp. I wish I could give you some magic formula, but each of us must find his own role. One man in Virginia found what he could do, and dozens of business firms have followed his lead. Concerned because his two hundred employees seemed unworried about government extravagance he conceived the idea of taking all of their withholding out of only the fourth paycheck each month. For three paydays his employees received their full salary. On the fourth payday all withholding...
was taken. He has one employee who owes him $4.70 each fourth payday. It only took one month to produce two hundred conservatives.

Are you willing to spend time studying the issues, making yourself aware, and then conveying that information to family and friends? Will you resist the temptation to get a government handout for your community? Realize that the doctor’s fight against socialized medicine is your fight. We can’t socialize the doctors without socializing the patients. Recognize that government invasion of public power is eventually an assault upon your own business. If some among you fear taking a stand because you are afraid of reprisals from customers, clients, or even government, recognize that you are just feeding the crocodile hoping he’ll eat you last.

If all of this seems like a great deal of trouble, think what’s at stake. We are faced with the most evil enemy mankind has known in his long climb from the swamp to the stars. There can be no security anywhere in the free world if there is not fiscal and economic stability within the United States. Those who ask us to trade our freedom for the soup kitchen of the welfare state are architects of a policy of accommodation. They tell us that by avoiding a direct confrontation with the enemy he will learn to love us and give up his evil ways. All who oppose this idea are blanket indicted as war-mongers. Well, let us set one thing straight, there is no argument with regard to peace and war. It is cheap demagoguery to suggest that anyone would want to send other people’s sons to war. The only argument is with regard to the best way to avoid war. There is only one sure way—surrender.

Appeasement or Courage? The spectre our well-meaning liberal friends refuse to face is that their policy of accommodation is appeasement, and appeasement does not give you a choice between peace and war, only between fight and surrender. We are told that the problem is too complex for a simple answer. They are wrong. There is no easy answer, but there is a simple answer. We must have the courage to do what we know is morally right, and this policy of accommodation asks us to accept the greatest possible immorality. We are
being asked to buy our safety from the threat of “the bomb” by selling into permanent slavery our fellow human beings enslaved behind the Iron Curtain, to tell them to give up their hope of freedom because we are ready to make a deal with their slave masters.

Alexander Hamilton warned us that a nation which can prefer disgrace to danger is prepared for a master and deserves one. Admittedly there is a risk in any course we follow. Choosing the high road cannot eliminate that risk. Already some of the architects of accommodation have hinted what their decision will be if their plan fails and we are faced with the final ultimatum. The English commentator [Kenneth] Tynan has put it this way: he would rather live on his knees than die on his feet. Some of our own have said “Better Red than dead.” If we are to believe that nothing is worth the dying, when did this begin? Should Moses have told the children of Israel to live in slavery rather than dare the wilderness? Should Christ have refused the Cross? Should the patriots at Concord Bridge have refused to fire the shot heard ’round the world? Are we to believe that all the martyrs of history died in vain?

You and I have a rendezvous with destiny. We can preserve for our children this, the last best hope of man on earth, or we can sentence them to take the first step into a thousand years of darkness. If we fail, at least let our children and our children’s children say of us we justified our brief moment here. We did all that could be done.
PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN (R)
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GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What crisis does Reagan identify as facing America in 1981?
2. What does Reagan consider the problem with a government that is too large?
3. What is Reagan's attitude toward the crisis he identifies?
4. Why does Reagan refer to the statues surrounding the U.S. Capitol? What do they represent?

Senator Hatfield, Mr. Chief Justice, Mr. President, Vice President Bush, Vice President Mondale, Senator Baker, Speaker O'Neill, Reverend Moomaw, and my fellow citizens: To a few of us here today, this is a solemn and most momentous occasion; and yet, in the history of our Nation, it is a commonplace occurrence. The orderly transfer of authority as called for in the Constitution routinely takes place as it has for almost two centuries and few of us stop to think how unique we really are. In the eyes of many in the world, this every-4-year ceremony we accept as normal is nothing less than a miracle.

Mr. President, I want our fellow citizens to know how much you did to carry on this tradition. By your gracious cooperation in the transition process, you have shown a watching world that we are a united people pledged to maintaining a political system which guarantees individual liberty to a greater degree than any other, and I thank you and your people for all your help in maintaining the continuity which is the bulwark of our Republic.

The business of our nation goes forward. These United States are confronted with an economic affliction of great proportions. We suffer from the longest and one of the worst sustained inflations in our national history. It distorts our economic decisions, penalizes thrift, and crushes the struggling young and the fixed-income elderly alike. It threatens to shatter the lives of millions of our people.

Idle industries have cast workers into unemployment, causing human misery and personal indignity. Those who do work are denied a fair return for their labor by a tax system which penalizes successful achievement and keeps us from maintaining full productivity.

But great as our tax burden is, it has not kept pace with public spending. For decades, we have piled deficit upon deficit, mortgaging our future and our children’s future for the temporary convenience of the present. To continue this long trend is to guarantee tremendous social, cultural, political, and economic upheavals.

You and I, as individuals, can, by borrowing, live beyond our means, but for only a limited period of time. Why, then, should we think that collectively, as a nation, we are not bound by that same limitation?
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We must act today in order to preserve tomorrow. And let there be no misunderstanding--we are going to begin to act, beginning today.

The economic ills we suffer have come upon us over several decades. They will not go away in days, weeks, or months, but they will go away. They will go away because we, as Americans, have the capacity now, as we have had in the past, to do whatever needs to be done to preserve this last and greatest bastion of freedom.

In this present crisis, government is not the solution to our problem; government is the problem.

From time to time, we have been tempted to believe that society has become too complex to be managed by self-rule, that government by an elite group is superior to government for, by, and of the people. But if no one among us is capable of governing himself, then who among us has the capacity to govern someone else? All of us together, in and out of government, must bear the burden. The solutions we seek must be equitable, with no one group singled out to pay a higher price.

We hear much of special interest groups. Our concern must be for a special interest group that has been too long neglected. It knows no sectional boundaries or ethnic and racial divisions, and it crosses political party lines. It is made up of men and women who raise our food, patrol our streets, man our mines and our factories, teach our children, keep our homes, and heal us when we are sick—professionals, industrialists, shopkeepers, clerks, cabbies, and truckdrivers. They are, in short, "We the people," this breed called Americans.

Well, this administration's objective will be a healthy, vigorous, growing economy that provides equal opportunity for all Americans, with no barriers born of bigotry or discrimination. Putting America back to work means putting all Americans back to work. Ending inflation means freeing all Americans from the terror of runaway living costs. All must share in the productive work of this "new beginning" and all must share in the bounty of a revived economy. With the idealism and fair play which are the core of our system and our strength, we can have a strong and prosperous America at peace with itself and the world.
So, as we begin, let us take inventory. We are a nation that has a government—not the other way around. And this makes us special among the nations of the Earth. Our Government has no power except that granted it by the people. It is time to check and reverse the growth of government which shows signs of having grown beyond the consent of the governed.

It is my intention to curb the size and influence of the Federal establishment and to demand recognition of the distinction between the powers granted to the Federal Government and those reserved to the States or to the people. All of us need to be reminded that the Federal Government did not create the States; the States created the Federal Government.

Now, so there will be no misunderstanding, it is not my intention to do away with government. It is, rather, to make it work-work with us, not over us; to stand by our side, not ride on our back. Government can and must provide opportunity, not smother it; foster productivity, not stifle it.

If we look to the answer as to why, for so many years, we achieved so much, prospered as no other people on Earth, it was because here, in this land, we unleashed the energy and individual genius of man to a greater extent than has ever been done before. Freedom and the dignity of the individual have been more available and assured here than in any other place on Earth. The price for this freedom at times has been high, but we have never been unwilling to pay that price.

It is no coincidence that our present troubles parallel and are proportionate to the intervention and intrusion in our lives that result from unnecessary and excessive growth of government. It is time for us to realize that we are too great a nation to limit ourselves to small dreams. We are not, as some would have us believe, loomed to an inevitable decline. I do not believe in a fate that will all on us no matter what we do. I do believe in a fate that will fall on us if we do nothing. So, with all the creative energy at our command, let us begin an era of national renewal. Let us renew our determination, our courage, and our strength. And let us renew our faith and our hope.
We have every right to dream heroic dreams. Those who say that we are in a time when there are no heroes just don't know where to look. You can see heroes every day going in and out of factory gates. Others, a handful in number, produce enough food to feed all of us and then the world beyond. You meet heroes across a counter—and they are on both sides of that counter. There are entrepreneurs with faith in themselves and faith in an idea who create new jobs, new wealth and opportunity. They are individuals and families whose taxes support the Government and whose voluntary gifts support church, charity, culture, art, and education. Their patriotism is quiet but deep. Their values sustain our national life.

I have used the words "they" and "their" in speaking of these heroes. I could say "you" and "your" because I am addressing the heroes of whom I speak—you, the citizens of this blessed land. Your dreams, your hopes, your goals are going to be the dreams, the hopes, and the goals of this administration, so help me God.

We shall reflect the compassion that is so much a part of your makeup. How can we love our country and not love our countrymen, and loving them, reach out a hand when they fall, heal them when they are sick, and provide opportunities to make them self-sufficient so they will be equal in fact and not just in theory?

Can we solve the problems confronting us? Well, the answer is an unequivocal and emphatic "yes." To paraphrase Winston Churchill, I did not take the oath I have just taken with the intention of presiding over the dissolution of the world's strongest economy.

In the days ahead I will propose removing the roadblocks that have slowed our economy and reduced productivity. Steps will be taken aimed at restoring the balance between the various levels of government. Progress may be slow—measured in inches and feet, not miles—but we will progress. Is it time to reawaken this industrial giant, to get government back within its means, and to lighten our punitive tax burden. And these will be our first priorities, and on these principles, there will be no compromise.
On the eve of our struggle for independence a man who might have been one of the greatest among the Founding Fathers, Dr. Joseph Warren, President of the Massachusetts Congress, said to his fellow Americans, "Our country is in danger, but not to be despaired of...On you depend the fortunes of America. You are to decide the important questions upon which rests the happiness and the liberty of millions yet unborn. Act worthy of yourselves."

Well, I believe we, the Americans of today, are ready to act worthy of ourselves, ready to do what must be done to ensure happiness and liberty for ourselves, our children and our children's children.

And as we renew ourselves here in our own land, we will be seen as having greater strength throughout the world. We will again be the exemplar of freedom and a beacon of hope for those who do not now have freedom.

To those neighbors and allies who share our freedom, we will strengthen our historic ties and assure them of our support and firm commitment. We will match loyalty with loyalty. We will strive for mutually beneficial relations. We will not use our friendship to impose on their sovereignty, for our own sovereignty is not for sale.

As for the enemies of freedom, those who are potential adversaries, they will be reminded that peace is the highest aspiration of the American people. We will negotiate for it, sacrifice for it; we will not surrender for it—now or ever.

Our forbearance should never be misunderstood. Our reluctance for conflict should not be misjudged as a failure of will. When action is required to preserve our national security, we will act. We will maintain sufficient strength to prevail if need be, knowing that if we do so we have the best chance of never having to use that strength.

Above all, we must realize that no arsenal, or no weapon in the arsenals of the world, is so formidable as the will and moral courage of free men and women. It is a weapon our adversaries in today's world do not have. It is a weapon that we as Americans do have. Let that be understood by those who practice terrorism and prey upon their neighbors.
I am told that tens of thousands of prayer meetings are being held on this day, and for that I am deeply grateful. We are a nation under God, and I believe God intended for us to be free. It would be fitting and good, I think, if on each Inauguration Day in future years it should be declared a day of prayer.

This is the first time in history that this ceremony has been held, as you have been told, on this West Front of the Capitol. Standing here, one faces a magnificent vista, opening up on this city’s special beauty and history. At the end of this open mall are those shrines to the giants on whose shoulders we stand.

Directly in front of me, the monument to a monumental man: George Washington, Father of our country. A man of humility who came to greatness reluctantly. He led America out of revolutionary victory into infant nationhood. Off to one side, the stately memorial to Thomas Jefferson. The Declaration of Independence火焰着，他的文采飞扬。

And then beyond the Reflecting Pool the dignified columns of the Lincoln Memorial. Whoever would understand in his heart the meaning of America will find it in the life of Abraham Lincoln.

Beyond those monuments to heroism is the Potomac River, and on the far shore the sloping hills of Arlington National Cemetery with its row on row of simple white markers bearing crosses or Stars of David. They add up to only a tiny fraction of the price that has been paid for our freedom.

Each one of those markers is a monument to the kinds of hero I spoke of earlier. Their lives ended in places called Belleau Wood, The Argonne, Omaha Beach, Salerno and halfway around the world on Guadalcanal, Tarawa, Pork Chop Hill, the Chosin Reservoir, and in a hundred rice paddies and jungles of a place called Vietnam.

Under one such marker lies a young man--Martin Treptow--who left his job in a small town barber shop in 1917 to go to France with the famed Rainbow Division. There, on the western front, he was killed trying to carry a message between battalions under heavy artillery fire.
We are told that on his body was found a diary. On the flyleaf under the heading, "My Pledge," he had written these words: "America must win this war. Therefore, I will work, I will save, I will sacrifice, I will endure, I will fight cheerfully and do my utmost, as if the issue of the whole struggle depended on me alone."

The crisis we are facing today does not require of us the kind of sacrifice that Martin Treptow and so many thousands of others were called upon to make. It does require, however, our best effort, and our willingness to believe in ourselves and to believe in our capacity to perform great deeds; to believe that together, with God's help, we can and will resolve the problems which now confront us.

And, after all, why shouldn't we believe that? We are Americans. God bless you, and thank you.
UNIT 6
Institutions and Policy

UNIT PREVIEW

Structure

| LESSON 1    | Congress                  | 3-4 classes | p. 7  |
| LESSON 2    | The Presidency            | 3-4 classes | p. 10 |
| LESSON 3    | The Bureaucracy and the Administrative State | 3-4 classes | p. 14 |
| LESSON 4    | Placeholder: State and Local Government | 1-2 classes | p. 18 |
| LESSON 5    | Domestic Policy           | 3-4 classes | p. 20 |
| LESSON 6    | National Security and Foreign Policy | 2-3 classes | p. 23 |
| APPENDIX    | Study Guide, Test, and Writing Assignment |            | p. 27 |

Why Teach Institutions and Policy

Few Americans ever hold public office, let alone the offices of the highest government in the land. Nevertheless, those officeholders are to be representatives of the people. Citizens themselves should therefore be familiar with what their representatives ought to do and how they are meant to go about representing their constituents. Such knowledge will enable students to be better informed about the ends and means of government institutions and their representatives. They will be able to make more informed decisions when considering voting for someone, and they will be better attuned to what may be reasonably expected of their representative in office. This unit aims to teach students about each of these institutions...
and the public policy issues that officeholders seek to address through them. Students should be able to understand how government works within the federal government, the more recent administrative state, and their state and local government. They should also be familiar with how these institutions address and carry out certain public policies, both domestic and foreign, and be able to converse with one another on certain specific policy issues with civility and respect.

What Teachers Should Consider

This unit builds on the students’ study of the Constitution’s design, the arguments of The Federalist, and the later changes to the constitutional order made by the Progressives and their successors. Students may now draw on what they first learned about the Founders’ intentions and designs for governing institutions in Unit 3 (Governing in the Constitution) and the Progressives’ departures from those intentions in Unit 5 (Progressivism and the State). While this unit involves more of the modern “nuts and bolts” of government (with a placeholder lesson for a school to incorporate instruction on its own state and local governments), teachers may still point out both the consistency and change in our constitutional practices. Students should see how the Constitution still directs modern governance but also how modern governance breaks with the Constitution and its original purposes.

Noteworthy among these changes to our constitutional order are the decline of Congress as a lawmaking body and the rising power of the administrative state and the courts. Teachers may stress how our newer system of government challenges the constitutional separation of powers and weakens federalism. They should also discuss the ways in which the presidency has been made stronger—especially in foreign policy and in the president’s role as a rhetorical and partisan leader rather than a mere executor of laws. Students should also discuss the ways in which laws, court cases, and the growth of the bureaucracy and the administrative state have weakened the president’s control of the executive branch. Other important themes include the budget process, the rise of the welfare state, and the growth of entitlements.

Throughout this entire section, students should be asked to determine who really makes the rules that govern citizens’ lives and to evaluate the justness of such a system in light of the founding ideas. Students should also learn about the public policy that governing bodies seek to address today. While teachers should by no means attempt to drive student opinions on policies in a particular partisan direction, they may explain the nature of example policy issues and present the strongest logical arguments for each side of a given position. Conversation on such policies will likely arise and students should be civil, logical, and respectful in disagreements. Ultimately, students should gain a “lay of the land” concerning broad areas of public policy rather than attempting to address current event issues.
How Teachers Can Learn More

**TEXTS**

*American Government and Politics*, Joseph Bessette and John Pitney
*Democracy in America*, Alexis de Tocqueville

- Chapters 12–14, 16–18
- II.3.22–26

**ONLINE COURSES** | Online.Hillsdale.edu

*Introduction to the Constitution*
*Constitution 101*
*Constitution 201*
*Congress*
*The Presidency and the Constitution*
*The U.S. Supreme Court*
LESSON PLANS, ASSIGNMENTS, AND FORMATIVE QUIZ
Lesson 1 — Congress

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about Congress, congressional power, and how the legislative process operates today, drawing comparisons between the intentions of the Founders in the Constitution and Progressive departures therefrom.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

Congress

Lectures 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12

TEXTS

Students should read the text below and come to class prepared to complete a short reading quiz on the contents of the reading. The reading quiz should be based on questions on pages 373–374 of American Government and Politics.

American Government and Politics

Chapter 12

TERMS AND TOPICS

| legislative power          | joint resolution       |
| bicameral legislature      | lame duck              |
| Senate                     | rider                  |
| House of Representatives   | filibuster             |
| majority/minority leader  | committees/subcommittees |
| legislation                | Speaker of the House   |
| oversight                  | President pro tempore  |
| casework                   | veto                   |
| cloture                    | whip                   |
| earmark                    | divided government     |
| logrolling                 | delegate               |
| pork barrel                | nondelegation doctrine |
| joint committee            | 10th, 14th, 16th, and 17th Amendments |

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What is the legislative power, and who has it, per the Constitution?
- Why were the Articles of Confederation insufficient?
- Why, in a representative democracy, did the Founders consider the legislature the most important branch of government?
- What does it mean to be a representative? What does it mean to be a delegate?
- What are the major differences between the House of Representatives and the Senate? What does this say about their purposes?
- What are the different types of committees, and what do they accomplish? Why would Congress have to split up into committees?
- Explain how impeachment works in each house of Congress.
- How does a bill become a law?
- How have Congress and the legislative power changed since the founding?
- What is delegation? Why has it been so consequential? Why has Congress embraced it?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 18: What part of the federal government writes laws?
  - Question 19: What are the two parts of the U.S. Congress?
  - Question 20: Name one power of the U.S. Congress.
  - Question 21: How many U.S. senators are there?
  - Question 22: How long is a term for a U.S. senator?
  - Question 23: Who is one of your state’s U.S. senators now?
  - Question 24: How many voting members are in the House of Representatives?
  - Question 25: How long is a term for a member of the House of Representatives?
  - Question 26: Why do U.S. representatives serve shorter terms than U.S. senators?
  - Question 27: How many senators does each state have?
  - Question 28: Why does each state have two senators?
  - Question 29: Name your U.S. representative.
  - Question 30: What is the name of the Speaker of the House of Representatives now?
  - Question 31: Who does a U.S. senator represent?
  - Question 32: Who elects U.S. senators?
  - Question 33: Who does a member of the House of Representatives represent?
  - Question 34: Who elects members of the House of Representatives?
  - Question 35: Some states have more representatives than other states. Why?

**Keys to the Lesson**

The legislative power and the Congress that holds it are the most quintessentially American facets to government in the United States. Composed of the elected representatives of the American people, Congress embodies self-government in America. Historically, its power had been great and intentionally so. The two houses of Congress were intended to bring a diverse group of elected leaders from individual States together to form national laws for the common good of the American people. The structure and functions of Congress are manifold but also inspiring, for it is the clearest expression of the people governing themselves. A proper understanding of legislative power, and the constitutional original intent, make the abdication or delegation of this power by members of Congress an affront to the very principles of self-government and representative government. Students should come away from this unit knowing both the mechanics and functions of Congress today, and how those mechanics and functions make the modern Congress very different from the design of the Founders.

Teachers might best plan and teach Congress with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Discuss with students the nature of legislative power and the central role of lawmaking in government. Note that the legislative branch is listed first in the Constitution.
- Have students understand clearly the requirements for holding office in the House of Representatives and the Senate and the terms of office. Students should be able to account for the
differences and what it means for the purposes and manner of legislating in each body: namely, that the House is more reflective and responsive to the people, while the Senate is more deliberative and refining of the majority will.

- Discuss how the division of the Congress into two houses was a compromise at the Constitutional Convention (between the large and small states) but also allows each to check the other and fosters better legislative outcomes. This can be seen in some of the differences between them: the House must instigate all legislation raising revenue and has the power to declare war, and the Senate approves judges and treaties. The two Houses share the power of impeachment of the President: the House impeaches (charges) and the Senate conducts the trial.

- Walk students through the various offices and committees within Congress and the details of how laws are made. Discuss how “regular order” (holding committee hearings and legislation-writing sessions, and debating and amending legislation before voting) makes for a more deliberative and representative process.

- Consider the enormous power of Congress to check the other branches of government and shape the direction of government through its control of the federal budget. The “power of the purse” gives Congress the ability (and responsibility) to control and oversee all the operations of the federal government. The President cannot spend money without the authorization of Congress.

- Note for students the incredible power that party leadership wields in determining committee appointments, lower leadership positions, and the introduction and advancement of legislation. Students should understand the relationship between these awards and the leadership’s financial support in campaign funding for members of Congress in their party.

- Explain how Members of Congress address constituent relations, and note the amount of time Members today spend on helping their constituents deal with the activities of the federal government (both in terms of over-regulation and receiving benefits).

- Consider with students the ways in which Congress’s power has waned in comparison to the executive branch, the judicial branch, and the so-called fourth branch called the bureaucracy or the administrative state. Note especially Congress’s delegation of legislative authority to federal bureaucracies. Students should understand how many members of Congress either do not understand the authority they have over federal bureaucracies or actually prefer delegating the responsibility for detailed lawmaking in order to avoid criticism by their constituents when policies created by the bureaucrats end up not working.

- Survey and discuss with students the various amendments to the Constitution that have changed the role and functioning of Congress, namely the 10th, 14th, 16th, and 17th Amendments. Students should consider the merits and consequences of each change to Congress.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

**Assignment:** Explain how Congress works today and the merits and disadvantages of today’s Congress in light of the intentions the American Founders had for the legislative branch (2–3 paragraphs).
Lesson 2 — The Presidency

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn how the executive power and how the presidency is structured, how it has changed through American history, and how it functions today.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

The Presidency and the Constitution

Lectures 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9

TEXTS

Students should read the text below and come to class prepared to complete a short reading quiz on the contents of the reading. The reading quiz should be based on questions on pages 408–409 of American Government and Politics.

American Government and Politics

Chapter 13

TERMS AND TOPICS

executive prerogative
presidential oath
bully pulpit
rhetorical presidency
imperial presidency
State of the Union address
foreign policy
executive office
chief of staff
cabinet
vice president
executive order

signing statement
veto
line-item veto
impoundment
War Powers Resolution
National Security Council
executive privilege
pardonning power
impeachment
12th, 20th, 22nd, and 25th Amendments

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What were the debates about the presidency at the Constitutional Convention?
- What is the executive power? Why do we need a president?
- Why did the Founders create the office of the vice president?
- How does the Constitution aim to keep Congress and the presidency separate?
- What were the original cabinet positions in the executive branch? What has happened to these positions? Why were they not a threat to the idea of a unitary executive?
- What was the purpose of the State of the Union address?
- How have presidents used rhetoric?
- How have presidents used emergency powers?
- Why has executive privilege been deemed necessary?
- Why is the pardoning power an executive function? What purpose does it serve?
- What is an executive order? Is it constitutional?
- How has the role of the president changed as political parties have changed?
- Explain the role of the president in relation to foreign policy. What powers does he have and not have? How has this role been misused?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 17: The President of the United States is in charge of which branch of government?
  - Question 36: The President of the United States is elected for how many years?
  - Question 37: The President of the United States can serve only two terms. Why?
  - Question 38: What is the name of the President of the United States now?
  - Question 39: What is the name of the Vice President of the United States now?
  - Question 40: If the president can no longer serve, who becomes president?
  - Question 41: Name one power of the president.
  - Question 42: Who is Command in Chief of the U.S. military?
  - Question 43: Who signs bills to become laws?
  - Question 44: Who vetoes bills?
  - Question 45: Who appoints federal judges?
  - Question 46: The executive branch has many parts. Name one.
  - Question 47: What does the President’s cabinet do?
  - Question 48: What are two Cabinet-level positions?
  - Question 49: Why is the Electoral College important?

**Keys to the Lesson**

Although the presidency is a unique and powerful position created by the Constitution, it has acquired an outsized role and prestige over the course of American history. This is partly owing to the talents of exceptional presidents in defining the necessities of the office, partly to the Progressive reinvention of the office, and partly to America becoming a superpower in which international relations and presidential foreign policy have played a more prominent role on the world stage. It is important, therefore, to help students understand the nature of the executive power and its relation to the president.

The key to executive power as expressed in the Constitution is its subordination to the rule of law. The primary job of the president is to “take care that the laws be faithfully executed.” Though the president participates in the legislative process by signing or vetoing legislation (and any veto may be overridden by Congress), the president cannot create laws and is duty bound to enforce them. In this sense, the president is beholden to the laws passed by Congress—and so the rule of law. This is rarely how the presidency is thought of or conducts itself today, but it is an important distinction to draw for students and should permeate this lesson on the executive.

The second part to executive power is found in the presidential oath of office: “I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.” The highest law that the president has to enforce—but also protect and defend—is the supreme law of the land, the Constitution.
This is an acknowledgement that the executive power is something more than merely the execution of the laws but has a character of its own: law enforcement, which ultimately means the necessary force behind law, as well as the power under certain circumstances to protect and defend the rule of law and the Constitution from enemies foreign and domestic that intend it harm. Students should understand these features of executive power as well as how the presidency functions.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Presidency with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Consider with students the nature of executive power and its ultimate reliance on a fear of losing liberty, property, or even life, should appeals to virtue and right conduct fail to elicit an adherence to the law by citizens.
- Explain the Electoral College system as intended by the Founders and as it functions today.
- Make sure students understand how the presidency operates in the twenty-first century, with its various personnel and the responsibilities and roles the White House has acquired over the years. Spend time discussing the cabinet, the armed forces, and the bureaucratic agencies. Consider the president’s role in foreign policy and in appointing members of the judiciary.
- Discuss the parameters of exigency in the executive branch. The executive is necessary for those particular and unforeseen situations for which the legislature cannot or has not made laws. The legislature cannot legislate in advance for every exigency; it is not possible to know all human action and plan for it in advance. Furthermore, there are instances in which swift action is necessary to avoid lawlessness (for example, rebellion), where there must be a person to act in the absence of specific laws. In these cases, a unified singular executive is necessary to provide force to the situation in order to regain lawfulness.
- Explain how the presidency has gained and lost power over the decades. Like the delegation of legislative authority, executive authority has also been increasingly delegated by Congress to bureaucratic agencies. Nevertheless, the election of the president is more significant than it used to be, and the president’s power in foreign affairs has been greatly expanded. The chief role of the modern president is to lead and direct rather than work with Congress to determine policy. As such, Congress is undermined and the power of the presidency has moved more and more into the legislative arena.
- Explain how presidential power is exercised to its greatest extent during times of war when the president has the “war power,” which fully exercises the president’s constitutional power as commander in chief of military forces. Since the Progressive era, presidents (authorized by Congress) have more frequently declared states of emergency in order to exert their authority in domestic policy matters. Students should examine the Constitution and the nature of the executive to determine the consequences of this reorientation of presidential authority.
- Discuss with students the idea of executive orders. Although a legitimate way for the president to direct those under the executive branch, students should consider how the vast expansion and increased authority of the executive branch (by the legislative creation of departments and agencies under the executive, and then the delegation of legislative power to those departments and agencies) has enabled executive orders to fundamentally redirect government policy with or without congressional approval.
- Survey and discuss with students the various amendments to the Constitution that have changed the role and functioning of the president and the executive branch, namely the 12th, 20th, 22nd, and 25th Amendments. Students should consider the merits and consequences of each change to the presidency.
STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST LESSON ASSIGNMENT

Assignment: Explain the various roles the presidency fulfills, how the president fulfills them today, and how these roles have changed from the Founders’ intentions (2-3 paragraphs).
Lesson 3 — The Bureaucracy and the Administrative State

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the federal bureaucracy and the administrative state that have arisen since the Progressive era, how these function within government, and how their existence is contrary to the principles of the Founders.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Lectures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constitution 101</td>
<td>Lectures 8 and 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to the Constitution</td>
<td>Lectures 11 and 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution 201</td>
<td>Lecture 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress</td>
<td>Lectures 3, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Presidency and the Constitution</td>
<td>Lecture 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The U.S. Supreme Court</td>
<td>Lecture 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TEXTS

Students should read the text below and come to class prepared to complete a short reading quiz on the contents of the reading. The reading quiz should be based on questions on pages 434–435 of *American Government and Politics*.

*American Government and Politics* Chapter 14

TERMS AND TOPICS

- bureaucracy/bureaucrat
- civil service
- administrative state
- red tape
- accountability
- administrative law
- merit system
- Pendleton Act
- Office of Management and Budget
- independent regulatory commission
- iron triangle
- spoils system
- consent
- Congressional Review Act

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What powers does the bureaucracy have, how did it acquire those powers, and what does it look like when those powers are exercised?
- How does the administrative state violate the principle of separation of powers?
- To what extent are bureaucrats accountable to the people? How so?
- What are the arguments for and against government by expertise?
- What are the arguments for and against the control of bureaucracies by political appointments that change with administrations?
• What is meant by the “iron triangle,” and how does it function? Why is it considered “iron”?
• What is bureaucratic work like? Why does it have this character?
• What are the arguments for and against centralized planning by federal bureaucrats? What is lost in the process?
• How can the concentration of all three powers in the bureaucracies be weaponized against political opponents or specific groups of people?
• To what extent have Americans come to accept lawmaking by bureaucrats? Why do you think this is the case?

**KEYS TO THE LESSON**

Students should review how the bureaucratic government or administrative state was created by the Progressives. One reason for bureaucracy or administration, in the Progressive view, was that government by expertise was necessary in order to address the complexity of the modern world. The other justification was that the powers of government ought to be insulated from politics. This was accomplished through apolitical positions that would be protected from the influence of interests of the people and then consolidated for the sake of efficiency. Students should understand how these views have shaped the structure and role of the bureaucracy today. They should also understand what departments and agencies exist, how these departments and agencies exercise their power, and how this bureaucratic system is or is not connected to the principles of self-government. In the process, students should see Congress’s willingness to cede its power to the administrative bureaucracies throughout the government, the tremendous growth in the size and centralization of power under unelected officials of the federal government, and the absence of separation of powers in many cases in that arrangement, as the extent of independence these bureaucrats have from Congress, the President, and the consent of the people.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Bureaucracy and the Administrative State with emphasis on the following approaches:

• Walk students through the mechanics of bureaucratic government. Teach students about the departments and various kinds of agencies and their roles, origins, and the private sector fields from which they usually draw their employees.
• Consider with students the argument of trusting governance to experts vs. elected representatives. The Founders would have argued that it is the role of the representative to listen to the views of the experts in their various fields and then employ prudence to govern (whether in Congress or as President) in a manner that preserves rights, follows the rule of law, and upholds the common good. Abdicating governing authority to those whom some regard as experts necessarily allows government policy to be determined by a very narrow set of technical criteria and goals. These often do not consider the totality of a situation, nor the principles that should guide such decision-making. It is the responsibility of those elected to not only represent their constituents but also exercise sound judgment and to employ prudence in making policy decisions for the entire political body.
• Explain to students the argument for making bureaucrats independent of politics and entrusting lawmaking to career civil servants rather than to political appointments. While separating such government employees from elected officials may imply that all of politics is dishonest and corrupt, the Founders argued that however dishonest or corrupt politics sometimes seems, government must still be responsive to the people. While the Founders would have warned
against a large bureaucracy in general beyond the cabinet positions and immediate assistance, they would have argued that more positions should be appointed, directed by, and subject to removal based on who has been elected to office. The idea of a permanent civil service was an affront to consent and self-government.

- Describe to students what is called the “iron triangle” of Congress, interest groups, and bureaucratic agencies. Lawmaking on the federal (and state) levels has largely fallen to conversations between these entities rather than to the collaboration between elected members of the government who reflect and represent the views of their citizens. Walk students through what is meant by this term and how those involved in it orchestrate legislation.

- Consider with students the nature of bureaucratic work. On the one hand, the concentration of legislative, executive, and judicial power into singular hands violates the principle of separation of powers and is, as many Founders asserted, the very definition of tyranny. On the other hand, note how cumbersome and slow bureaucratic work is and why this is the case, contrary to the expectations of the Progressives. Also discuss the risk of such agencies targeting certain political opponents or groups of people.

- Consider the issue of those who are the most removed from the people being the ones who are making what amount to laws (technically regulations) for all the people. Also, consider the consequences of top-down, “one-size-fits-all” rules for the nation. Students should see how this direction, particularly in domestic policy, is an affront to one of the key conditions of the rule of law: that those who make the laws are also bound by the law just as much as their constituents. Students should also consider whether political life under centralized, bureaucratic rule might be understood to resemble the rule of a faraway parliament or king.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

**Assignment:** Explain how the federal bureaucracy functions today and the extent to which it is consistent with the principles of self-government on which America was founded (2–3 paragraphs).
Unit 6 — Formative Quiz

Covering Lessons 1-3
10-15 minutes

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. What are the major differences between the House of Representatives and the Senate? What does this say about their purposes?

2. How does a bill become a law?

3. What is delegation? Why has it been so consequential? Why has Congress embraced it?

4. How does the Constitution aim to keep Congress and the presidency separate?

5. How have presidents used emergency powers?

6. How does the administrative state violate the principle of separation of powers?

7. What is meant by the “iron triangle,” and how does it function? Why is it considered “iron”?
Lesson 4 — Placeholder: State and Local Government

1-2 classes

Note: This lesson affords a school the space to teach about the specific details of their own state and local governments. Teachers may pull in content related to their state and community while still addressing the broad points outlined below.

Lesson Objective

Students learn about the state and local governments in which they are represented, as well as some of the principles and history undergirding these governing institutions in the United States.

Online Courses for Teachers | Online.Hillsdale.edu

- Constitution 101
- The Federalist Papers

Terms and Topics

- federalism
- local government
- state government
- county
- township
- ward
- precinct
- village
- city
- school board
- domestic policy
- incorporation doctrine

Questions for the American Mind

- What value did the Founders place on state and local governments?
- How did the Framers of the Constitution seek to empower state and local governments?
- What benefits has federalism afforded the American experiment in self-government?
- What are the structure and primary roles of offices in the state government?
- What are the structure and primary roles of offices in the local government?
- What is the relationship among federal, state, and local governments?
- Which domestic policy areas are most commonly addressed by state governments?
- Which domestic policy areas are most commonly addressed by local governments?
- How has the power of the federal, state, and local governments changed in relationship to each other through history? What has accounted for those fluctuations?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 61: Who is the governor of your state now?
  - Question 62: What is the capital of your state?
KEYS TO THE LESSON

Students should understand how their state and local governments are structured, along with the roles that each has. Students should also consider these governments in light of the Founders’ views.

Beyond teaching about their specific state and local governments, teachers might best plan and teach with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Emphasize with students how, historically, states and local governments had far more power than they do today. The Founders placed great importance on the roles and powers of state and local governments as being one of the fundamental checks on the authority of the federal government.
- Note how the policies enacted in state and local governments often directly affect and shape the daily lives of citizens more than the policies of the federal government.
- Explain to students some of the benefits of federalism and of state and local governments, asking them to recall what they had read of *The Federalist* concerning this point. Besides forming another kind of separation of powers, state and local governments allow for experimentation with certain policies on small scales prior to adopting a policy for the entire country. Federal lawmakers can then learn from these experiments. They can avoid those that were poor or adapt or improve those that worked without inflicting experimental damage on the entire country. These state governments can also sue the federal government in court and, perhaps most importantly, state and local governments allow citizens to “vote with their feet” by moving from one place with policies they dislike to another place with policies they believe are good. This requires another level of responsiveness to the people and affords sanctuaries for freedom when one state becomes more tyrannical for a time.
- Point out to students that it is the state and especially the local governments where they and their fellow citizens have the greatest opportunity to be involved officially in government and where they are most likely to bring about policy changes. The local level in particular becomes both an outlet for civic participation as well as an arena for future state and federal statesmen to gain experience and practice in the art of statesmanship. These levels of government, due to the smaller and more personal constituency, are also the most likely to be the most representative of a citizenry’s interests and opinions.
- Discuss with students how the power of the federal government has grown relative to state and local governments. Help students to consider the roles the Civil War, Progressivism, welfare programs, the incorporation doctrine, and federal funding mandates have played in shifting power to such an extreme concentration in the federal government and its bureaucracy.

STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS

**Assignment 1:** Explain why the Founders sought to preserve the roles and powers of state and local governments and how these governments function today by comparison (1 paragraph).

**Assignment 2:** Outline the kinds of government under which you live and how these kinds of government affect the daily lives of you and your neighbors (1–2 paragraphs).
Lesson 5 — Domestic Policy

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about social and economic policy within the United States—including the various fields of social and economic policy, the branches of government, bureaucratic agencies, and interests involved in such policy decisions—and a broad overview of the types of contested issues in these fields that have emerged in the country’s history to the present day.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

Constitution 201 Lecture 8
The U.S. Supreme Court Lecture 4

TEXTS

Students should read the text below and come to class prepared to complete a short reading quiz on the contents of the reading. The reading quiz should be based on questions on pages 504 and 531–532 of American Government and Politics.

