UNIT 5

The Turn of the Century

1877–1919

45-50-minute classes | 13-16 classes

UNIT PREVIEW

Structure

Why Teach the Turn of the Century

There has perhaps never been a period of more dramatic transformation in America than the final decades of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth. The ways of life for tens of millions of Americans and immigrants changed frequently and rapidly in but a single lifetime. And amid all that was gained, some things were lost, and new challenges arose. Most poignantly, these years put to the test the country's faith that the ideas and legacy of the American Founding could still be fruitfully applied in a modern age of industrialization and mass markets.

Enduring Ideas from This Unit

1. The Gilded Age brought a great transformation to the American economy, society, and way of life—a transformation that included unparalleled benefits to the lives of millions of Americans, along with unprecedented challenges.
2. The closing of the frontier in the West marked the end of an era in American history; the pioneering character of American society began to diminish, or shift its focus, as American energies became redirected to overseas interests.
3. A group of reformers and political thinkers known as the Progressives sought to answer challenges associated with the Gilded Age through new ideas about the purpose and structure of government—ideas they themselves considered to be a critique of the American Founding.
4. The Great War was one of the greatest disasters in the history of mankind, and it forever changed America's place on the world stage.

What Teachers Should Consider

The chief experience students should take away from the study of this unit is the great transformation that Americans living at the turn of the 20th century experienced. In a single lifetime, countless Americans went from a quiet, agrarian nation of dispersed small communities to an industrial and urban giant and world power. The texture of American life, especially for those in cities or near them, changed dramatically.

Students should recognize the great benefits most Americans enjoyed from such changes, especially in their material standard of living. These changes did not "just happen"; entrepreneurial individuals made them happen. We should acknowledge, alongside these advantages, that there were disadvantages that some unskilled workers, small businesses, and new immigrants had to endure.

Students should be directed toward aspects of the American past beyond its urban centers, particularly those of the Eastern Seaboard. There is much to be learned from the histories of the Old West, the frontier, and the American South during these decades, especially regarding U.S. government policy toward Native Americans and the status of African American civil rights.

The challenges of the "Gilded Age" gave rise to new ways of thinking and a new generation of social and political thinkers who sought to solve the problems of the day through a more active government. The Progressives rethought the very concept of government, basing it on a new view of human nature and a "scientific" understanding of government as an activity that should be based on the application of expert knowledge. The changes that Progressives brought to the Constitution and government in the United States in many respects endure to the present day.

Finally, the Great War is of paramount importance in the history of the 20th century, both for the world and for America. So many observers had begun the new century believing that the world was entering a century of peace and enlightenment, but their expectations were cruelly dashed, as the war's unprecedented destruction left much of Europe in ruins. But at the same time, the power and responsibility the United States assumed in fighting the war established its essential place of leadership in the world order.

How Teachers Can Learn More

TEXTS

A Fierce Discontent, Michael McGerr
The Myth of the Robber Barons, Burton Folsom
The Guns of August, Barbara Tuchman
The First World War, John Keegan
World War I and America, A. Scott Berg
American Heritage: A Reader, ed. Hillsdale College History Faculty

ONLINE COURSES | Online.Hillsdale.edu

The Great American Story
American Heritage
Civil Rights in American History
Introduction to the Constitution
Constitution 101
Constitution 201

Lesson Planning Resources

TEACHER RESOURCES

A Teacher's Guide to Land of Hope, Wilfred McClay and John McBride
A Student Workbook for Land of Hope, Wilfred McClay and John McBride
A Short History of World War I, James Stokesbury
Fighting the Great War, Michael Neiberg

STUDENT RESOURCES

Land of Hope, Wilfred McClay

PRIMARY SOURCES

"Surrender," Chief Joseph
"Wealth," Andrew Carnegie
"The Triumph of America," Andrew Carnegie
"The Mission of the Populist Party," William A. Peffer
"The Cross of Gold," William Jennings Bryan
"The March of the Flag," Albert J. Beveridge
Platform, American Anti-Imperialist League
Atlanta Exposition Address, Booker T. Washington
"The Significance of the Frontier in American History," Frederick Jackson Turner

"What Is Progress?", Woodrow Wilson
"Natural Law," Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr.
"The Presidency," Theodore Roosevelt
"The Study of Administration," Woodrow Wilson
"The Talented Tenth," *The Souls of Black Folk*, W. E. B. DuBois
War Message to Congress, Woodrow Wilson
Fourteen Points, Woodrow Wilson
League of Nations Speech, Henry Cabot Lodge

LESSON PLANS, ASSIGNMENTS, AND FORMATIVE QUIZ

Lesson 1 — The Gilded Age

1877-1901

5-6 classes

Lesson Objective

Students learn about the rapid changes America underwent in the decades following the Civil War, especially in the realms of industrialization, technology, economics, and foreign policy.

Teacher Preparation

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts

Land of Hope	Pages 205-239
Primary Sources	See below.

Teacher Texts

A Teacher's Guide to Land of Hope	Pages 200-208, 211-217, 234-236
A Student Workbook for Land of Hope	Pages 120-123, 125-127, 142-143

Online.Hillsdale.edu

The Great American Story	Lectures 12-13
Civil Rights in American History	Lectures 5-6

Student Preparation

Assignment 1: Students read *Land of Hope*, pages 205-214, and either complete the reading questions handout in *A Student Workbook for Land of Hope* (pages 120-121) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 2: Students read *Land of Hope*, pages 214-224, and either complete the reading questions handout in *A Student Workbook for Land of Hope* (pages 121-123 & 142-143) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 3: Students read *Land of Hope*, pages 225-239, and either complete the reading questions handout in *A Student Workbook for Land of Hope* (pages 125-127) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Core Content in This Lesson

Geography & Places

Pittsburgh	Alaska
Great Lakes	North Dakota
Promontory Point	South Dakota
Ellis Island	Montana
Coney Island	Washington
Lower East Side	Idaho

Wyoming
Utah
Hawaiian Islands
Spain
Cuba
Puerto Rico
Santiago Bay
San Juan Hill
Philippines
Manila Bay
China

Persons

Mark Twain
Elijah McCoy
Thomas Edison
Cornelius Vanderbilt
Andrew Carnegie
John D. Rockefeller
J. Pierpont Morgan
Samuel Gompers
Booker T. Washington
Anna Julia Cooper
George Washington Carver
Winslow Homer
Thomas Eakins
N. C. Wyeth
Antonín Dvořák
George Armstrong Custer
Sitting Bull
Rutherford B. Hayes
James A. Garfield
Chester A. Arthur
Grover Cleveland
Benjamin Harrison
William Jennings Bryan
William McKinley
Queen Liliʻuokalani
Sanford Dole
Theodore Roosevelt

Terms and Topics

Homestead Act
railroads
Transcontinental Railroad
industrialization
patent
steel
Bessemer process
self-made man
coal
oil refining
Standard Oil Co.
economies of scale
mass production
division of labor
vertical integration
general incorporation laws
monopoly
"captains of industry"
"robber barons"
philanthropy
urbanization
Brooklyn Bridge
immigration
tenement
Chinese Exclusion Act
pollution
Tuskegee Institute
Plessy v. Ferguson
frontier
cowboys
Plains Indians
Buffalo Soldiers
Dawes Act
Battle of Little Bighorn
Wounded Knee
political boss
special interests
Granger Movement
Panic of 1893
labor unions
Populist Party
gold standard
deflation
bimetallism
inflation
Cross of Gold
social gospel
The Influence of Sea Power upon History
Great White Fleet

USS *Maine*
yellow journalism
Spanish-American War
Rough Riders
Gatling gun
Philippine-American War
Open Door Policy
Boxer Rebellion

Primary Sources

"Surrender," Chief Joseph
"Wealth," Andrew Carnegie
"The Triumph of America," Andrew Carnegie
"The Mission of the Populist Party," William A. Peffer
"The Cross of Gold," William Jennings Bryan
"The March of the Flag," Albert J. Beveridge
Platform, American Anti-Imperialist League
Atlanta Exposition Address, Booker T. Washington
"The Significance of the Frontier in American History," Frederick Jackson Turner