American Government and Politics Chapters 16–17

TERMS AND TOPICS

free market capitalism
socialism
mixed market
communism
welfare state
New Deal
Social Security
Medicare/Medicaid
payroll tax
negative rights
positive rights
charter school
War on Poverty
Great Society
redistribution
entitlement
Gross Domestic Product (GDP)

unemployment
inflation
fiscal policy
monetary policy
deficit
mandatory spending
progressive taxation
income tax
supply-side economics
Federal Reserve System
Internal Revenue Service
tariff
protectionism
Justice Department
Federal Bureau of Investigation
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What are the various kinds of social and economic policies?
- How have these policy areas and the arguments within them changed through American history?
- What were the views of the Founders in these areas?
- How did Progressivism and the New Deal change the role of government in domestic policy?
- Explain the difference between negative and positive rights. Why do positive rights usually require a larger government and higher taxation?
- How have entitlement programs changed the way people view the government?
- Government involvement in domestic issues has effectively removed what non-governmental institutions from being of service?
- Is GDP a good measure for the economic health of a country?
- Why are few politicians concerned with fiscal and monetary policy?
- What accounts for the complexity of the United States tax system?
- Explain how the Federal Reserve works. What might the Founders have thought about this?
- How are government programs funded?
- How does trade policy with other nations affect U.S. businesses, individuals, GDP, and unemployment?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 20: Name one power of the U.S. Congress.
  - Question 41: Name one power of the president.
  - Question 48: What are two Cabinet-level positions?
  - Question 58: Name one power that is only for the federal government.
  - Question 59: Name one power that is only for the states.
  - Question 71: Why is it important to pay federal taxes?

KEYS TO THE LESSON

Students should receive a survey of the kinds of domestic policy areas in which government is involved. This would include especially economic, fiscal, monetary, and welfare policy, but also cultural matters and various kinds of legal, election, immigration, education, and family policy. American Government and Politics can provide a good guide to these fields. Students should understand of what each consists, how policy is determined, and the government officials and interest groups involved in such decisions. Students need not have a deep knowledge of each field but should understand the types of practical effects that certain policy decisions have and the basic contours of opposing arguments on a policy, both in history and today. Of special note is the role that Progressivism played in expanding the influence of the federal government in domestic policy, which led to associated growth of the federal government, especially in economic policy. Concerning economic policy, students should be able to draw on their study of economics in a separate economics course, but the main purpose of its study here is to see how policy is set in relation to economics.

Teachers might best plan and teach Domestic Policy with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Outline for students the various domestic policy areas. Students should be able to identify each and the kinds of actions that fall within each field.
• Proceed to trace in history the growth in kinds of policy fields and the basic arguments that emerged within those areas. Students should appreciate that the Founders recognized and had carefully informed views on many of the same policy areas that are dealt with today. In many cases, their views defy contemporary stereotypes about how they approached various issues. Their thoughts regarding policy for the poor, immigration, and trade, for example, are worth careful consideration. Review the views of the Founders from Unit 1 to access with accuracy these positions and arguments.

• Discuss with students some of today’s leading domestic policy issues. Explain each side with the strongest arguments that each side would use. Students may naturally engage in some debate or conversation on these issues, but ensure that any debate is civil and that it does not replace instruction. Students should gain a “lay of the land” but not be expected to form judgments on which policy ought to be adopted.

• While there are certain functions of the federal government that deal with domestic policy (most notably maintaining the rule of law, regulating interstate commerce, coining money and setting weights and measures), note for students the great expansion in the size of the federal government, and in particular, its role in domestic policy. The Founders had structured the federal government to be principally concerned with national security and foreign policy, those fields which only an energetic and united federal government could address.

• The vast majority of policies that most directly affect the daily lives of citizens were to be made by state and local governments. This was purposeful, as such lower governments could be more knowledgeable and responsive to their constituents and the needs and interests associated with life in a certain geographic area, much more so than a centralized and distant central government could be. The Civil War, Progressive era, and New Deal all shifted the locus of power in domestic policy away from states and localities and toward Washington, DC, and its bureaucracies.

**Strengthening Understanding: Post-Lesson Assignment**

**Assignment:** Choose one area of domestic policy and outline what it addresses, how decisions are made, its historical development, and the basic arguments of each side of a current issue within that field (2–3 paragraphs).
Lesson 6 — National Security and Foreign Policy

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the foreign policy of the United States, including the branches of the armed forces, bureaucratic agencies, and interests involved in such policy decisions, and gain a broad overview of the types of contested issues related to national security that have emerged in the country’s history to the present day.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

The Presidency and the Constitution Lecture 6

TEXTS

Students should read the text below and come to class prepared to complete a short reading quiz on the contents of the reading. The reading quiz should be based on questions on page 558 of American Government and Politics.

American Government and Politics Chapter 18

TERMS AND TOPICS

- national security
- foreign policy
- border
- citizen-controlled military
- U.S. Army
- U.S. Navy
- U.S. Marine Corps
- U.S. Air Force
- U.S. Coast Guard
- U.S. Space Force
- U.S. Border Patrol
- State Department
- National Security Agency
- Central Intelligence Agency
- Department of Homeland Security
- Monroe Doctrine
- containment
- uplift
- preemption
- isolationism
- unilateralism
- multilateralism
- intelligence
- embargo
- sanctions
- nongovernmental organizations

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What is the primary purpose of the federal government? Why is this the case?
- What is foreign policy? How is it related to national security?
- How is foreign policy determined in the United States?
- How is foreign policy carried out in the United States?
- Who makes treaties? Who declares war? Who conducts war? Why are these powers separated in this manner?
- How has foreign policy changed throughout American history? Consider trade, treaties, war, alliances, etc.
- What was the Monroe Doctrine? Was this a continuation of or a departure from the principles of the founding?
- What were the foreign policy concerns about expansion?
- What is the Progressive idea of “uplift,” and how did it play out in foreign policy?
- What is the difference between unilateralism and multilateralism? When did the shift to multilateralism occur, and what domestic policies accompanied it?
- What is the liberal world order? How does it relate to spreading democracy?
- What are the major lessons of Cold War foreign policy?
- How did the policy of containment and preemption change the goals of foreign policy?
- What are the main divisions of view on foreign policy today?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 20: Name one power of the U.S. Congress.
  - Question 41: Name one power of the president.
  - Question 48: What are two Cabinet-level positions?
  - Question 58: Name one power that is only for the federal government.
  - Question 67: Name two promises that new citizens make in the Oath of Allegiance.
  - Question 70: What is one way Americans can serve their country?
  - Question 72: It is important for all men ages 18 through 25 to register for the Selective Service. Name one reason why.
  - Question 76: What war did the Americans fight to win independence from Britain?
  - Question 91: Name one war fought by the United States in the 1800s.
  - Question 100: Name one war fought by the United States in the 1900s.
  - Question 101: Why did the United States enter World War I?
  - Question 106: Why did the United States enter World War II?
  - Question 108: Who was the United States’ main rival during the Cold War?
  - Question 110: Why did the United States enter the Korean War?
  - Question 111: Why did the United States enter the Vietnam War?
  - Question 114: Why did the United States enter the Persian Gulf War?
  - Question 115: What major event happened on September 11, 2001 in the United States?
  - Question 116: Name one U.S. military conflict after the September 11, 2001 attacks.
  - Question 128: What is Veterans Day?

**Keys to the Lesson**

Students should understand the importance of the country’s foreign policy and its fundamental connection to America’s national security. The core purpose of the federal government (as with any national government) as laid out in the United States Constitution is to provide for the common defense. All other functions—lawmaking itself, and the establishment of justice—will fall if the nation is not defended. As such, the federal government has been historically and is still primarily oriented toward national security and national self-defense. Students should be made familiar with what government actions are involved in foreign policy and national security, how the executive branch and the military are arranged toward this end, and what other entities and groups are involved in determining foreign policy. Students should also learn about the changes in foreign policy in history, including the moments in which foreign policy resulted
in conflict, as well as foreign policy issues in recent years and today. The views of the Founders per the Constitution and George Washington should be reviewed from Unit 1 and referenced in this unit.

Teachers might best plan and teach National Security and Foreign Policy with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Outline with students which areas of government action fall under the titles of national security, which fall under foreign policy, and how the two categories are related.
- Review with students how the Constitution designed the federal government and the executive in particular to address issues of national security above all its other roles. Compare the structure and functioning of the federal government with respect to foreign policy in the view of the Founders to how it is conducted today.
- Emphasize with students how the American armed forces are citizen-controlled, which means military authority is responsible to political authority under the constitutional rule of law. Spend some time outlining the roles of each branch of the armed forces.
- Chart with students the changes in the principles that underlie foreign policy through American history. In general, students should recognize a shift from a defensive posture during much of the first 150 years of American history toward a positive idealistic thrust to, as Woodrow Wilson put it, “Make the world safe for democracy.” While this is partly owing to the greater power and capacities America garnered on the world stage, there was also shift toward international activism. Progressives and many subsequent administrations have asserted the idea of America’s moral obligation to improve man’s nature and bring progress to other peoples and countries of the world, sometimes through military force.
- Review how this shift has departed from the American founding, both in principle and practice, as articulated by statements such as George Washington’s Farewell Address: “The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign Nations[,] is in extending our commercial relations to have with them as little political connection as possible.” Political alliances or conflicts with other nations were only to be out of necessity. As in the Declaration of Independence, other nations assume their own “separate and equal station” as well, and their independence should be respected. In general, the United States should not interfere in the internal governance of other nations unless necessary for self-defense regarding the nation’s security. Today, the United States is often involved in the governance of other nations, and has largely abandoned its founding principles of national-self-determination and sovereignty.
- Discuss with students how George Washington’s overall objective in foreign policy was to defend the institutions of American constitutional government at home and develop the United States to “that degree of strength and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.” That is, the purpose of American foreign policy is to protect and defend American constitutional self-government. America’s principles are universal (“all men are created equal”) but America is a particular nation, which means that while the United States models and advocates for American principles its first obligation is to the defense and perpetuation of this country.
- Discuss with students the broad contours of arguments related to foreign policy issues today. Debate will naturally arise, but make sure it remains civil and that it does not overtake the rest of class. Students should be familiar with policy issues of today, but they need not arrive at decisions on the course of action the nation should take. In doing so, they will learn that foreign policy is
informed by principle but is largely an exercise in prudential decision-making in particular circumstances.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

**Assignment:** Outline the areas that national security and foreign policy address, how decisions are made in these fields, their historical development, and the basic arguments of each side of a current issue within these fields (2–3 paragraphs).
APPENDIX

Study Guide

Test

Writing Assignment
## TERMS AND TOPICS

*Explain each of the following and the context in which each was discussed during this unit's lessons.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislative Power</th>
<th>Executive Privilege</th>
<th>Charter School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bicameral</td>
<td>pardoning power</td>
<td>War on Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>impeachment</td>
<td>Great Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Reps.</td>
<td>bureaucracy/bureaucrat</td>
<td>redistribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority/minority leader</td>
<td>administrative state</td>
<td>entitlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oversight</td>
<td>red tape</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product (GDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>earmark</td>
<td>merit system</td>
<td>unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logrolling</td>
<td>Pendleton Act</td>
<td>inflation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pork barrel</td>
<td>iron triangle</td>
<td>fiscal policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joint committee</td>
<td>spoils system</td>
<td>monetary policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joint resolution</td>
<td>Congressional Review Act</td>
<td>deficit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lame duck</td>
<td>federalism</td>
<td>progressive taxation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filibuster</td>
<td>local government</td>
<td>income tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committees/subcommittees</td>
<td>state government</td>
<td>supply-side economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker of the House</td>
<td>county</td>
<td>Federal Reserve System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President pro tempore</td>
<td>township</td>
<td>Internal Revenue Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>veto</td>
<td>ward/precinct</td>
<td>tariff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whip</td>
<td>city</td>
<td>protectionism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nondelegation doctrine</td>
<td>school board</td>
<td>Monroe Doctrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bully pulpit</td>
<td>domestic policy</td>
<td>containment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of the Union address</td>
<td>incorporation doctrine</td>
<td>uplift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foreign policy</td>
<td>welfare state</td>
<td>preemption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chief of staff</td>
<td>New Deal</td>
<td>isolationism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cabinet</td>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>unilateralism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vice president</td>
<td>Medicare/Medicaid</td>
<td>multilateralism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>executive order</td>
<td>payroll tax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Powers Resolution</td>
<td>negative rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Security Council</td>
<td>positive rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.

Lesson 1 | Congress

□ What is the legislative power and who has it, per the Constitution?
□ Why, in a representative democracy, did the Founders consider the legislature the most important branch of government?
□ What are the major differences between the House of Representatives and the Senate? What does this say about their purposes?
□ What are the different types of committees and what do they accomplish? Why would Congress have to split up into committees?
□ How does a bill become a law?
□ How have Congress and the legislative power changed since the Founding?
□ What is delegation? Why has it been so consequential? Why has Congress embraced it?

Lesson 2 | The Presidency

□ What is the executive power? Why do we need a president?
□ What were the original cabinet positions in the executive branch? What has happened to these positions? Why were they not a threat to the idea of a unitary executive?
□ How have presidents used rhetoric?
□ How have presidents used emergency powers?
□ Why is the pardoning power an executive function? What purpose does it serve?
□ What is an executive order? Is it constitutional?
□ How has the role of the president changed as political parties have changed?

Lesson 3 | The Bureaucracy and the Administrative State

□ What powers does the bureaucracy have, how did the bureaucracy acquire those powers, and what does it look like when those powers are exercised?
□ How does the administrative state violate the principle of separation of powers?
□ To what extent are bureaucrats accountable to the people? How so?
□ What are the arguments for and against government by expertise?
□ What are the arguments for and against the control of bureaucracies by political appointments that change with administrations?
□ What is meant by the “iron triangle” and how does it function? Why is it considered “iron”?
□ What is bureaucratic work like? Why does it have this character?
□ What are the arguments for and against centralized planning by federal bureaucrats? What is lost in the process?
□ How can the concentration of all three powers in the bureaucracies be weaponized against political opponents or specific groups of people?
□ To what extent have Americans come to accept lawmaking by bureaucrats? Why do you think this is the case?
Lesson 4 | State and Local Government

- What value did the Founders place on state and local governments?
- How did the Framers of the Constitution seek to empower state and local governments?
- What benefits has federalism afforded the American experiment in self-government?
- What are the structure and primary roles of offices in the state government?
- What are the structure and primary roles of offices in the local government?
- How has the power of the federal, state, and local governments changed in relationship to each other throughout history? Was has accounted for those fluctuations?

Lesson 5 | Domestic Policy

- What are the various kinds of social and economic policies?
- How have these policy areas and the arguments within them changed through American history?
- What were the views of the Founders in these areas?
- How did Progressivism and the New Deal change the role of government in domestic policy?
- Explain the difference between negative and positive rights. Why do positive rights usually require a larger government and higher taxation?
- How have entitlement programs changed the way people view the government?
- What accounts for the complexity of the United States tax system?
- Explain how the Federal Reserve works. What might the Founders have thought about this?
- How are government programs funded?

Lesson 6 | National Security and Foreign Policy

- What is the primary purpose of the federal government? Why is this the case?
- What is foreign policy? How is it related to national security?
- How is foreign policy determined in the United States?
- How is foreign policy carried out in the United States?
- Who makes treaties? Who declares war? Who conducts war? Why are these powers separated in this manner?
- How has foreign policy changed throughout American history? Consider trade, treaties, war, alliances, etc.
- What is the Progressive idea of “uplift,” and how did it play out in foreign policy?
- What is the difference between unilateralism and multilateralism? When did the shift to multilateralism occur, and what domestic policies accompanied it?
- What are the main divisions of view on foreign policy today?
Test — Institutions and Policy

TERMS AND TOPICS

Explain each of the following and the context in which it was discussed during this unit’s lessons.

1. majority/minority leader

2. earmark

3. filibuster

4. Speaker of the House

5. nondelegation doctrine

6. cabinet

7. Pendleton Act

8. township

9. domestic policy

10. fiscal policy

11. monetary policy

12. deficit
13. supply-side economics

14. Federal Reserve System

15. multilateralism

**Questions for the American Mind**

*Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and writing should be employed, and responses must fully answer each question.*

16. Why, in a representative democracy, did the Founders consider the legislature the most important branch of government?

17. What is delegation? Why has it been so consequential? Why has Congress embraced it?

18. What is the executive power? Why do we need a president?

19. What is an executive order? Is it constitutional?

20. How does the administrative state violate the principle of separation of powers?

21. To what extent are bureaucrats accountable to the people? How so?

22. What are the arguments for and against government by expertise?
23. What is meant by the “iron triangle,” and how does it function? Why is it considered “iron”?

24. What value did the Founders place on state and local governments?

25. What benefits has federalism afforded the American experiment in self-government?

26. How has the power of the federal, state, and local governments changed in relationship to each other throughout history? What has accounted for those fluctuations?

27. Explain the difference between negative and positive rights. Why do positive rights usually require a larger government and higher taxation?

28. How have entitlement programs changed the way people view the government?

29. What is the primary purpose of the federal government? Why is this the case?

30. What is foreign policy? How is it related to national security?
Writing Assignment — Institutions and Policy

DIRECTIONS

Due on __________

Citing conversations from class in your argument, write a 500–800-word essay answering the question:

What have been the combined effects on government and politics that have resulted from the following changes to the American constitutional order:

- the increased power of Congressional leadership
- the increased power of the presidency
- the delegation, centralization, and insulation of power in the federal bureaucracy
- the increased power of the federal government compared to state and local government
- the increased role of the federal government in domestic policy
- the increased role of the United States in world affairs
UNIT 7
Politics in Practice

45-50-minute classes | 14-18 classes

UNIT PREVIEW

Structure

| LESSON 1 | Parties, Elections, and Campaigns | 4-5 classes | p. 5 |
| LESSON 2 | Civic Participation and Public Opinion | 3-4 classes | p. 8 |
| LESSON 3 | Civic Associations and Interest Groups | 3-4 classes | p. 13 |
| LESSON 4 | The First Amendment and the Media | 2-3 classes | p. 16 |
| APPENDIX A | Study Guide, Test, and Writing Assignment | | p. 19 |
| APPENDIX B | Primary Source | | p. 29 |

Why Teach Politics in Practice

After studying the history of political thought in the United States and the institutions and policies involved in American governance, students must recognize that such thought and governance does not happen in a vacuum. Instead, many individuals and private associations together influence and reflect the views of citizens and lawmakers alike. The political process and arena in the United States are the unofficial parts to American representative democracy. Students should understand their origins and how they operate so as to know the ways in which their civic participation may be effective and effected. Students can also make judgments on which elements in politics are proper to the Founders’ understanding of self-government and which inhibit or curtail such self-rule.
What Teachers Should Consider

The Founders’ principal fears in practical politics—faction and demagogues—were well founded, and their attempts to mitigate these threats were some of the most innovative parts to the constitutional order they arranged. Nevertheless, partisanship arose even with the ratification of the Constitution. The growth of political parties, the dominance of the election cycle, and the plethora of interest groups and civic associations have become hallmarks of American self-government. While the Founders may have sought to avoid this arrangement more than was possible, party politics are cemented in place in the United States. Moreover, general civic participation, as Alexis de Tocqueville noted, has provided for a degree of stability and practice in self-government that has been salutary. Students should appreciate the roles of these various forms of civic participation and how they function. They should of course consider circumstances today in light of the Founders’ views and understand how politics work practically in twenty-first century America. Students should come to understand their own role in the political process, the important privilege that Americans have to participate in the political process, and the various associations, groups, parties, and media with which they may engage. The goal of this unit is to help students make sense of how representatives are chosen, how policy decisions are shaped, how public opinion is formed, and the civic responsibilities and opportunities afforded to students when they become adult citizens.

How Teachers Can Learn More

Texts

*American Government and Politics*, Joseph Bessette and John Pitney

Chapters 4, 7–11

Online Courses | Online.Hillsdale.edu

*Introduction to the Constitution*

*The U.S. Supreme Court*

Primary Sources Studied in This Unit

Seneca Falls “Declaration of Sentiments and Resolutions,” Elizabeth Cady Stanton
LESSON PLANS, ASSIGNMENTS, AND FORMATIVE QUIZ
Lesson 1 — Parties, Elections, and Campaigns

**LESSON OBJECTIVE**

Students learn how representative self-government is achieved through the constitutional framework for elections, the Electoral College, the election process, political parties, and campaigns.

**ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS** | Online.Hillsdale.edu

*Introduction to the Constitution* | Lecture 10

**TEXTS**

Students should read the text below and come to class prepared to complete a short reading quiz on the contents of the readings. The reading quiz should be based on the questions on pages 286–287 and 316 of *American Government and Politics*.

*American Government and Politics* | Chapters 9–10

**TERMS AND TOPICS**

- political party
- Electoral College
- proportional vote
- popular vote
- winner-take-all
- party realignment
- caucus
- king caucus
- ballot
- split ticket
- tabulation
- divided government
- platform
- Federal Election Commission
- referendum
- recall
- initiative
- general election
- primary/primary election
- voter turnout
- gerrymandering
- incumbent
- incumbency advantage
- PAC/super PAC
- campaign advertisements

**QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND**

- What does it mean to have free and fair elections?
- What is the significance of “ballots over bullets”?
- What are the major party realignments, when did they happen, and what were the consequences?
- What has happened to local parties? How did this happen? What are the consequences?
- What was the purpose of the Electoral College? How does it work?
- Why do we have two parties? What are the advantages and disadvantages of this system?
Why have third parties historically been unable to gain a foothold in the election process?
Why was the election of 1800 so important?
What was the change in the party system that happened in the New Deal era?
Why do incumbents usually win elections even when people are unsatisfied with the institution?
What makes gerrymandering possible, and what are the advantages and disadvantages of this process?
How do candidates finance their campaigns?

Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
- Question 1: What is the form of government of the United States?
- Question 4: The U.S. Constitution starts with the words “We the People.” What does “We the People” mean?
- Question 22: How long is a term for a U.S. Senator?
- Question 25: How long is a term for a member of the House of Representatives?
- Question 32: Who elects U.S. senators?
- Question 34: Who elects members of the House of Representatives?
- Question 36: The President of the United States is elected for how many years?
- Question 64: Who can vote in federal elections, run for federal office, and serve on a jury in the United States?
- Question 69: What are two examples of civic participation in the United States?
- Question 70: What is one way Americans can serve their country?
- Question 119: What is the capital of the United States?

**Keys to the Lesson**

If there is one practice that is the most famous gesture of American life, it is the holding of elections. Indeed, the foundational governing principle of America—that of representative self-government—is expressed and achieved through elections. Freely voting for our neighbors to represent our views in making and enforcing laws—and to have confidence that the process for doing so is fair and just—is the bedrock of American representative democracy, the great achievement of the founding and the envy of oppressed peoples throughout the world and down through the ages. Students should appreciate these facts and also understand how this process of choosing representatives works: both how it was originally intended to work and how it has changed over the centuries to the political process of today.

Teachers might best plan and teach Parties, Elections, and Campaigns with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Explain to students how the American Founders structured the election process. Note the great deference in matters of elections that the Founders gave to state legislatures in particular. The reason they lodged this power for establishing election procedures in state legislatures is so that a separate elected body responsive to the people of a certain area would be accountable to the people for how the elections are conducted in that area. The key was, as much as possible, to make sure that those who establish election procedure were accountable to the people of a whole state, thus dispersing the potential for election fraud and corruption. This is the same reason why redrawing congressional districts is also left up to the state legislatures.
- Explain the one major nationally directed election, that of the president. Explain what the Electoral College is, how it works, and why. Chief goals for the Founders in establishing the
Electoral College for choosing the president were twofold. First, by dividing the electorate into geographic groups by state, the Electoral College forces presidential candidates to recognize and incorporate the interests of more rural and remote citizens instead of only the interests of citizens who live in high-density areas, where it is easiest and most efficient to campaign. This arrangement has arguably prevented the division of American citizens into a ruling class of cities and a colony class of rural dwellers, whose interests and needs are ignored. Second, the Electoral College was meant to allow its electors to deny someone the presidency should the electors determine that the candidate was a demagogue or might act tyrannically. Students should understand that many state legislatures have both allotted the state’s electoral vote to the winner of the state’s popular vote and have required that electors be faithful to that outcome, thus undermining the second purpose of the Electoral College. The first goal, however, remains in place, except in those states that have required their state electors to follow the national popular vote.

- Walk students through the election process.
- Review with students the emergence of parties and how they have changed in history to their current form, particularly the changes from the founding generation and those that took place during the Progressive era.
- Emphasize how it is the parties that determine the vast majority of what happens in the election process and who ends up on a ballot. Students should recognize that one of the most influential roles ordinary citizens can have in the official election process is being involved in the leadership of political parties, beginning at the local level. In fact, it was the focus on the local party that was the traditional place to practice self-government in the United States. Politicians first gained power in their local communities, where they had to develop a good reputation before becoming part of the national system. This meant they were personally tied to their local communities and the issues therein. This enabled local issues to be considered by national politicians as well. Students should understand that while this tradition may still be the most congruent with the intentions of the Founders and with much of American history, in recent decades national parties often dictate the direction of a party based on national priorities, rather than local parties and the issues they seek to address.
- Share with students how campaigns work and the various ways in which candidates attempt to secure citizens’ votes.
- Consider the relationship between elected officials and their constituents. Not only do relatively few Americans know who their representatives are or who governs them, the representative himself or herself has increasingly been separated from his or her constituency in terms of geography—and especially by lifestyle and economic status. Have students consider what effect this has on self-government.
- Have students consider why so many people do not know who governs them. Help them to understand that politicians used to be part of the community and not separate from it. Ask them what this separation does to politicians, to politics, and to the people governed by such representatives.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

**Assignment:** Explain how elections are the embodiment of representative self-government and how political parties and campaigns may honor or subvert that principle in how they choose and support candidates (2–3 paragraphs).
Lesson 2 — Civic Participation and Public Opinion

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about how public opinion shapes personal opinion and how civic participation can influence election outcomes.

TEXTS

Students should read the text below and come to class prepared to complete a short reading quiz on the contents of the reading. The reading quiz should be based on questions from pages 233–234 of American Government and Politics.

American Government and Politics

Chapters 4 and 7

Students are to read or, if they have previously read, review the following primary source. While reading, students should annotate these sources. For particularly challenging texts or if the class is offered earlier in high school, the teacher may wish to provide students with guided reading questions to assist with comprehension, clarity, and direction. Using their annotations and any guided reading questions, students should come to class prepared to participate in a seminar conversation on each text.

Seneca Falls “Declaration of Sentiments and Resolutions,” Elizabeth Cady Stanton

TERMS AND TOPICS

citizen
citizenship
13th, 14th, 15th, and 19th Amendments
Worcester v. Georgia
Dawes Act
Indian Citizenship Act
birthright citizenship
naturalization
assimilation
melting pot
public opinion poll
suffrage

19th Amendment
turnout
political participation
liberal
conservative
moderate
independent
libertarian
populist
voter registration
polling
poll tax
social media

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What were the limits on voting at the time of the founding? While these were limits compared to today, how did they compare to practices in human history up to the time of the founding?
- How has suffrage been expanded since the founding?
Why are polls often inaccurate measures of public opinion?
How do citizens learn about or become influenced by public opinion?
How has new technology (social media) impacted how public opinion is spread and understood?
What are direct and indirect means of political participation?
Should everyone choose to exercise their right to vote? Why or why not?

Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
- Question 1: What is the form of government of the United States?
- Question 4: The U.S. Constitution starts with the words “We the People.” What does “We the People” mean?
- Question 63: There are four amendments to the U.S. Constitution about who can vote. Describe one of them.
- Question 64: Who can vote in federal elections, run for federal office, and serve on a jury in the United States?
- Question 68: How can people become United States citizens?
- Question 69: What are two examples of civic participation in the United States?
- Question 70: What is one way Americans can serve their country?
- Question 97: What amendment gives citizenship to all persons born in the United States?
- Question 98: When did all men get the right to vote?
- Question 102: When did all women get the right to vote?

**KEYS TO THE LESSON**

In human history, the right to vote is extraordinarily, almost miraculously, rare. It is yet another of the many privileges and benefits that Americans have and that are so easily taken for granted. This right to vote and the holding of elections lies at the heart of representative self-government, as it is this action and this process through which the people give consent to the laws under which they conduct all their other actions. It is thus important that as many legal voters be enabled to vote as wish to do so, that they vote only once, that their vote counts so long as it abides by the process, and that those who do not have a legal right to vote are not permitted to do so. Students should also recognize, however, how their views when they go to vote are often influenced by the prevailing opinion shared in the community. This public opinion can be shaped not only by the combination of views of the people, but also by individual leaders or powerful groups, including the media and, at present, social media. Beyond voting and running for office, students should recognize the other ways in which citizens may and should seek to fulfill their responsibilities as free citizens, including being well-informed, making their views heard at government meetings, generally abiding by the law, and respecting and assisting others.

Teachers might best plan and teach Civic Participation and Public Opinion with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Discuss with students what a citizen is and the meaning, rights, and responsibilities of citizenship. Survey and discuss with students the various amendments to the Constitution that concern citizenship, namely the 13th, 14th, 15th, and 19th Amendments. Include conversations on birthright citizenship and the naturalization process, the various responsibilities held by citizens such as respecting the rule of law, voting, volunteering, staying well-informed, and exhibited personal virtue and a responsible use of time, talents, and resources.
Students should gain a clear perspective on voting in human history. In brief, this privilege has been exceptionally rare and, therefore, the American citizen’s right to vote is a remarkable achievement. And nearly all of the groundbreaking moments in this achievement occurred in American history. The American colonies, for instance, were one of the few places in history where most ordinary male citizens of European descent were permitted to vote. The rule in history has been that one person made the law (monarchy) or a few did so (oligarchy). That most male citizens, even though still restricted to those of European descent, were allowed to vote in the American colonies is therefore a consequential development in world history, a significant step toward universal suffrage.

Explain to students how women, African Americans, and men who did not own property were generally, though not always, prohibited from voting. At the Founding, every state north of Pennsylvania allowed free African Americans to vote. Students should appreciate the historic gains the American people made securing the right to vote for each of these groups while also recognizing that their original curtailment was more the rule than the exception in human history, not a phenomenon unique to America. What was unique to America was the right to vote at all and then the relatively rapid rate at which the right to vote was expanded to these groups.

Explain that originally, voting was a privilege of citizenship and not a right. It was also a serious duty. It was meant to be carried out by people who had significant interest in protecting America, who actively informed themselves on the issues independent of what they were simply told, and who would be called to give their lives up for their country if it were threatened. Put another way, they had a high personal stake in what the country did regarding various policies, including going to war.

In general, canvass with students various government actions related to voter participation, such as the 15th, 19th, and 26th Amendments, Jim Crow, poll taxes, and absentee, early, and mail-in voting. Students should consider how each of these changes affects voting and the practice of representative self-government.

Read with students Elizabeth Cady Stanton’s 1848 Seneca Falls “Declaration of Sentiments and Resolutions.” Note Stanton’s appeal to the principles of the Declaration to argue for women’s suffrage.

Trace with students the history of Native Americans and U.S. citizenship. Consider the numerous instances in which Native Americans were denied their rights and the great gains they have witnessed in having those rights secured through American history, including the various laws to make Native Americans citizens and the ways in which Native Americans retain their own status as nations.

Consider with students the power of public opinion and its foundations in a moral outlook and education. Students should understand how public opinion is formed and influenced and how, in turn, it influences the opinions of individual citizens. Public opinion is something that dominates in a democratic society because everyone is equally powerful in a democratic republic through their votes. People tend, therefore, to consider the majority opinion to be correct, meaning that many political fights occur in the court of public opinion more than in the legislative process. The side that can command public opinion can shape the nation politically. Students should recognize the famous importance that Abraham Lincoln placed on public opinion in moving northerners not only to vote but also fight and even to die to preserve a union without slavery.

Make special note of how generations of educational practices, particularly at the collegiate level, as well as the emergence of powerful new forces such as activist organizations, corporate marketing, and social media have greatly influenced public opinion over the past several decades.
- Share with students the variety of ways in which citizens can and in many cases should participate in the civic life of the country and their local community. At the very least, citizens have a responsibility to respect the rights of others, conduct their own personal lives with virtue, and take minimal steps to be informed on issues and on their representatives by seeking out the truth and thinking for themselves.

- Help students see the robust tradition of local civic participation America used to have and the great decline in civic participation in the United States, partly owing to the centralization of politics and lawmaking at the national level, the power of interest groups, activist groups, and bureaucracy in lawmaking, and the various new kinds of entertainment and technology that occupy citizens’ time and attention.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignment:** Explain the responsibilities and ways in which ordinary American citizens may participate in the American experiment of self-government, why such participation has been historically significant, and why civic participation has declined in recent years (2-3 paragraphs).
Unit 7 — Formative Quiz

**DIRECTIONS:** Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. What is the significance of “ballots over bullets”?

2. What has happened to local parties? How did this happen? What are the consequences?

3. What was the purpose of the Electoral College? How does it work?

4. How has suffrage been expanded since the founding?

5. Why are polls often inaccurate measures of public opinion?
Lesson 3 — Civic Associations and Interest Groups

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about civic associations and interest groups, the power they hold, and the ways in which they may enhance or detract from the interests of individuals.

TEXTS

Students should read the below texts and come to class prepared to complete a short reading quiz on the contents of the readings. The reading quiz should be based on questions on pages 257-258 of *American Government and Politics*.

*American Government and Politics*  Chapter 8

TERMS AND TOPICS

- interest group
- faction
- civic association
- philanthropy
- churches
- unions
- think tank
- grassroots
- lobbyist

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- Why did James Madison say that factions will always exist in a free society? What is the significance of this?
- How do interest groups ensure that individuals’ voices are heard?
- How do interest groups act against the wills of individuals?
- Are interest groups factions? Do they serve an important function?
- Why are interest groups often looked down upon?
- How did unions change the way political associations were understood?
- Why are most interest groups and think tanks headquartered in Washington, DC? What does this say about power in America? What does this mean about local associations?
- What are the benefits and drawbacks to allowing professional lobbying?
- What forms of civic associations have been more traditional in American history? On what levels of government did they tend to focus?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 65: What are three rights of everyone living in the United States?
  - Question 69: What are two examples of civic participation in the United States?
  - Question 70: What is one way Americans can serve their country?
KEYS TO THE LESSON

So long as there is human nature, there will be differences of opinion and interest. Factions, as the Founders so aptly recognized, will always arise and will always exist. In a political community, these factions may coalesce into separate but sometimes overlapping official entities. Such groups serve different purposes and go about achieving their goals through different means, but they all have the same goal: to influence lawmaking by influencing lawmakers, public opinion, and, increasingly, government bureaucrats. Students should understand what these kinds of groups are, how they arise, what they do, and how effective they are in American society. While such civic-focused groups have historically been a hallmark of American representative democracy, they have become increasingly separated from the interests of ordinary Americans and have instead operated on behalf of the comparably wealthy and well-connected portion of the American citizenry.

Teachers might best plan and teach Civic Associations and Interest Groups with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Make sure students understand the Founders’ argument that factions have and will always exist in a free society because people who are free willingly choose to associate with others who have the same interests. When a government begins to tell its people what to think and with whom they can associate, it encroaches on the natural rights of those people to think for themselves. At the same time, the Founders were concerned that factions could gain enough power to take away the rights of others. Instead of prohibiting liberty, however, the Founders created the Constitution with the principles of representation, an enlarged republic, separation of powers, checks and balances, and federalism in order to channel factions to constructive, cooperative ends. Review with students these principles from Unit 2 and, in particular, Federalist 10.
- Note for students how private associations have always existed in America and that America was known for the vibrancy of such associations, a phenomenon recognized by Alexis de Tocqueville. Associations are innately factious, because they define beliefs and prescribe limits to participation. In early America, associations allowed individuals to come together to make their voices heard against the majority. In this way, they protected individual rights.
- Consider the role that philanthropic individuals, organizations, and religious institutions have played in American representative democracy. These associations have shaped not only the moral character and conduct of their members but also major reform movements in America, such as abolition, anti-poverty, temperance, and civil rights.
- Clarify for students that the modern interest groups that lobby in Washington, DC, are significantly different from the private and local associations that existed in early America. Many interest groups generally do not represent private individuals but reflect the interests of the comparably wealthy and powerful—and even those who have become wealthy and powerful in the name of representing the weak and the downtrodden. Their ascendency tracks with that of the federal government. As government power was increasingly concentrated in the federal government, and as the federal bureaucracy burgeoned under Progressivism, it was natural that wealthier and more powerful interests throughout the entire country would centralize themselves into single groups to influence lawmaking most efficiently in that singular national location. By comparison, federalism and the previous power of state and local governments had not only required interests to disperse their efforts but also allowed for greater voice and representation from local citizens.
▪ Help students to understand why certain interests dominate national policy, even when that interest represents a relatively small number of individuals.

▪ Ask students how they can have political sway as individuals. Help them imagine what it would have been like to have local associations that were powerful and what that would have meant for their individual interests.

▪ Canvass with students the structure and methods of the various types of civic associations: think tanks, activist groups, political action committees, nonprofits, grassroots groups, local civic associations, etc.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

**Assignment:** Explain how the nature and methods of civic-focused groups have changed over the timeline of American history (1–2 paragraphs).
Lesson 4 — The First Amendment and the Media

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the role of the media in the political process and in public opinion, as well as the ways in which the First Amendment preserves the freedoms necessary for citizens to participate freely in the civic body.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

The U.S. Supreme Court Lecture 5

TEXTS

Students should read the text below and come to class prepared to complete a short reading quiz on the contents of the reading. The reading quiz should be based on the questions on page 342 of American Government and Politics.

American Government and Politics Chapter 11

TERMS AND TOPICS

- news
- editorial
- news media
- watchdogs
- mass media
- spin
- yellow journalism
- narrative
- muckrakers
- “fake news”
- political cartoons
- news release
- network
- opposition research
- radio
- Federal Communications Commission (FCC)
- priming
- First Amendment
- framing

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What is the relationship between reporting and creating news?
- How has mass media centralized public opinion?
- What is the purpose of freedom of the press? Does mass media accomplish this?
- Why does local journalism matter?
- Analyze the advantages and disadvantages of a government organization overseeing broadcast media.
- Alexis de Tocqueville wrote that Americans were attached to the news. Is this true? Why would this occur in a representative democracy?
• How has yellow journalism impacted the way people think about politics? Do personal scandals matter?
• How and why has journalism changed, especially in recent decades?
• Why is freedom of speech for individuals necessary for freedom and justice?
• What role has social media played in the civic body?
• Are social media restrictions on what users share violations of freedom of speech? Why or why not?
• Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 65: What are three rights of everyone living in the United States?
  - Question 69: What are two examples of civic participation in the United States?

**KEYS TO THE LESSON**

The freedom of the press is the extension of freedom of speech to enable the mass distribution of ideas. This freedom has been and is still crucial to a free civic body. The free press is yet another emblem by which people all over the world have recognized American freedom and self-government. At the same time, students should understand the value of individual free speech and the freedom of speech of other organizations guaranteed by the First Amendment. Free speech itself allows citizens to think for themselves and share what they think with others.

Teachers might best plan and teach the First Amendment and the Media with emphasis on the following approaches:

• Help students understand the central role journalism and writing played in the American Revolution and founding. Consider all the documents that students have read that were published and promoted through newspapers or print.
• Have students consider also the reason behind the First Amendment. Freedom of speech and of the press are a vital check against the government. They provide a means for criticizing the government and for informing the public about government actions. Furthermore, freedom of speech is connected to freedom of conscience. The destruction of speech will inevitably lead to the destruction of ideas, which is possible only by destroying the creators and possessors of those ideas: people themselves.
• Consider how the media is also able to abuse the respect traditionally afforded to them by the people to engage in biased reporting under the cover of objectivity, oftentimes to the benefit of those who are most powerful in society.
• Emphasize that intentional efforts by individuals to research, critique, and discern true reporting when making informed political decisions is essential to a free people and to being a responsible citizen.
• Consider also with students the rise of social media and its influence on public opinion. Important questions have been raised in recent years over the power that social media has held in shaping public opinion by channeling or restricting access to the sharing of certain ideas.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**
Assignment: Explain the role that free speech and freedom of the press play in representative self-government and how such rights have influenced public opinion in recent decades (1–2 paragraphs).
APPENDIX A

Study Guide

Test

Writing Assignment
Study Guide — Politics in Practice Test

TERMS AND TOPICS

Explain each of the following and the context in which it was discussed during this unit’s lessons.

political party 
suffrage
Electoral College 
liberal
caucus 
conservative
ballot 
moderate
split ticket 
independent
divided government 
libertarian
platform 
populist
Federal Election Commission 
voter registration
referendum 
social media
recall 
interest group
initiative 
faction
general election 
civic association
primary/primary election 
unions
gerrymandering 
think tank
incumbent 
grassroots
PAC/super PAC 
lobbyist
public opinion poll 
news

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.

Lesson 1 | Parties, Elections, and Campaigns

☐ What does it mean to have free and fair elections?
☐ What is the significance of “ballots over bullets”?
☐ What has happened to local parties? How did this happen? What are the consequences?
☐ What was the purpose of the Electoral College? How does it work?
☐ Why do we have two parties? What are the advantages and disadvantages of this system?
☐ Why do incumbents usually win elections, even when people are dissatisfied with the institution?
☐ What makes gerrymandering possible, and what are the advantages and disadvantages of this process?
☐ How do candidates finance their campaigns?

Lesson 2 | Civic Participation and Public Opinion

☐ What were the limits on voting at the time of the founding? While these were limits compared to today, how did they compare to practices in human history up to the time of the founding?
How has suffrage been expanded since the founding?
Why are polls often inaccurate measures of public opinion?
How do citizens learn about or become influenced by public opinion?
How has new technology (e.g., social media) impacted how public opinion is spread and understood?
What are direct and indirect means of political participation?

Lesson 3 | Civic Associations and Interest Groups

Why did James Madison say that factions will always exist in a free society? What is the significance of this?
How do interest groups ensure that individuals’ voices are heard?
How do interest groups act against the wills of individuals?
How did unions change the way political associations were understood?
Why are most interest groups and think tanks headquartered in Washington, DC? What does this say about power in America? What does this mean about local associations?
What are the benefits and drawbacks to allowing professional lobbying?
What forms of civic associations have been more traditional in American history? On what levels of government did they tend to focus?

Lesson 4 | The First Amendment and the Media

What is the relationship between reporting and creating news?
How has mass media centralized public opinion?
What is the purpose of freedom of the press?
Why does local journalism matter?
Analyze the advantages and disadvantages of a government organization overseeing broadcast media.
Alexis de Tocqueville wrote that Americans were attached to the news. Is this true? Why would this occur in a representative democracy?
How has yellow journalism impacted the way people think about politics? Do personal scandals matter?
How and why has journalism changed, especially in recent decades?
Why is freedom of speech for individuals necessary for freedom and justice?
What role has social media played in the civic body?
Are social media restrictions on what users share violations of freedom of speech? Why or why not?
Test — Politics in Practice

TERMS AND TOPICS

Explain each of the following and the context in which it was discussed during this unit's lessons.

1. split ticket

2. platform

3. referendum

4. recall

5. initiative

6. primary/primary election

7. liberal

8. conservative

9. interest group

10. think tank

11. lobbyist

12. yellow journalism
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and writing should be employed, and responses must fully answer each question.

16. What is the significance of “ballots over bullets”?

17. What has happened to local parties? How did this happen? What are the consequences?

18. What was the purpose of the Electoral College? How does it work?

19. What makes gerrymandering possible, and what are the advantages and disadvantages of this process?

20. What were the limits on voting at the time of the founding? While these were limits compared to today, how did they compare to practices in human history up to the time of the founding?

21. How has suffrage been expanded since the founding?

22. How do citizens learn about or become influenced by public opinion?
23. Why did James Madison say that factions will always exist in a free society? What is the significance of this?

24. How do interest groups act against the wills of individuals?

25. What forms of civic associations have been more traditional in American history? At which levels of government did these associations tend to focus?

26. What is the relationship between reporting and creating news?

27. What is the purpose of freedom of the press?

28. How and why has journalism changed, especially in recent decades?

29. Why is freedom of speech for individuals so necessary for freedom and justice?

30. What role has social media played in the civic body?
Writing Assignment — Politics in Practice

Due on

DIRECTIONS

Citing conversations from class in your argument, write a 500–800-word essay answering the question:

How does the American political process ensure government by the people, and what challenges have emerged in recent decades to these mechanisms for determining representation?
APPENDIX B

Primary Source

Elizabeth Cady Stanton
WOMEN’S RIGHTS CONVENTION

Declarations of Sentiments and Resolutions

DECLARATION

July 19, 1848

Wesleyan Chapel | Seneca Falls, New York

BACKGROUND

Early suffragist leader Elizabeth Cady Stanton drafted this statement at the 1848 Women’s Rights Convention at Seneca Falls.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Who is the "he" referred to in the document?

2. What do the women demand from American society?

---

When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one portion of the family of man to assume among the people of the earth a position different from that which they have hitherto occupied, but one to which the laws of nature and of nature’s God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes that impel them to such a course.

We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men and women are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of those who suffer from it to refuse allegiance to it, and to insist upon the institution of a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they were accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their duty to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security. Such has been the patient sufferance of the women under this government, and such is now the necessity which constrains them to demand the equal station to which they are entitled.

The history of mankind is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations on the part of man toward woman, having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over her. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world.

He has never permitted her to exercise her inalienable right to the elective franchise.

He has compelled her to submit to laws, in the formation of which she had no voice.
He has withheld from her rights which are given to the most ignorant and degraded men—both natives and foreigners.

Having deprived her of this first right of a citizen, the elective franchise, thereby leaving her without representation in the halls of legislation, he has oppressed her on all sides.

He has made her, if married, in the eye of the law, civilly dead.

He has taken from her all right in property, even to the wages she earns.

He has made her, morally, an irresponsible being, as she can commit many crimes with impunity, provided they be done in the presence of her husband. In the covenant of marriage, she is compelled to promise obedience to her husband, he becoming, to all intents and purposes, her master—the law giving him power to deprive her of her liberty, and to administer chastisement.

He has so framed the laws of divorce, as to what shall be the proper causes, and in case of separation, to whom the guardianship of the children shall be given, as to be wholly regardless of the happiness of women—the law, in all cases, going upon a false supposition of the supremacy of man, and giving all power into his hands.

After depriving her of all rights as a married woman, if single, and the owner of property, he has taxed her to support a government which recognizes her only when her property can be made profitable to it.

He has monopolized nearly all the profitable employments, and from those she is permitted to follow, she receives but a scanty remuneration. He closes against her all the avenues to wealth and distinction which he considers most honorable to himself. As a teacher of theology, medicine, or law, she is not known.

He has denied her the facilities for obtaining a thorough education, all colleges being closed against her.
He allows her in Church, as well as State, but a subordinate position, claiming Apostolic authority for her exclusion from the ministry, and, with some exceptions, from any public participation in the affairs of the Church.

He has created a false public sentiment by giving to the world a different code of morals for men and women, by which moral delinquencies which exclude women from society, are not only tolerated, but deemed of little account in man.

He has usurped the prerogative of Jehovah himself, claiming it as his right to assign for her a sphere of action, when that belongs to her conscience and to her God.

He has endeavored, in every way that he could, to destroy her confidence in her own powers, to lessen her self-respect, and to make her willing to lead a dependent and abject life.

Now, in view of this entire disfranchisement of one-half the people of this country, their social and religious degradation— in view of the unjust laws above mentioned, and because women do feel themselves aggrieved, oppressed, and fraudulently deprived of their most sacred rights, we insist that they have immediate admission to all the rights and privileges which belong to them as citizens of the United States.

In entering upon the great work before us, we anticipate no small amount of misconception, misrepresentation, and ridicule; but we shall use every instrumentality within our power to effect our object. We shall employ agents, circulate tracts, petition the State and National legislatures, and endeavor to enlist the pulpit and the press in our behalf. We hope this Convention will be followed by a series of Conventions embracing every part of the country.
UNIT 8
Late 20th Century Government and Politics

UNIT PREVIEW

Structure

LESSON 1  The Civil Rights Movement  5-6 classes  p. 7
LESSON 2  Recent Political Philosophy  4-5 classes  p. 11
LESSON 3  Major Supreme Court Decisions  4-5 classes  p. 19
APPENDIX A  Study Guide, Test, and Writing Assignment  p. 25
APPENDIX B  Primary Sources  p. 37

Why Teach Late 20th Century Government and Politics

Despite ending totalitarian regimes in World War II, many Americans still faced significant forms of legal discrimination and inequality at home even in the latter half of the 20th Century. The civil rights movement sought to address these injustices and to fulfill America’s founding principles of equality before the law based on the inherent equal dignity and natural rights of all people. While it remained to the consciences of individual Americans to decide how they would view their fellow man going forward, in the eyes of the law all people’s rights would be protected equally. Even as the civil rights movement worked to secure such rights, new political philosophies and movements emerged with different ends for government and politics. At the same time, the Supreme Court adopted a new judicial approach to cases before it. Following from such movements, cultural changes, and judicial decisions, novel debates arose concerning equality and
liberty in America. Students who are approaching the full responsibilities of adult citizens should be familiar with these late twentieth century historical debates, especially surrounding equality. After all, the principle that “all men are created equal” is the central idea upon which the United States was established.

What Teachers Should Consider

America’s victory in World War II catapulted her into a promising but strained unknown. America’s status on the world stage was initially unrivaled and then overshadowed by the prospect of nuclear annihilation in the Cold War. Her domestic standard of living was unprecedented. And the experience of having stopped totalitarianism in World War II put in stark relief the unequal treatment of African Americans at home.

The Civil Rights Movement came to a head in the 1950s and 1960s to address the scourges of discrimination, segregation, and unequal protection of rights and enforcement of the law. The movement was diverse in its approaches and its voices. The most prominent was that of Martin Luther King, Jr. His view and perhaps that of the majority of the civil rights movement was that America’s injustices against minorities were not the result of America’s founding but were rather a departure from the principles of America’s founding. As King put it, “When the architects of our republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was a promise that all men, yes, black men as well as white men, would be guaranteed the unalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.”

Through such rhetoric and the sacrifices of thousands of Americans, a bipartisan consensus was reached in the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and subsequent Voting Rights Act in 1965.

Other views also circulated and grew in prominence during the 1960s and 1970s, ones that cast racism and prejudice as the founding ideas of America. New political philosophies also emerged to propose different ends and means for government. And the place of protest and political activism reshaped American politics.

Meanwhile, the United States Supreme Court handed down a number of decisions that tended to mirror or give legal standing to these new political philosophies. The tumult surrounding the Vietnam War and the Watergate Scandal embroiling American politics seemed to justify the recasting of America’s founding and undermined the argument that America was somehow unique in world history. New debates over equality and liberty also came to restructure American political discourse. As America entered the 21st century, many of these debates were expressed in new ways while the scope of the American government grew to new proportions.
How Teachers Can Learn More

TEXTS

The U.S. Constitution: A Reader, ed. Hillsdale College Politics Faculty
“A Letter to the New Left,” C. Wright Mills
Taking Rights Seriously, Ronald Dworkin
American Government and Politics, Joseph Bessette and John Pitney

ONLINE COURSES | Online.Hillsdale.edu

Constitution 101
Constitution 201
Civil Rights in American History
The U.S. Supreme Court

Primary Sources Studied in This Unit

Plessy v. Ferguson
Brown v. Board of Education
“I Have a Dream,” Martin Luther King Jr.
“Letter from Birmingham Jail,” Martin Luther King Jr.
Port Huron Statement, Students for a Democratic Society
“Repressive Tolerance,” Herbert Marcuse
A Theory of Justice, John Rawls
Commencement address at Howard University, Lyndon Johnson
Regents of the University of California v. Bakke
Roe v. Wade
Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania v. Casey, “Mystery of Life” passage
Griswold v. Connecticut
Abrams v. United States, Dissent by Justice Holmes
Gitlow v. New York, Dissent by Justice Holmes
United States v. Carolene Products Company, Footnote 4
Brandenburg v. Ohio
Everson v. Board of Education
Engel v. Vitale
Cohen v. California
Buckley v. Valeo
District of Columbia v. Heller
LESSON PLANS, ASSIGNMENTS, AND FORMATIVE QUIZ
Lesson 1 — The Civil Rights Movement

Lesson Objective

Students learn about the various ideas, figures, and accomplishments of the civil rights movement in the 20th century.

Online Courses for Teachers | Online.Hillsdale.edu

- Civil Rights in American History Lectures 7 and 8
- The U.S. Supreme Court Lecture 8

Primary Sources

Students are to read or, if they have previously read, review the following primary sources. While reading, students should annotate these sources. For particularly challenging texts or if the class is offered earlier in high school, the teacher may wish to provide students with guided reading questions to assist with comprehension, clarity, and direction. Using their annotations and any guided reading questions, students should come to class prepared to participate in a seminar conversation on each text.

- Plessy v. Ferguson
- Brown v. Board of Education
- “I Have a Dream,” Martin Luther King Jr.
- “Letter from Birmingham Jail,” Martin Luther King Jr.

Terms and Topics

discrimination civil rights movement
segregation “promissory note”
“separate but equal” color-blind
civil rights Civil Rights Act of 1964

Questions for the American Mind

- What was the civil rights movement?
- What is the distinction between natural and civil rights?
- How did Martin Luther King Jr. justify the civil rights movement with the Declaration of Independence and the principles of the American founding?
- What did King mean by the “promissory note”?
- In what ways and by what means did the civil rights movement seek to change laws?

In what ways did the civil rights movement seek to change the private consciences of individuals?

Against which forms of discrimination did the early civil rights movement work?

What were the different internal disagreements among participants in the civil rights movement?

How did the civil rights movement address discrimination by businesses?

Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
- Question 112: What did the civil rights movement do?
- Question 113: Martin Luther King Jr. Is famous for many things. Name one.

KEYS TO THE LESSON

Students should understand the fundamental link between the civil rights movement as presented by Martin Luther King Jr. and the founding principles of the United States, namely, the legal equality of each person and his or her possession of natural rights. King saw the civil rights movement as fulfilling the “promissory note” that the American Founders had set forth in the Declaration of Independence, that the Constitution sought to defend, and that abolitionists and the cause of the Union fought to fulfill in the Civil War era. The civil rights movement ensured that the law would be applied equally in the protection of each person’s rights, regardless of skin color. In tandem, King called also for a conversion in the heart of each American, a conversion to color-blindness that only the individual’s own free will could ultimately complete.

Teachers might best plan and teach the Civil Rights Movement with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Begin the lesson with a review of the various historical forms of legal discrimination, segregation, and unequal application of the law. This treatment should include vivid descriptions and explanations of the real world and personal effects of such legal actions for millions of Americans, especially African Americans. From this point, the majority of the lesson is spending several class periods engaged in the primary sources, especially the works of Martin Luther King, Jr.
- Explain to students how the Supreme Court argued in Plessy v. Ferguson that segregation based on race, so long as facilities were the same, would be considered “equal.” Students should think about Justice Harlan’s dissent, however, which appealed to the understanding of equality as found in the Declaration in order to critique the ruling, for the government was still making judgments based on a group identified by skin color instead of treating each person equally under the law.
- Help students to understand the significance of Brown v. Board of Education, especially once it was gradually enforced in the years following the decision. The court arrived at a judgment that aligned with the founding understanding of equality, even though it did not cite the founding principles but instead social science. Consider whether or not basing the decision on social science instead of the founding principles left open the possibility for government discrimination in different forms going forward.
- Consider with students the goals and means of the civil rights movement in the terms in which Martin Luther King Jr. set them. He argued that the civil rights movement was meant to redeem the “promissory note” of the Declaration of Independence and Reconstruction Amendments that founded America on an idea: that since all men are created equal, justice demands that the rule of law be applied equally to all citizens. The civil rights movement, in King’s view, thus carried on the legacy of the founders, Frederick Douglass, and Abraham Lincoln. The two primary sources from King outline this view, its ties to the natural law, and its appeals to the Christian roots of such a political philosophy.
• Spend time outlining what was meant by equality during the civil rights movement, both politically and philosophically. On the civil or political side, the civil rights movement’s appeal to equality in the Declaration of Independence demanded the equal application of the rule of law and the end to laws that established and enforced segregation and discrimination. The rights of all citizens were to be protected equally instead of protecting the rights of only some and not others based on the color of their skin. This was the great achievement of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. On the philosophical or moral side, Martin Luther King, Jr. also as a pastor called for a transformation in the heart of each American. For in addition to reforms in law, a color-blind society requires that each person would decide to view all people as equals in their humanity and rights.

• Clarify with students how the civil rights movement largely focused on the government’s resolve and ability, based on the principle of equality, to enforce equal treatment as opposed to the creation of equity, that is, to enforcing an equality of results and outcomes.

• Revisit some of the historical debates during the latter part of the civil rights movement. For example, although Martin Luther King, Jr. appealed to the individual conscience and not merely the force of law to bring about a color-blind society, some looked to the force of law to change individual consciences.* In these historical debates, some asserted that the letter or enforcement of the Civil Rights Act with respect to public accommodation, for example, tried to force a change in individual opinions, while others argued that some private businesses operate in the public sphere and are therefore subject to public laws.

• Consider the different approaches to political action taken during the civil rights movement. The majority of the movement changed hearts and minds through nonviolent disobedience to unjust laws. They argued that the law was unjust and therefore did not deserve to be followed, and that they would be willing to suffer the legal consequences for breaking it with the hope that others would see by their imprisonment just how unjust the law was. Another segment of the movement advocated more aggressive and sometimes even violent actions, insisting that the whole American legal system was unjust and that revolutionary tactics were therefore justified.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

**Assignment:** Explain the relationship between the Civil Rights Movement as led by Martin Luther King Jr. and the principles of the American founding (3–4 paragraphs).

*This sentence has been revised to make it clear to the reader that King believed Civil Rights reform required changing laws as well as hearts and minds.
Lesson 2 — Recent Political Philosophy

LESSON OBJECTIVE

Students learn about the new political philosophies that emerged during the later 20th Century and their various views on rights and the purpose of government.

ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu

- Civil Rights in American History
  - Lectures 7, 8, 9
- The U.S. Supreme Court
  - Lecture 8
- Constitution 201
  - Lecture 8

PRIMARY SOURCES

Students are to read or, if they have previously read, review the following primary sources. While reading, students should annotate these sources. For particularly challenging texts or if the class is offered earlier in high school, the teacher may wish to provide students with guided reading questions to assist with comprehension, clarity, and direction. Using their annotations and any guided reading questions, students should come to class prepared to participate in a seminar conversation on each text.

- Port Huron Statement, Students for a Democratic Society
- “Repressive Tolerance,” Herbert Marcuse
- A Theory of Justice, John Rawls
- Commencement address at Howard University, Lyndon Johnson
- Regents of the University of California v. Bakke

TERMS AND TOPICS

- personal fulfillment
- culture conflict
- moral judgments
- self-expression
- middle class
- participatory democracy
- social democracy
- socialism
- the New Left
- identity politics
- protest movements
- feminism
- pacifism
- environmentalism
- political correctness
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What were the chief characteristics of each of the following in the late 20th century:
  - academia
  - moral and political philosophy
  - student activism
  - critiques of traditional cultural norms
  - feminism
  - environmentalism
- How did the New Left think differently about rights and the ends of government compared to the Founders?
- What was the connection between being accepted in society and one’s personal fulfillment?
- How did some believe moral judgments based on tradition, religion, or cultural norms were impediments to personal fulfillment and, therefore, violations of rights?
- What was the role of the middle class in these debates?
- To what extent did ideas developed from the writings of Karl Marx inform these new political philosophies and movements?
- What is the relationship between the class conflict within Marxist thought and the cultural conflicts that emerged in the late 20th century?
- What government policies did some movements support in order to bring about cultural change, liberation, and personal fulfillment?
- What is the significance of protest movements? How did these manifest themselves in the 1960s?
- What roles did pacifism and environmentalism play in the 1960s and in the decades since?
- By the late 20th Century, how had Supreme Court jurisprudence changed since Justice John Marshall Harlan’s dissent in Plessy v. Ferguson?
- Is there a difference between equality of opportunity and equality of result(s) (or equity)?

KEYS TO THE LESSON

The purpose of this lesson is to canvas briefly some of the political philosophies and movements that emerged in the late 20th century. Many of these philosophies argued for different conceptions of human society, both in its ends and its means. European thinkers who were generally more critical of the ideas of equality, natural rights, consent, and limited government informed many of these movements. They saw traditional morality, self-government, and natural rights largely as artificial constructs used to perpetuate what they considered the injustices of capitalism. In a country like the United States with a large and politically engaged middle class, the approach of radical social revolution based on the traditional class distinctions that dominated Europe was not available: the ever-expanding breadth of America’s middle class and relative ease of economic opportunity and mobility made the United States much less susceptible to class-based political warfare. Instead, new philosophies were developed that looked to exploit or create different kinds of group identities within American society. This shift from equal rights of each individual grounded in nature toward unequal rights according to one’s group identity (e.g., race or sex) had implications for the role and function of government.

Teachers might best plan and teach Recent Political Philosophy with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Review with students from the beginning of the course the philosophical premises on which America was established. Ask students to consider once more the claims to objective truth and objective morality on which the American regime rests. On one hand, thinkers in the West since
ancient times had seen in nature and in human nature a basic objective reality that the human mind is capable of recognizing and understanding, and upon which government could be based. On the other hand, the founders also argued for the existence of an objective human good, something toward which all human actions should aim and in light of which human beings should act freely in the pursuit of their happiness, but which government had no power to control unless a pursuit violated the natural rights of an individual. It is important to review both of these facets to truth and morality as they relate to establishing self-government and to what a government may and may not do. Many critiques in the late 20th century challenged these presumptions.

- Proceed to reviewing with students the Progressive movement from its philosophical origins through its expression during the Wilson Administration and then through the New Deal.

- The era of progressivism sometimes known as the New Left may best be considered by focusing on the following areas of its thought.
  - First, the New Left argued against assertions of objective truth and morality. Objective reality was inaccessible and such truth claims were replaced by the personal experiences and views of individuals. Truth was understood to be relative to the values of each individual. This held also for truth about the rightness or wrongness of actions, as each person could determine for themselves what was right and wrong. The New Left accounted for historical claims of objectivity as merely constructions put in place by those in power to control those who were not in power. It may be worth exploring that similar critiques are found in the thought of previous European thinkers Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Georg Hegel, and Karl Marx.
  - Second, these arguments meant the New Left understood rights and equality differently than the founding generation. “Natural” rights meant that rights arose from an objective truth found in man’s shared nature, what the founding generation meant by “the Laws of Nature and Nature’s God” in the Declaration of Independence. Since objectivity did not exist, the New Left argued, there was no such thing as a “natural” right and equality based on the equal possession of natural rights did not exist. Likewise, if there is no truth in nature, then it makes no sense to say that all men were equal in any meaningful or fundamental way.
  - Third, and conversely, since each person defined their own sense of identity in place of an objective truth, equality exists only among other people who expressed the same identity (forming a group), not among all people on account of their shared humanity.
  - Fourth, therefore, the role of government cannot be, as the founders had asserted, to secure the natural rights of all individuals who are equal by nature, since the idea of such rights and such equality are simply a fabrication meant to uphold the power of oppressors. Instead, government, in order to achieve equity, is to identify and advance—sometimes by treating groups unequally—the various rights claims that arise out of the different groups with which one identifies. This is what is meant by “identity groups” and “identity politics.”

- Consider how these positions result in a critique of the American founding. For the New Left, the founding may be reduced to an effort by those who are in power to maintain their power by developing a false system of objectivity on which to base civil society and self-government. Some would advocate for a complete overthrow of this system, but most on the New Left sought to modify and use the existing government and political system to protect rights, but group rights as opposed to natural rights.
Explain how many individuals within the New Left and its various causes argued that the ultimate purpose of government was not to protect fundamental rights and liberties (as in the founding), or even to lift all people economically (as in early and New Deal progressivism). Instead, the role of politics, the government, and bureaucracy was to identify, protect, and expand group rights based on group identity, which were often in flux. The question remained, “To protect group rights from what?” For many thinkers, the main threat to group rights came from those who held views or expressed beliefs that there was an objective moral standard to human behavior, since views or laws based on objective moral standards led to unequal treatment, in the view of this new philosophy, of groups who held otherwise. Inequality, therefore, was not the result of laws failing to protect natural rights, but was born of the prejudices that the oppressor group imposed on the oppressed group when asserting objective standards for moral conduct.

Consider the extent to which such views were informed by the thought of Karl Marx. Instead of focusing on economics and class conflict, these movements generally focused on the other supports (e.g., family, religious belief, culture, principles of self-government) they believed were utilized by the traditional middle class in their practice of capitalism to oppress the less fortunate.

Read with students excerpts from the Port Huron Statement and “Repressive Tolerance.” The above-mentioned ideas are captured in each work, and the works outline certain practical ideas for adoption. One such action was to outlaw intolerant thought and speech as oppressive to an individual’s personal fulfillment.

Read with students John Rawls’s A Theory of Justice. Highlight with students Rawls’s argument that if everybody acknowledged their advantages and privileges, they would live so as to prioritize the economically and socially disadvantaged. Note his view that it is the job of government to take away advantages from those who do not recognize their advantages and privileges and redistribute not merely material resources but also societal and cultural honor and respect—the very sources of a human being’s sense of dignity and self. Ask students what this means for the American founding’s principle of inherent human dignity of each person, as articulated in the words “all men are created equal.”

Help students understand recent debates about affirmative action. Discuss the traditional definition of affirmative action as actions (especially in law and government policy) that treat some groups in a more beneficial way than it does others in order to address real or perceived unequal group outcomes. Attempts to address these injustices are usually well intended, and individuals, groups, or organizations in their personal or private capacities have long worked to correct those injustices, especially concerning those unable to defend themselves. The civic question involves whether assembling the powers of the government to correct the consequences of injustice is an extension of America’s founding principles or if it may result in a new injustice. This is a worthwhile historical debate that may arise in this lesson.

Make clear for students how the ideas of liberation and social justice were important in the modern feminist movement and the sexual revolution. Assertions of new rights to privacy and self-expression against the moral judgments of parents, religious institutions, and established moral codes coalesced into group identity. Liberation and justice for the social group replaced these traditional institutions as individuals expressed their own identities and found community with others who did the same.

Share with students the role of communal acceptance through activism and protest that took hold during the 1960s, whether it was a later element of the civil rights movement, in opposition to the Vietnam War, or for environmentalism. On the environmentalism point, consider that what was unique about this form of environmentalism was the placement of environmental concerns
always and absolutely above human concerns and the willingness to use government force to carry out such priorities.

**STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT**

**Assignment:** Explain the moral and political philosophy of the New Left, particularly as it concerns the understanding of rights and the new realms of government activity necessary to fulfill such an understanding (2–3 paragraphs).
Unit 8 — Formative Quiz

Covering Lessons 1–2
10-15 minutes

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. How did Martin Luther King Jr. justify the civil rights movement with the Declaration of Independence and the principles of the American founding?

2. In what ways and by what means did the civil rights movement seek to change laws?

3. How did the New Left think differently about rights and the ends of government compared to the Founders?

4. How did some believe moral judgments based on tradition, religion, or cultural norms were impediments to personal fulfillment and, therefore, violations of rights?

5. What government policies did some movements support in order to bring about cultural change, liberation, and personal fulfillment?
Lesson 3 — Major Supreme Court Decisions

**LESSON OBJECTIVE**

Students learn about the major Supreme Court decisions of the late twentieth century and their relationship to civil rights, civil liberties, cultural changes, and the role of the Court itself.

**ONLINE COURSES FOR TEACHERS | Online.Hillsdale.edu**

- *Constitution 201* Lectures 7 and 8
- *The U.S. Supreme Court* Lectures 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10

**TEXTS**

Students are to read or, if they have previously read, review the following primary sources. While reading, students should annotate these sources. For particularly challenging texts or if the class is offered earlier in high school, the teacher may wish to provide students with guided reading questions to assist with comprehension, clarity, and direction. Using their annotations and any guided reading questions, students should come to class prepared to participate in a seminar conversation on each text.

- *Roe v. Wade*
- *Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania v. Casey*, “Mystery of Life” passage
- *Griswold v. Connecticut*
- *Abrams v. United States*, Dissent by Justice Holmes
- *Gitlow v. New York*, Dissent by Justice Holmes
- *United States v. Carolene Products Company*, Footnote 4
- *Brandenburg v. Ohio*
- *Everson v. Board of Education*
- *Engel v. Vitale*
- *Cohen v. California*
- *Buckley v. Valeo*
- *District of Columbia v. Heller*

Students should also read the below texts and come to class prepared to complete a short reading quiz on the contents of the readings. The reading quiz should be based on questions on pages 171–172 of *American Government and Politics*.

- **American Government and Politics** Chapter 5

**TERMS AND TOPICS**

- originalism
- living Constitution
- judicial activism
- “preferred freedoms”
- Bill of Rights
- 14th Amendment
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

- What kinds of cases did the Supreme Court decide to focus on in the late twentieth century?
- What is the difference between originalism and a living Constitution?
- How has the Supreme Court utilized the incorporation doctrine to apply the Bill of Rights to the states?
- What was the relationship between cultural and moral changes and the Supreme Court’s review, discovery, and incorporation of rights?
- How did family structure and supports change with the culture during the 1960s and 1970s?
- On what basis were rights to privacy and to abortion asserted by the Supreme Court?
- What is feminism?
- What have been the arguments and motivations for the liberalization of immigration policy?
- How has freedom of religion been both curtailed and protected by recent Supreme Court decisions?
- How have freedom of speech and freedom of the press been both curtailed and protected by recent Supreme Court decisions?

KEYS TO THE LESSON

In recent decades, the Supreme Court shifted away from understanding the Constitution in its original meaning as intended by those who wrote and ratified the Constitution and relied more on an evolving or “living Constitution” view. It sought to meet the questions and challenges of the day with a degree of doubt concerning both the permanency of the Founders’ views and the Court’s responsibility to apply them definitively despite contemporary circumstances. The Court has increasingly relied on the latest views of academic thought, contemporary science, and a general pragmatism in deciding cases, rather than attempting to apply the original meaning of the Constitution and its amendments. These novel approaches, moreover, were applied amidst many meaningful cultural changes, both shaping and being influenced by them.

Teachers might best plan and teach Major Supreme Court Decisions with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Review with students the role of the Supreme Court as one branch of government designed to uphold the basic rights and framework of the United States Constitution. The role of the Court in our constitutional system is to adjudicate the cases and controversies that come before the Court in light of the Constitution.
• Set up this lesson by explaining to students the new focus the Supreme Court would have in the second half of the twentieth century as articulated in its fourth footnote in *United States v. Carolene Products Co.* The Supreme Court in this footnote stated that having repeatedly upheld the government’s ability to regulate nearly any activity that has an economic effect, the Court would in future years shift away from cases concerning economic activity. Instead, the Court would become more concerned with civil liberties, the democratic process, and questions of discrimination. Rather than simply judging as disputes arise before it, the Court would now choose cases that tacked toward these issues, one component of what some would criticize as “judicial activism.”

• Explain how the new direction and what some considered “activism” that the Supreme Court would take led to its reevaluating a host of ideas about rights. The result was that some rights were expanded while others were restricted. Undergirding it all were evolving standards of what is just and what freedom demands. The overall message from the Court was generally that the government cannot judge or base its laws on how people decide to use their freedom. For example, the Court would utilize the 14th Amendment to discover more and greater freedoms. Some argued that this approach challenged the moral philosophy of the founding generation.

• Spend some time with students to consider the changes that the Supreme Court wrought in criminal law. In particular, focus on the incorporation of civil liberties related to criminals by applying the due process clause of the 14th Amendment to expand the rights protected in the 4th, 5th, 6th, and 8th amendments. This would include the exclusionary rule, Miranda rights, and the right to an attorney at the taxpayers’ expense. While many rulings make logical sense, their combination, alongside the shift in cultural focus away from protecting the innocent toward rehabilitating the criminal, led some to conclude that the rulings were at least somewhat responsible for higher crime rates during the 1970s and ’80s. This challenged the founding view that while rehabilitation is necessary, it must not come at the expense of protecting the innocent.

• Consider with students the Supreme Court’s assertion of a new right to privacy. In and of itself, the Constitution, by implication, also guarantees a right to privacy. The shift that the Supreme Court made through *Griswold v. Connecticut*, *Roe v. Wade*, and *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* was that the government did not have power to prevent private activities that might harm others (or society in general) simply by claiming that such activities were untethered from nature. In these instances, preventing or aborting the natural result of a natural biological act—one that normally promotes family life and the procreation of future citizens—was deemed to be legal. The Court indicated that the public interest for family life and the country’s population do not constitute a government interest or power to limit practices that inhibit them (e.g., abortion), as such limits on what were judged to be private practices infringed on the individual’s personal fulfillment.

• Read with students aloud in class and discuss the paradigmatic statement on not only new understandings of liberty, truth, and justice, but also how the Supreme Court ushered in such moral and political shifts: Justice Kennedy’s “Mystery of Life” passage from *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*. Students should consider the extent to which this argument for the relativity of truth is compatible with the American founding. That is, does *liberty* so construed become separated from the nature of things, from truth, and from the prerequisites for a free and just society that respects the inherent human dignity of each person? To what extent is this conception of liberty compatible with reason, logic, justice, and equality, and with the experience of our daily lives?

• Track with students the changes in the right to freedom of speech. Although there was some question regarding the protection of revolutionary speech in the founding generation, the
understanding that political speech and written arguments were permissible was widely held. Indeed, America’s history catalogs the remarkable and continuous protection of the freedom of speech as a fundamental component to a free society. The greatest shift in freedom of speech came in the 1960s and afterwards as the Supreme Court in *Cohen v. California* established a new right to freedom of expression. “Expression” was again separate from a moral foundation as the Court accepted expressive speech as another form of the new focus on personal self-fulfillment in the eyes of society. The liberalization of laws curbing obscenity in public and the publication of obscene materials were the immediate conduits for this change.

- Help students to see the changes in the freedom of religion in the last several decades. The First Amendment’s free exercise clause and establishment clause capture the Founders’ general consensus on religious freedom. It was necessary that individuals be permitted to express their religion so long as it did not infringe on the rights of another. And it was necessary that there not be an official church of the United States at the national level. The question of official churches at the state level varied from the actual existence of official churches to those who argued against them. But what is equally important is the emphasis the Founders placed, as evident in their speeches and writings, on a people practicing religion for free self-government. Review with students the Founders’ various statements on this point from Unit 1. They held the general position that government should express a mild support and encouragement of religion, so long as all were free to practice their own religion. Beginning in the New Deal and accelerating in the 1960s, the Supreme Court began to limit government support for religion. The shift first came in requiring schools to become more secular, which tracked with the general secularization of the country and culture. Government could not support, even indirectly, the promotion of religious belief that held to certain moral judgments about others, especially about groups perceived to be oppressed. The Court’s strict application of the establishment clause has led some to argue has curtailed the free exercise clause in certain cases.

- Discuss the arguments made in recent cases on marriage, sex, and the family between removing such decisions from state legislatures and localities and concentrating them in the federal courts or leaving them to local legislatures to address.

- Consider with students attempts to limit the right to bear arms but also the Supreme Court’s general reluctance to hear cases that infringe on this right. At the founding, the essential natural law purposes of the right to bear arms was both for personal self-defense and for guarding against and preventing tyranny. Some argue that the latter purpose has operated as a deterrence that has slowed attempts to limit other rights in recent decades while others argue for greater limits on this right.

- Consider with students whether the inconsistency in these shifts concerning rights is problematic. For instance, some argue that relativistic views and actions assert as much of a moral claim as views and actions rooted in traditional religion or objective reality and nature, but that the former have generally been advanced at the expense of the latter. When views on liberty that are relativistic thus meet with understandings of liberty rooted in a claim to objective truth, students should consider how the issue can logically be resolved, and whether it has been resolved. In the United States, in light of both its unprecedented achievements for human life and the first principles on which it was founded, can relativism effectively replace the principles on which it was founded? Why or why not? What would be the consequences? Has this been tried before in other times or countries?
• In addition to the cases highlighted above, students may also benefit from summary explanations of the following cases: Gideon v. Wainright; Miranda v. Arizona; in re Gault; Tinker v. Des Moines; Hazelwood v. Kuhlmeier; United States v. Nixon; Bush v. Gore; Texas v. Johnson; Mapp v. Ohio; Obergefell v. Hodges; Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization; Kennedy v. Bremerton School District; Carson v. Makin.