To Know by Heart

"The New Colossus"—Emma Lazarus
"The cause of freedom is not the cause of a race or a sect, a party or a class—it is the cause of human kind, the very birthright of humanity." —Anna Julia Cooper
"Lift Every Voice and Sing" —James Weldon Johnson
"Pledge of Allegiance" —Francis Bellamy
"America the Beautiful" —Katharine Lee Bates

Timeline

1869	Transcontinental Railroad completed
1898	Spanish-American War
1901	Oil discovered in Beaumont, Texas

Images

Historical figures and events
New inventions
The "Golden spike" picture
First professional sports teams
Western settlement under the Homestead Act
Maps of railroad lines over time
Mansions of industrial leaders
Philanthropic buildings
Brooklyn Bridge
First skyscrapers
Cityscapes
Factories and workers
Life in tenement buildings
Immigrants on boats and at Ellis Island
Statue of Liberty construction
First greenbacks
Electoral maps
American battleships
Images and uniforms of Spanish and American officers and soldiers

Depictions of figures at various scenes and moments in battle
Maps: overall strategies, specific battles
Medical equipment
Reenactment photos

Stories for the American Heart

- Biographies and the roles of Elijah McCoy, Thomas Edison, Cornelius Vanderbilt, Andrew Carnegie, John D. Rockefeller, J. P. Morgan, Samuel Gompers, Booker T. Washington, Grover Cleveland, William Jennings Bryan, William McKinley, and Theodore Roosevelt
- Grenville Dodge's account of the completion of the Transcontinental Railroad at Promontory Point, Utah
- Thomas Edison's account of the first successful lightbulb
- Albert Goodwill Spalding's account of innovations in baseball
- James Naismith's account of inventing basketball
- J. P. Morgan's bailouts of the federal government
- Frank Lloyd Wright on first seeing a city
- Accounts of the Great Chicago Fire
- Jacob Riis photographing life of the poor in the cities
- Barton Simonson's account of the Haymarket Square riot
- Immigrant stories
- Edward Steiner's account from Ellis Island
- Robert Louis Stevenson's travel with immigrants on a train from New York to California
- Chief White Bull's account of Custer's Last Stand at Little Bighorn
- The exploits of Jesse James
- Hamilton Wick's account of the Oklahoma Land Rush
- Black Elk's account of the massacre at Wounded Knee
- Rutherford B. Hayes's promotion of Frederick Douglass to marshal in Washington, D.C.
- The assassination of James Garfield
- William Jennings Bryan's "Cross of Gold" speech
- The overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy
- The explosion of the USS *Maine*
- The surrender of Guam
- Theodore Roosevelt and the Rough Riders in the Spanish-American War
- Richard Harding Davis's account of the Battle of San Juan Hill

Questions for the American Mind

- How did America change after the Civil War with respect to the agrarian makeup of its economy, workforce, and population distribution?
- What sorts of technological changes were developed in the late 19th century? Which were the most important and why?
- What is the importance of patent law to American prosperity?
- Why were the railroads so significant to the transformation of the American economy?
- What are some of the beneficial developments produced during the Gilded Age?
- What is the relationship between economies of scale, mass production, and the division of labor?

- How did general incorporation laws come into existence in America in the Jacksonian era? How did they help larger American businesses expand in the late 19th century?
- What were some of the characteristics of America's most successful companies and businessmen? In what ways were they similar and in what ways different?
- In what ways might America's leading businessmen be considered "captains of industry," and in what ways might they be considered "robber barons"?
- What challenges emerged from the technological and economic changes during the Gilded Age?
- What problems did farmers face during the Gilded Age?
- Why did so many people immigrate to the United States in the late 19th century?
- How did this immigration wave differ demographically from previous migration patterns?
- To what extent did immigrants assimilate into the American populace? What are the advantages and disadvantages of this situation?
- How did the relationship between the employer and employee change relative to the size of a business?
- How did labor unions organize, and how did businesses and government officials sometimes respond?
- What was life like for African Americans in the late 19th century?
- What were Booker T. Washington's ideas for improving conditions for African Americans?
- What did the U.S. Supreme Court rule in *Plessy v. Ferguson*?
- What happened in the western United States with respect to relations between Native Americans and the U.S. government?
- What was the nature of the gold standard–bimetallism debates? What groups preferred which standard, and why?
- Who belonged to the Populist Party, and what was its platform?
- What was the significance of the frontier in American history? What effects might its "closing" have on America?
- What motivations led some Americans to seek out certain overseas lands?
- How did the idea of a more active foreign policy and imperialism contend with the American founding and foreign policy precedent?
- What was Alfred Thayer Mahan's thesis in *The Influence of Sea Power upon History*? How did this book influence the American military?
- Where did America expand during the McKinley administration, and why?
- How did the Spanish-American War begin, and why was it fought?
- For what reasons did the Americans soundly defeat the Spanish in the Spanish-American War?
- What issues did America face in the Philippines and Cuba following the Spanish-American War?
- How did America's imperial ventures compare to those of Europe and Japan at the time?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
    - Question 67: Name two promises that new citizens make in the Oath of Allegiance.
    - Question 68: How can people become United States citizens?
    - Question 117: Name one American Indian tribe in the United States.
    - Question 118: Name one example of an American innovation.
    - Question 120: Where is the Statue of Liberty?

KEYS TO THE LESSON

The lives of Americans underwent an unprecedented transformation in the decades following Reconstruction. Many of the policies and practices of centralized action forged during the Civil War continued and expanded into other parts of the American economy and society. Simultaneously, the entire developed world was undergoing a period of remarkable and rapid technological development. The benefits from these changes were immense, but they also presented a number of new challenges to the lives of ordinary Americans. Students should come to appreciate the great extent of this upheaval and transformation of daily life that Americans experienced within a single lifetime. They should also understand the many benefits of these changes and be asked to consider the balance between those benefits and their costs.

Teachers might best plan and teach The Gilded Age with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Introduce students to Mark Twain and his branding of the final decades of the 19th century as a "gilded age." Ask students what "gilded" means, then have them think throughout the lesson about why Mark Twain applied this term to these decades—and whether he was right to do so.
- The Gilded Age is one period in teaching American history where the narrative form is more difficult to employ, simply because so much was changing all at once, while isolatable events of great historical import were less common. Because the Gilded Age is a period for which a conventional chronological narrative form is difficult to employ, consider dividing this lesson into halves. First, teach about the major changes in American life, the economy, and society from Reconstruction to 1900, giving students an experience of the rapid and rather disorienting pace of change that defined the period. Then move on to a more chronological treatment of political history during the same years. The political events of the era will remain more muted than in other periods, reflecting the primacy of large structural forces over politics.
- Help students to recognize and understand two critical causes of the great changes America experienced after the Civil War: the use of mass organization and the development of mass production—both derived from fighting and supplying the war. With many of the institutions, policies, skills, and even equipment still in place following the war, it was natural to apply these practices and knowledge to peacetime endeavors, especially in manufacturing. At the same time, a series of new inventions worked together within the mass production mechanisms from wartime America to expand at a breakneck pace the capacity of production, as well as the size of markets.
- In general, help students to understand the significant shift away from agrarianism and toward urban living and working, and how this shift marked a major change in most Americans' way of life.
- Highlight for students the most significant inventions created or significantly improved during the mid- to late 19th century. These would include, among others: improved railroads (including standard gauges, time zones, the automatic lubricator, and the air brake); the steel cast plow; the mechanical reaper; the light bulb; the flush toilet and sewer system; the elevator brake; the Bessemer process; steel cable; and the telephone. Most such inventions were developed or at least monetized in America. Ask students to imagine life without these things. Also include the inventions that responded to the growing capacity for leisure in the life of the middle class: the gramophone, professional sports, department stores, mail-order retail, amusement parks, etc. With each major invention, explain briefly how it worked, the need it met, and the impact it had. Students should especially appreciate America's revolutionary patent system, which vigorously protected inventions and innovations—including intellectual property rights—all under the banner of private property.