STRENGTHENING UNDERSTANDING: POST-LESSON ASSIGNMENT

Assignment: Explain the major Supreme Court rulings of the late twentieth century pertaining to criminal rights, privacy, speech, and religion (2–3 paragraphs).
APPENDIX A

Study Guide

Test

Writing Assignment
Study Guide — Late 20th Century Government and Politics Test

TERMS AND TOPICS

Explain each of the following and the context in which it was discussed during this unit’s lessons.

discrimination
segregation
separate but equal
civil rights
civil rights movement
promissory note
color-blind
the New Left
Marxism
personal fulfillment
culture conflict
moral judgments
middle class
participatory democracy
social democracy
socialism
identity politics
protest movements
feminism
pacifism
environmentalism
political correctness
originalism
living Constitution
preferred freedoms
Bill of Rights
14th Amendment
Due Process Clause
incorporation doctrine
criminal procedure
rights of criminals
sexual revolution
right to privacy
right to abortion
Equal Protection Clause
religious liberty
free exercise of religion
Establishment Clause
freedom of speech
freedom of the press
rights to assembly and petition

PRIMARY SOURCES

Explain the main arguments in each of the following sources and their significance to our understanding of late twentieth century government and politics.

Plessy v. Ferguson
Brown v. Board of Education
“I Have a Dream,” Martin Luther King Jr.
“Letter from Birmingham Jail,” Martin Luther King Jr.
Port Huron Statement, Students for a Democratic Society
“Repressive Tolerance,” Herbert Marcuse
A Theory of Justice, John Rawls
Commencement address at Howard University, Lyndon Johnson
Regents of the University of California v. Bakke
Roe v. Wade
Planned Parenthood v. Casey, “Mystery of Life” passage
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.

Lesson 1 | The Civil Rights Movement

☐ What was the civil rights movement?
☐ How did Martin Luther King Jr. justify the civil rights movement with the Declaration of Independence and the principles of the American founding?
☐ What did King mean by the “promissory note”?
☐ In what ways did the civil rights movement seek to change laws?
☐ In what ways did the civil rights movement seek to change the private consciences of individuals?
☐ Against which forms of discrimination did the early civil rights movement work?
☐ What were the differences between the early and late stages of the civil rights movement?
☐ How did the civil rights movement address discrimination by businesses?

Lesson 2 | Recent Political Philosophy

☐ What were the chief characteristics of each of the following in the late 20th century:
  – academia
  – moral and political philosophy
  – student activism
  – critiques of traditional cultural norms
  – feminism
  – environmentalism
☐ To what extent did these various movements make up what came to be called the New Left?
☐ What was the connection between being accepted in society and one’s personal fulfillment?
☐ How did some believe moral judgments based on tradition, religion, or cultural norms were impediments to personal fulfillment and, therefore, violations of rights?
☐ What was the role of the middle class in these debates?
☐ To what extent did ideas developed from the writings of Karl Marx inform these new political philosophies and movements?
☐ What is the relationship between the class conflict within Marxist thought and the cultural conflicts that emerged in the late 20th century?
☐ What government policies did some movements support in order to bring about cultural change, liberation, and personal fulfillment?
☐ What is the significance of protest movements? How did these manifest themselves in the 1960s?
☐ What roles did pacifism and environmentalism play in the 1960s and in the decades since?
☐ By the late 20th Century, how had Supreme Court jurisprudence changed since Justice John Marshall Harlan’s dissent in Plessy v. Ferguson?
Lesson 3 | Major Supreme Court Decisions

☐ What kinds of cases did the Supreme Court decide to focus on in the late twentieth century?
☐ What is the difference between originalism and a living Constitution?
☐ How has the Supreme Court utilized the incorporation doctrine to apply the Bill of Rights to the states?
☐ What was the relationship between cultural and moral changes and the Supreme Court’s review, discovery, and incorporation of rights?
☐ How did family structure and supports change with the culture during the 1960s and 1970s?
☐ On what basis were rights to privacy and to abortion asserted by the Supreme Court?
☐ What is feminism?
☐ What have been the arguments and motivations for the liberalization of immigration policy?
☐ How has freedom of religion been both curtailed and protected by recent Supreme Court decisions?
☐ How have freedom of speech and freedom of the press been both curtailed and protected by recent Supreme Court decisions?
Test — Late 20th Century Government and Politics

**TERMS AND TOPICS**

*Explain each of the following and the context in which it was discussed during this unit’s lessons.*

1. discrimination

2. separate but equal

3. civil rights

4. promissory note

5. color-blind

6. Marxism

7. culture conflict

8. political correctness

9. environmentalism

10. living Constitution

11. preferred freedoms

12. right to privacy
PRIMARY SOURCES

Explain the main arguments in each of the following sources and the significance of each to understanding late twentieth century government and politics.

13. Brown v. Board of Education

14. “I Have a Dream,” Martin Luther King Jr.

15. Planned Parenthood v. Casey, “Mystery of Life” passage
QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and writing should be employed, and responses must fully answer each question.


17. Against what forms of discrimination did the early civil rights movement work?

18. How did Martin Luther King Jr. justify the civil rights movement with the Declaration of Independence and the principles of the American founding?

19. In what ways did the civil rights movement seek to change laws?

20. In what ways did the civil rights movement seek to change the private consciences of individuals?

21. What were the differences between the early and late stages of the civil rights movement?

22. What was the connection between being accepted in society and one’s personal fulfillment?

23. How did some believe moral judgments based on tradition, religion, or cultural norms were impediments to personal fulfillment and, therefore, violations of rights?

24. What was the role of the middle class in these debates?

25. What is the relationship between the class conflict of Marxism and the cultural conflicts that emerged in the Late 20th century?
26. What is the difference between originalism and a living Constitution?

27. What government policies did some movements support in order to bring about cultural change, liberation, and personal fulfillment?

28. By the late 20th Century, how had Supreme Court jurisprudence changed since Justice John Marshall Harlan’s dissent in *Plessy v. Ferguson*?

29. What kinds of cases did the Supreme Court decide to focus on in the late twentieth century?

30. How has the Supreme Court utilized the incorporation doctrine to apply the Bill of Rights to the states?

31. What was the relationship between cultural and moral changes and the Supreme Court’s review, discovery, and incorporation of rights?

32. On what basis were rights to privacy and to abortion asserted by the Supreme Court?

33. How has freedom of religion been both curtailed and protected by recent Supreme Court decisions?

34. How have freedom of speech and freedom of the press been both curtailed and protected by recent Supreme Court decisions?
Writing Assignment — Late 20th Century Government and Politics

DIRECTIONS

Citing primary sources and conversations from class in your argument, write a 500–800-word essay answering the question:

To what extent and in which ways did the Civil Rights Movement, recent political philosophies, and Supreme Court decisions in the late 20th century engage with the ideas of the Declaration of Independence and Constitution as understood by the founding generation?
APPENDIX B

Primary Sources

The United States Supreme Court

Martin Luther King Jr.

Students for a Democratic Society

Herbert Marcuse

John Rawls

Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr.

Lyndon Johnson
JUSTICE HENRY BILLINGS BROWN AND JUSTICE JOHN MARSHALL HARLAN

Homer A. Plessy v. John H. Ferguson

U.S. SUPREME COURT MAJORITY AND DISSenting OPINIONS EXCERPTS

May 18, 1896

Supreme Court | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

A majority of the Supreme Court delivered this ruling on a Louisiana law requiring separate railroad cars for African Americans. Justice John Marshall Harlan offered his dissenting view.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. On what two constitutional grounds is the law being challenged, and why does the Court say that neither applies?

2. How does Justice Brown respond to the charge that enforced separation "stamps the colored race with a badge of inferiority"?

3. According to Justice Harlan’s dissent, what is the relationship between civil rights and race under the Constitution?

4. According to Harlan, what was the original purpose of the Louisiana statute in question?

5. What is the standing of the white race in America, as Harlan sees it?

6. Why is "equal accommodation" of citizens of different races ultimately problematic for Harlan, in terms of freedom?

---

Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537 (1896).
JUSTICE BROWN delivers the opinion of the Court.

[Homer Plessy] was a citizen of the United States and a resident of the State of Louisiana, of mixed descent, in the proportion of seven eighths Caucasian and one eighth African blood; that the mixture of colored blood was not discernible in him, and that he was entitled to every recognition, right, privilege and immunity secured to the citizens of the United States of the white race by its Constitution and laws; that, on June 7, 1892, he engaged and paid for a first class passage on the East Louisiana Railway from New Orleans to Covington, in the same State, and thereupon entered a passenger train, and took possession of a vacant seat in a coach where passengers of the white race were accommodated; that such railroad company was incorporated by the laws of Louisiana as a common carrier, and was not authorized to distinguish between citizens according to their race. But, notwithstanding this, [Plessy] was required by the conductor, under penalty of ejection from said train and imprisonment, to vacate said coach and occupy another seat in a coach assigned by said company for persons not of the white race, and for no other reason than that petitioner was of the colored race; that, upon petitioner’s refusal to comply with such order, he was, with the aid of a police officer, forcibly ejected from said coach and hurried off to and imprisoned in the parish jail of New Orleans, and there held to answer a charge made by such officer to the effect that he was guilty of having criminally violated an act of the General Assembly of the State, approved July 10, 1890, in such case made and provided.

[Plessy] was subsequently brought before the recorder of the city for preliminary examination and committed for trial to the criminal District Court for the parish of Orleans, where an information was filed against him in the matter above set forth, for a violation of the above act, which act [Plessy] affirmed to be null and void, because in conflict with the Constitution of the United States . . . .

The constitutionality of this act is attacked upon the ground that it conflicts both with the Thirteenth Amendment of the Constitution, abolishing slavery, and the Fourteenth Amendment, which prohibits certain restrictive legislation on the part of the States.
1. That it does not conflict with the Thirteenth Amendment, which abolished slavery and involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, is too clear for argument. Slavery implies involuntary servitude—a state of bondage; the ownership of mankind as a chattel, or at least the control of the labor and services of one man for the benefit of another, and the absence of a legal right to the disposal of his own person, property and services. . . .

A statute which implies merely a legal distinction between the white and colored races—a distinction which is founded in the color of the two races and which must always exist so long as white men are distinguished from the other race by color—has no tendency to destroy the legal equality of the two races, or reestablish a state of involuntary servitude. Indeed, we do not understand that the Thirteenth Amendment is strenuously relied upon by the plaintiff in error in this connection.

2. By the Fourteenth Amendment, all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are made citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside, and the States are forbidden from making or enforcing any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, or shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or deny to any person within their jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. . . .

The object of the amendment was undoubtedly to enforce the absolute equality of the two races before the law, but, in the nature of things, it could not have been intended to abolish distinctions based upon color, or to enforce social, as distinguished from political, equality, or a commingling of the two races upon terms unsatisfactory to either. Laws permitting, and even requiring, their separation in places where they are liable to be brought into contact do not necessarily imply the inferiority of either race to the other, and have been generally, if not universally, recognized as within the competency of the state legislatures in the exercise of their police power. The most common instance of this is connected with the establishment of separate schools for white and colored children, which has been held to be a valid exercise of the legislative power even by courts of States where the political rights of the colored race have been longest and most earnestly enforced. . . .
. . . [W]e think the enforced separation of the races, as applied to the internal commerce of the State, neither abridges the privileges or immunities of the colored man, deprives him of his property without due process of law, nor denies him the equal protection of the laws within the meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment. . . .

We consider the underlying fallacy of the plaintiff’s argument to consist in the assumption that the enforced separation of the two races stamps the colored race with a badge of inferiority. If this be so, it is not by reason of anything found in the act, but solely because the colored race chooses to put that construction upon it. The argument necessarily assumes that if, as has been more than once the case and is not unlikely to be so again, the colored race should become the dominant power in the state legislature, and should enact a law in precisely similar terms, it would thereby relegate the white race to an inferior position. We imagine that the white race, at least, would not acquiesce in this assumption. The argument also assumes that social prejudices may be overcome by legislation, and that equal rights cannot be secured to the negro except by an enforced commingling of the two races. We cannot accept this proposition. If the two races are to meet upon terms of social equality, it must be the result of natural affinities, a mutual appreciation of each other’s merits, and a voluntary consent of individuals. As was said by the Court of Appeals of New York in People v. Gallagher, 93 N. Y. 438, 448, “this end can neither be accomplished nor promoted by laws which conflict with the general sentiment of the community upon whom they are designed to operate. When the government, therefore, has secured to each of its citizens equal rights before the law and equal opportunities for improvement and progress, it has accomplished the end for which it was organized, and performed all of the functions respecting social advantages with which it is endowed.”

Legislation is powerless to eradicate racial instincts or to abolish distinctions based upon physical differences, and the attempt to do so can only result in accentuating the difficulties of the present situation. If the civil and political rights of both races be equal, one cannot be inferior to the other civilly or politically. If one race be inferior to the other socially, the Constitution of the United States cannot put them upon the same plane. . . .
... The judgment of the court below is, therefore, Affirmed.

JUSTICE HARLAN, dissenting.

... [W]e have before us a state enactment that compels, under penalties, the separation of the two races in railroad passenger coaches, and makes it a crime for a citizen of either race to enter a coach that has been assigned to citizens of the other race.

Thus, the State regulates the use of a public highway by citizens of the United States solely upon the basis of race.

However apparent the injustice of such legislation may be, we have only to consider whether it is consistent with the Constitution of the United States. . . .

In respect of civil rights common to all citizens, the Constitution of the United States does not, I think, permit any public authority to know the race of those entitled to be protected in the enjoyment of such rights. Every true man has pride of race, and, under appropriate circumstances, when the rights of others, his equals before the law, are not to be affected, it is his privilege to express such pride and to take such action based upon it as to him seems proper. But I deny that any legislative body or judicial tribunal may have regard to the race of citizens when the civil rights of those citizens are involved. Indeed, such legislation as that here in question is inconsistent not only with that equality of rights which pertains to citizenship, National and State, but with the personal liberty enjoyed by everyone within the United States.

The Thirteenth Amendment does not permit the withholding or the deprivation of any right necessarily inhering in freedom. It not only struck down the institution of slavery as previously existing in the United States, but it prevents the imposition of any burdens or disabilities that constitute badges of slavery or servitude. It decreed universal civil freedom in this country. This court has so adjudged. But that amendment having been found inadequate to the protection of the rights of those who had been in slavery, it was followed by
the Fourteenth Amendment, which added greatly to the dignity and glory of American citizenship and to the security of personal liberty by declaring that “all persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside,” and that “no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”

These two amendments, if enforced according to their true intent and meaning, will protect all the civil rights that pertain to freedom and citizenship. Finally, and to the end that no citizen should be denied, on account of his race, the privilege of participating in the political control of his country, it was declared by the Fifteenth Amendment that “the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude.”

These notable additions to the fundamental law were welcomed by the friends of liberty throughout the world. They removed the race line from our governmental systems. They had, as this court has said, a common purpose, namely to secure “to a race recently emancipated, a race that through many generations have been held in slavery, all the civil rights that the superior race enjoy.”

They declared, in legal effect, this court has further said, “that the law in the States shall be the same for the black as for the white; that all persons, whether colored or white, shall stand equal before the laws of the States, and, in regard to the colored race, for whose protection the amendment was primarily designed, that no discrimination shall be made against them by law because of their color.” . . . It was said in argument that the statute of Louisiana does not discriminate against either race, but prescribes a rule applicable alike to white and colored citizens. But this argument does not meet the difficulty. Everyone knows that the statute in question had its origin in the purpose not so much to exclude white persons from railroad cars occupied by blacks as to exclude colored people from coaches occupied by or assigned to white persons. Railroad corporations of Louisiana did not make
discrimination among whites in the matter of accommodation for travelers. The thing to accomplish was, under the guise of giving equal accommodation for whites and blacks, to compel the latter to keep to themselves while traveling in railroad passenger coaches. No one would be so wanting in candor as to assert the contrary. The fundamental objection, therefore, to the statute is that it interferes with the personal freedom of citizens.

It is one thing for railroad carriers to furnish, or to be required by law to furnish, equal accommodations for all whom they are under a legal duty to carry. It is quite another thing for government to forbid citizens of the white and black races from traveling in the same public conveyance, and to punish officers of railroad companies for permitting persons of the two races to occupy the same passenger coach. If a State can prescribe, as a rule of civil conduct, that whites and blacks shall not travel as passengers in the same railroad coach, why may it not so regulate the use of the streets of its cities and towns as to compel white citizens to keep on one side of a street and black citizens to keep on the other? Why may it not, upon like grounds, punish whites and blacks who ride together in streetcars or in open vehicles on a public road or street? Why may it not require sheriffs to assign whites to one side of a courtroom and blacks to the other? And why may it not also prohibit the comingling of the two races in the galleries of legislative halls or in public assemblages convened for the consideration of the political questions of the day? Further, if this statute of Louisiana is consistent with the personal liberty of citizens, why may not the State require the separation in railroad coaches of native and naturalized citizens of the United States, or of Protestants and Roman Catholics?

The white race deems itself to be the dominant race in this country. And so it is in prestige, in achievements, in education, in wealth and in power. So, I doubt not, it will continue to be for all time if it remains true to its great heritage and holds fast to the principles of constitutional liberty. But in view of the Constitution, in the eye of the law, there is in this country no superior, dominant, ruling class of citizens. There is no caste here. Our Constitution is color-blind, and neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens. In respect of civil rights, all citizens are equal before the law. The humblest is the peer of the most powerful. The law regards man as man, and takes no account of his surroundings or of his color.
when his civil rights as guaranteed by the supreme law of the land are involved. It is there-fore to be regretted that this high tribunal, the final expositor of the fundamental law of the land, has reached the conclusion that it is competent for a State to regulate the enjoyment by citizens of their civil rights solely upon the basis of race.

In my opinion, the judgment this day rendered will, in time, prove to be quite as pernicious as the decision made by this tribunal in the *Dred Scott Case*. It was adjudged in that case that the descendants of Africans who were imported into this country and sold as slaves were not included nor intended to be included under the word “citizens” in the Constitution, and could not claim any of the rights and privileges which that instrument provided for and secured to citizens of the United States; that, at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, they were “considered as a subordinate and inferior class of beings, who had been subjugated by the dominant race, and, whether emancipated or not, yet remained subject to their authority, and had no rights or privileges but such as those who held the power and the government might choose to grant them.”

The recent amendments of the Constitution, it was supposed, had eradicated these principles from our institutions. But it seems that we have yet, in some of the States, a dominant race—a superior class of citizens, which assumes to regulate the enjoyment of civil rights, common to all citizens, upon the basis of race. The present decision, it may well be apprehended, will not only stimulate aggressions, more or less brutal and irritating, upon the admitted rights of colored citizens, but will encourage the belief that it is possible, by means of state enactments, to defeat the beneficent purposes which the people of the United States had in view when they adopted the recent amendments of the Constitution, by one of which the blacks of this country were made citizens of the United States and of the States in which they respectively reside, and whose privileges and immunities, as citizens, the States are forbidden to abridge. Sixty millions of whites are in no danger from the presence here of eight millions of blacks. The destinies of the two races in this country are indissolubly linked together, and the interests of both require that the common government of all shall not permit the seeds of race hate to be planted under the sanction of law. What can more certainly arouse race hate, what more certainly create and perpetuate a feeling of distrust
between these races, than state enactments which, in fact, proceed on the ground that colored citizens are so inferior and degraded that they cannot be allowed to sit in public coaches occupied by white citizens. That, as all will admit, is the real meaning of such legislation as was enacted in Louisiana.

The sure guarantee of the peace and security of each race is the clear, distinct, unconditional recognition by our governments, National and State, of every right that inheres in civil freedom, and of the equality before the law of all citizens of the United States, without regard to race. State enactments regulating the enjoyment of civil rights upon the basis of race, and cunningly devised to defeat legitimate results of the war under the pretense of recognizing equality of rights, can have no other result than to render permanent peace impossible and to keep alive a conflict of races the continuance of which must do harm to all concerned. This question is not met by the suggestion that social equality cannot exist between the white and black races in this country. That argument, if it can be properly regarded as one, is scarcely worthy of consideration, for social equality no more exists between two races when traveling in a passenger coach or a public highway than when members of the same races sit by each other in a street car or in the jury box, or stand or sit with each other in a political assembly, or when they use in common the street of a city or town, or when they are in the same room for the purpose of having their names placed on the registry of voters, or when they approach the ballot box in order to exercise the high privilege of voting.

There is a race so different from our own that we do not permit those belonging to it to become citizens of the United States. Persons belonging to it are, with few exceptions, absolutely excluded from our country. I allude to the Chinese race. But, by the statute in question, a Chinaman can ride in the same passenger coach with white citizens of the United States, while citizens of the black race in Louisiana, many of whom, perhaps, risked their lives for the preservation of the Union, who are entitled, by law, to participate in the political control of the State and nation, who are not excluded, by law or by reason of their race, from public stations of any kind, and who have all the legal rights that belong to white citizens, are yet declared to be criminals, liable to imprisonment, if they ride in a public
coach occupied by citizens of the white race. It is scarcely just to say that a colored citizen should not object to occupying a public coach assigned to his own race. He does not object, nor, perhaps, would he object to separate coaches for his race if his rights under the law were recognized. But he [is] objecting, and ought never to cease objecting, to the proposition that citizens of the white and black race can be adjudged criminals because they sit, or claim the right to sit, in the same public coach on a public highway.

The arbitrary separation of citizens on the basis of race while they are on a public highway is a badge of servitude wholly inconsistent with the civil freedom and the equality before the law established by the Constitution. It cannot be justified upon any legal grounds.

If evils will result from the commingling of the two races upon public highways established for the benefit of all, they will be infinitely less than those that will surely come from state legislation regulating the enjoyment of civil rights upon the basis of race. We boast of the freedom enjoyed by our people above all other peoples. But it is difficult to reconcile that boast with a state of the law which, practically, puts the brand of servitude and degradation upon a large class of our fellow citizens, our equals before the law. The thin disguise of “equal” accommodations for passengers in railroad coaches will not mislead anyone, nor atone for the wrong this day done.

I am of opinion that the statute of Louisiana is inconsistent with the personal liberty of citizens, white and black, in that State, and hostile to both the spirit and letter of the Constitution of the United States. If laws of like character should be enacted in the several States of the Union, the effect would be in the highest degree mischievous. Slavery, as an institution tolerated by law would, it is true, have disappeared from our country, but there would remain a power in the States, by sinister legislation, to interfere with the full enjoyment of the blessings of freedom to regulate civil rights, common to all citizens, upon the basis of race, and to place in a condition of legal inferiority a large body of American citizens now constituting a part of the political community called the People of the United States, for whom and by whom, through representatives, our government is administered. Such a sys-
tem is inconsistent with the guarantee given by the Constitution to each State of a republic-
can form of government, and may be stricken down by Congressional action, or by the
courts in the discharge of their solemn duty to maintain the supreme law of the land, any-
thing in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

For the reasons stated, I am constrained to withhold my assent from the opinion and judg-
ment of the majority.
BACKGROUND

This case was the consolidation of cases arising in Kansas, South Carolina, Virginia, Delaware, and Washington, D.C. relating to the segregation of public schools on the basis of race. In each of the cases, African American students had been denied admittance to certain public schools based on laws allowing public education to be racially segregated. Chief Justice Earl Warren penned this opinion to the Court’s ruling.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What effect do separate schools have on students, according to the decision?

2. What does the court ultimately hold?

3. On what bases does the Court make its decision?

---

These cases come to us from the States of Kansas, South Carolina, Virginia, and Delaware. They are premised on different facts and different local conditions, but a common legal question justifies their consideration together in this consolidated opinion.

In each of the cases, minors of the Negro race, through their legal representatives, seek the aid of the courts in obtaining admission to the public schools of their community on a nonsegregated basis. In each instance, they had been denied admission to schools attended by white children under laws requiring or permitting segregation according to race. This segregation was alleged to deprive the plaintiffs of the equal protection of the laws under the Fourteenth Amendment. In each of the cases other than the Delaware case, a three-judge federal district court denied relief to the plaintiffs on the so-called "separate but equal" doctrine announced by this Court in *Plessy v. Ferguson*, 163 U. S. 537. Under that doctrine, equality of treatment is accorded when the races are provided substantially equal facilities, even though these facilities be separate. In the Delaware case, the Supreme Court of Delaware adhered to that doctrine, but ordered that the plaintiffs be admitted to the white schools because of their superiority to the Negro schools.

The plaintiffs contend that segregated public schools are not "equal" and cannot be made "equal," and that hence they are deprived of the equal protection of the laws. Because of the obvious importance of the question presented, the Court took jurisdiction. Argument was heard in the 1952 Term, and reargument was heard this Term on certain questions propounded by the Court.

Reargument was largely devoted to the circumstances surrounding the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment in 1868. It covered exhaustively consideration of the Amendment in Congress, ratification by the states, then-existing practices in racial segregation, and the
views of proponents and opponents of the Amendment. This discussion and our own inves-
tigation convince us that, although these sources cast some light, it is not enough to resolve the problem with which we are faced. At best, they are inconclusive. The most avid proponents of the post-War Amendments undoubtedly intended them to remove all legal distinctions among "all persons born or naturalized in the United States." Their opponents, just as certainly, were antagonistic to both the letter and the spirit of the Amendments and wished them to have the most limited effect. What others in Congress and the state legislatures had in mind cannot be determined with any degree of certainty.

An additional reason for the inconclusive nature of the Amendment’s history with respect to segregated schools is the status of public education at that time. In the South, the movement toward free common schools, supported by general taxation, had not yet taken hold. Education of white children was largely in the hands of private groups. Education of Negroes was almost nonexistent, and practically all of the race were illiterate. In fact, any education of Negroes was forbidden by law in some states. Today, in contrast, many Negroes have achieved outstanding success in the arts and sciences, as well as in the business and professional world. It is true that public school education at the time of the Amendment had advanced further in the North, but the effect of the Amendment on Northern States was generally ignored in the congressional debates. Even in the North, the conditions of public education did not approximate those existing today. The curriculum was usually rudimentary; ungraded schools were common in rural areas; the school term was but three months a year in many states, and compulsory school attendance was virtually unknown. As a consequence, it is not surprising that there should be so little in the history of the Fourteenth Amendment relating to its intended effect on public education.

In the first cases in this Court construing the Fourteenth Amendment, decided shortly after its adoption, the Court interpreted it as proscribing all state-imposed discriminations against the Negro race. The doctrine of "separate but equal" did not make its appearance in this Court until 1896 in the case of Plessy v. Ferguson, supra, involving not education but transportation. American courts have since labored with the doctrine for over half a century. In this Court, there have been six cases involving the "separate but equal" doctrine in
the field of public education. In *Cumming v. County Board of Education*, 175 U. S. 528, and *Gong Lum v. Rice*, 275 U. S. 78, the validity of the doctrine itself was not challenged. In more recent cases, all on the graduate school

level, inequality was found in that specific benefits enjoyed by white students were denied to Negro students of the same educational qualifications. Missouri ex rel. *Gaines v. Canada*, 305 U. S. 337; *Sipuel v. Oklahoma*, 332 U. S. 631; *Sweatt v. Painter*, 339 U. S. 629; *McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents*, 339 U. S. 637. In none of these cases was it necessary to reexamine the doctrine to grant relief to the Negro plaintiff. And in *Sweatt v. Painter*, supra, the Court expressly reserved decision on the question whether *Plessy v. Ferguson* should be held inapplicable to public education.

In the instant cases, that question is directly presented. Here, unlike *Sweatt v. Painter*, there are findings below that the Negro and white schools involved have been equalized, or are being equalized, with respect to buildings, curricula, qualifications and salaries of teachers, and other "tangible" factors. Our decision, therefore, cannot turn on merely a comparison of these tangible factors in the Negro and white schools involved in each of the cases. We must look instead to the effect of segregation itself on public education.

In approaching this problem, we cannot turn the clock back to 1868, when the Amendment was adopted, or even to 1896, when *Plessy v. Ferguson* was written. We must consider public education in the light of its full development and its present place in American life throughout the Nation. Only in this way can it be determined if segregation in public schools deprives these plaintiffs of the equal protection of the laws.

Today, education is perhaps the most important function of state and local governments. Compulsory school attendance laws and the great expenditures for education both demonstrate our recognition of the importance of education to our democratic society. It is required in the performance of our most basic public responsibilities, even service in the
armed forces. It is the very foundation of good citizenship. Today it is a principal instrument in awakening the child to cultural values, in preparing him for later professional training, and in helping him to adjust normally to his environment. In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms.

We come then to the question presented: does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other "tangible" factors may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities? We believe that it does.

In *Sweatt v. Painter*, supra, in finding that a segregated law school for Negroes could not provide them equal educational opportunities, this Court relied in large part on "those qualities which are incapable of objective measurement but which make for greatness in a law school." In *McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents*, supra, the Court, in requiring that a Negro admitted to a white graduate school be treated like all other students, again resorted to intangible considerations: "...his ability to study, to engage in discussions and exchange views with other students, and, in general, to learn his profession."

Such considerations apply with added force to children in grade and high schools. To separate them from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone. The effect of this separation on their educational opportunities was well stated by a finding in the Kansas case by a court which nevertheless felt compelled to rule against the Negro plaintiffs:

"Segregation of white and colored children in public schools has a detrimental effect upon the colored children. The impact is greater when it has the sanction of the law, for the policy of separating the races is usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the negro group. A sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. Segregation with the sanction of law, therefore, has a tendency to [retard] the educational and mental development
of negro children and to deprive them of some of the benefits they would receive in a racial[ly] integrated school system.”

Whatever may have been the extent of psychological knowledge at the time of Plessy v. Ferguson, this finding is amply supported by modern authority. Any language in Plessy v. Ferguson contrary to this finding is rejected.

We conclude that, in the field of public education, the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. Therefore, we hold that the plaintiffs and others similarly situated for whom the actions have been brought are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment. This disposition makes unnecessary any discussion whether such segregation also violates the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Because these are class actions, because of the wide applicability of this decision, and because of the great variety of local conditions, the formulation of decrees in these cases presents problems of considerable complexity. On reargument, the consideration of appropriate relief was necessarily subordinated to the primary question -- the constitutionality of segregation in public education. We have now announced that such segregation is a denial of the equal protection of the laws. In order that we may have the full assistance of the parties in formulating decrees, the cases will be restored to the docket, and the parties are requested to present further argument on Questions 4 and 5 previously propounded by the Court for the reargument this Term. The Attorney General of the United States is again invited to participate. The Attorneys General of the states requiring or permitting segregation in public education will also be permitted to appear as amici curiae upon request to do so by September 15, 1954, and submission of briefs by October 1, 1954.

It is so ordered.
MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

At the March on Washington

SPEECH

August 28, 1963

Lincoln Memorial | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

Martin Luther King, Jr., delivered this address at the March on Washington from the steps of the Lincoln Memorial.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What historical documents does King refer to in his speech?

2. What is the “promissory note”?

3. What is King’s dream?

4. What is the significance of King’s ending the speech quoting “My Country Tis of Thee”?

—

Martin Luther King, Jr., “I Have A Dream,” in I Have A Dream: Writings and Speeches that Changed the World (San Francisco: Harper, 1986).
I am happy to join with you today in what will go down in history as the greatest demonstration for freedom in the history of our nation.

Five score years ago, a great American, in whose symbolic shadow we stand today, signed the Emancipation Proclamation. This momentous decree came as a great beacon light of hope to millions of Negro slaves who had been seared in the flames of withering injustice. It came as a joyous daybreak to end the long night of their captivity.

But one hundred years later, the Negro still is not free; one hundred years later, the life of the Negro is still sadly crippled by the manacles of segregation and the chains of discrimination; one hundred years later, the Negro lives on a lonely island of poverty in the midst of a vast ocean of material prosperity; one hundred years later, the Negro is still languished in the corners of American society and finds himself in exile in his own land.

So we've come here today to dramatize a shameful condition. In a sense we've come to our nation's capital to cash a check. When the architects of our republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was the promise that all men, yes, black men as well as white men, would be guaranteed the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory note in so far as her citizens of color are concerned. Instead of honoring this sacred obligation, America has given the Negro people a bad check, a check which has come back marked “insufficient funds.”

But we refuse to believe that the bank of justice is bankrupt. We refuse to believe that there are insufficient funds in the great vaults of opportunity of this nation. And so we have come to cash this check, a check that will give us upon demand the riches of freedom and the security of justice.

We have also come to this hallowed spot to remind America of the fierce urgency of now.
This is no time to engage in the luxury of cooling off or to take the tranquilizing drug of gradualism.

Now is the time to make real the promises of democracy; now is the time to rise from the dark and desolate valley of segregation to the sunlit path of racial justice; now is the time to lift our nation from the quicksands of racial injustice to the solid rock of brotherhood; now is the time to make justice a reality for all of God’s children.

It would be fatal for the nation to overlook the urgency of the moment.

This sweltering summer of the Negro’s legitimate discontent will not pass until there is an invigorating autumn of freedom and equality. Nineteen sixty-three is not an end, but a beginning. And those who hope that the Negro needed to blow off steam and will now be content, will have a rude awakening if the nation returns to business as usual. There will be neither rest nor tranquility in America until the Negro is granted his citizenship rights. The whirlwinds of revolt will continue to shake the foundations of our nation until the bright day of justice emerges.

But there is something that I must say to my people, who stand on the worn threshold which leads into the palace of justice. In the process of gaining our rightful place, we must not be guilty of wrongful deeds. Let us not seek to satisfy our thirst for freedom by drinking from the cup of bitterness and hatred.

We must forever conduct our struggle on the high plane of dignity and discipline. We must not allow our creative protests to degenerate into physical violence. Again and again we must rise to the majestic heights of meeting physical force with soul force. The marvelous new militancy, which has engulfed the Negro community, must not lead us to a distrust of all white people. For many of our white brothers, as evidenced by their presence here today, have come to realize that their destiny is tied up with our destiny. And they have come to realize that their freedom is inextricably bound to our freedom.

We cannot walk alone. And as we walk, we must make the pledge that we shall always march ahead. We cannot turn back.
There are those who are asking the devotees of Civil Rights, “When will you be satisfied?”

We can never be satisfied as long as the Negro is the victim of the unspeakable horrors of police brutality; we can never be satisfied as long as our bodies, heavy with the fatigue of travel, cannot gain lodging in the motels of the highways and the hotels of the cities; we cannot be satisfied as long as the Negro’s basic mobility is from a smaller ghetto to a larger one; we can never be satisfied as long as our children are stripped of their selfhood and robbed of their dignity by signs stating “For Whites Only”; we cannot be satisfied as long as the Negro in Mississippi cannot vote, and the Negro in New York believes he has nothing for which to vote.

No! no, we are not satisfied, and we will not be satisfied until “justice rolls down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream.”

I am not unmindful that some of you have come here out of great trials and tribulations. Some of you have come fresh from narrow jail cells. Some of you have come from areas where your quest for freedom left you battered by the storms of persecution and staggered by the winds of police brutality.

You have been the veterans of creative suffering.

Continue to work with the faith that unearned suffering is redemptive.

Go back to Mississippi. Go back to Alabama. Go back to South Carolina. Go back to Georgia. Go back to Louisiana. Go back to the slums and ghettos of our Northern cities, knowing that somehow this situation can and will be changed. Let us not wallow in the valley of despair.

I say to you today, my friends, so even though we face the difficulties of today and tomorrow, I still have a dream.

It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream.
I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed, “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal.”

I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia, sons of former slaves and the sons of former slaveowners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood.

I have a dream that one day even the state of Mississippi, a state sweltering with the heat of injustice, sweltering with the heat of oppression, will be transformed into an oasis of freedom and justice.

I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character.

I have a dream today!

I have a dream that one day down in Alabama — with its vicious racists, with its Governor having his lips dripping with the words of interposition and nullification — one day right there in Alabama, little black boys and black girls will be able to join hands with little white boys and white girls as sisters and brothers.

I have a dream today!

I have a dream that one day every valley shall be exalted, and every hill and mountain shall be made low. The rough places will be plain and the crooked places will be made straight, “and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together.”

This is our hope. This is the faith that I go back to the South with. With this faith we will be able to hew out of the mountain of despair a stone of hope.

With this faith we will be able to transform the jangling discords of our nation into a beautiful symphony of brotherhood. With this faith we will be able to work together, to pray together, to struggle together, to go to jail together, to stand up for freedom together, knowing that we will be free one day.
And this will be the day.

This will be the day when all of God’s children will be able to sing with new meaning, “My country ’tis of thee, sweet land of liberty, of thee I sing. Land where my father died, land of the pilgrim’s pride, from every mountainside, let freedom ring.” And if America is to be a great nation, this must become true.

So let freedom ring from the prodigious hilltops of New Hampshire; let freedom ring from the mighty mountains of New York; let freedom ring from the heightening Alleghenies of Pennsylvania; let freedom ring from the snow-capped Rockies of Colorado; let freedom ring from the curvaceous slopes of California.

But not only that.

Let freedom ring from Stone Mountain of Georgia; let freedom ring from Lookout Mountain of Tennessee; let freedom ring from every hill and mole hill of Mississippi. “From every mountainside, let freedom ring.”

And when this happens, and when we allow freedom to ring, when we let it ring from every village and every hamlet, from every state and every city, we will be able to speed up that day when all of God’s children, black men and white men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual:

“Free at last. Free at last. Thank God Almighty, we are free at last.”
**MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.**

**Letter from Birmingham Jail**

**Open Letter**

April 16, 1963

Birmingham Jail | Birmingham, Alabama

**BACKGROUND**

While in prison, Martin Luther King, Jr., began this open response to an article by clergymen entitled "A Call For Unity" that had denounced King’s methods in the civil rights movement.

**GUIDING QUESTIONS**

1. What, according to King, are the four basic steps of a nonviolent campaign?

2. What references does King make to religion and philosophy?

3. How does King differentiate between a just and unjust law?

4. What examples does King give defending extremists?

5. Why is King unable to commend the police? What change does he want to see?

---

My Dear Fellow Clergymen:

While confined here in the Birmingham city jail, I came across your recent statement calling my present activities "unwise and untimely." Seldom do I pause to answer criticism of my work and ideas. If I sought to answer all the criticisms that cross my desk, my secretaries would have little time for anything other than such correspondence in the course of the day, and I would have no time for constructive work. But since I feel that you are men of genuine good will and that your criticisms are sincerely set forth, I want to try to answer your statement in what I hope will be patient and reasonable terms.