- Above all, spend time on the foundational inventions that made most of the others possible and drove the many changes American life was undergoing. If iron, coal, and textiles undergirded the First Industrial Revolution, then steel, oil, and electricity drove the Second Industrial Revolution. Take the time to explain the importance of these inventions and industries, including the major figures associated with them, such as Andrew Carnegie, John D. Rockefeller, and Thomas Edison.
- Review with students the main tenets of the American economic system: free-market capitalism, private property, the rule of law, contract enforcement, and patents. Remind students that this system had largely defined America from colonial times through the Gilded Age and was responsible for much of America's prosperity, upward mobility, and economic opportunity afforded to its people.
- In the course of teaching about these industries, walk students through some of the major economic and business practices that allowed for the tremendous rate of change and the scale of production, such as economies of scale, mass production, and the division of labor. Alongside these practices were general incorporation laws that continued from emergency measures enacted during the Civil War. Thanks to such instruments, capital was easier to raise than ever before, allowing entrepreneurs to take full advantage of the possibilities new technology afforded them.
- In discussing the major business leaders of the Gilded Age, present the two disparate ways these leaders are sometimes described: "captains of industry" and "robber barons." As with all historical figures, teach these figures as the facts lead you. The accomplishments and benefits these men provided are impossible to ignore, while there are also broader questions that might be raised about certain specific business practices. Specificity is key, as in all historical controversies. Discourage your students from making sweeping generalizations, either favorable or unfavorable.
- From the conversation on business practices, pivot to other underlying challenges that economic changes brought to American life. This conversation should include the livelihood of small businesses and farmers, working conditions for unskilled laborers, and general life in America's growing cities. Accompanying these changes and challenges was a massive immigration wave—"nearly 12 million immigrants …[arrived] between 1870 and 1900" (link). Students should understand the many reasons why these immigrants came to America, especially its positive attraction compared to their status in the Old World. Students should appreciate the effects of so many immigrants all at once settling in already crowded cities and joining the urban workforce. They should also learn about the various reasons for ethnic and religious resistance of the native-born to the Catholic, Jewish, and Orthodox immigrants of eastern and southern Europe, and how the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 was the only law in American history to outlaw immigration based solely on national origin. Students should also consider the importance of citizenship education with so many new people added to the country.
- Discuss the emergence of some labor unions to advocate for better working conditions and wages. Note also the several major strikes and sometimes violence that accompanied these efforts, such as the Molly Maguires, the Great Railroad Strike, the Haymarket Square riot, the Homestead Strike, and the Pullman Strike.
- Teach about the political machines and bosses that emerged in the cities in this period of rapid urban growth.
- Consider changes in life outside of America's major cities. Include in these conversations the status of African Americans, who faced continued discrimination, literacy tests, poll taxes, Jim Crow, convict leasing, and violence, particularly (but not exclusively) in the states of the former Confederacy. Many of these practices were led by members of the Ku Klux Klan as it terrorized

African Americans, immigrants, Catholics, Jews, and Republicans. At the same time, discuss the response of Anna Julia Cooper, Booker T. Washington, and the Tuskegee Institute to these circumstances, and record the successes African Americans achieved in other places in America. Teach also about the U.S. Supreme Court's declaration in *Plessy v. Ferguson* that discrimination that was "separate, but equal" was constitutional. Students should consider the extent to which such a ruling is consistent with the principles they studied about the American Founding.

- Teach about the American West, from cowboys and cattle drives to the Plains Indians and U.S. government policy toward them. As with the other lessons on relationships between Native Americans, settlers, and the U.S. government, important questions of justice and prudence should be directed toward the actions of all parties.
- Finally, while teaching about the West, briefly share with students the developing art of the American West; the gradual development of an American culture in music; and the literary output of Louisa May Alcott, Mark Twain, Emily Dickinson, Stephen Crane, and Laura Ingalls Wilder.
- Review with students the Compromise of 1877 that put Rutherford B. Hayes in the White House. As for his administration itself, show how it was a welcomed reprieve from the corruption of the Grant administration. In his otherwise uneventful term, Hayes is noteworthy for vetoing legislation against Chinese immigrants and African Americans.
- With the Benjamin Harrison administration, introduce the growing debate over the gold standard vs. bimetallism, which should be viewed along with trusts and tariffs as the defining economic issues of the late 19th century. Students should be made to understand that, although this subject seems a bit esoteric, it was of great importance for ordinary American families.
- Against this backdrop, discuss the rise of the Populist Party and William Jennings Bryan, including his 1896 campaign against William McKinley, during which he delivered his "Cross of Gold" speech at the Democratic National Convention.
- Discuss the new military technology that had been developed since the Civil War, the growing U.S. Navy, the "closing" of the Western frontier, the "social gospel," and shifts in the European balance of power that further fueled colonization and imperialism among those powers, especially in Africa and Asia. Pages 225-231 of *Land of Hope* are helpful for highlighting America's first forays into overseas possessions and the inherent tension between this policy and the principles of the American Founding—a tension evident in the debates of the time.
- Teach the Spanish-American War with brevity, in accordance with the way it was fought. Give proper attention to the role of yellow journalism leading up to the war, the tales of Theodore Roosevelt and the Rough Riders, America's resounding victory, and the challenges that followed the war.