I think I should indicate why I am here in Birmingham, since you have been influenced by the view which argues against "outsiders coming in." I have the honor of serving as president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, an organization operating in every southern state, with headquarters in Atlanta, Georgia. We have some eighty five affiliated organizations across the South, and one of them is the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights. Frequently we share staff, educational and financial resources with our affiliates. Several months ago the affiliate here in Birmingham asked us to be on call to engage in a nonviolent direct action program if such were deemed necessary. We readily consented, and when the hour came we lived up to our promise. So I, along with several members of my staff, am here because I was invited here. I am here because I have organizational ties here.

But more basically, I am in Birmingham because injustice is here. Just as the prophets of the eighth century B.C. left their villages and carried their "thus saith the Lord" far beyond the boundaries of their home towns, and just as the Apostle Paul left his village of Tarsus and carried the gospel of Jesus Christ to the far corners of the Greco Roman world, so am I compelled to carry the gospel of freedom beyond my own home town. Like Paul, I must constantly respond to the Macedonian call for aid.

Moreover, I am cognizant of the interrelatedness of all communities and states. I cannot sit idly by in Atlanta and not be concerned about what happens in Birmingham. Injustice an-
ywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly, affects all indirectly. Never again can we afford to live with the narrow, provincial "outside agitator" idea. Anyone who lives inside the United States can never be considered an outsider anywhere within its bounds.

You deplore the demonstrations taking place in Birmingham. But your statement, I am sorry to say, fails to express a similar concern for the conditions that brought about the demonstrations. I am sure that none of you would want to rest content with the superficial kind of social analysis that deals merely with effects and does not grapple with underlying causes. It is unfortunate that demonstrations are taking place in Birmingham, but it is even more unfortunate that the city’s white power structure left the Negro community with no alternative.

In any nonviolent campaign there are four basic steps: collection of the facts to determine whether injustices exist; negotiation; self purification; and direct action. We have gone through all these steps in Birmingham. There can be no gainsaying the fact that racial injustice engulfs this community. Birmingham is probably the most thoroughly segregated city in the United States. Its ugly record of brutality is widely known. Negroes have experienced grossly unjust treatment in the courts. There have been more unsolved bombings of Negro homes and churches in Birmingham than in any other city in the nation. These are the hard, brutal facts of the case. On the basis of these conditions, Negro leaders sought to negotiate with the city fathers. But the latter consistently refused to engage in good faith negotiation.

Then, last September, came the opportunity to talk with leaders of Birmingham’s economic community. In the course of the negotiations, certain promises were made by the merchants--for example, to remove the stores’ humiliating racial signs. On the basis of these promises, the Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth and the leaders of the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights agreed to a moratorium on all demonstrations. As the weeks and months went by, we realized that we were the victims of a broken promise. A few signs,
briefly removed, returned; the others remained. As in so many past experiences, our hopes had been blasted, and the shadow of deep disappointment settled upon us. We had no alternative except to prepare for direct action, whereby we would present our very bodies as a means of laying our case before the conscience of the local and the national community. Mindful of the difficulties involved, we decided to undertake a process of self purification. We began a series of workshops on nonviolence, and we repeatedly asked ourselves: "Are you able to accept blows without retaliating?" "Are you able to endure the ordeal of jail?"

We decided to schedule our direct action program for the Easter season, realizing that except for Christmas, this is the main shopping period of the year. Knowing that a strong economic-withdrawal program would be the by product of direct action, we felt that this would be the best time to bring pressure to bear on the merchants for the needed change.

Then it occurred to us that Birmingham's mayoral election was coming up in March, and we speedily decided to postpone action until after election day. When we discovered that the Commissioner of Public Safety, Eugene "Bull" Connor, had piled up enough votes to be in the run off, we decided again to postpone action until the day after the run off so that the demonstrations could not be used to cloud the issues. Like many others, we waited to see Mr. Connor defeated, and to this end we endured postponement after postponement. Having aided in this community need, we felt that our direct action program could be delayed no longer.

You may well ask: "Why direct action? Why sit ins, marches and so forth? Isn't negotiation a better path?" You are quite right in calling for negotiation. Indeed, this is the very purpose of direct action. Nonviolent direct action seeks to create such a crisis and foster such a tension that a community which has constantly refused to negotiate is forced to confront the issue. It seeks so to dramatize the issue that it can no longer be ignored. My citing the creation of tension as part of the work of the nonviolent resister may sound rather shocking. But I must confess that I am not afraid of the word "tension." I have earnestly opposed violent tension, but there is a type of constructive, nonviolent tension which is necessary for growth. Just as Socrates felt that
it was necessary to create a tension in the mind so that individuals could rise from the
bondage of myths and half truths to the unfettered realm of creative analysis and objective
appraisal, so must we see the need for nonviolent gadflies to create the kind of tension in
society that will help men rise from the dark depths of prejudice and racism to the majestic
heights of understanding and brotherhood. The purpose of our direct action program is to
create a situation so crisis packed that it will inevitably open the door to negotiation. I
therefore concur with you in your call for negotiation. Too long has our beloved Southland
been bogged down in a tragic effort to live in monologue rather than dialogue.

One of the basic points in your statement is that the action that I and my associates have
taken in Birmingham is untimely. Some have asked: "Why didn't you give the new city
administration time to act?" The only answer that I can give to this query is that the new
Birmingham administration must be prodded about as much as the outgoing one, before
it will act. We are sadly mistaken if we feel that the election of Albert Boutwell as mayor
will bring the millennium to Birmingham. While Mr. Boutwell is a much more gentle per-
son than Mr. Connor, they are both segregationists, dedicated to maintenance of the status
quo. I have hope that Mr. Boutwell will be reasonable enough to see the futility of massive
resistance to desegregation. But he will not see this without pressure from devotees of civil
rights. My friends, I must say to you that we have not made a single gain in civil rights
without determined legal and nonviolent pressure. Lamentably, it is an historical fact that
privileged groups seldom give up their privileges voluntarily. Individuals may see the moral
light and voluntarily give up their unjust posture; but, as Reinhold Niebuhr has reminded
us, groups tend to be more immoral than individuals.

We know through painful experience that freedom is never voluntarily given by the opp-
pressor; it must be demanded by the oppressed. Frankly, I have yet to engage in a direct
action campaign that was "well timed" in the view of those who have not suffered unduly
from the disease of segregation. For years now I have heard the word "Wait!" It rings in the
ear of every Negro with piercing familiarity. This "Wait" has almost always meant "Never."
We must come to see, with one of our distinguished jurists, that "justice too long delayed
is justice denied."
We have waited for more than 340 years for our constitutional and God given rights. The nations of Asia and Africa are moving with jetlike speed toward gaining political independence, but we still creep at horse and buggy pace toward gaining a cup of coffee at a lunch counter. Perhaps it is easy for those who have never felt the stinging darts of segregation to say, "Wait." But when you have seen vicious mobs lynch your mothers and fathers at will and drown your sisters and brothers at whim; when you have seen hate filled policemen curse, kick and even kill your black brothers and sisters; when you see the vast majority of your twenty million Negro brothers smothering in an airtight cage of poverty in the midst of an affluent society; when you suddenly find your tongue twisted and your speech stammering as you seek to explain to your six year old daughter why she can't go to the public amusement park that has just been advertised on television, and see tears welling up in her eyes when she is told that Funtown is closed to colored children, and see ominous clouds of inferiority beginning to form in her little mental sky, and see her beginning to distort her personality by developing an unconscious bitterness toward white people; when you have to concoct an answer for a five year old son who is asking: "Daddy, why do white people treat colored people so mean?"; when you take a cross county drive and find it necessary to sleep night after night in the uncomfortable corners of your automobile because no motel will accept you; when you are humiliated day in and day out by nagging signs reading "white" and "colored"; when your first name becomes "nigger," your middle name becomes "boy" (however old you are) and your last name becomes "John," and your wife and mother are never given the respected title "Mrs."; when you are harried by day and haunted by night by the fact that you are a Negro, living constantly at tiptoe stance, never quite knowing what to expect next, and are plagued with inner fears and outer resentments; when you are forever fighting a degenerating sense of "nobodiness"--then you will understand why we find it difficult to wait. There comes a time when the cup of endurance runs over, and men are no longer willing to be plunged into the abyss of despair. I hope, sirs, you can understand our legitimate and unavoidable impatience. You express a great deal of anxiety over our willingness to break laws. This is certainly a legitimate concern. Since we so diligently urge people to obey the Supreme Court's decision of 1954 outlawing seg-
regation in the public schools, at first glance it may seem rather paradoxical for us con-
sciously to break laws. One may well ask: "How can you advocate breaking some laws and
obeying others?" The answer lies in the fact that there are two types of laws: just and unjust.
I would be the first to advocate obeying just laws. One has not only a legal but a moral
responsibility to obey just laws. Conversely, one has a moral responsibility to disobey un-
just laws. I would agree with St. Augustine that "an unjust law is no law at all."

Now, what is the difference between the two? How does one determine whether a law is
just or unjust? A just law is a man made code that squares with the moral law or the law of
God. An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law. To put it in the
terms of St. Thomas Aquinas: An unjust law is a human law that is not rooted in eternal
law and natural law. Any law that uplifts human personality is just. Any law that degrades
human personality is unjust. All segregation statutes are unjust because segregation distorts
the soul and damages the personality. It gives the segregator a false sense of superiority and
the segregated a false sense of inferiority. Segregation, to use the terminology of the Jewish
philosopher Martin Buber, substitutes an "I it" relationship for an "I thou" relationship and
ends up relegating persons to the status of things. Hence segregation is not only politically,
economically and sociologically unsound, it is morally wrong and sinful. Paul Tillich has
said that sin is separation. Is not segregation an existential expression of man's tragic sepa-
ration, his awful estrangement, his terrible sinfulness? Thus it is that I can urge men to obey
the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court, for it is morally right; and I can urge them to
disobey segregation ordinances, for they are morally wrong.

Let us consider a more concrete example of just and unjust laws. An unjust law is a code
that a numerical or power majority group compels a minority group to obey but does not
make binding on itself. This is difference made legal. By the same token, a just law is a code
that a majority compels a minority to follow and that it is willing to follow itself. This is
sameness made legal. Let me give another explanation. A law is unjust if it is inflicted on a
minority that, as a result of being denied the right to vote, had no part in enacting or devis-
ing the law. Who can say that the legislature of Alabama which set up that state's segrega-
tion laws was democratically elected? Throughout Alabama all sorts of devious methods
are used to prevent Negroes from becoming registered voters, and there are some counties in which, even though Negroes constitute a majority of the population, not a single Negro is registered. Can any law enacted under such circumstances be considered democratically structured?

Sometimes a law is just on its face and unjust in its application. For instance, I have been arrested on a charge of parading without a permit. Now, there is nothing wrong in having an ordinance which requires a permit for a parade. But such an ordinance becomes unjust when it is used to maintain segregation and to deny citizens the First-Amendment privilege of peaceful assembly and protest.

I hope you are able to see the distinction I am trying to point out. In no sense do I advocate evading or defying the law, as would the rabid segregationist. That would lead to anarchy. One who breaks an unjust law must do so openly, lovingly, and with a willingness to accept the penalty. I submit that an individual who breaks a law that conscience tells him is unjust, and who willingly accepts the penalty of imprisonment in order to arouse the conscience of the community over its injustice, is in reality expressing the highest respect for law.

Of course, there is nothing new about this kind of civil disobedience. It was evidenced sublimely in the refusal of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego to obey the laws of Nebuchadnezzar, on the ground that a higher moral law was at stake. It was practiced superbly by the early Christians, who were willing to face hungry lions and the excruciating pain of chopping blocks rather than submit to certain unjust laws of the Roman Empire. To a degree, academic freedom is a reality today because Socrates practiced civil disobedience. In our own nation, the Boston Tea Party represented a massive act of civil disobedience.

We should never forget that everything Adolf Hitler did in Germany was "legal" and everything the Hungarian freedom fighters did in Hungary was "illegal." It was "illegal" to aid and comfort a Jew in Hitler's Germany. Even so, I am sure that, had I lived in Germany at the time, I would have aided and comforted my Jewish brothers. If today I lived in a Communist country where certain principles dear to the Christian faith are suppressed, I would openly advocate disobeying that country's antireligious laws.
I must make two honest confessions to you, my Christian and Jewish brothers. First, I must confess that over the past few years I have been gravely disappointed with the white moderate. I have almost reached the regrettable conclusion that the Negro's great stumbling block in his stride toward freedom is not the White Citizen's Counciler or the Ku Klux Klanner, but the white moderate, who is more devoted to "order" than to justice; who prefers a negative peace which is the absence of tension to a positive peace which is the presence of justice; who constantly says: "I agree with you in the goal you seek, but I cannot agree with your methods of direct action"; who paternalistically believes he can set the timetable for another man's freedom; who lives by a mythical concept of time and who constantly advises the Negro to wait for a "more convenient season." Shallow understanding from people of good will is more frustrating than absolute misunderstanding from people of ill will. Lukewarm acceptance is much more bewildering than outright rejection.

I had hoped that the white moderate would understand that law and order exist for the purpose of establishing justice and that when they fail in this purpose they become the dangerously structured dams that block the flow of social progress. I had hoped that the white moderate would understand that the present tension in the South is a necessary phase of the transition from an obnoxious negative peace, in which the Negro passively accepted his unjust plight, to a substantive and positive peace, in which all men will respect the dignity and worth of human personality. Actually, we who engage in nonviolent direct action are not the creators of tension. We merely bring to the surface the hidden tension that is already alive. We bring it out in the open, where it can be seen and dealt with. Like a boil that can never be cured so long as it is covered up but must be opened with all its ugliness to the natural medicines of air and light, injustice must be exposed, with all the tension its exposure creates, to the light of human conscience and the air of national opinion before it can be cured.

In your statement you assert that our actions, even though peaceful, must be condemned because they precipitate violence. But is this a logical assertion? Isn't this like condemning a robbed man because his possession of money precipitated the evil act of robbery? Isn't
this like condemning Socrates because his unswerving commitment to truth and his philosophical inquiries precipitated the act by the misguided populace in which they made him drink hemlock? Isn't this like condemning Jesus because his unique God consciousness and never ceasing devotion to God's will precipitated the evil act of crucifixion? We must come to see that, as the federal courts have consistently affirmed, it is wrong to urge an individual to cease his efforts to gain his basic constitutional rights because the quest may precipitate violence. Society must protect the robbed and punish the robber. I had also hoped that the white moderate would reject the myth concerning time in relation to the struggle for freedom. I have just received a letter from a white brother in Texas. He writes: "All Christians know that the colored people will receive equal rights eventually, but it is possible that you are in too great a religious hurry. It has taken Christianity almost two thousand years to accomplish what it has. The teachings of Christ take time to come to earth." Such an attitude stems from a tragic misconception of time, from the strangely irrational notion that there is something in the very flow of time that will inevitably cure all ills. Actually, time itself is neutral; it can be used either destructively or constructively. More and more I feel that the people of ill will have used time much more effectively than have the people of good will. We will have to repent in this generation not merely for the hateful words and actions of the bad people but for the appalling silence of the good people. Human progress never rolls in on wheels of inevitability; it comes through the tireless efforts of men willing to be co workers with God, and without this hard work, time itself becomes an ally of the forces of social stagnation. We must use time creatively, in the knowledge that the time is always ripe to do right. Now is the time to make real the promise of democracy and transform our pending national elegy into a creative psalm of brotherhood. Now is the time to lift our national policy from the quicksand of racial injustice to the solid rock of human dignity.

You speak of our activity in Birmingham as extreme. At first I was rather disappointed that fellow clergymen would see my nonviolent efforts as those of an extremist. I began thinking about the fact that I stand in the middle of two opposing forces in the Negro community. One is a force of complacency, made up in part of Negroes who, as a result of long years of
Oppressed people cannot remain oppressed forever. The yearning for freedom eventually manifests itself, and that is what has happened to the American Negro. Something within has reminded him of his birthright of freedom, and something without has reminded him that it can be gained. Consciously or unconsciously, he has been caught up by the Zeitgeist, and with his black brothers of Africa and his brown and yellow brothers of Asia, South America and the Caribbean, the United States Negro is moving with a sense of great urgency toward the promised land of racial justice. If one recognizes this vital urge that has engulfed the Negro community, one should readily understand why public demonstrations are taking place. The Negro has many pent up resentments and latent frustrations, and he
must release them. So let him march; let him make prayer pilgrimages to the city hall; let him go on freedom rides—and try to understand why he must do so. If his repressed emotions are not released in nonviolent ways, they will seek expression through violence; this is not a threat but a fact of history. So I have not said to my people: "Get rid of your discontent." Rather, I have tried to say that this normal and healthy discontent can be channeled into the creative outlet of nonviolent direct action. And now this approach is being termed extremist. But though I was initially disappointed at being categorized as an extremist, as I continued to think about the matter I gradually gained a measure of satisfaction from the label. Was not Jesus an extremist for love: "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you." Was not Amos an extremist for justice: "Let justice roll down like waters and righteousness like an ever flowing stream." Was not Paul an extremist for the Christian gospel: "I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus." Was not Martin Luther an extremist: "Here I stand; I cannot do otherwise, so help me God." And John Bunyan: "I will stay in jail to the end of my days before I make a butchery of my conscience." And Abraham Lincoln: "This nation cannot survive half slave and half free." And Thomas Jefferson: "We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal..." So the question is not whether we will be extremists, but what kind of extremists we will be. Will we be extremists for hate or for love? Will we be extremists for the preservation of injustice or for the extension of justice? In that dramatic scene on Calvary's hill three men were crucified. We must never forget that all three were crucified for the same crime—the crime of extremism. Two were extremists for immorality, and thus fell below their environment. The other, Jesus Christ, was an extremist for love, truth and goodness, and thereby rose above his environment. Perhaps the South, the nation and the world are in dire need of creative extremists.

I had hoped that the white moderate would see this need. Perhaps I was too optimistic; perhaps I expected too much. I suppose I should have realized that few members of the oppressor race can understand the deep groans and passionate yearnings of the oppressed race, and still fewer have the vision to see that injustice must be rooted out by strong, persistent and determined action. I am thankful, however, that some of our white brothers in
the South have grasped the meaning of this social revolution and committed themselves to it. They are still all too few in quantity, but they are big in quality. Some—such as Ralph McGill, Lillian Smith, Harry Golden, James McBride Dabbs, Ann Braden and Sarah Patton Boyle—have written about our struggle in eloquent and prophetic terms. Others have marched with us down nameless streets of the South. They have languished in filthy, roach infested jails, suffering the abuse and brutality of policemen who view them as “dirty nigger-lovers.” Unlike so many of their moderate brothers and sisters, they have recognized the urgency of the moment and sensed the need for powerful “action” antidotes to combat the disease of segregation. Let me take note of my other major disappointment. I have been so greatly disappointed with the white church and its leadership. Of course, there are some notable exceptions. I am not unmindful of the fact that each of you has taken some significant stands on this issue. I commend you, Reverend Stallings, for your Christian stand on this past Sunday, in welcoming Negroes to your worship service on a nonsegregated basis. I commend the Catholic leaders of this state for integrating Spring Hill College several years ago.

But despite these notable exceptions, I must honestly reiterate that I have been disappointed with the church. I do not say this as one of those negative critics who can always find something wrong with the church. I say this as a minister of the gospel, who loves the church; who was nurtured in its bosom; who has been sustained by its spiritual blessings and who will remain true to it as long as the cord of life shall lengthen.

When I was suddenly catapulted into the leadership of the bus protest in Montgomery, Alabama, a few years ago, I felt we would be supported by the white church. I felt that the white ministers, priests and rabbis of the South would be among our strongest allies. Instead, some have been outright opponents, refusing to understand the freedom movement and misrepresenting its leaders; all too many others have been more cautious than courageous and have remained silent behind the anesthetizing security of stained glass windows.

In spite of my shattered dreams, I came to Birmingham with the hope that the white religious leadership of this community would see the justice of our cause and, with deep moral
concern, would serve as the channel through which our just grievances could reach the power structure. I had hoped that each of you would understand. But again I have been disappointed.

I have heard numerous southern religious leaders admonish their worshipers to comply with a desegregation decision because it is the law, but I have longed to hear white ministers declare: "Follow this decree because integration is morally right and because the Negro is your brother." In the midst of blatant injustices inflicted upon the Negro, I have watched white churchmen stand on the sideline and mouth pious irrelevancies and sanctimonious trivialities. In the midst of a mighty struggle to rid our nation of racial and economic injustice, I have heard many ministers say: "Those are social issues, with which the gospel has no real concern." And I have watched many churches commit themselves to a completely other worldly religion which makes a strange, un-Biblical distinction between body and soul, between the sacred and the secular.

I have traveled the length and breadth of Alabama, Mississippi and all the other southern states. On sweltering summer days and crisp autumn mornings I have looked at the South's beautiful churches with their lofty spires pointing heavenward. I have beheld the impressive outlines of her massive religious education buildings. Over and over I have found myself asking: "What kind of people worship here? Who is their God? Where were their voices when the lips of Governor Barnett dripped with words of interposition and nullification? Where were they when Governor Wallace gave a clarion call for defiance and hatred? Where were their voices of support when bruised and weary Negro men and women decided to rise from the dark dungeons of complacency to the bright hills of creative protest?"

Yes, these questions are still in my mind. In deep disappointment I have wept over the laxity of the church. But be assured that my tears have been tears of love. There can be no deep disappointment where there is not deep love. Yes, I love the church. How could I do otherwise? I am in the rather unique position of being the son, the grandson and the great grandson of preachers. Yes, I see the church as the body of Christ. But, oh! How we have
blemished and scarred that body through social neglect and through fear of being nonconformists.

There was a time when the church was very powerful—indeed, in the time when the early Christians rejoiced at being deemed worthy to suffer for what they believed. In those days the church was not merely a thermometer that recorded the ideas and principles of popular opinion; it was a thermostat that transformed the mores of society. Whenever the early Christians entered a town, the people in power became disturbed and immediately sought to convict the Christians for being "disturbers of the peace" and "outside agitators." But the Christians pressed on, in the conviction that they were "a colony of heaven," called to obey God rather than man. Small in number, they were big in commitment. They were too God-intoxicated to be "astronomically intimidated." By their effort and example they brought an end to such ancient evils as infanticide and gladiatorial contests. Things are different now. So often the contemporary church is a weak, ineffectual voice with an uncertain sound. So often it is an archdefender of the status quo. Far from being disturbed by the presence of the church, the power structure of the average community is consoled by the church's silent—and often even vocal—sanction of things as they are.

But the judgment of God is upon the church as never before. If today's church does not recapture the sacrificial spirit of the early church, it will lose its authenticity, forfeit the loyalty of millions, and be dismissed as an irrelevant social club with no meaning for the twentieth century. Every day I meet young people whose disappointment with the church has turned into outright disgust.

Perhaps I have once again been too optimistic. Is organized religion too inextricably bound to the status quo to save our nation and the world? Perhaps I must turn my faith to the inner spiritual church, the church within the church, as the true ekklesia and the hope of the world. But again I am thankful to God that some noble souls from the ranks of organized religion have broken loose from the paralyzing chains of conformity and joined us as active partners in the struggle for freedom. They have left their secure congregations and
walked the streets of Albany, Georgia, with us. They have gone down the highways of the South on tortuous rides for freedom. Yes, they have gone to jail with us. Some have been dismissed from their churches, have lost the support of their bishops and fellow ministers. But they have acted in the faith that right defeated is stronger than evil triumphant. Their witness has been the spiritual salt that has preserved the true meaning of the gospel in these troubled times. They have carved a tunnel of hope through the dark mountain of disappointment. I hope the church as a whole will meet the challenge of this decisive hour. But even if the church does not come to the aid of justice, I have no despair about the future. I have no fear about the outcome of our struggle in Birmingham, even if our motives are at present misunderstood. We will reach the goal of freedom in Birmingham and all over the nation, because the goal of America is freedom. Abused and scorned though we may be, our destiny is tied up with America's destiny. Before the pilgrims landed at Plymouth, we were here. Before the pen of Jefferson etched the majestic words of the Declaration of Independence across the pages of history, we were here. For more than two centuries our forebears labored in this country without wages; they made cotton king; they built the homes of their masters while suffering gross injustice and shameful humiliation - and yet out of a bottomless vitality they continued to thrive and develop. If the inexpressible cruelties of slavery could not stop us, the opposition we now face will surely fail. We will win our freedom because the sacred heritage of our nation and the eternal will of God are embodied in our echoing demands. Before closing I feel impelled to mention one other point in your statement that has troubled me profoundly. You warmly commended the Birmingham police force for keeping "order" and "preventing violence." I doubt that you would have so warmly commended the police force if you had seen its dogs sinking their teeth into unarmed, nonviolent Negroes. I doubt that you would so quickly commend the policemen if you were to observe their ugly and inhumane treatment of Negroes here in the city jail; if you were to watch them push and curse old Negro women and young Negro girls; if you were to see them slap and kick old Negro men and young boys; if you were to observe them, as they did on two occasions, refuse to give us food because we wanted to sing our grace together. I cannot join you in your praise of the Birmingham police department.
It is true that the police have exercised a degree of discipline in handling the demonstrators. In this sense they have conducted themselves rather "nonviolently" in public. But for what purpose? To preserve the evil system of segregation. Over the past few years I have consistently preached that nonviolence demands that the means we use must be as pure as the ends we seek. I have tried to make clear that it is wrong to use immoral means to attain moral ends. But now I must affirm that it is just as wrong, or perhaps even more so, to use moral means to preserve immoral ends. Perhaps Mr. Connor and his policemen have been rather nonviolent in public, as was Chief Pritchett in Albany, Georgia, but they have used the moral means of nonviolence to maintain the immoral end of racial injustice. As T. S. Eliot has said: "The last temptation is the greatest treason: To do the right deed for the wrong reason."

I wish you had commended the Negro sit-inners and demonstrators of Birmingham for their sublime courage, their willingness to suffer and their amazing discipline in the midst of great provocation. One day the South will recognize its real heroes. They will be the James Merediths, with the noble sense of purpose that enables them to face jeering and hostile mobs, and with the agonizing loneliness that characterizes the life of the pioneer. They will be old, oppressed, battered Negro women, symbolized in a seventy-two-year-old woman in Montgomery, Alabama, who rose up with a sense of dignity and with her people decided not to ride segregated buses, and who responded with ungrammatical profundity to one who inquired about her weariness: "My feets is tired, but my soul is at rest." They will be the young high school and college students, the young ministers of the gospel and a host of their elders, courageously and nonviolently sitting in at lunch counters and willingly going to jail for conscience' sake. One day the South will know that when these disinherited children of God sat down at lunch counters, they were in reality standing up for what is best in the American dream and for the most sacred values in our Judaeo Christian heritage, thereby bringing our nation back to those great wells of democracy which were dug deep by the founding fathers in their formulation of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence.
Never before have I written so long a letter. I’m afraid it is much too long to take your precious time. I can assure you that it would have been much shorter if I had been writing from a comfortable desk, but what else can one do when he is alone in a narrow jail cell, other than write long letters, think long thoughts and pray long prayers?

If I have said anything in this letter that overstates the truth and indicates an unreasonable impatience, I beg you to forgive me. If I have said anything that understates the truth and indicates my having a patience that allows me to settle for anything less than brotherhood, I beg God to forgive me.

I hope this letter finds you strong in the faith. I also hope that circumstances will soon make it possible for me to meet each of you, not as an integrationist or a civil-rights leader but as a fellow clergyman and a Christian brother. Let us all hope that the dark clouds of racial prejudice will soon pass away and the deep fog of misunderstanding will be lifted from our fear drenched communities, and in some not too distant tomorrow the radiant stars of love and brotherhood will shine over our great nation with all their scintillating beauty.

Yours for the cause of Peace and Brotherhood, Martin Luther King, Jr.
STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

The Port Huron Statement

MANIFESTO EXCERPTS

June 15, 1962

United Auto Workers Summer Retreat | Port Huron, Michigan

BACKGROUND

Members of the college student activist group, Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), drafted this political manifesto during a meeting in Port Huron, Michigan. SDS member Tom Hayden was its principal author.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Who are the authors of the Port Huron Statement and why are they critical of contemporary American society?

2. Why do the authors find little moral guidance from universities and political leaders?

3. Why do the authors say their generation is "plagued by program without vision"?

4. What are the political principles of participatory democracy, according to the authors?

5. What are the economic principles of participatory democracy, according to the authors?

6. What is the agenda the authors set forth for the New Left?

We are people of this generation, bred in at least modest comfort, housed now in universities, looking uncomfortably to the world we inherit.

When we were kids the United States was the wealthiest and strongest country in the world; the only one with the atom bomb, the least scarred by modern war, an initiator of the United Nations that we thought would distribute Western influence throughout the world. Freedom and equality for each individual, government of, by, and for the people – these American values we found good, principles by which we could live as men. Many of us began maturing in complacency.

As we grew, however, our comfort was penetrated by events too troubling to dismiss. First, the permeating and victimizing fact of human degradation, symbolized by the Southern struggle against racial bigotry, compelled most of us from silence to activism. Second, the enclosing fact of the Cold War, symbolized by the presence of the Bomb, brought awareness that we ourselves, and our friends, and millions of abstract “others” we knew more directly because of our common peril, might die at any time. We might deliberately ignore, or avoid, or fail to feel all other human problems, but not these two, for these were too immediate and crushing in their impact, too challenging in the demand that we as individuals take the responsibility for encounter and resolution.

While these and other problems either directly oppressed us or rankled our consciences and became our own subjective concerns, we began to see complicated and disturbing paradoxes in our surrounding America. The declaration “all men are created equal . . .” rang hollow before the facts of Negro life in the South and the big cities of the North. The proclaimed peaceful intentions of the United States contradicted its economic and military investments in the Cold War status quo. . . .

Some would have us believe that Americans feel contentment amidst prosperity – but might it not better be called a glaze above deeply felt anxieties about their role in the new world? And if these anxieties produce a developed indifference to human affairs, do they not as well produce a yearning to believe there is an alternative to the present, that some-
thing can be done to change circumstances in the school, the workplaces, the bureaucracies, the government? It is to this latter yearning, at once the spark and engine of change, that we direct our present appeal. The search for truly democratic alternatives to the present, and a commitment to social experimentation with them, is a worthy and fulfilling human enterprise, one which moves us and, we hope, others today. 

***

Making values explicit—an initial task in establishing alternatives—is an activity that has been devalued and corrupted. The conventional moral terms of the age, the politician moralities—"free world," "people's democracies"—reflect realities poorly, if at all, and seem to function more as ruling myths than as descriptive principles. But neither has our experience in the universities brought us moral enlightenment. Our professors and administrators sacrifice controversy to public relations; their curriculums change more slowly than the living events of the world; their skills and silence are purchased by investors in the arms race; passion is called unscholastic. The questions we might want raised—what is really important? can we live in a different and better way? if we wanted to change society, how would we do it?—are not thought to be questions of a "fruitful, empirical nature," and thus are brushed aside.

Unlike youth in other countries we are used to moral leadership being exercised and moral dimensions being clarified by our elders. But today, for us, not even the liberal and socialist preachments of the past seem adequate to the forms of the present. Consider the old slogans: Capitalism Cannot Reform Itself, United Front Against Fascism, General Strike, All Out on May Day. Or, more recently, No Cooperation with Commies and Fellow Travelers, Ideologies Are Exhausted, Bipartisanship, No Utopias. These are incomplete, and there are few new prophets. It has been said that our liberal and socialist predecessors were plagued by vision without program, while our own generation is plagued by program without vision. All around us there is astute grasp of method, technique—the committee, the ad hoc group, the lobbyist, the hard and soft sell, the make, the projected image—but, if pressed critically, such expertise in incompetent to explain its implicit ideals. It is highly fashionable...
to identify oneself by old categories, or by naming a respected political figure, or by explaining "how we would vote" on various issues.

Theoretic chaos has replaced the idealistic thinking of old--and, unable to reconstitute theoretic order, men have condemned idealism itself. Doubt has replaced hopefulness--and men act out a defeatism that is labeled realistic. The decline of utopia and hope is in fact one of the defining features of social life today. The reasons are various: the dreams of the older left were perverted by Stalinism and never re-created; the congressional stalemate makes men narrow their view of the possible; the specialization of human activity leaves little room for sweeping thought; the horrors of the twentieth century symbolized in the gas ovens and concentration camps and atom bombs, have blasted hopefulness. To be idealistic is to be considered apocalyptic, deluded. To have no serious aspirations, on the contrary, is to be "tough-minded."

In suggesting social goals and values, therefore, we are aware of entering a sphere of some disrepute. Perhaps matured by the past, we have no formulas, no closed theories--but that does not mean values are beyond discussion and tentative determination. A first task of any social movement is to convince people that the search for orienting theories and the creation of human values is complex but worthwhile. We are aware that to avoid platitudes we must analyze the concrete conditions of social order. But to direct such an analysis we must use the guideposts of basic principles. Our own social values involve conceptions of human beings, human relationships, and social systems.

We regard men as infinitely precious and possessed of unfulfilled capacities for reason, freedom, and love. In affirming these principles we are aware of countering perhaps the dominant conceptions of man in the twentieth century: that he is a thing to be manipulated, and that he is inherently incapable of directing his own affairs. We oppose the depersonalization that reduces human being to the status of things--if anything, the brutalities of the twentieth century teach that means and ends are intimately related, that vague appeals to "posterity" cannot justify the mutilations of the present. We oppose, too, the doctrine of human incompetence because it rests essentially on the modern fact that men have been
"competently" manipulated into incompetence--we see little reason why men cannot meet with increasing the skill the complexities and responsibilities of their situation, if society is organized not for minority, but for majority, participation in decision-making.

Men have unrealized potential for self-cultivation, self-direction, self-understanding, and creativity. It is this potential that we regard as crucial and to which we appeal, not to the human potentiality for violence, unreason, and submission to authority. The goal of man and society should be human independence: a concern not with image of popularity but with finding a meaning in life that is personally authentic; a quality of mind not compulsively driven by a sense of powerlessness, nor one which unthinkingly adopts status values, nor one which represses all threats to its habits, but one which has full, spontaneous access to present and past experiences, one which easily unites the fragmented parts of personal history, one which openly faces problems which are troubling and unresolved; one with an intuitive awareness of possibilities, an active sense of curiosity, an ability and willingness to learn.

This kind of independence does not mean egotistic individualism--the object is not to have one's way so much as it is to have a way that is one's own. Nor do we deify man--we merely have faith in his potential.

Human relationships should involve fraternity and honesty. Human interdependence is contemporary fact; human brotherhood must be willed, however, as a condition of future survival and as the most appropriate form of social relations. Personal links between man and man are needed, especially to go beyond the partial and fragmentary bonds of function that bind men only as worker to worker, employer to employee, teacher to student, American to Russian.

Loneliness, estrangement, isolation describe the vast distance between man and man today.

These dominant tendencies cannot be overcome by better personnel management, nor by improved gadgets, but only when a love of man overcomes the idolatrous worship of things by man. As the individualism we affirm is not egoism, the selflessness we affirm is not self-elimination. On the contrary, we believe in generosity of a kind that imprints one's unique
individual qualities in the relation to other men, and to all human activity. Further, to dislike isolation is not to favor the abolition of privacy; the latter differs from isolation in that it occurs or is abolished according to individual will.

We would replace power rooted in possession, privilege, or circumstance by power and uniqueness rooted in love, reflectiveness, reason, and creativity. As a social system we seek the establishment of a democracy of individual participation, governed by two central aims: that the individual share in those social decisions determining the quality and direction of his life; that society be organized to encourage independence in men and provide the media for their common participation.

In a participatory democracy, the political life would be based in several root principles: that decision-making of basic social consequence be carried on by public groupings; that politics be seen positively, as the art of collectively creating an acceptable pattern of social relations; that politics has the function of bringing people out of isolation and into community, thus being a necessary, though not sufficient, means of finding meaning in personal life; that the political order should serve to clarify problems in a way instrumental to their solution; it should provide outlets for the expression of personal grievance and aspiration; opposing views should be organized so as to illuminate choices and facilitate the attainment of goals; channels should be commonly available to relate men to knowledge and to power so that private problems--from bad recreation facilities to personal alienation--are formulated as general issues.

The economic sphere would have as its basis the principles:

that work should involve incentives worthier than money or survival. It should be educative, not stultifying; creative, not mechanical; self-directed, not manipulated, encouraging independence, a respect for others, a sense of dignity, and a willingness to accept social responsibility, since it is this experience that has crucial influence on habits, perceptions
and individual ethics; that the economic experience is so personally decisive that the individual must share in its full determination;

that the economy itself is of such social importance that its major resources and means of production should be open to democratic participation and subject to democratic social regulation.

Like the political and economic ones, major social institutions--cultural, educational, rehabilitative, and others--should be generally organized with the well-being and dignity of man as the essential measure of success.

In social change or interchange, we find violence to be abhorrent because it requires generally the transformation of the target, be it a human being or a community of people, into a depersonalized object of hate. It is imperative that the means of violence be abolished and the institutions--local, national, international--that encourage non-violence as a condition of conflict be developed.

These are our central values, in skeletal form. It remains vital to understand their denial or attainment in the context of the modern world.

***

1. Any new left in America must be, in large measure, a left with real intellectual skills, committed to deliberativeness, honesty, reflection as working tools. The university permits the political life to be an adjunct to the academic one, and action to be informed by reason.

2. A new left must be distributed in significant social roles throughout the country. The universities are distributed in such a manner.

3. A new left must consist of younger people who matured in the postwar world, and partially be directed to the recruitment of younger people. The university is an obvious beginning point.
4. A new left must include liberals and socialists, the former for their relevance, the latter for their sense of thoroughgoing reforms in the system. The university is a more sensible place than a political party for these two traditions to begin to discuss their differences and look for political synthesis.

5. A new left must start controversy across the land, if national policies and national apathy are to be reversed. The ideal university is a community of controversy, within itself and in its effects on communities beyond.

6. A new left must transform modern complexity into issues that can be understood and felt close up by every human being. It must give form to the feelings of helplessness and indifference, so that people may see the political, social, and economic sources of their private troubles, and organize to change society. In a time of supposed prosperity, moral complacency, and political manipulation, a new left cannot rely on only aching stomachs to be the engine force of social reform. The case for change, for alternatives that will involve uncomfortable personal efforts, must be argued as never before. The university is a relevant place for all of these activities.
HERBERT MARCUSE
“Repressive Tolerance”
CHAPTER EXCERPTS FROM A CRITIQUE OF PURE TOLERANCE
1965, 1968

BACKGROUND

University of California San Diego professor Herbert Marcuse, a German-American who subscribed to the Frankfurt School of critical theory, contributed this chapter essay to the book A Critique of Pure Tolerance.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. How does Marcuse define tolerance?

2. Why does true tolerance not exist in modern democracy, according to Marcuse?

3. How does Marcuse distinguish between false and true or liberating tolerance?

4. Are there any real differences between modern democracies and modern dictatorships, according to Marcuse?

5. What does Marcuse think is necessary to establish the conditions necessary for a free society?

Tolerance is an end in itself. The elimination of violence, and the reduction of suppression to the extent required for protecting man and animals from cruelty and aggression are pre-conditions for the creation of a humane society. Such a society does not yet exist; progress toward it is perhaps more than before arrested by violence and suppression on a global scale. As deterrents against nuclear war, as police action against subversion, as technical aid in the fight against imperialism and communism, as methods of pacification in neo-colonial massacres, violence and suppression are promulgated, practiced, and defended by democratic and authoritarian governments alike, and the people subjected to these governments are educated to sustain such practices as necessary for the preservation of the status quo. Tolerance is extended to policies, conditions, and modes of behavior which should not be tolerated because they are impeding, if not destroying, the chances of creating an existence without fear and misery.

In the Contemporary period, the democratic argument for abstract tolerance tends to be invalidated by the invalidation of the democratic process itself. The liberating force of democracy was the chance it gave to effective dissent, on the individual as well as social scale, its openness to qualitatively different forms of government, of culture, education, work — of the human existence in general. The toleration of free discussion and the equal right of opposites was to define and clarify the different forms of dissent: their direction, content, prospect. But with the concentration of economic and political power and the integration of opposites in a society which uses technology as an instrument of domination, effective dissent is blocked where it could freely emerge: in the formation of opinion, in information and communication, in speech and assembly. Under the rule of monopolistic media — themselves the mere instruments of economic and political power — a mentality is created for which right and wrong, true and false are predefined wherever they affect the vital interests of the society. This is, prior to all expression and communication, a matter of semantics: the blocking of effective dissent, of the recognition of that which is not of the Establishment which begins in the language that is publicized and administered. The meaning of words is rigidly stabilized. Rational persuasion, persuasion to the opposite is all but precluded. The avenues of entrance are closed to the meaning of words and ideas other than
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the established one — established by the publicity of the powers that be, and verified in their practices. Other words can be spoken and heard, other ideas can be expressed, but, at the massive scale of the conservative majority (outside such enclaves as the intelligentsia), they are immediately “evaluated” (i.e., automatically understood) in terms of the public language — a language which determines a priori the direction in which the thought process moves. Thus the process of reflection ends where it started: in the given conditions and relations. Self-validating, the argument of the discussion repels the contradiction because the antithesis is redefined in terms of the thesis. For example, thesis: we work for peace; antithesis: we prepare for war (or even: we wage war); unification of opposites: preparing for war is working for peace. Peace is redefined as necessarily, in the prevailing situation, including preparation for war (or even war) and in this Orwellian form, the meaning of the word “peace” is stabilized. Thus, the basic vocabulary of the Orwellian language operates as a priori categories of understanding: preforming all content. These conditions invalidate the logic of tolerance which involves the rational development of meaning and precludes the closing of meaning. Consequently, persuasion through discussion and the equal presentation of opposites (even where it is really equal) easily lose their liberating force as factors of understanding and learning; they are far more likely to strengthen the established thesis and to repel the alternatives….

The factual barriers which totalitarian democracy erects against the efficacy of qualitative dissent are weak and pleasant enough compared with the practices of a dictatorship which claims to educate the people in the truth. With all its limitations and distortions, democratic tolerance is under all circumstances more humane than an institutionalized intolerance which sacrifices the rights and liberties of the living generations for the sake of future generations. The question is whether this is the only alternative. I shall presently try to suggest the direction in which an answer may be sought. In any case, the contrast is not between democracy in the abstract and dictatorship in the abstract.

Democracy is a form of government which fits very different types of society (this holds true even for a democracy with universal suffrage and equality before the law), and the human costs of a democracy are always and everywhere those exacted by the society whose
government it is. Their range extends all the way from normal exploitation, poverty, and insecurity to the victims of wars, police actions, military aid, etc., in which the society is engaged — and not only to the victims within its own frontiers. These considerations can never justify the exacting of different sacrifices and different victims on behalf of a future better society, but they do allow weighing the costs involved in the perpetuation of an existing society against the risk of promoting alternatives which offer a reasonable chance of pacification and liberation. Surely, no government can be expected to foster its own subversion, but in a democracy such a right is vested in the people (i.e., in the majority of the people). This means that the ways should not be blocked on which a subversive majority could develop, and if they are blocked by organized repression and indoctrination, their reopening may require apparently undemocratic means. They would include the withdrawal of toleration of speech and assembly from groups and movements which promote aggressive policies, armament, chauvinism, discrimination on the grounds of race and religion, or which oppose the extension of public services, social security, medical care, etc.

Moreover, the restoration of freedom of thought may necessitate new and rigid restrictions on teachings and practices in the educational institutions which, by their very methods and concepts, serve to enclose the mind within the established universe of discourse and behavior — thereby precluding a priori a rational evaluation of the alternatives. And to the degree to which freedom of thought involves the struggle against inhumanity, restoration of such freedom would also imply intolerance toward scientific research in the interest of deadly “deterrents,” of abnormal human endurance under inhuman conditions, etc.

The very notion of false tolerance, and the distinction between right and wrong limitations on tolerance, between progressive and regressive indoctrination, revolutionary and reactionary violence demand the statement of criteria for its validity. These standards must be prior to whatever constitutional and legal criteria are set up and applied in an existing society (such as “clear and present danger,” and other established definitions of civil rights and liberties), for such definitions themselves presuppose standards of freedom and repression as applicable or not applicable in the respective society: they are specifications of more general concepts. By whom, and according to what standards, can the political distinction
between true and false, progressive and regressive (for in this sphere, these pairs are equivalent) be made and its validity be justified? At the outset, I propose that the question cannot be answered in terms of the alternative between democracy and dictatorship, according to which, in the latter, one individual or group, without any effective control from below, arrogate to themselves the decision. Historically, even in the most democratic democracies, the vital and final decisions affecting the society as a whole have been made, constitutionally or in fact, by one or several groups without effective control by the people themselves. The ironical question: who educates the educators (i.e. the political leaders) also applies to democracy. The only authentic alternative and negation of dictatorship (with respect to this question) would be a society in which “the people” have become autonomous individuals, freed from the repressive requirements of a struggle for existence in the interest of domination, and as such human beings choosing their government and determining their life. Such a society does not yet exist anywhere. In the meantime, the question must be treated in abstracto — abstraction, not from the historical possibilities but from the realities of the prevailing societies.

I suggested that the distinction between true and false tolerance, between progress and regression can be made rationally on empirical grounds. The real possibilities of human freedom are relative to the attained stage of civilization. They depend on the material and intellectual resources available at the respective stage, and they are quantifiable and calculable to a high degree. So are, at the stage of advanced industrial society, the most rational ways of using these resources and distributing the social product with priority on the satisfaction of vital needs and with a minimum of toil and injustice. In other words, it is possible to define the direction in which prevailing institutions, policies, opinions would have to be changed in order to improve the chance of a peace which is not identical with cold war and a little hot war, and a satisfaction of needs which does not feed on poverty, oppression, and exploitation. Consequently, it is also possible to identify policies, opinions, movements which would promote this chance, and those which would do the opposite. Suppression of the regressive ones is a prerequisite for the strengthening of the progressive ones....
Liberating tolerance, then, would mean intolerance against movements from the Right, and toleration of movements from the Left. As to the scope of this tolerance and intolerance: . . . it would extend to the stage of action as well as of discussion and propaganda, of deed as well as of word. […] Such extreme suspension of the right of free speech and free assembly is indeed justified only if the whole of society is in extreme danger. I maintain that our society is in such an emergency situation, and that it has become the normal state of affairs. Different opinions and “philosophies” can no longer compete peacefully for adherence and persuasion on rational grounds: the “marketplace of ideas” is organized and delimited by those who determine the national and the individual interest. In this society, for which the ideologists have proclaimed the “end of ideology,” the false consciousness has become the general consciousness — from the government down to its last objects. The small and powerless minorities which struggle against the false consciousness and its beneficiaries must be helped: their continued existence is more important than the preservation of abused rights and liberties which grant constitutional powers to those who oppress these minorities. It should be evident by now that the exercise of civil rights by those who don’t have them presupposes the withdrawal of civil rights from those who prevent their exercise, and that liberation of the Damned of the Earth presupposes suppression not only of their old but also of their new masters.

Withdrawal of tolerance from regressive movements before they can become active; intolerance even toward thought, opinion, and word, and finally, intolerance in the opposite direction, that is, toward the self-styled conservatives, to the political Right — these antidemocratic notions respond to the actual development of the democratic society which has destroyed the basis for universal tolerance. The conditions under which tolerance can again become a liberating and humanizing force have still to be created. When tolerance mainly serves the protection and preservation of a repressive society, when it serves to neutralize opposition and to render men immune against other and better forms of life, then tolerance has been perverted. And when this perversion starts in the mind of the individual, in his consciousness, his needs, when heteronomous interests occupy him before he can experience his servitude, then the efforts to counteract his dehumanization must begin at the
place of entrance, there where the false consciousness takes form (or rather: is systematically formed) — it must begin with stopping the words and images which feed this consciousness. To be sure, this is censorship, even precensorship, but openly directed against the more or less hidden censorship that permeates the free media. Where the false consciousness has become prevalent in national and popular behavior, it translates itself almost immediately into practice: the safe distance between ideology and reality, repressive thought and repressive action, between the word of destruction and the deed of destruction is dangerously shortened. Thus, the break through the false consciousness may provide the Archimedean point for a larger emancipation — at an infinitesimally small spot, to be sure, but it is on the enlargement of such small spots that the chance of change depends.

Postscript, 1968

Under the conditions prevailing in this country, tolerance does not, and cannot, fulfill the civilizing function attributed to it by the liberal protagonists of democracy, namely, protection of dissent. The progressive historical force of tolerance lies in its extension to those modes and forms of dissent which are not committed to the status quo of society, and not confined to the institutional framework of the established society. Consequently, the idea of tolerance implies the necessity, for the dissenting group or individuals, to become illegitimate if and when the established legitimacy prevents and counteracts the development of dissent. This would be the case not only in a totalitarian society, under a dictatorship, in one-party states, but also in a democracy (representative, parliamentary, or "direct") where the majority does not result from the development of independent thought and opinion but rather from the monopolistic or oligopolistic administration of public opinion, without terror and (normally) without censorship. In such cases, the majority is self-perpetuating while perpetuating the vested interests which made it a majority. In its very structure this majority is "closed," petrified; it repels "a priori" any change other than changes within the system. But this means that the majority is no longer justified in claiming the democratic title of the best guardian of the common interest. And such a majority is all but the opposite of Rousseau’s "general will": it is composed, not of individuals who, in their political functions, have made effective "abstraction" from their private interests, but, on the contrary, of
individuals who have effectively identified their private interests with their political functions. And the representatives of this majority, in ascertaining and executing its will, ascertain and execute the will of the vested interests which have formed the majority. The ideology of democracy hides its lack of substance.

In the United States, this tendency goes hand in hand with the monopolistic or oligopolistic concentration of capital in the formation of public opinion, i.e., of the majority. The chance of influencing, in any effective way, this majority is at a price, in dollars, totally out of reach of the radical opposition. Here too, free competition and exchange of ideas have become a farce. The Left has no equal voice, no equal access to the mass media and their public facilities – not because a conspiracy excludes it, but because, in good old capitalist fashion, it does not have the required purchasing power. And the Left does not have the purchasing power because it is the Left. These conditions impose upon the radical minorities a strategy which is in essence a refusal to allow the continuous functioning of allegedly indiscriminate but in fact discriminate tolerance, for example, a strategy of protesting against the alternate matching of a spokesman for the Right (or Center) with one for the Left. Not "equal" but more representation of the Left would be equalization of the prevailing inequality.

Within the solid framework of preestablished inequality and power, tolerance is practiced indeed. Even outrageous opinions are expressed, outrageous incidents are televised; and the critics of established policies are interrupted by the same number of commercials as the conservative advocates. Are these interludes supposed to counteract the sheer weight, magnitude, and continuity of system-publicity, indoctrination which operates playfully through the endless commercials as well as through the entertainment?

Given this situation, I suggested in "Repressive Tolerance" the practice of discriminating tolerance in an inverse direction, as a means of shifting the balance between Right and Left by restraining the liberty of the Right, thus counteracting the pervasive inequality of freedom (unequal opportunity of access to the means of democratic persuasion) and strengthening the oppressed against the oppressors. Tolerance would be restricted with respect to
movements of a demonstrably aggressive or destructive character (destructive of the prospects for peace, justice, and freedom for all). Such discrimination would also be applied to movements opposing the extension of social legislation to the poor, weak, disabled. As against the virulent denunciations that such a policy would do away with the sacred liberalistic principle of equality for "the other side," I maintain that there are issues where either there is no "other side" in any more than a formalistic sense, or where "the other side" is demonstrably "regressive" and impedes possible improvement of the human condition. To tolerate propaganda for inhumanity vitiates the goals not only of liberalism but of every progressive political philosophy.

I presupposed the existence of demonstrable criteria for aggressive, regressive, destructive forces. If the final democratic criterion of the declared opinion of the majority no longer (or rather not yet) prevails, if vital ideas, values, and ends of human progress no longer (or rather not yet) enter, as competing equals, the formation of public opinion, if the people are no longer (or rather not yet) sovereign but "made" by the real sovereign powers – is there any alternative other than the dictatorship of an "elite" over the people? For the opinion of people (usually designated as The People) who are unfree in the very faculties in which liberalism saw the roots of freedom: independent thought and independent speech, can carry no overriding validity and authority - even if The People constitute the overwhelming majority.

If the choice were between genuine democracy and dictatorship, democracy would certainly be preferable. But democracy does not prevail. The radical critics of the existing political process are thus readily denounced as advocating an "elitism," a dictatorship of intellectuals as an alternative. What we have in fact is government, representative government by a non-intellectual minority of politicians, generals, and businessmen. The record of this "elite" is not very promising, and political prerogatives for the intelligentsia may not necessarily be worse for the society as a whole. . . .

However, the alternative to the established semi-democratic process is not a dictatorship or elite, no matter how intellectual and intelligent, but the struggle for a real democracy.
Part of this struggle is the fight against an ideology of tolerance which, in reality, favors and fortifies the conservation of the status quo of inequality and discrimination. For this struggle, I proposed the practice of discriminating tolerance. To be sure, this practice already presupposes the radical goal which it seeks to achieve. I committed this *petitio principia* in order to combat the pernicious ideology that tolerance is already institutionalized in this society. The tolerance which is the life element, the token of a free society, will never be the gift of the powers that be; it can, under the prevailing conditions of tyranny by the majority, only be won in the sustained effort of radical minorities, willing to break this tyranny and to work for the emergence of a free and sovereign majority – minorities intolerant, militantly intolerant and disobedient to the rules of behavior which tolerate destruction and suppression.
**BACKGROUND**

American political philosopher and Harvard University professor John Rawls outlined his new ideas on freedom and equality in his 1971 book *A Theory of Justice*.

**GUIDING QUESTIONS**

1. What are Rawls's two principles of justice, and why does the first necessarily precede the second, according to his logic?

2. What is the role of distribution in Rawls's general conceptions of justice and injustice?

3. What is the "difference principle," and how does it relate to the "principle of redress"?

4. What is the role of self-respect in Rawls's conception of justice?

---

Chapter 11: Two Principles of Justice

I shall now state in a provisional form the two principles of justice that I believe would be chosen in the original position. In this section I wish to make only the most general comments, and therefore the first formulation of these principles is tentative. As we go on I shall run through several formulations and approximate step by step the final statement to be given much later. I believe that doing this allows the exposition to proceed in a natural way.

The first statement of the two principles reads as follows.

First: each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive basic liberty compatible with a similar liberty for others.

Second: social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both (a) reasonably expected to be to everyone’s advantage, and (b) attached to positions and offices open to all.

There are two ambiguous phrases in the second principle, namely “everyone’s advantage” and “open to all.” Determining their sense more exactly will lead to a second formulation of the principle in § 13. The final version of the two principles is given in § 46; § 39 considers the rendering of the first principle.

By way of general comment, these principles primarily apply, as I have said, to the basic structure of society. They are to govern the assignment of rights and duties and to regulate the distribution of social and economic advantages. As their formulation suggests, these principles presuppose that the social structure can be divided into two more or less distinct parts, the first principle applying to the one, the second to the other. They distinguish between those aspects of the social system that define and secure the equal liberties of citizenship and those that specify and establish social and economic inequalities. The basic liberties of citizens are, roughly speaking, political liberty (the right to vote and to be eligible for public office) together with freedom of speech and assembly; liberty of conscience and freedom of thought; freedom of the person along with the right to hold (personal) property;
and freedom from arbitrary arrest and seizure as defined by the concept of the rule of law. These liberties are all required to be equal by the first principle, since citizens of a just society are to have the same basic rights.

The second principle applies, in the first approximation, to the distribution of income and wealth and to the design of organizations that make use of differences in authority and responsibility, or chains of command. While the distribution of wealth and income need not be equal, it must be to everyone’s advantage, and at the same time, positions of authority and offices of command must be accessible to all. One applies the second principle by holding positions open, and then, subject to this constraint, arranges social and economic inequalities so that everyone benefits.

These principles are to be arranged in a serial order with the first principle prior to the second. This ordering means that a departure from the institutions of equal liberty required by the first principle cannot be justified by, or compensated for, by greater social and economic advantages. The distribution of wealth and income, and the hierarchies of authority, must be consistent with both the liberties of equal citizenship and equality of opportunity.

It is clear that these principles are rather specific in their content, and their acceptance rests on certain assumptions that I must eventually try to explain and justify. A theory of justice depends upon a theory of society in ways that will become evident as we proceed. For the present, it should be observed that the two principles (and this holds for all formulations) are a special case of a more general conception of justice that can be expressed as follows.

All social values—liberty and opportunity, income and wealth, and the bases of self-respect—are to be distributed equally unless an unequal distribution of any, or all, of these values is to everyone’s advantage.

Injustice, then, is simply inequalities that are not to the benefit of all. Of course, this conception is extremely vague and requires interpretation.

As a first step, suppose that the basic structure of society distributes certain primary goods, that is, things that every rational man is presumed to want. These goods normally have a
use whatever a person’s rational plan of life. For simplicity, assume that the chief primary goods at the disposition of society are rights and liberties, powers and opportunities, income and wealth. (Later on in Part Three the primary good of self-respect has a central place.) These are the social primary goods. Other primary goods such as health and vigor, intelligence and imagination, are natural goods; although their possession is influenced by the basic structure, they are not so directly under its control. Imagine, then, a hypothetical initial arrangement in which all the social primary goods are equally distributed: everyone has similar rights and duties, and income and wealth are evenly shared. This state of affairs provides a benchmark for judging improvements. If certain inequalities of wealth and organizational powers would make everyone better off than in this hypothetical starting situation, then they accord with the general conception.

Now it is possible, at least theoretically, that by giving up some of their fundamental liberties men are sufficiently compensated by the resulting social and economic gains. The general conception of justice imposes no restrictions on what sort of inequalities are permissible; it only requires that everyone’s position be improved. We need not suppose anything so drastic as consenting to a condition of slavery. Imagine instead that men forego certain political rights when the economic returns are significant and their capacity to influence the course of policy by the exercise of these rights would be marginal in any case. It is this kind of exchange which the two principles as stated rule out; being arranged in serial order they do not permit exchanges between basic liberties and economic and social gains. The serial ordering of principles expresses and underlying preference among primary social goods. When this preference is rational so likewise is the choice of these principles in this order.

In developing justice as fairness I shall, for the most part, leave aside the general conception of justice and examine instead the special case of the two principles in serial order. The advantage of this procedure is that from the first the matter of priorities is recognized and an effort made to find principles to deal with it. One is led to attend throughout to the conditions under which the acknowledgment of the absolute weight of liberty with respect to social and economic advantages, as defined by the lexical order of the two principles,
would be reasonable. Offhand, this ranking appears extreme and too special a case to be of much interest; but there is more justification for it than would appear at first sight. Or at any rate, so I shall maintain (§ 82). Furthermore, the distinction between fundamental rights and liberties and economic and social benefits marks a difference among primary social goods that one should try to exploit. It suggests an important division in the social system. Of course, the distinctions drawn and the ordering proposed are bound to be at best only approximations. There are surely circumstances in which they fail. But it is essential to depict clearly the main lines of a reasonable conception of justice; and under many conditions anyway, the two principles in serial order may serve well enough. When necessary we can fall back on the more general conception…

Chapter 17: The Tendency to Equality

I wish to conclude this discussion of the two principles by explaining the sense in which they express an egalitarian conception of justice. Also I should like to forestall the objection to the principle of fair opportunity that it leads to a callous meritocratic society. In order to prepare the way for doing this, I note several aspects of the conception of justice I have set out.

First we may observe that the difference principle gives some weight to the considerations singled out by the principle of redress. This is the principle that undeserved inequalities call for redress; and since inequalities of birth and natural endowment are undeserved, these inequalities are to be somehow compensated for. Thus the principle holds that in order to treat all persons equally, to provide genuine equality of opportunity, society must give more attention to those fewer native assets and to those born into the less favorable social positions. The idea is to redress the bias of contingencies in the direction of equality. In pursuit of this principle greater resources might be spent on the education of the less rather than the more intelligent, at least over a certain time of life, say the earlier years of school.

Now the principle of redress has not to my knowledge been proposed as the sole criterion of justice, as the single aim of the social order. It is plausible as most such principles are only as a prima facie principle, one that is to be weighed in the balance with others. For
example, we are to weight it against the principle to improve the average standard of life, or to advance the common good. But whatever other principles we hold, the claims of redress are to be taken into account. It is thought to represent one of the elements in our conception of justice. Now the difference principle is not of course the principle of redress. It does not require society to try to even out handicaps as if all were expected to compete on a fair basis in the same race. But the difference principle would allocate resources in education, say, so as to improve the long-term expectation of the least favored. If this end is attained by giving more attention to the better endowed, it is permissible; otherwise not. And in making this decision, the value of education should not be assessed solely in terms of economic efficiency and social welfare. Equally if not more important is the role of education in enabling a person to enjoy the culture of his society and to take part in its affairs, and in this way to provide for each individual a secure sense of his own worth.

Thus although the difference principle is not the same as that of redress, it does achieve some of the intent of the latter principle. It transforms the aims of the basic structure so that the total scheme of institutions no longer emphasizes social efficiency and technocratic values. We see then that the difference principle represents, in effect, an agreement to regard the distribution of natural talents as a common asset and to share in the benefits of this distribution whatever it turns out to be. Those who have been favored by nature, whoever they are, may gain from their good fortune only on terms that improve the situation of those who have lost out…

Chapter 29: Main Grounds for the Two Principles

…Furthermore, the public recognition of the two principles gives greater support to men’s self-respect and this in turn increases the effectiveness of social cooperation. Both effects are reasons for choosing these principles. It is clearly rational for men to secure their self-respect. A sense of their own worth is necessary if they are to pursue their conception of the good with zest and to delight in its fulfillment. Self-respect is not so much a part of any rational plan of life as the sense that one’s plan is worth carrying out. Now our self-respect
Normally depends upon the respect of others. Unless we feel that our endeavors are honored by them, it is difficult if not impossible for us to maintain the conviction that our ends are worth advancing (§ 67). Hence for this reason the parties would accept the natural duty of mutual respect which asks them to treat one another civilly and to be willing to explain the grounds of their actions, especially when the claims of others are overruled (§ 51).

Moreover, one may assume that those who respect themselves are more likely to respect each other and conversely. Self-contempt leads to contempt of others and threatens their good as much as envy does. Self-respect is reciprocally self-supporting.

Thus a desirable feature of a conception of justice is that it should publicly express men’s respect for one another. In this way they insure a sense of their own value. Now the two principles achieve this end. For when society follows these principles, everyone’s good is included in a scheme of mutual benefit and this public affirmation in institutions of each man’s endeavors supports men’s self-esteem. The establishment of equal liberty and the operation of the difference principle are bound to have this effect. The two principles are equivalent, as I have remarked, to an undertaking to regard the distribution of natural abilities as a collective asset so that the more fortunate are to benefit only in ways that help those who have lost out. I do not say that the parties are moved by the ethical propriety of this idea. But there are reasons for them to accept this principle. For by arranging inequalities for reciprocal advantage and by abstaining from the exploitation of the contingencies of nature and social circumstance within a framework of equal liberty, persons express their respect for one another in the very constitution of their society. In this way they insure their self-esteem as it is rational for them to do…
JUSTICE HARRY BLACKMUN

Jane Roe, et al. v. Henry Wade,
District Attorney of Dallas County
U.S. SUPREME COURT MAJORITY OPINION EXCERPTS

January 22, 1973
Supreme Court | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

Jane Roe (Norma McCorvey) sought an abortion in Texas, which Texas law held as illegal at the time. The Supreme Court handed down this ruling on the constitutionality of states to prohibit abortions within their boundaries.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Why does the court argue that states should have an interest in making abortion legal?
2. How does the court locate the right to privacy within the Constitution?
3. In what ways does the court take into account the life of the baby and the life of the mother?
4. How does the court limit abortion in its opinion?
5. Why does the court argue it need not determine when human life begins?

MR. JUSTICE BLACKMUN delivered the opinion of the Court.

...When most criminal abortion laws were first enacted, the procedure was a hazardous one for the woman. This was particularly true prior to the development of antisepsis. Antiseptic techniques, of course, were based on discoveries by Lister, Pasteur, and others first announced in 1867, but were not generally accepted and employed until about the turn of the century. Abortion mortality was high. Even after 1900, and perhaps until as late as the development of antibiotics in the 1940's, standard modern techniques such as dilation and curettage were not nearly so safe as they are today. Thus, it has been argued that a State's real concern in enacting a criminal abortion law was to protect the pregnant woman, that is, to restrain her from submitting to a procedure that placed her life in serious jeopardy.

Modern medical techniques have altered this situation. Appellants and various amici refer to medical data indicating that abortion in early pregnancy, that is, prior to the end of the first trimester, although not without its risk, is now relatively safe. Mortality rates for women undergoing early abortions, where the procedure is legal, appear to be as low as or lower than the rates for normal childbirth. Consequently, any interest of the State in protecting the woman from an inherently hazardous procedure, except when it would be equally dangerous for her to forgo it, has largely disappeared. Of course, important state interests in the areas of health and medical standards do remain. The State has a legitimate interest in seeing to it that abortion, like any other medical procedure, is performed under circumstances that insure maximum safety for the patient. This interest obviously extends at least to the performing physician and his staff, to the facilities involved, to the availability of after-care, and to adequate provision for any complication or emergency that might arise. The prevalence of high mortality rates at illegal "abortion mills" strengthens, rather than weakens, the State's interest in regulating the conditions under which abortions are performed. Moreover, the risk to the woman increases as her pregnancy continues. Thus, the State retains a definite interest in protecting the woman's own health and safety when an abortion is proposed at a late stage of pregnancy.
The third reason is the State’s interest - some phrase it in terms of duty - in protecting prenatal life. Some of the argument for this justification rests on the theory that a new human life is present from the moment of conception. The State’s interest and general obligation to protect life then extends, it is argued, to prenatal life. Only when the life of the pregnant mother herself is at stake, balanced against the life she carries within her, should the interest of the embryo or fetus not prevail. Logically, of course, a legitimate state interest in this area need not stand or fall on acceptance of the belief that life begins at conception or at some other point prior to live birth. In assessing the State’s interest, recognition may be given to the less rigid claim that as long as at least potential life is involved, the State may assert interests beyond the protection of the pregnant woman alone.

The Constitution does not explicitly mention any right of privacy. In a line of decisions, however…the Court has recognized that a right of personal privacy, or a guarantee of certain areas or zones of privacy, does exist under the Constitution. In varying contexts, the Court or individual Justices have, indeed, found at least the roots of that right…in the penumbras of the Bill of Rights, *Griswold v. Connecticut*…or in the concept of liberty guaranteed by the first section of the Fourteenth Amendment, see *Meyer v. Nebraska*. These decisions make it clear that only personal rights that can be deemed "fundamental" or "implicit in the concept of ordered liberty," *Palko v. Connecticut*, are included in this guarantee of personal privacy.

This right of privacy, whether it be founded in the Fourteenth Amendment’s concept of personal liberty and restrictions upon state action, as we feel it is, or, as the District Court determined, in the Ninth Amendment’s reservation of rights to the people, is broad enough to encompass a woman’s decision whether or not to terminate her pregnancy. The detriment that the State would impose upon the pregnant woman by denying this choice altogether is apparent. Specific and direct harm medically diagnosable even in early pregnancy may be involved. Maternity, or additional offspring, may force upon the woman a distressful life and future. Psychological harm may be imminent. Mental and physical health may be taxed by child care. There is also the distress, for all concerned, associated with the unwanted child, and there is the problem of bringing a child into a family already unable,
psychologically and otherwise, to care for it. In other cases, as in this one, the additional difficulties and continuing stigma of unwed motherhood may be involved. All these are factors the woman and her responsible physician necessarily will consider in consultation.

On the basis of elements such as these, appellant and some amici argue that the woman's right is absolute and that she is entitled to terminate her pregnancy at whatever time, in whatever way, and for whatever reason she alone chooses. With this we do not agree. Appellant's arguments that Texas either has no valid interest at all in regulating the abortion decision, or no interest strong enough to support any limitation upon the woman's sole determination, are unpersuasive. The Court's decisions recognizing a right of privacy also acknowledge that some state regulation in areas protected by that right is appropriate. As noted above, a State may properly assert important interests in safeguarding health, in maintaining medical standards, and in protecting potential life. At some point in pregnancy, these respective interests become sufficiently compelling to sustain regulation of the factors that govern the abortion decision. The privacy right involved, therefore, cannot be said to be absolute. In fact, it is not clear to us that the claim asserted by some amici that one has an unlimited right to do with one's body as one pleases bears a close relationship to the right of privacy previously articulated in the Court's decisions. The Court has refused to recognize an unlimited right of this kind in the past. *Jacobson v. Massachusetts*, (vaccination); *Buck v. Bell*, ( sterilization).

We, therefore, conclude that the right of personal privacy includes the abortion decision, but that this right is not unqualified and must be considered against important state interests in regulation.…

In the recent abortion cases, cited above, courts have recognized these principles. Those striking down state laws have generally scrutinized the State's interests in protecting health and potential life, and have concluded that neither interest justified broad limitations on the reasons for which a physician and his pregnant patient might decide that she should have an abortion in the early stages of pregnancy. Courts sustaining state laws have held
that the State's determinations to protect health or prenatal life are dominant and constitutionally justifiable.

The Constitution does not define "person" in so many words. Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment contains three references to "person." The first, in defining "citizens," speaks of "persons born or naturalized in the United States." The word also appears both in the Due Process Clause and in the Equal Protection Clause. "Person" is used in other places in the Constitution... None indicates, with any assurance, that it has any possible pre-natal application.

All this, together with our observation, supra, that throughout the major portion of the 19th century prevailing legal abortion practices were far freer than they are today, persuades us that the word "person," as used in the Fourteenth Amendment, does not include the unborn...

The pregnant woman cannot be isolated in her privacy. She carries an embryo and, later, a fetus, if one accepts the medical definitions of the developing young in the human uterus... The situation therefore is inherently different from marital intimacy, or bedroom possession of obscene material, or marriage, or procreation, or education... As we have intimated above, it is reasonable and appropriate for a State to decide that at some point in time another interest, that of health of the mother or that of potential human life, becomes significantly involved. The woman's privacy is no longer sole and any right of privacy she possesses must be measured accordingly.

Texas urges that, apart from the Fourteenth Amendment, life begins at conception and is present throughout pregnancy, and that, therefore, the State has a compelling interest in protecting that life from and after conception. We need not resolve the difficult question of when life begins. When those trained in the respective disciplines of medicine, philosophy, and theology are unable to arrive at any consensus, the judiciary, at this point in the development of man's knowledge, is not in a position to speculate as to the answer.
It should be sufficient to note briefly the wide divergence of thinking on this most sensitive and difficult question.

In view of all this, we do not agree that, by adopting one theory of life, Texas may override the rights of the pregnant woman that are at stake. We repeat, however, that the State does have an important and legitimate interest in preserving and protecting the health of the pregnant woman, whether she be a resident of the State or a nonresident who seeks medical consultation and treatment there, and that it has still another important and legitimate interest in protecting the potentiality of human life. These interests are separate and distinct. Each grows in substantiality as the woman approaches term and, at a point during pregnancy, each becomes "compelling."

With respect to the State's important and legitimate interest in the health of the mother, the "compelling" point, in the light of present medical knowledge, is at approximately the end of the first trimester. This is so because of the now-established medical fact...that until the end of the first trimester mortality in abortion may be less than mortality in normal childbirth. It follows that, from and after this point, a State may regulate the abortion procedure to the extent that the regulation reasonably relates to the preservation and protection of maternal health. Examples of permissible state regulation in this area are requirements as to the qualifications of the person who is to perform the abortion; as to the licensure of that person; as to the facility in which the procedure is to be performed, that is, whether it must be a hospital or may be a clinic or some other place of less-than-hospital status; as to the licensing of the facility; and the like.

This means, on the other hand, that, for the period of pregnancy prior to this "compelling" point, the attending physician, in consultation with his patient, is free to determine, without regulation by the State, that, in his medical judgment, the patient's pregnancy should be terminated. If that decision is reached, the judgment may be effectuated by an abortion free of interference by the State.

With respect to the State's important and legitimate interest in potential life, the "compelling" point is at viability. This is so because the fetus then presumably has the capability of
meaningful life outside the mother's womb. State regulation protective of fetal life after viability thus has both logical and biological justifications. If the State is interested in protecting fetal life after viability, it may go so far as to proscribe abortion during that period, except when it is necessary to preserve the life or health of the mother.

5 Measured against these standards, Art. 1196 of the Texas Penal Code, in restricting legal abortions to those "procured or attempted by medical advice for the purpose of saving the life of the mother," sweeps too broadly. The statute makes no distinction between abortions performed early in pregnancy and those performed later, and it limits to a single reason, "saving" the mother's life, the legal justification for the procedure. The statute, therefore, cannot survive the constitutional attack made upon it here....

Our conclusion that Art. 1196 is unconstitutional means, of course, that the Texas abortion statutes, as a unit, must fall. The exception of Art. 1196 cannot be struck down separately, for then the State would be left with a statute proscribing all abortion procedures no matter how medically urgent the case.
JUSTICE ANTHONY KENNEDY


U.S. SUPREME COURT MAJORITY OPINION EXCERPTS

June 29, 1992

Supreme Court | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

The Supreme Court ruled that a Pennsylvania law requiring parental consent for a minor to abort her baby was constitutional but that its requirement that a wife notify her husband before aborting their baby was unconstitutional. In his opinion for the majority, Justice Anthony Kennedy offered his view on liberty and the mystery of life.

ANNOTATIONS

Our law affords constitutional protection to personal decisions relating to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, child rearing, and education. Carey v. Population Services International, 431 U. S., at 685. Our cases recognize "the right of the individual, married or single, to be free from unwarranted governmental intrusion into matters so fundamentally affecting a person as the decision whether to bear or beget a child." Eisenstadt v. Baird, supra, at 453 (emphasis in original). Our precedents "have respected the private realm of family life which the state cannot enter." Prince v. Massachusetts, 321 U. S. 158, 166 (1944). These matters, involving the most intimate and personal choices a person may make in a lifetime, choices central to personal dignity and autonomy, are central to the liberty protected by the Fourteenth Amendment. At the heart of liberty is the right to define one's own concept of existence, of meaning, of the universe, and of the mystery of human life. Beliefs about these matters could not define the attributes of personhood were they formed under compulsion of the State.

JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

Estelle T. Griswold and C. Lee Buxton
v. Connecticut

U.S. SUPREME COURT MAJORITY OPINION EXCERPTS

June 7, 1965
Supreme Court | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

“The Executive Director of the Planned Parenthood League of Connecticut, and its medical director, a licensed physician, were convicted as accessories for giving married persons information and medical advice on how to prevent conception…. A Connecticut statute makes it a crime for any person to use any drug or article to prevent conception. Appellants claimed that the accessory statute, as applied, violated the Fourteenth Amendment. An intermediate appellate court and the State’s highest court affirmed the judgment....” The Supreme Court issued this ruling on the case.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What right does the Court claim protects the use of contraceptives by married couples?

2. Where in the Bill of Rights does the Court say this right is protected?

MR. JUSTICE DOUGLAS delivered the opinion of the Court.

….Coming to the merits, we are met with a wide range of questions that implicate the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. We do not sit as a super-legislature to determine the wisdom, need, and propriety of laws that touch economic problems, business affairs, or social conditions. This law, however, operates directly on an intimate relation of husband and wife and their physician’s role in one aspect of that relation.

The association of people is not mentioned in the Constitution nor in the Bill of Rights. The right to educate a child in a school of the parents' choice -- whether public or private or parochial -- is also not mentioned. Nor is the right to study any particular subject or any foreign language. Yet the First Amendment has been construed to include certain of those rights.