Strengthening Understanding: Post-Lesson Assignments

Assignment 1: Explain how America changed in the decades following Reconstruction and what accounted for those changes (2-3 paragraphs).

Assignment 2: Explain the difficulties that accompanied America's rapid economic and societal changes in the late 19th century and how various groups of people addressed these issues (2-3 paragraphs).

Assignment 3: Explain the extent to which American foreign policy under William McKinley both departed from and held to America's traditional stance toward international affairs (2-3 paragraphs).

Name_____ Date_____

Reading Quiz

The Turn of the Century | Lesson 1, Quiz #1
Land of Hope, Pages 205-214

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. What was the date of the Grand Review?

2. What were two areas of business that became dominant in post-Civil War America?

3. Name a positive benefit described in the book of the influence of the railroad industry.

4. Name two prominent businessmen, and their respective industries, who emerged in post-Civil War America.

5. What was the main principle behind "Morganization"?

Name_____ Date_____

Reading Quiz

The Turn of the Century | Lesson 1, Quiz #2
Land of Hope, Pages 214-224

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. Name one reason why labor unions were slow to gain a foothold in America in the late 19th century.

2. What political development was a result of the increasing poverty of American cities?

3. Name three ethnic groups that comprised the growing immigration population in America in the late 19th century.

4. Who wrote the 1893 essay "The Significance of the Frontier in American History"?

5. Briefly describe one argument advanced by the above essay relevant to late 19th-century America.

Name_____ Date_____

Reading Quiz

The Turn of the Century | Lesson 1, Quiz #3
Land of Hope, Pages 225-239

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. Which American statesman delivered an influential foreign policy address in 1821?

2. What term best describes the Western nations' quest for foreign territorial acquisitions in the 19th century?

3. Who was the author of the 1890 book *The Influence of Sea Power upon History*?

4. What event in 1898 directly led to the Spanish-American War?

5. Name three foreign countries the United States became involved in following the Spanish-American War.

Lesson 2 — The Progressive Era

1901–1914

4–5 classes

Lesson Objective

Students learn about the issues the Progressive movement sought to address, how its political philosophy compared to that of the American Founding, and how Progressive policy changed American government, politics, and economics.

Teacher Preparation

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts

Land of Hope	Pages 240–258
Primary Sources	See below.

Teacher Texts

A Teacher's Guide to Land of Hope	Pages 232–239
A Student Workbook for Land of Hope	Pages 142–145

Online.Hillsdale.edu

The Great American Story	Lectures 14–15
American Heritage	Lecture 8
Introduction to the Constitution	Lecture 12
Constitution 101	Lecture 8
Constitution 201	Lectures 1-4
Civil Rights in American History	Lecture 6

Student Preparation

Assignment 1: Students read *Land of Hope*, pages 240-249, and either complete the reading questions handout in *A Student Workbook for Land of Hope* (pages 143-144) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 2: Students read *Land of Hope*, pages 249-258, and either complete the reading questions handout in *A Student Workbook for Land of Hope* (pages 144-145) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Core Content in This Lesson

Geography & Places

Panama Canal	New Mexico
Oklahoma	Arizona

Persons

Jacob Riis	Ida Tarbell

Eugene V. Debs
John Dewey
Woodrow Wilson
W. E. B. DuBois
William Howard Taft
Pancho Villa
John Muir