By Pierce v. Society of Sisters, supra, the right to educate one’s children as one chooses is made applicable to the States by the force of the First and Fourteenth Amendments. By Meyer v. Nebraska, supra, the same dignity is given the right to study the German language in a private school. In other words, the State may not, consistently with the spirit of the First Amendment, contract the spectrum of available knowledge. The right of freedom of speech and press includes not only the right to utter or to print, but the right to distribute, the right to receive, the right to read (Martin v. Struthers, 319 U. S. 141, 319 U. S. 143) and freedom of inquiry, freedom of thought, and freedom to teach (see Wiemann v. Updegraff, 344 U. S. 183, 344 U. S. 195) -- indeed, the freedom of the entire university community..... Without those peripheral rights, the specific rights would be less secure. And so we reaffirm the principle of the Pierce and the Meyer cases.

In NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U. S. 449, 357 U. S. 462 we protected the "freedom to associate and privacy in one's associations," noting that freedom of association was a peripheral First Amendment right. Disclosure of membership lists of a constitutionally valid association, we held, was invalid “as entailing the likelihood of a substantial restraint upon the exercise by petitioner’s members of their right to freedom of association.”
Ibid. In other words, the First Amendment has a penumbra where privacy is protected from governmental intrusion. In like context, we have protected forms of "association" that are not political in the customary sense, but pertain to the social, legal, and economic benefit of the members. *NAACP v. Button*, 371 U. S. 415, 371 U. S. 430-431. In *Schware v. Board of Bar Examiners*, 353 U. S. 232, we held it not permissible to bar a lawyer from practice because he had once been a member of the Communist Party. The man's "association with that Party" was not shown to be "anything more than a political faith in a political party" (id. at 353 U. S. 244), and was not action of a kind proving bad moral character. Id. at 353 U. S. 245-246.

Those cases involved more than the "right of assembly" -- a right that extends to all, irrespective of their race or ideology. *De Jonge v. Oregon*, 299 U. S. 353. The right of "association," like the right of belief (*Board of Education v. Barnette*, 319 U. S. 624), is more than the right to attend a meeting; it includes the right to express one's attitudes or philosophies by membership in a group or by affiliation with it or by other lawful means. Association in that context is a form of expression of opinion, and, while it is not expressly included in the First Amendment, its existence is necessary in making the express guarantees fully meaningful.

The foregoing cases suggest that specific guarantees in the Bill of Rights have penumbras, formed by emanations from those guarantees that help give them life and substance. See *Poe v. Ullman*, 367 U. S. 497, 367 U. S. 516-522 (dissenting opinion). Various guarantees create zones of privacy. The right of association contained in the penumbra of the First Amendment is one, as we have seen. The Third Amendment, in its prohibition against the quartering of soldiers "in any house" in time of peace without the consent of the owner, is another facet of that privacy. The Fourth Amendment explicitly affirms the "right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures." The Fifth Amendment, in its Self-Incrimination Clause, enables the citizen to create a zone of privacy which government may not force him to surrender to his detriment. The Ninth Amendment provides: "The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."
The Fourth and Fifth Amendments were described in *Boyd v. United States*, 116 U. S. 616, 116 U. S. 630, as protection against all governmental invasions "of the sanctity of a man's home and the privacies of life." We recently referred in *Mapp v. Ohio*, 367 U. S. 643, 367 U. S. 656, to the Fourth Amendment as creating a "right to privacy, no less important than any other right carefully an particularly reserved to the people."...

We have had many controversies over these penumbral rights of "privacy and repose."... These cases bear witness that the right of privacy which presses for recognition here is a legitimate one.

The present case, then, concerns a relationship lying within the zone of privacy created by several fundamental constitutional guarantees. And it concerns a law which, in forbidding the use of contraceptives, rather than regulating their manufacture or sale, seeks to achieve its goals by means having a maximum destructive impact upon that relationship. Such a law cannot stand in light of the familiar principle, so often applied by this Court, that a "governmental purpose to control or prevent activities constitutionally subject to state regulation may not be achieved by means which sweep unnecessarily broadly and thereby invade the area of protected freedoms."

*NAACP v. Alabama*, 377 U. S. 288, 377 U. S. 307. Would we allow the police to search the sacred precincts of marital bedrooms for telltale signs of the use of contraceptives? The very idea is repulsive to the notions of privacy surrounding the marriage relationship.

We deal with a right of privacy older than the Bill of Rights -- older than our political parties, older than our school system. Marriage is a coming together for better or for worse, hopefully enduring, and intimate to the degree of being sacred. It is an association that promotes a way of life, not causes; a harmony in living, not political faiths; a bilateral loyalty, not commercial or social projects. Yet it is an association for as noble a purpose as any involved in our prior decisions.

Reversed.
JUSTICE OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES, JR.

Dissents

IN ABRAMS v. UNITED STATES AND GITLOW v. NEW YORK

1919 and 1925
Supreme Court | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

Just Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote these dissents in two cases involving speech against the government.

ANNOTATIONS

Jacob Abrams, et al. v. United States

Persecution for the expression of opinions seems to me perfectly logical. If you have no doubt of your premises or your power, and want a certain result with all your heart, you naturally express your wishes in law, and sweep away all opposition. To allow opposition by speech seems to indicate that you think the speech impotent, as when a man says that he has squared the circle, or that you do not care wholeheartedly for the result, or that you doubt either your power or your premises. But when men have realized that time has upset many fighting faiths, they may come to believe even more than they believe the very foundations of their own conduct that the ultimate good desired is better reached by free trade in ideas—that the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market, and that truth is the only ground upon which their wishes safely can be carried out. That, at any rate, is the theory of our Constitution. It is an experiment, as all life is an experiment. Every year, if not every day, we have to wager our salvation upon some prophecy based upon imperfect knowledge. While that experiment is part of our system, I think that we should be eternally vigilant against attempts to check the expression of opinions that we loathe and believe to be fraught with death, unless they so imminently threaten immediate interference with the lawful and pressing purposes of the law that an

immediate check is required to save the country. I wholly disagree with the argument of the Government that the First Amendment left the common law as to seditious libel in force. History seems to me against the notion. I had conceived that the United States, through many years, had shown its repentance for the Sedition Act of 1798, by repaying fines that it imposed. Only the emergency that makes it immediately dangerous to leave the correction of evil counsels to time warrants making any exception to the sweeping command, “Congress shall make no law…abridging the freedom of speech.” Of course, I am speaking only of expressions of opinion and exhortations, which were all that were uttered here, but I regret that I cannot put into more impressive words my belief that, in their conviction upon this indictment, the defendants were deprived of their rights under the Constitution of the United States.

Benjamin Gitlow v. People of the State of New York

MR. JUSTICE BRANDEIS and I are of opinion that this judgment should be reversed. The general principle of free speech, it seems to me, must be taken to be included in the Fourteenth Amendment, in view of the scope that has been given to the word "liberty" as there used, although perhaps it may be accepted with a somewhat larger latitude of interpretation than is allowed to Congress by the sweeping language that governs or ought to govern the laws of the United States. If I am right, then I think that the criterion sanctioned by the full Court in Schenck v. United States, 249 U. S. 47, 249 U. S. 52, applies.

"The question in every case is whether the words used are used in such circumstances and are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about the substantive evils that [the State] has a right to prevent."

It is true that, in my opinion, this criterion was departed from in Abrams v. United States, 250 U. S. 616, but the convictions that I expressed in that case are too deep for it to be possible for me as yet to believe that it and Schaefer v. United States, 251 U. S. 466, have settled the law. If what I think the correct test is applied, it is manifest that there was no
present danger of an attempt to overthrow the government by force on the part of the admittedly small minority who shared the defendant’s views. It is said that this manifesto was more than a theory, that it was an incitement. Every idea is an incitement. It offers itself for belief, and, if believed, it is acted on unless some other belief outweighs it or some failure of energy stifles the movement at its birth. The only difference between the expression of an opinion and an incitement in the narrower sense is the speaker’s enthusiasm for the result. Eloquence may set fire to reason. But whatever may be thought of the redundant discourse before us, it had no chance of starting a present conflagration. If, in the long run, the beliefs expressed in proletarian dictatorship are destined to be accepted by the dominant forces of the community, the only meaning of free speech is that they should be given their chance and have their way.

If the publication of this document had been laid as an attempt to induce an uprising against government at once, and not at some indefinite time in the future, it would have presented a different question. The object would have been one with which the law might deal, subject to the doubt whether there was any danger that the publication could produce any result, or in other words, whether it was not futile and too remote from possible consequences. But the indictment alleges the publication, and nothing more.
JUSTICE HARLAN FISKE STONE

United States v. Carolene Products Co.,

Footnote 4

U.S. SUPREME COURT MAJORITY OPINION EXCERPT

April 25, 1938
Supreme Court | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

Justice Harlan Fiske Stone offered this preview of the direction the Supreme Court would like to take future cases in the footnote to his majority opinion in United States v. Carolene Products Co.

ANNOTATIONS

There may be narrower scope for operation of the presumption of constitutionality when legislation appears on its face to be within a specific prohibition of the Constitution, such as those of the first ten amendments, which are deemed equally specific when held to be embraced within the Fourteenth….

It is unnecessary to consider now whether legislation which restricts those political processes which can ordinarily be expected to bring about repeal of undesirable legislation is to be subjected to more exacting judicial scrutiny under the general prohibitions of the Fourteenth Amendment than are most other types of legislation….

Nor need we enquire whether similar considerations enter into the review of statutes directed at particular religious…or national…or racial minorities…: whether prejudice against discrete and insular minorities may be a special condition, which tends seriously to curtail the operation of those political processes ordinarily to be relied upon to protect minorities, and which may call for a correspondingly more searching judicial inquiry….

U.S. SUPREME COURT  

Clarence Brandenburg v. State of Ohio  
UNSIGNED OPINION EXCERPTS

June 9, 1969  
Supreme Court | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

The Supreme Court offered this unsigned opinion in response to Clarence Brandenburg, who appealed his conviction under an Ohio law that prohibited speech encouraging of criminal actions, arguing that the law violated his First Amendment rights.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What type of speech did Ohio make illegal?

2. What did the Court rule on the Ohio law? Why?

---

The appellant, a leader of a Ku Klux Klan group, was convicted under the Ohio Criminal Syndicalism statute for 'advocat(ing) * * * the duty, necessity, or propriety of crime, sabotage, violence, or unlawful methods of terrorism as a means of accomplishing industrial or political reform' and for 'voluntarily assembl(ing) with any society, group, or assemblage of persons formed to teach or advocate the doctrines of criminal syndicalism.' Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 2923.13. He was fined $1,000 and sentenced to one to 10 years' imprisonment. The appellant challenged the constitutionality of the criminal syndicalism statute under the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, but the intermediate appellate court of Ohio affirmed his conviction without opinion. The Supreme Court of Ohio dismissed his appeal, sua sponte, 'for the reason that no substantial constitutional question exists herein.' It did not file an opinion or explain its conclusions. Appeal was taken to this Court, and we noted probable jurisdiction. 393 U.S. 948, 89 S.Ct. 377, 21 L.Ed.2d 360 (1968). We reverse….

The Ohio Criminal Syndicalism Statute was enacted in 1919. From 1917 to 1920, identical or quite similar laws were adopted by 20 States and two territories. E. Dowell, A History of Criminal Syndicalism Legislation in the United States 21 (1939). In 1927, this Court sustained the constitutionality of California's Criminal Syndicalism Act, Cal. Penal Code §§ 11400—11402, the text of which is quite similar to that of the laws of Ohio. Whitney v. California, 274 U.S. 357, 47 S.Ct. 641, 71 L.Ed. 1095 (1927). The Court upheld the statute on the ground that, without more, 'advocating' violent means to effect political and economic change involves such danger to the security of the State that the State may outlaw it. Cf. Fiske v. Kansas, 274 U.S. 380, 47 S.Ct. 655, 71 L.Ed. 1108 (1927). But Whitney has been thoroughly discredited by later decisions. See Dennis v. United States, 341 U.S. 494, at 507, 71 S.Ct. 857, at 866, 95 L.Ed. 1137 (1951). These later decisions have fashioned the principle that the constitutional guarantees of free speech and free press do not permit a State to forbid or proscribe advocacy of the use of force or of law violation except where such advocacy is directed to inciting or producing imminent lawless action and is likely to incite or produce such action.2 As we said in Noto v. United States, 367 U.S. 290, 297—298, 81 S.Ct. 1517, 1520—1521, 6 L.Ed.2d 836 (1961), 'the mere abstract teaching * * * of the moral
propriety or even moral necessity for a resort to force and violence, is not the same as preparing a group for violent action and steeling it to such action.’ See also *Herndon v. Lowry*, 301 U.S. 242, 259—261, 57 S.Ct. 732, 739—740, 81 L.Ed. 1066 (1937); *Bond v. Floyd*, 385 U.S. 116, 134, 87 S.Ct. 339, 348, 17 L.Ed.2d 235 (1966). A statute which fails to draw this distinction impermissibly intrudes upon the freedoms guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments. It sweeps within its condemnation speech which our Constitution has immunized from governmental control….

Measured by this test, Ohio’s Criminal Syndicalism Act cannot be sustained. The Act punishes persons who 'advocate or teach the duty, necessity, or propriety' of violence 'as a means of accomplishing industrial or political reform'; or who publish or circulate or display any book or paper containing such advocacy; or who 'justify' the commission of violent acts 'with intent to exemplify, spread or advocate the propriety of the doctrines of criminal syndicalism'; or who 'voluntarily assemble' with a group formed 'to teach or advocate the doctrines of criminal syndicalism.' Neither the indictment nor the trial judge's instructions to the jury in any way refined the statute's bald definition of the crime in terms of mere advocacy not distinguished from incitement to imminent lawless action.

Accordingly, we are here confronted with a statute which, by its own words and as applied, purports to punish mere advocacy and to forbid, on pain of criminal punishment, assembly with others merely to advocate the described type of action. Such a statute falls within the condemnation of the First and Fourteenth Amendments. The contrary teaching of *Whitney v. California*, supra, cannot be supported, and that decision is therefore overruled.

Mr. Justice BLACK, concurring.
BACKGROUND

The Supreme Court made this ruling on the relationship between religion and government support thereof.

ANNOTATIONS

The “establishment of religion” clause of the First Amendment means at least this: neither a state nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go to or to remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or non-attendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a state nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups, and vice versa. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect “a wall of separation between church and State.”

...The First Amendment has erected a wall between church and state. That wall must be kept high and impregnable. We could not approve the slightest breach.

JUSTICE HUGO BLACK

Steven I. Engel, et al. v.
William J. Vitale, Jr., et al.
U.S. SUPREME COURT MAJORITY OPINION EXCERPTS

June 6, 1962
Supreme Court | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

Justice Hugo Black delivered this opinion concerning the government’s relationship with religion.

ANNOTATIONS

The First Amendment was added to the Constitution to stand as a guarantee that neither the power nor the prestige of the Federal Government would be used to control, support or influence the kinds of prayer the American people can say--that the people’s religions must not be subjected to the pressures of government for change each time a new political administration is elected to office. Under that Amendment’s prohibition against governmental establishment of religion, as reinforced by the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment, government in this country, be it state or federal, is without power to prescribe by law any particular form of prayer which is to be used as an official prayer in carrying on any program of governmentally sponsored religious activity.

There can be no doubt that New York’s state prayer program officially establishes the religious beliefs embodied in the Regents’ prayer. The respondents' argument to the contrary, which is largely based upon the contention that the Regents’ prayer is "nondenominational" and the fact that the program, as modified and approved by state courts, does not require all pupils to recite the prayer, but permits those who wish to do so to remain silent or be

excused from the room, ignores the essential nature of the program’s constitutional defects. Neither the fact that the prayer may be denominationally neutral nor the fact that its observance on the part of the students is voluntary can serve to free it from the limitations of the Establishment Clause, as it might from the Free Exercise Clause, of the First Amendment, both of which are operative against the States by virtue of the Fourteenth Amendment. Although these two clauses may, in certain instances, overlap, they forbid two quite different kinds of governmental encroachment upon religious freedom. The Establishment Clause, unlike the Free Exercise Clause, does not depend upon any showing of direct governmental compulsion and is violated by the enactment of laws which establish an official religion whether those laws operate directly to coerce nonobserving individuals or not. This is not to say, of course, that laws officially prescribing a particular form of religious worship do not involve coercion of such individuals. When the power, prestige and financial support of government is placed behind a particular religious belief, the indirect coercive pressure upon religious minorities to conform to the prevailing officially approved religion is plain. But the purposes underlying the Establishment Clause go much further than that. Its first and most immediate purpose rested on the belief that a union of government and religion tends to destroy government and to degrade religion.
JUSTICE JOHN MARSHALL HARLAN

Paul Robert Cohen v. State of California

U.S. SUPREME COURT MAJORITY OPINION EXCERPTS

June 7, 1971

Supreme Court | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

Paul Cohen was charged under a California statute that prohibited offensive conduct for wearing a jacket emblazoned with profanity while inside a county courthouse. He was found guilty and sentenced to 30 days in jail. Cohen argued that California’s statute violated a right to free expression protected by the First Amendment. The Court ruled on his appeal in this decision.

ANNOTATIONS

[T]he principle contended for by the State seems inherently boundless. How is one to distinguish this from any other offensive word? Surely the State has no right to cleanse public debate to the point where it is grammatically palatable to the most squeamish among us. Yet no readily ascertainable general principle exists for stopping short of that result were we to affirm the judgment below. For, while the particular four-letter word being litigated here is perhaps more distasteful than most others of its genre, it is nevertheless often true that one man’s vulgarity is another’s lyric. Indeed, we think it is largely because governmental officials cannot make principled distinctions in this area that the Constitution leaves matters of taste and style so largely to the individual.

Additionally, we cannot overlook the fact, because it is well illustrated by the episode involved here, that much linguistic expression serves a dual communicative function: it conveys not only ideas capable of relatively precise, detached explication, but otherwise inexpressible emotions as well. In fact, words are often chosen as much for their emotive as their cognitive force. We cannot sanction the view that the Constitution, while solicitous of the cognitive content of individual speech, has little or no regard for that emotive func-

tion which, practically speaking, may often be the more important element of the overall message sought to be communicated. Indeed, as Mr. Justice Frankfurter has said, “[o]ne of the prerogatives of American citizenship is the right to criticize public men and measures—and that means not only informed and responsible criticism, but the freedom to speak foolishly and without moderation....”

Finally, and in the same vein, we cannot indulge the facile assumption that one can forbid particular words without also running a substantial risk of suppressing ideas in the process. Indeed, governments might soon seize upon the censorship of particular words as a convenient guise for banning the expression of unpopular views. We have been able, as noted above, to discern little social benefit that might result from running the risk of opening the door to such grave results.
BACKGROUND

Congress attempted to amend the Campaign Finance Act of 1971 to impose contribution and expenditure restrictions, and the Court delivered this opinion on the constitutionality of the changes by Congress.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What Constitutional amendment did the Court hold that the limits on expenditures violated?
2. Why did the Court determine that the individual contribution limits were constitutional?

The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (Act), as amended in 1974, (a) limits political contributions to candidates for federal elective office by an individual or a group to $1,000 and by a political committee to $5,000 to any single candidate per election, with an overall annual limitation of $25,000 by an individual contributor; (b) limits expenditures by individuals or groups "relative to a clearly identified candidate" to $1,000 per candidate per election, and by a candidate from his personal or family funds to various specified annual amounts depending upon the federal office sought, and restricts over-all general election and primary campaign expenditures by candidates to various specified amounts, again depending upon the federal office sought; (c) requires political committees to keep detailed records of contributions and expenditures, including the name and address of each individual contributing in excess of $10, and his occupation and principal place of business if his contribution exceeds $100, and to file quarterly reports with the Federal Election Commission disclosing the source of every contribution exceeding $100 and the recipient and purpose of every expenditure over $100, and also requires every individual or group, other than a candidate or political committee, making contributions or expenditures exceeding $100 "other than by contribution to a political committee or candidate" to file a statement with the Commission; and (d) creates the eight-member Commission as the administering agency with recordkeeping, disclosure, and investigatory functions and extensive rulemaking, adjudicatory, and enforcement powers, and consisting of two members appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, two by the Speaker of the House, and two by the President (all subject to confirmation by both Houses of Congress), and the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House as ex officio nonvoting members. Subtitle H of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (IRC), as amended in 1974, provides for public financing of Presidential nominating conventions and general election and primary campaigns from general revenues and allocates such funding to conventions and general election campaigns by establishing three categories: (1) "major" parties (those whose candidate received 25% or more of the vote in the most recent election), which receive full funding; (2) "minor" parties (those whose candidate received at least 5% but less than 25% of the votes at the last election), which receive only a percentage of the funds to which the major parties are entitled; and (3) "new" parties (all other parties), which are limited to receipt of post-election
funds or are not entitled to any funds if their candidate receives less than 5% of the vote. A primary candidate for the Presidential nomination by a political party who receives more than $5,000 from private sources (counting only the first $250 of each contribution) in each of at least 20 States is eligible for matching public funds. Appellants (various federal office-holders and candidates, supporting political organizations, and others) brought suit against appellees (the Secretary of the Senate, Clerk of the House, Comptroller General, Attorney General, and the Commission) seeking declaratory and injunctive relief against the above statutory provisions on various constitutional grounds. The Court of Appeals, on certified questions from the District Court, upheld all but one of the statutory provisions. A three-judge District Court upheld the constitutionality of Subtitle H.

The Act’s contribution provisions are constitutional, but the expenditure provisions violate the First Amendment.

(a) The contribution provisions, along with those covering disclosure, are appropriate legislative weapons against the reality or appearance of improper influence stemming from the dependence of candidates on large campaign contributions, and the ceilings imposed accordingly serve the basic governmental interest in safeguarding the integrity of the electoral process without directly impinging upon the rights of individual citizens and candidates to engage in political debate and discussion.

A restriction on the amount of money a person or group can spend on political communication during a campaign necessarily reduces the quantity of expression by restricting the number of issues discussed, the depth of their exploration, and the size of the audience reached. This is because virtually every means of communicating ideas in today’s mass society requires the expenditure of money. The distribution of the humblest handbill or leaflet entails printing, paper, and circulation costs. Speeches and rallies generally necessitate hiring a hall and publicizing the event. The electorate’s increasing dependence on television, radio, and other mass media for news and information has made these expensive modes of communication indispensable instruments of effective political speech.
(b) The First Amendment requires the invalidation of the Act's independent expenditure ceiling, its limitation on a candidate's expenditures from his own personal funds, and its ceilings on overall campaign expenditures, since those provisions place substantial and direct restrictions on the ability of candidates, citizens, and associations to engage in protected political expression, restrictions that the First Amendment cannot tolerate.… 5

The expenditure limitations contained in the Act represent substantial rather than merely theoretical restraints on the quantity and diversity of political speech. The $1,000 ceiling on spending "relative to a clearly identified candidate," 18 U.S.C. § 608(e)(1) (1970 ed., Supp. IV), would appear to exclude all citizens and groups except candidates, political parties, and the institutional press19 from any significant use of the most effective modes of communication.20 Although the Act's limitations on expenditures by campaign organizations and political parties provide substantially greater room for discussion and debate, they would have required restrictions in the scope of a number of past congressional and Presidential campaigns21 and would operate to constrain campaigning by candidates who raise sums in excess of the spending ceiling. 10

By contrast with a limitation upon expenditures for political expression, a limitation upon the amount that any one person or group may contribute to a candidate or political committee entails only a marginal restriction upon the contributor's ability to engage in free communication. A contribution serves as a general expression of support for the candidate and his views, but does not communicate the underlying basis for the support. The quantity of communication by the contributor does not increase perceptibly with the size of his contribution, since the expression rests solely on the undifferentiated, symbolic act of contributing. At most, the size of the contribution provides a very rough index of the intensity of the contributor's support for the candidate.22 A limitation on the amount of money a person may give to a candidate or campaign organization thus involves little direct restraint on his political communication, for it permits the symbolic expression of support evidenced by a contribution but does not in any way infringe the contributor's freedom to discuss candidates and issues. While contributions may result in political expression if
spent by a candidate or an association to present views to the voters, the transformation of contributions into political debate involves speech by someone other than the contributor.

Given the important role of contributions in financing political campaigns, contribution restrictions could have a severe impact on political dialogue if the limitations prevented candidates and political committees from amassing the resources necessary for effective advocacy. There is no indication, however, that the contribution limitations imposed by the Act would have any dramatic adverse effect on the funding of campaigns and political associations. The overall effect of the Act's contribution ceilings is merely to require candidates and political committees to raise funds from a greater number of persons and to compel people who would otherwise contribute amounts greater than the statutory limits to expend such funds on direct political expression, rather than to reduce the total amount of money potentially available to promote political expression.

The Act's contribution and expenditure limitations also impinge on protected associational freedoms. Making a contribution, like joining a political party, serves to affiliate a person with a candidate. In addition, it enables like-minded persons to pool their resources in furtherance of common political goals. The Act's contribution ceilings thus limit one important means of associating with a candidate or committee, but leave the contributor free to become a member of any political association and to assist personally in the association's efforts on behalf of candidates. And the Act's contribution limitations permit associations and candidates to aggregate large sums of money to promote effective advocacy. By contrast, the Act's $1,000 limitation on independent expenditures "relative to a clearly identified candidate" precludes most associations from effectively amplifying the voice of their adherents, the original basis for the recognition of First Amendment protection of the freedom of association.
BACKGROUND

Provisions of the District of Columbia Code made it illegal to carry an unregistered firearm and prohibited the registration of handguns, though the chief of police could issue one-year licenses for handguns. The Code also contained provisions that required owners of lawfully registered firearms to keep them unloaded and disassembled or bound by a trigger lock or other similar device unless the firearms were located in a place of business or being used for legal recreational activities. The Court delivered its opinion on the constitutionality of these restrictions in the following decision.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What are the clauses into which Scalia divides the 2nd Amendment?
2. What was meant by "arms" during the founding, according to Scalia?
3. How do the clauses of the amendment stand in relation to each other?
4. What does the Court rule and why?

---

…We turn first to the meaning of the Second Amendment.

The Second Amendment provides: “A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.” In interpreting this text, we are guided by the principle that “[t]he Constitution was written to be understood by the voters; its words and phrases were used in their normal and ordinary as distinguished from technical meaning.” United States v. Sprague, 282 U. S. 716, 731 (1931); see also Gibbons v. Ogden, 9 Wheat. 1, 188 (1824). Normal meaning may of course include an idiomatic meaning, but it excludes secret or technical meanings that would not have been known to ordinary citizens in the founding generation.

The two sides in this case have set out very different interpretations of the Amendment. Petitioners and today’s dissenting Justices believe that it protects only the right to possess and carry a firearm in connection with militia service. See Brief for Petitioners 11–12; post, at 1 (Stevens, J., dissenting). Respondent argues that it protects an individual right to possess a firearm unconnected with service in a militia, and to use that arm for traditionally lawful purposes, such as self-defense within the home. See Brief for Respondent 2–4.

The Second Amendment is naturally divided into two parts: its prefatory clause and its operative clause. The former does not limit the latter grammatically, but rather announces a purpose. The Amendment could be rephrased, “Because a well regulated Militia is necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms shall not be infringed.” See J. Tiffany, A Treatise on Government and Constitutional Law §585, p. 394 (1867); Brief for Professors of Linguistics and English as Amici Curiae 3 (hereinafter Linguists’ Brief). Although this structure of the Second Amendment is unique in our Constitution, other legal documents of the founding era, particularly individual-rights provisions of state constitutions, commonly included a prefatory statement of purpose. See generally Volokh, The Commonplace Second Amendment, 73 N. Y. U. L. Rev. 793, 814–821 (1998).
Logic demands that there be a link between the stated purpose and the command. The Second Amendment would be nonsensical if it read, “A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to petition for redress of grievances shall not be infringed.” That requirement of logical connection may cause a prefatory clause to resolve an ambiguity in the operative clause (“The separation of church and state being an important objective, the teachings of canons shall have no place in our jurisprudence.” The preface makes clear that the operative clause refers not to canons of interpretation but to clergymen.) But apart from that clarifying function, a prefatory clause does not limit or expand the scope of the operative clause. See F. Dwarris, A General Treatise on 5
Statutes 268–269 (P. Potter ed. 1871) (hereinafter Dwarris); T. Sedgwick, The Interpretation and Construction of Statutory and Constitutional Law 42–45 (2d ed. 1874). “‘It is nothing unusual in acts … for the enacting part to go beyond the preamble; the remedy often extends beyond the particular act or mischief which first suggested the necessity of the law.’” J. Bishop, Commentaries on Written Laws and Their Interpretation §51, p. 49 (1882) (quoting Rex v. Marks, 3 East, 157, 165 (K. B. 1802)). Therefore, while we will begin our textual analysis with the operative clause, we will return to the prefatory clause to ensure that our reading of the operative clause is consistent with the announced purpose.

1. Operative Clause.

a. “Right of the People.” The first salient feature of the operative clause is that it codifies a “right of the people.” The unamended Constitution and the Bill of Rights use the phrase “right of the people” two other times, in the First Amendment’s Assembly-and-Petition Clause and in the Fourth Amendment’s Search-and-Seizure Clause. The Ninth Amendment uses very similar terminology (“The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people”). All three of these instances unambiguously refer to individual rights, not “collective” rights, or rights that may be exercised only through participation in some corporate body.

Three provisions of the Constitution refer to “the people” in a context other than “rights”—the famous preamble (“We the people”), §2 of Article I (providing that “the people” will
choose members of the House), and the Tenth Amendment (providing that those powers not given the Federal Government remain with “the States” or “the people”). Those provisions arguably refer to “the people” acting collectively—but they deal with the exercise or reservation of powers, not rights. Nowhere else in the Constitution does a “right” attributed to “the people” refer to anything other than an individual right.

What is more, in all six other provisions of the Constitution that mention “the people,” the term unambiguously refers to all members of the political community, not an unspecified subset. As we said in *United States v. Verdugo-Urquidez*, 494 U. S. 259, 265 (1990):

“ ‘[T]he people’ seems to have been a term of art employed in select parts of the Constitution…. [Its uses] suggest that ‘the people’ protected by the Fourth Amendment, and by the First and Second Amendments, and to whom rights and powers are reserved in the Ninth and Tenth Amendments, refers to a class of persons who are part of a national community or who have otherwise developed sufficient connection with this country to be considered part of that community.”

This contrasts markedly with the phrase “the militia” in the prefatory clause. As we will describe below, the “militia” in colonial America consisted of a subset of “the people”—those who were male, able bodied, and within a certain age range. Reading the Second Amendment as protecting only the right to “keep and bear Arms” in an organized militia therefore fits poorly with the operative clause’s description of the holder of that right as “the people.”

We start therefore with a strong presumption that the Second Amendment right is exercised individually and belongs to all Americans.

b. “Keep and bear Arms.” We move now from the holder of the right—“the people”—to the substance of the right: “to keep and bear Arms.”

Before addressing the verbs “keep” and “bear,” we interpret their object: “Arms.” The 18th-century meaning is no different from the meaning today. The 1773 edition of Samuel John-
son’s dictionary defined “arms” as “weapons of offence, or armour of defence.” 1 Dictionary of the English Language 107 (4th ed.) (hereinafter Johnson). Timothy Cunningham’s important 1771 legal dictionary defined “arms” as “any thing that a man wears for his defence, or takes into his hands, or useth in wrath to cast at or strike another.” 1 A New and Complete Law Dictionary (1771); see also N. Webster, American Dictionary of the English Language (1828) (reprinted 1989) (hereinafter Webster) (similar).

The term was applied, then as now, to weapons that were not specifically designed for military use and were not employed in a military capacity. For instance, Cunningham’s legal dictionary gave as an example of usage: “Servants and labourers shall use bows and arrows on Sundays, &c. and not bear other arms.” See also, e.g., An Act for the trial of Negroes, 1797 Del. Laws ch. XLIII, §6, p. 104, in 1 First Laws of the State of Delaware 102, 104 (J. Cushing ed. 1981 (pt. 1)); see generally State v. Duke, 42 Tex. 455, 458 (1874) (citing decisions of state courts construing “arms”). Although one founding-era thesaurus limited “arms” (as opposed to “weapons”) to “instruments of offence generally made use of in war,” even that source stated that all firearms constituted “arms.” 1 J. Trusler, The Distinction Between Words Esteemed Synonymous in the English Language 37 (1794) (emphasis added).

Some have made the argument, bordering on the frivolous, that only those arms in existence in the 18th century are protected by the Second Amendment. We do not interpret constitutional rights that way. Just as the First Amendment protects modern forms of communications, e.g., Reno v. American Civil Liberties Union, 521 U. S. 844, 849 (1997), and the Fourth Amendment applies to modern forms of search, e.g., Kyllo v. United States, 533 U. S. 27, 35–36 (2001), the Second Amendment extends, prima facie, to all instruments that constitute bearable arms, even those that were not in existence at the time of the founding.

We turn to the phrases “keep arms” and “bear arms.” Johnson defined “keep” as, most relevantly, “[t]o retain; not to lose,” and “[t]o have in custody.” Johnson 1095. Webster defined it as “[t]o hold; to retain in one’s power or possession.” No party has apprised us of
an idiomatic meaning of “keep Arms.” Thus, the most natural reading of “keep Arms” in the Second Amendment is to “have weapons.”

The phrase “keep arms” was not prevalent in the written documents of the founding period that we have found, but there are a few examples, all of which favor viewing the right to “keep Arms” as an individual right unconnected with militia service. William Blackstone, for example, wrote that Catholics convicted of not attending service in the Church of England suffered certain penalties, one of which was that they were not permitted to “keep arms in their houses.” 4 Commentaries on the Laws of England 55 (1769) (hereinafter Blackstone); see also 1 W. & M., c. 15, §4, in 3 Eng. Stat. at Large 422 (1689) (“[N]o Papist … shall or may have or keep in his House … any Arms … “); 1 Hawkins, Treatise on the Pleas of the Crown 26 (1771) (similar). Petitioners point to militia laws of the founding period that required militia members to “keep” arms in connection with militia service, and they conclude from this that the phrase “keep Arms” has a militia-related connotation.

At the time of the founding, as now, to “bear” meant to “carry.” See Johnson 161; Webster; T. Sheridan, A Complete Dictionary of the English Language (1796); 2 Oxford English Dictionary 20 (2d ed. 1989) (hereinafter Oxford). When used with “arms,” however, the term has a meaning that refers to carrying for a particular purpose—confrontation. In Muscarello v. United States, 524 U. S. 125 (1998), in the course of analyzing the meaning of “carries a firearm” in a federal criminal statute, Justice Ginsburg wrote that “[s]urely a most familiar meaning is, as the Constitution’s Second Amendment … indicate[s]: ‘wear, bear, or carry … upon the person or in the clothing or in a pocket, for the purpose … of being armed and ready for offensive or defensive action in a case of conflict with another person.’” Id., at 143 (dissenting opinion) (quoting Black’s Law Dictionary 214 (6th ed. 1998)). We think that Justice Ginsburg accurately captured the natural meaning of “bear arms.” Although
the phrase implies that the carrying of the weapon is for the purpose of “offensive or defensive action,” it in no way connotes participation in a structured military organization.

From our review of founding-era sources, we conclude that this natural meaning was also the meaning that “bear arms” had in the 18th century. In numerous instances, “bear arms” was unambiguously used to refer to the carrying of weapons outside of an organized militia. The most prominent examples are those most relevant to the Second Amendment: Nine state constitutional provisions written in the 18th century or the first two decades of the 19th, which enshrined a right of citizens to “bear arms in defense of themselves and the state” or “bear arms in defense of himself and the state.” It is clear from those formulations that “bear arms” did not refer only to carrying a weapon in an organized military unit. Justice James Wilson interpreted the Pennsylvania Constitution’s arms-bearing right, for example, as a recognition of the natural right of defense “of one’s person or house”—what he called the law of “self preservation.” 2 Collected Works of James Wilson 1142, and n. x (K. Hall & M. Hall eds. 2007) (citing Pa. Const., Art. IX, §21 (1790)); see also T. Walker, Introduction to American Law 198 (1837) (“Thus the right of self-defence [is] guaranteed by the [Ohio] constitution”); see also id., at 157 (equating Second Amendment with that provision of the Ohio Constitution). That was also the interpretation of those state constitutional provisions adopted by pre-Civil War state courts. These provisions demonstrate—again, in the most analogous linguistic context—that “bear arms” was not limited to the carrying of arms in a militia.

The phrase “bear Arms” also had at the time of the founding an idiomatic meaning that was significantly different from its natural meaning: “to serve as a soldier, do military service, fight” or “to wage war.” See Linguists’ Brief 18; post, at 11 (Stevens, J., dissenting). But it unequivocally bore that idiomatic meaning only when followed by the preposition “against,” which was in turn followed by the target of the hostilities. See 2 Oxford 21. (That is how, for example, our Declaration of Independence ¶28, used the phrase: “He has constrained our fellow Citizens taken Captive on the high Seas to bear Arms against their Country … .”) Every example given by petitioners’ amici for the idiomatic meaning of “bear arms” from the founding period either includes the preposition “against” or is not clearly
idiomatic. See Linguists’ Brief 18–23. Without the preposition, “bear arms” normally
meant (as it continues to mean today) what Justice Ginsburg’s opinion in Muscarello
said.…

c. Meaning of the Operative Clause. Putting all of these textual elements together, we find
that they guarantee the individual right to possess and carry weapons in case of confronta-
tion. This meaning is strongly confirmed by the historical background of the Second
Amendment. We look to this because it has always been widely understood that the Second
Amendment, like the First and Fourth Amendments, codified a pre-existing right. The very
text of the Second Amendment implicitly recognizes the pre-existence of the right and de-
clares only that it “shall not be infringed.” As we said in United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U.
S. 542, 553 (1876), “[t]his is not a right granted by the Constitution. Neither is it in any
manner dependent upon that instrument for its existence. The Second amendment de-
clares that it shall not be infringed … .” …

There seems to us no doubt, on the basis of both text and history, that the Second Amend-
ment conferred an individual right to keep and bear arms. Of course the right was not un-
limited, just as the First Amendment’s right of free speech was not, see, e.g., United States
v. Williams, 553 U. S. ___ (2008). Thus, we do not read the Second Amendment to protect
the right of citizens to carry arms for any sort of confrontation, just as we do not read the
First Amendment to protect the right of citizens to speak for any purpose. Before turning
to limitations upon the individual right, however, we must determine whether the prefatory
clause of the Second Amendment comports with our interpretation of the operative clause.

2. Prefatory Clause.

The prefatory clause reads: “A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a
free State … .”

a. “Well-Regulated Militia.” In United States v. Miller, 307 U. S. 174, 179 (1939), we ex-
plained that “the Militia comprised all males physically capable of acting in concert for the
common defense.” That definition comports with founding-era sources. See, e.g., Webster
(“The militia of a country are the able bodied men organized into companies, regiments and brigades … and required by law to attend military exercises on certain days only, but at other times left to pursue their usual occupations”); The Federalist No. 46, pp. 329, 334 (B. Wright ed. 1961) (J. Madison) (“near half a million of citizens with arms in their hands”); Letter to Destutt de Tracy (Jan. 26, 1811), in The Portable Thomas Jefferson 520, 524 (M. Peterson ed. 1975) (“[T]he militia of the State, that is to say, of every man in it able to bear arms”).

Petitioners take a seemingly narrower view of the militia, stating that “[m]ilitias are the state- and congressionally-regulated military forces described in the Militia Clauses (art. I, §8, cls. 15–16).” Brief for Petitioners 12. Although we agree with petitioners’ interpretive assumption that “militia” means the same thing in Article I and the Second Amendment, we believe that petitioners identify the wrong thing, namely, the organized militia. Unlike armies and navies, which Congress is given the power to create (“to raise … Armies”; “to provide … a Navy,” Art. I, §8, cls. 12–13), the militia is assumed by Article I already to be in existence. Congress is given the power to “provide for calling forth the militia,” §8, cl. 15; and the power not to create, but to “organiz[e]” it—and not to organize “a” militia, which is what one would expect if the militia were to be a federal creation, but to organize “the” militia, connoting a body already in existence, ibid., cl. 16. This is fully consistent with the ordinary definition of the militia as all able-bodied men. From that pool, Congress has plenary power to organize the units that will make up an effective fighting force. That is what Congress did in the first militia Act, which specified that “each and every free able-bodied white male citizen of the respective states, resident therein, who is or shall be of the age of eighteen years, and under the age of forty-five years (except as is herein after excepted) shall severally and respectively be enrolled in the militia.” Act of May 8, 1792, 1 Stat. 271. To be sure, Congress need not conscript every able-bodied man into the militia, because nothing in Article I suggests that in exercising its power to organize, discipline, and arm the militia, Congress must focus upon the entire body. Although the militia consists of all able-bodied men, the federally organized militia may consist of a subset of them.
Finally, the adjective “well-regulated” implies nothing more than the imposition of proper discipline and training. See Johnson 1619 (“Regulate”: “To adjust by rule or method”); Rawle 121–122; cf. Va. Declaration of Rights §13 (1776), in 7 Thorpe 3812, 3814 (referring to “a well-regulated militia, composed of the body of the people, trained to arms”).

b. “Security of a Free State.” The phrase “security of a free state” meant “security of a free polity,” not security of each of the several States as the dissent below argued, see 478 F. 3d, at 405, and n. 10. Joseph Story wrote in his treatise on the Constitution that “the word ‘state’ is used in various senses [and in] its most enlarged sense, it means the people composing a particular nation or community.” 1 Story §208; see also 3 id., §1890 (in reference to the Second Amendment’s prefatory clause: “The militia is the natural defence of a free country”). It is true that the term “State” elsewhere in the Constitution refers to individual States, but the phrase “security of a free state” and close variations seem to have been terms of art in 18th-century political discourse, meaning a “‘free country’” or free polity. See Volokh, “Necessary to the Security of a Free State,” 83 Notre Dame L. Rev. 1, 5 (2007); see, e.g., 4 Blackstone 151 (1769); Brutus Essay III (Nov. 15, 1787), in The Essential Antifederalist 251, 253 (W. Allen & G. Lloyd eds., 2d ed. 2002). Moreover, the other instances of “state” in the Constitution are typically accompanied by modifiers making clear that the reference is to the several States—“each state,” “several states,” “any state,” “that state,” “particular states,” “one state,” “no state.” And the presence of the term “foreign state” in Article I and Article III shows that the word “state” did not have a single meaning in the Constitution.

There are many reasons why the militia was thought to be “necessary to the security of a free state.” See 3 Story §1890. First, of course, it is useful in repelling invasions and suppressing insurrections. Second, it renders large standing armies unnecessary—an argument that Alexander Hamilton made in favor of federal control over the militia. The Federalist No. 29, pp. 226, 227 (B. Wright ed. 1961) (A. Hamilton). Third, when the able-bodied men of a nation are trained in arms and organized, they are better able to resist tyranny.

3. Relationship between Prefatory Clause and Operative Clause
We reach the question, then: Does the preface fit with an operative clause that creates an
individual right to keep and bear arms? It fits perfectly, once one knows the history that the
founding generation knew and that we have described above. That history showed that the
way tyrants had eliminated a militia consisting of all the able-bodied men was not by ban-
ning the militia but simply by taking away the people’s arms, enabling a select militia or
standing army to suppress political opponents. This is what had occurred in England that
prompted codification of the right to have arms in the English Bill of Rights.

The debate with respect to the right to keep and bear arms, as with other guarantees in the
Bill of Rights, was not over whether it was desirable (all agreed that it was) but over whether
it needed to be codified in the Constitution. During the 1788 ratification debates, the fear
that the federal government would disarm the people in order to impose rule through a
standing army or select militia was pervasive in Antifederalist rhetoric. See, e.g., Letters
from The Federal Farmer III (Oct. 10, 1787), in 2 The Complete Anti-Federalist 234, 242
(H. Storing ed. 1981). John Smilie, for example, worried not only that Congress’s “com-
mand of the militia” could be used to create a “select militia,” or to have “no militia at all,”
but also, as a separate concern, that “[w]hen a select militia is formed; the people in general
may be disarmed.” 2 Documentary History of the Ratification of the Constitution 508–509
(M. Jensen ed. 1976) (hereinafter Documentary Hist.). Federalists responded that because
Congress was given no power to abridge the ancient right of individuals to keep and bear
arms, such a force could never oppress the people. See, e.g., A Pennsylvanian III (Feb. 20,
1788), in The Origin of the Second Amendment 275, 276 (D. Young ed., 2d ed. 2001) (here-
inafter Young); White, To the Citizens of Virginia, Feb. 22, 1788, in id., at 280, 281; A Cit-
izen of America, (Oct. 10, 1787) in id., at 38, 40; Remarks on the Amendments to the federal
Constitution, Nov. 7, 1788, in id., at 556. It was understood across the political spectrum
that the right helped to secure the ideal of a citizen militia, which might be necessary to
oppose an oppressive military force if the constitutional order broke down.

It is therefore entirely sensible that the Second Amendment’s prefatory clause announces
the purpose for which the right was codified: to prevent elimination of the militia. The
prefatory clause does not suggest that preserving the militia was the only reason Americans
valued the ancient right; most undoubtedly thought it even more important for self-defense and hunting. But the threat that the new Federal Government would destroy the citizens’ militia by taking away their arms was the reason that right—unlike some other English rights—was codified in a written Constitution. Justice Breyer’s assertion that individual self-defense is merely a “subsidiary interest” of the right to keep and bear arms, see post, at 36, is profoundly mistaken. He bases that assertion solely upon the prologue—but that can only show that self-defense had little to do with the right’s codification; it was the central component of the right itself.…

IV

We turn finally to the law at issue here. As we have said, the law totally bans handgun possession in the home. It also requires that any lawful firearm in the home be disassembled or bound by a trigger lock at all times, rendering it inoperable.

As the quotations earlier in this opinion demonstrate, the inherent right of self-defense has been central to the Second Amendment right. The handgun ban amounts to a prohibition of an entire class of “arms” that is overwhelmingly chosen by American society for that lawful purpose. The prohibition extends, moreover, to the home, where the need for defense of self, family, and property is most acute. Under any of the standards of scrutiny that we have applied to enumerated constitutional rights, banning from the home “the most preferred firearm in the nation to ‘keep’ and use for protection of one’s home and family,” 478 F. 3d, at 400, would fail constitutional muster.

Few laws in the history of our Nation have come close to the severe restriction of the District’s handgun ban. And some of those few have been struck down. In Nunn v. State, the Georgia Supreme Court struck down a prohibition on carrying pistols openly (even though it upheld a prohibition on carrying concealed weapons). See 1 Ga., at 251. In Andrews v. State, the Tennessee Supreme Court likewise held that a statute that forbade openly carrying a pistol “publicly or privately, without regard to time or place, or circumstances,” 50 Tenn., at 187, violated the state constitutional provision (which the court equated with the Second Amendment). That was so even though the statute did not restrict the carrying of
long guns. Ibid. See also State v. Reid, 1 Ala. 612, 616–617 (1840) (“A statute which, under the pretence of regulating, amounts to a destruction of the right, or which requires arms to be so borne as to render them wholly useless for the purpose of defence, would be clearly unconstitutional”).

It is no answer to say, as petitioners do, that it is permissible to ban the possession of handguns so long as the possession of other firearms (i.e., long guns) is allowed. It is enough to note, as we have observed, that the American people have considered the handgun to be the quintessential self-defense weapon. There are many reasons that a citizen may prefer a handgun for home defense: It is easier to store in a location that is readily accessible in an emergency; it cannot easily be redirected or wrestled away by an attacker; it is easier to use for those without the upper-body strength to lift and aim a long gun; it can be pointed at a burglar with one hand while the other hand dials the police. Whatever the reason, handguns are the most popular weapon chosen by Americans for self-defense in the home, and a complete prohibition of their use is invalid.

We must also address the District’s requirement (as applied to respondent’s handgun) that firearms in the home be rendered and kept inoperable at all times. This makes it impossible for citizens to use them for the core lawful purpose of self-defense and is hence unconstitutional. The District argues that we should interpret this element of the statute to contain an exception for self-defense. See Brief for Petitioners 56–57. But we think that is precluded by the unequivocal text, and by the presence of certain other enumerated exceptions: “Except for law enforcement personnel … , each registrant shall keep any firearm in his possession unloaded and disassembled or bound by a trigger lock or similar device unless such firearm is kept at his place of business, or while being used for lawful recreational purposes within the District of Columbia.” D. C. Code §7–2507.02. The nonexistence of a self-defense exception is also suggested by the D. C. Court of Appeals’ statement that the statute forbids residents to use firearms to stop intruders, see McIntosh v. Washington, 395 A. 2d 744, 755–756 (1978).
Apart from his challenge to the handgun ban and the trigger-lock requirement respondent asked the District Court to enjoin petitioners from enforcing the separate licensing requirement “in such a manner as to forbid the carrying of a firearm within one’s home or possessed land without a license.” App. 59a. The Court of Appeals did not invalidate the licensing requirement, but held only that the District “may not prevent [a handgun] from being moved throughout one’s house.” 478 F. 3d, at 400. It then ordered the District Court to enter summary judgment “consistent with [respondent’s] prayer for relief.” Id., at 401. Before this Court petitioners have stated that “if the handgun ban is struck down and respondent registers a handgun, he could obtain a license, assuming he is not otherwise disqualified,” by which they apparently mean if he is not a felon and is not insane. Brief for Petitioners 58. Respondent conceded at oral argument that he does not “have a problem with … licensing” and that the District’s law is permissible so long as it is “not enforced in an arbitrary and capricious manner.” Tr. of Oral Arg. 74–75. We therefore assume that petitioners’ issuance of a license will satisfy respondent’s prayer for relief and do not address the licensing requirement.…

In sum, we hold that the District’s ban on handgun possession in the home violates the Second Amendment, as does its prohibition against rendering any lawful firearm in the home operable for the purpose of immediate self-defense. Assuming that Heller is not disqualified from the exercise of Second Amendment rights, the District must permit him to register his handgun and must issue him a license to carry it in the home.
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Background

President Lyndon Johnson delivered the commencement address to the 1965 class at Howard University.

Guiding Questions

1. What is Johnson’s definition of freedom?
2. Why does Johnson argue that this freedom is insufficient?
3. What role does nature or nurture play in Johnson’s account of inequality?
4. Johnson speaks of “true equality”; what does he mean by this?
5. What does Johnson deem the most important cause of poverty among African Americans?
6. What does Johnson declare to be his chief goal for his next term?

Dr. Nabrit, my fellow Americans:

I am delighted at the chance to speak at this important and this historic institution. Howard has long been an outstanding center for the education of Negro Americans. Its students are of every race and color and they come from many countries of the world. It is truly a working example of democratic excellence.

Our earth is the home of revolution. In every corner of every continent men charged with hope contend with ancient ways in the pursuit of justice. They reach for the newest of weapons to realize the oldest of dreams, that each may walk in freedom and pride, stretching his talents, enjoying the fruits of the earth.

Our enemies may occasionally seize the day of change, but it is the banner of our revolution they take. And our own future is linked to this process of swift and turbulent change in many lands in the world. But nothing in any country touches us more profoundly, and nothing is more freighted with meaning for our own destiny than the revolution of the Negro American.

In far too many ways American Negroes have been another nation: deprived of freedom, crippled by hatred, the doors of opportunity closed to hope.

In our time change has come to this Nation, too. The American Negro, acting with impressive restraint, has peacefully protested and marched, entered the courtrooms and the seats of government, demanding a justice that has long been denied. The voice of the Negro was the call to action. But it is a tribute to America that, once aroused, the courts and the Congress, the President and most of the people, have been the allies of progress.

Thus we have seen the high court of the country declare that discrimination based on race was repugnant to the Constitution, and therefore void. We have seen in 1957, and 1960, and again in 1964, the first civil rights legislation in this Nation in almost an entire century.
As majority leader of the United States Senate, I helped to guide two of these bills through the Senate. And, as your President, I was proud to sign the third. And now very soon we will have the fourth—a new law guaranteeing every American the right to vote.

No act of my entire administration will give me greater satisfaction than the day when my signature makes this bill, too, the law of this land.

The voting rights bill will be the latest, and among the most important, in a long series of victories. But this victory—as Winston Churchill said of another triumph for freedom—"is not the end. It is not even the beginning of the end. But it is, perhaps, the end of the beginning."

That beginning is freedom; and the barriers to that freedom are tumbling down. Freedom is the right to share, share fully and equally, in American society—to vote, to hold a job, to enter a public place, to go to school. It is the right to be treated in every part of our national life as a person equal in dignity and promise to all others.

But freedom is not enough. You do not wipe away the scars of centuries by saying: Now you are free to go where you want, and do as you desire, and choose the leaders you please.

You do not take a person who, for years, has been hobbled by chains and liberate him, bring him up to the starting line of a race and then say, "you are free to compete with all the others," and still justly believe that you have been completely fair.

Thus it is not enough just to open the gates of opportunity. All our citizens must have the ability to walk through those gates.

This is the next and the more profound stage of the battle for civil rights. We seek not just freedom but opportunity. We seek not just legal equity but human ability, not just equality as a right and a theory but equality as a fact and equality as a result.
For the task is to give twenty million Negroes the same chance as every other American to learn and grow, to work and share in society, to develop their abilities—physical, mental and spiritual, and to pursue their individual happiness.

To this end equal opportunity is essential, but not enough, not enough. Men and women of all races are born with the same range of abilities. But ability is not just the product of birth. Ability is stretched or stunted by the family that you live with, and the neighborhood you live in—by the school you go to and the poverty or the richness of your surroundings. It is the product of a hundred unseen forces playing upon the little infant, the child, and finally the man.

This graduating class at Howard University is witness to the indomitable determination of the Negro American to win his way in American life.

The number of Negroes in schools of higher learning has almost doubled in fifteen years. The number of non-white professional workers has more than doubled in ten years. The median income of Negro college women tonight exceeds that of white college women. And there are also the enormous accomplishments of distinguished individual Negroes—many of them graduates of this institution, and one of them the first lady ambassador in the history of the United States.

These are proud and impressive achievements. But they tell only the story of a growing middle class minority, steadily narrowing the gap between them and their white counterparts.

But for the great majority of Negro Americans—the poor, the unemployed, the uprooted, and the dispossessed—there is a much grimmer story. They still, as we meet here tonight, are another nation. Despite the court orders and the laws, despite the legislative victories and the speeches, for them the walls are rising and the gulf is widening.

Here are some of the facts of this American failure.
Thirty-five years ago the rate of unemployment for Negroes and whites was about the same. Tonight the Negro rate is twice as high.

In 1948 the eight percent unemployment rate for Negro teenage boys was actually less than that of whites. By last year that rate had grown to twenty-three percent, as against thirteen percent for whites unemployed.

Between 1949 and 1959, the income of Negro men relative to white men declined in every section of this country. From 1952 to 1963 the median income of Negro families compared to white actually dropped from fifty-seven percent to fifty-three percent.

In the years 1955 through 1957, twenty-two percent of experienced Negro workers were out of work at some time during the year. In 1961 through 1963 that proportion had soared to twenty-nine percent.

Since 1947 the number of white families living in poverty has decreased twenty-seven percent while the number of poorer nonwhite families decreased only three percent.

The infant mortality of nonwhites in 1940 was seventy percent greater than whites. Twenty-two years later it was ninety percent greater.

Moreover, the isolation of Negro from white communities is increasing, rather than decreasing as Negroes crowd into the central cities and become a city within a city.

Of course Negro Americans as well as white Americans have shared in our rising national abundance. But the harsh fact of the matter is that in the battle for true equality too many—far too many—are losing ground every day.

We are not completely sure why this is. We know the causes are complex and subtle. But we do know the two broad basic reasons. And we do know that we have to act.

First, Negroes are trapped—as many whites are trapped—in inherited, gateless poverty. They lack training and skills. They are shut in, in slums, without decent medical care. Private and public poverty combine to cripple their capacities.
We are trying to attack these evils through our poverty program, through our education program, through our medical care and our other health programs, and a dozen more of the Great Society programs that are aimed at the root causes of this poverty.

We will increase, and we will accelerate, and we will broaden this attack in years to come until this most enduring of foes finally yields to our unyielding will.

But there is a second cause—much more difficult to explain, more deeply grounded, more desperate in its force. It is the devastating heritage of long years of slavery; and a century of oppression, hatred, and injustice.

For Negro poverty is not white poverty. Many of its causes and many of its cures are the same. But there are differences—deep, corrosive, obstinate differences—radiating painful roots into the community, and into the family, and the nature of the individual.

These differences are not racial differences. They are solely and simply the consequence of ancient brutality, past injustice, and present prejudice. They are anguishing to observe. For the Negro they are a constant reminder of oppression. For the white they are a constant reminder of guilt. But they must be faced and they must be dealt with and they must be overcome, if we are ever to reach the time when the only difference between Negroes and whites is the color of their skin.

Nor can we find a complete answer in the experience of other American minorities. They made a valiant and a largely successful effort to emerge from poverty and prejudice.

The Negro, like these others, will have to rely mostly upon his own efforts. But he just can not do it alone. For they did not have the heritage of centuries to overcome, and they did not have a cultural tradition which had been twisted and battered by endless years of hatred and hopelessness, nor were they excluded—these others—because of race or color—a feeling whose dark intensity is matched by no other prejudice in our society.

Nor can these differences be understood as isolated infirmities. They are a seamless web. They cause each other. They result from each other. They reinforce each other.
Much of the Negro community is buried under a blanket of history and circumstance. It is not a lasting solution to lift just one corner of that blanket. We must stand on all sides and we must raise the entire cover if we are to liberate our fellow citizens.

One of the differences is the increased concentration of Negroes in our cities. More than seventy-three percent of all Negroes live in urban areas compared with less than seventy percent of the whites. Most of these Negroes live in slums. Most of these Negroes live together—a separated people.

Men are shaped by their world. When it is a world of decay, ringed by an invisible wall, when escape is arduous and uncertain, and the saving pressures of a more hopeful society are unknown, it can cripple the youth and it can desolate the men.

There is also the burden that a dark skin can add to the search for a productive place in our society. Unemployment strikes most swiftly and broadly at the Negro, and this burden erodes hope. Blighted hope breeds despair. Despair brings indifferences to the learning which offers a way out. And despair, coupled with indifferences, is often the source of destructive rebellion against the fabric of society.

There is also the lacerating hurt of early collision with white hatred or prejudice, distaste or condescension. Other groups have felt similar intolerance. But success and achievement could wipe it away. They do not change the color of a man's skin. I have seen this uncomprehending pain in the eyes of the little, young Mexican-American schoolchildren that I taught many years ago. But it can be overcome. But, for many, the wounds are always open.

Perhaps most important—its influence radiating to every part of life—is the breakdown of the Negro family structure. For this, most of all, white America must accept responsibility. It flows from centuries of oppression and persecution of the Negro man. It flows from the long years of degradation and discrimination, which have attacked his dignity and assaulted his ability to produce for his family.

This, too, is not pleasant to look upon. But it must be faced by those whose serious intent is to improve the life of all Americans.
Only a minority—less than half—of all Negro children reach the age of eighteen having lived all their lives with both of their parents. At this moment, tonight, little less than two-thirds are at home with both of their parents. Probably a majority of all Negro children receive federally-aided public assistance sometime during their childhood.

The family is the cornerstone of our society. More than any other force it shapes the attitude, the hopes, the ambitions, and the values of the child. And when the family collapses it is the children that are usually damaged. When it happens on a massive scale the community itself is crippled.

So, unless we work to strengthen the family, to create conditions under which most parents will stay together—all the rest: schools, and playgrounds, and public assistance, and private concern, will never be enough to cut completely the circle of despair and deprivation.

There is no single easy answer to all of these problems.

Jobs are part of the answer. They bring the income which permits a man to provide for his family.

Decent homes in decent surroundings and a chance to learn—an equal chance to learn—are part of the answer.

Welfare and social programs better designed to hold families together are part of the answer.

Care for the sick is part of the answer.

An understanding heart by all Americans is another big part of the answer.

And to all of these fronts—and a dozen more—I will dedicate the expanding efforts of the Johnson administration.

But there are other answers that are still to be found. Nor do we fully understand even all of the problems. Therefore, I want to announce tonight that this fall I intend to call a White
House conference of scholars, and experts, and outstanding Negro leaders—men of both races—and officials of Government at every level.

This White House conference's theme and title will be "To Fulfill These Rights."

Its object will be to help the American Negro fulfill the rights which, after the long time of injustice, he is finally about to secure.

To move beyond opportunity to achievement.

To shatter forever not only the barriers of law and public practice, but the walls which bound the condition of many by the color of his skin.

To dissolve, as best we can, the antique enmities of the heart which diminish the holder, divide the great democracy, and do wrong—great wrong—to the children of God.

And I pledge you tonight that this will be a chief goal of my administration, and of my program next year, and in the years to come. And I hope, and I pray, and I believe, it will be a part of the program of all America.

For what is justice?

It is to fulfill the fair expectations of man.

Thus, American justice is a very special thing. For, from the first, this has been a land of towering expectations. It was to be a nation where each man could be ruled by the common consent of all—enshrined in law, given life by institutions, guided by men themselves subject to its rule. And all—all of every station and origin—would be touched equally in obligation and in liberty.

Beyond the law lay the land. It was a rich land, glowing with more abundant promise than man had ever seen. Here, unlike any place yet known, all were to share the harvest.

And beyond this was the dignity of man. Each could become whatever his qualities of mind and spirit would permit—to strive, to seek, and, if he could, to find his happiness.
This is American justice. We have pursued it faithfully to the edge of our imperfections, and we have failed to find it for the American Negro.

So, it is the glorious opportunity of this generation to end the one huge wrong of the American Nation and, in so doing, to find America for ourselves, with the same immense thrill of discovery which gripped those who first began to realize that here, at last, was a home for freedom.

All it will take is for all of us to understand what this country is and what this country must become.

The Scripture promises: "I shall light a candle of understanding in thine heart, which shall not be put out."

Together, and with millions more, we can light that candle of understanding in the heart of all America.

And, once lit, it will never again go out.
BACKGROUND

The Supreme Court issued this ruling on universities using a student’s race in determining whether they would admit him or her.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What are the four reasons Powell gives arguing against the idea of preference programs?

2. Why does Powell use Harvard's diversity program as a favorable example?

3. How does Powell propose to reconcile the unconstitutionality of racial quotas with the professed benefits of factoring a student’s race into deciding to admit the student?

---

Justice POWELL delivered the opinion of the Court.

For the reasons stated in the following opinion, I believe that so much of the judgment of the California court as holds petitioner's special admissions program unlawful and directs that respondent be admitted to the Medical School must be affirmed. For the reasons expressed in a separate opinion, my Brothers THE CHIEF JUSTICE, MR. JUSTICE STEWART, MR. JUSTICE REHNQUIST, and MR. JUSTICE STEVENS concur in this judgment.

I also conclude for the reasons stated in the following opinion that the portion of the court's judgment enjoining petitioner from according any consideration to race in its admissions process must be reversed. For reasons expressed in separate opinions, my Brothers MR. JUSTICE BRENNAN, MR. JUSTICE WHITE, MR. JUSTICE MARSHALL, and MR. JUSTICE BLACKMUN concur in this judgment.

Affirmed in part and reversed in part....

The guarantees of the Fourteenth Amendment extend to all persons. Its language is explicit: "No State shall . . . deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." It is settled beyond question that the "rights created by the first section of the Fourteenth Amendment are, by its terms, guaranteed to the individual. The rights established are personal rights," Shelley v. Kraemer, supra, at 22. Accord, Missouri ex rel. Gaines v. Canada, supra, at 351; McCabe v. Atchison, T. & S. F. R. Co., 235 U. S. 151, 161-162 (1914). The guarantee of equal protection cannot mean one thing when applied to one individual and something else when applied to a person of another color. If both are not accorded the same protection, then it is not equal....

The Court has never questioned the validity of those pronouncements. Racial and ethnic distinctions of any sort are inherently suspect and thus call for the most exacting judicial examination.

Moreover, there are serious problems of justice connected with the idea of preference itself. First, it may not always be clear that a so-called preference is in fact benign. Courts may be asked to validate burdens imposed upon individual members of a particular group in order
to advance the group's general interest. See *United Jewish Organizations v. Carey*, 430 U. S., at 172-173 (BRENNAN, J., concurring in part). Nothing in the Constitution supports the notion that individuals may be asked to suffer otherwise impermissible burdens in order to enhance the societal standing of their ethnic groups. Second, preferential programs may only reinforce common stereotypes holding that certain groups are unable to achieve success without special protection based on a factor having no relationship to individual worth. See *DeFunis v. Odegaard*, 416 U. S. 312, 343 (1974) (Douglas, J., dissenting). Third, there is a measure of inequity in forcing innocent persons in respondent's position to bear the burdens of redressing grievances not of their making.

Nor would the state interest in genuine diversity be served by expanding petitioner's two-track system into a multitrack program with a prescribed number of seats set aside for each identifiable category of applicants. Indeed, it is inconceivable that a university would thus pursue the logic of petitioner's two-track program to the illogical end of insulating each category of applicants with certain desired qualifications from competition with all other applicants.

The experience of other university admissions programs, which take race into account in achieving the educational diversity valued by the First Amendment, demonstrates that the assignment of a fixed number of places to a minority group is not a necessary means toward that end. An illuminating example is found in the Harvard College program:

In recent years Harvard College has expanded the concept of diversity to include students from disadvantaged economic, racial and ethnic groups. Harvard College now recruits not only Californians or Louisianans but also blacks and Chicanos and other minority students.

In practice, this new definition of diversity has meant that race has been a factor in some admission decisions. When the Committee on Admissions reviews the large middle group of applicants who are `admissible' and deemed capable of doing good work in their courses, the race of an applicant may tip the balance in his favor just as geographic origin or a life spent on a farm may tip the balance in other candidates' cases. A farm boy from Idaho can
bring something to Harvard College that a Bostonian cannot offer. Similarly, a black student can usually bring something that a white person cannot offer....

In such an admissions program, race or ethnic background may be deemed a "plus" in a particular applicant's file, yet it does not insulate the individual from comparison with all other candidates for the available seats. The file of a particular black applicant may be examined for his potential contribution to diversity without the factor of race being decisive when compared, for example, with that of an applicant identified as an Italian-American if the latter is thought to exhibit qualities more likely to promote beneficial educational pluralism. Such qualities could include exceptional personal talents, unique work or service experience, leadership potential, maturity, demonstrated compassion, a history of overcoming disadvantage, ability to communicate with the poor, or other qualifications deemed important. In short, an admissions program operated in this way is flexible enough to consider all pertinent elements of diversity in light of the particular qualifications of each applicant, and to place them on the same footing for consideration, although not necessarily according them the same weight. Indeed, the weight attributed to a particular quality may vary from year to year depending upon the "mix" both of the student body and the applicants for the incoming class.

This kind of program treats each applicant as an individual in the admissions process. The applicant who loses out on the last available seat to another candidate receiving a "plus" on the basis of ethnic background will not have been foreclosed from all consideration for that seat simply because he was not the right color or had the wrong surname. It would mean only that his combined qualifications, which may have included similar nonobjective factors, did not outweigh those of the other applicant. His qualifications would have been weighed fairly and competitively, and he would have no basis to complain of unequal treatment under the Fourteenth Amendment....
OPTIONAL CIVICS ACTIVITIES

Fostering Civic Responsibility

Structure

ACTIVITIES BY UNIT

CIVICS CLUB IDEAS

VOLUNTEERISM AND VIRTUE FORMATION IDEAS

Encouraging Appropriate Civic Responsibility

Content knowledge and understanding through in-class conversations is the chief way that students learn of the rights and responsibilities of citizenship. Their relationships, moreover, with their teachers and classmates provide the first formation in the qualities that make for responsible and dutiful citizens. For schools that require some form of activity to adjoin civics instruction, however, we have curated a handful of sound activities through which students may practice citizenship following a unit test, for extra-credit, in a club, or simply as part of their lives outside of school at their and their parents’ discretion. It should be noted, however, that political activism, action civics, “new civics,” et al., have no place in formal education, especially in taxpayer-funded schools, and that the risk of bias on the part of the teacher even in these activities must be assiduously guarded against. Still, we do recognize that the following activities, mock civics, clubs, community service, and genuine apolitical volunteerism may be encouraged and prudently administered.

In concert with sound learning, rational thinking, and virtuous character, civic participation by each person upholds the American republic of self-government. Affording extracurricular opportunities to practice civic participation without politics or activism may be an appropriate part of an American student’s civic education.
Optional Extracurricular Civics Activities by Unit

UNIT 1 | THE PRINCIPLES OF AMERICA

Arrange with teachers of younger students, either at the same school or at a neighboring school, to have high school government students visit their classrooms and teach the younger students about America’s principles as studied in this unit. Students may adapt the lessons they have learned to the younger audience, adapt existing teacher materials, lead an activity, or read aloud a trade book story that conveys the principles of America to younger students at the appropriate grade level.

UNIT 2 | A CONSTITUTION OF PRINCIPLES

Have groups of students conduct research into certain issues in the political affairs of other countries that are or have recently been in the news. Have students apply the principles of the Constitution to the form of government that their researched country has and explain how the principles of the Constitution are present or absent in that government. Students should explain how the principles of the Constitution may be able to prevent or resolve the issue in the researched country. Remind students that as important as the form of government is to political liberty and justice, a people must also be practiced in self-government for it to be successful. Have students present their arguments briefly as a group.

UNIT 3 | GOVERNING IN THE CONSTITUTION

Set up a mock government among the students, assigning at random students to be representatives, states (representing legislatures and/or governors), local governments, senators, president, vice president, cabinet members, generals, Supreme Court justices, presidential electors, and voters. Based on the original structure, processes, and intentions of the Constitution, walk through the acts of governing that students learned in this unit and the principles they learned in the previous. Ask students plenty of comprehension questions about their requirements or roles given their office along the way.

UNIT 4 | EQUALITY IN AMERICA

Engage the class in mock political challenges aimed at abolishing and restricting slavery, the slave trade, and discrimination. Choose some or all of the efforts named below to abolish or restrict slavery. For each effort, explain to students that their goal is the same as those who attempted to abolish or restrict slavery at the time. As they propose ideas on how to do so in each situation, play devil’s advocate by positing the political reality or philosophical principle that was encountered at the time. Students should be able to see some paths forward, ranging from complete success to the more common partial victories, but they should also learn of how challenging and unlikely these efforts would be without a conversion in the hearts and minds of many slaveholders and the adherence to certain founding principles by the opponents of slavery—obstacles the Founders and Abraham Lincoln well understood. Students should feel free to cite the actions or words of these historical figures in the process. Students should compare what they have been able to accomplish with what the anti-slavery figures were or were not able to achieve, being mindful that they are operating in a situation far removed from the actual circumstances in which these efforts were attempted. Teachers should be aware that this activity will require the students to acquire a deeper understanding of
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the issues and politics surrounding these efforts; the Hillsdale College Online Courses can assist teachers in this.

Efforts to abolish or restrict slavery, the slave trade, and/or discrimination that students can attempt to navigate may include any of the following:

- in the colonies (compare to each colony prior to 1776)
- at the time of declaring independence (compare to the Declaration of Independence, both drafts)
- in drafting the Constitution (compare to the Constitution)
- in the Northwest Territory (compare to the Northwest Ordinance)
- in the Louisiana Territory (compare to the Missouri Compromise)
- in lands annexed following the Mexican-American War (compare to the Compromise of 1850)
- in the wake of the Kansas-Nebraska Act, arguments for popular sovereignty, and Dred Scott v. Sandford (compare to Lincoln’s speeches and the efforts of abolitionists Garrison, Douglass, and Stowe)
- from Lincoln’s election through the first months of the Civil War (compare to the secession of Southern states, Lincoln’s first inaugural address, and the retention of the border states)
- during the Civil War (compare to the Emancipation Proclamation)
- during Reconstruction (compare to the Reconstruction acts and amendments)
- after Reconstruction (compare to the Compromise of 1877)

**UNIT 5 | PROGRESSIVISM AND THE STATE**

Review with students how governing worked in the Constitution during the last mock government. This time, set up a mock government among the students that reflects the Progressive ideas of politics and administration. Assign at random students to be representatives, states (representing legislatures and/or governors), local governments, senators, president, cabinet members, Supreme Court justices, and voters. Add the new offices of civil employees/bureaucrats/experts who often will have had a prior career in a certain business sector. Based on the Progressive structure, processes, and intentions regarding government, walk through the acts of governing that students learned in this unit and connect them to the Progressive ideas behind them. Ask students plenty of comprehension questions about their requirements or roles given their office along the way, drawing distinctions between politics and administration, and between the Progressive and founding ideas and processes of governance.

**UNIT 6 | INSTITUTIONS AND POLICY**

Have students attend, watch virtually on their own, or visit as a field trip any one of a variety of government meetings, sessions, hearings, etc. Students should attempt to find out what each gathering intends to address and conduct some research on the topic if possible beforehand. Students should then write or present brief reports of the meetings and connect the governing body or official to what they have learned in this unit. If the student is attending in person apart from a school field trip, have the student receive the signature of an official as proof that the student did indeed attend.
Potential meetings may include:

- Township Trustee Meeting
- County Commissioner Meeting
- School Board Meeting
- City Council Meeting
- State Legislature Session or Hearing
- U.S. House of Representatives Session or Hearing
- U.S. Senate Session or Hearing
- Court Hearing

Alternatively, teachers may invite certain officials to visit their classrooms for a presentation. In addition to representatives from the abovementioned civic bodies, other guests may include a law enforcement officer, firefighter, EMS worker, etc.

UNIT 7 | POLITICS IN PRACTICE

Have students choose and research an issue connected to America’s founding principles as studied in class. Each student may write a letter about the issue to some person or organization in a related field of government and public policy. The letter should not advocate for the student’s position, but rather should ask for the recipient’s own stance on the issue and their reasons for their stance. Students should explain that they are students and kindly ask for a response to their questions. The goal is not to be confrontational but rather to cultivate the habit of engaging in civil dialogue and civic participation in a respectful and constructive manner.

Recipients may include the following:

- a local or state political party
- an elected official
- a journalist or reporter
- an interest group or lobbying firm
- a newspaper or other news outlet (this may take the form of a letter to the editor, in which case questions would be rhetorical)

UNIT 8 | LATE 20TH CENTURY GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

Assign to each student specific sections from the first two and final paragraphs of the Declaration of Independence, the Preamble to the Constitution, the Gettysburg Address, Abraham Lincoln’s second inaugural address, the 13th Amendment, and the “I Have a Dream” speech by Martin Luther King Jr. Each student should learn by heart his or her assigned part. On a specific day, have students recite their parts in this order. When finished, show students the entire video of King’s speech on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial. By completing this exercise, students should see the efficacious arc of America’s founding principles at work through American history.
Civics Club Ideas

- Debate/Forensics
- Historical Documentary/Movie Club
- History Club
- Mock Trial
- Political Thought Club
- School Newspaper
- Student Ambassador Program
- Student Government
Optional Volunteerism and Virtue Formation Ideas

- Adopt an American sister school
- Ask questions and listen to those with whom you disagree
- Assist neighbors, especially the elderly or those who could most use assistance, with lawn care, errands, etc.
- Care for parents and siblings
- Clean up litter when you see it
- Coach a sports team for younger children or lead a club for younger students
- Conduct a community cleanup of a park, waterway, street, etc.
- Contribute to a club, civic association, or religious association
- Create care packages for deployed service members, local law enforcement, EMS, medical staff, firefighters, prisoners, etc.
- Hold open the door for someone
- Hold an apprenticeship in a trade, starter job, or internship
- Lead and contribute to a food, clothing, backpack, coat, school supplies, toiletries, or baby supplies drive
- Let someone in while driving
- Recycle and be a generally good steward of water, electricity, etc.
- Shop and work at thrift stores and companies that respect the human dignity of their workers and freedom generally, as reflected in America’s founding documents and the 1st Amendment
- Save some money to keep on hand for when asked for a donation
- Say “Please” and “Thank you”
- Serve in the Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps (JROTC), as a firefighter auxiliary, as a police auxiliary, EMS auxiliary (depending on age requirements)
- Use time intentionally
- Tutor younger students
- Visit the lonely
- Volunteer at a local food bank, homeless shelter, medical facility, family center, historical site, or museum
- Volunteer at a camp, after-school, or vulnerable youth program
Hillsdale’s K-12 team operates from the Stanton Foundation Center for American Classical Education on the campus of Hillsdale College.
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For other inquiries, please call us at: (517) 607-3182