Terms and Topics

muckrakers
The Jungle
The Communist Manifesto
Hegelianism
social Darwinism
socialism
social gospel
Progressivism
living Constitution
politics
delegation of power
experts
bureaucracy
administration
Pendleton Civil Service Act
Sherman Antitrust Act
trust-busting
Interstate Commerce Act
The Square Deal
conservationism
national parks
Roosevelt Corollary
Bull Moose Party
The New Freedom
Election of 1912
Niagara Movement
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)
Baltimore redlining
Black Wall Street
eugenics
Buck v. Bell
San Francisco Earthquake
income tax
16th Amendment
17th Amendment

Primary Sources

"What Is Progress?", Woodrow Wilson
"Natural Law," Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr.
"The Presidency," Theodore Roosevelt
"The Study of Administration," Woodrow Wilson
"The Talented Tenth," *The Souls of Black Folk*, W. E. B. DuBois

To Know by Heart

"I aimed for the public's heart, and … hit it in the stomach." —Upton Sinclair
"Speak softly and carry a big stick." —Theodore Roosevelt
"Chicago" —Carl Sandburg
"The Road Not Taken" —Robert Frost

Timeline

1901	William McKinley assassinated Theodore Roosevelt becomes president
1908	William Howard Taft elected
1912	Woodrow Wilson defeats Taft and Roosevelt
June 14	Flag Day

Images

Historical figures and events
Muckraker newspapers and cartoons
Building the Panama Canal

National Parks
Eugenics propaganda

Stories for the American Heart

- Biographies and the roles of Woodrow Wilson, Theodore Roosevelt, and William Howard Taft
- Stories of working conditions within various industries
- Pauline Cuoio Pepe's account of the Triangle Shirtwaist Company fire
- Stories from Theodore Roosevelt's life
- Jack London's account of the San Francisco earthquake of 1906
- Theodore Roosevelt's account of building the Panama Canal

Questions for the American Mind

- How did journalists, churches, and charitable organizations seek to address the social challenges that came with a society of mass production, rapid industrialization, and urbanization?
- What ideas relating to democracy, the general will, class identity and struggle, human nature, government, and the processes of historical change (from sources including the French Revolution, Karl Marx, G.W.F. Hegel, and Charles Darwin) influenced the thought of American Progressives?
- What were early 20th-century socialists' main suggestions for controlling what they perceived as the dangers of private businesses, and what counterarguments were offered to their ideas?
- What legal reforms did Progressives pursue to deal with problems of urbanization and industrialization?
- What contributions did Woodrow Wilson make to Progressivism, both as a thinker and as president?
- How did Progressives explain their argument that human nature, truth, and politics were inevitably evolving and improving over the course of history?
- How did Progressives come to view human nature, history, and government in "Darwinian" terms, as a continual process of evolutionary improvement? Why did these ideas lead to a partial critique of the Declaration of Independence, natural rights, and social contract theory?
- What did Progressives mean by *equality*, and why did they believe equality of opportunity and dignity for ordinary citizens necessitated a powerfully activist government?
- How did Progressives critique individualism and the power of special interests, monopolies, and the wealthy in politics?
- In what ways did Progressives critique the Constitution as being too slow, mechanical, and at odds with itself, as presented in their critique of the separation of powers and of checks and balances?
- Why did Progressives believe that many of the Founders' worries over the dangers of tyranny (especially majority tyranny) and constitutional limits on governmental power were outdated?
- In what ways did Progressives promote direct democracy, and how was this concept to solve the problems posed by the influence of special interests? What limits, if any, did Progressives place on the role of the people in making laws?
- What was "government by expertise," and why did the Progressives argue for it?
- How did Progressives believe special interests and prejudices could be overcome by an administrative state insulated from the sway of politics that could enact the people's true will?

- By creating administrative bureaus, both during and after the Progressive era, how did Congress delegate its legislative power to executive agencies that combined into a single unelected body legislative, executive, and judicial functions?
- What were the problems some argued would arise through centralized decisions made by knowledgeable yet unelected experts? How did they compare to problems arising through dispersed decisions made by elected and accountable officials?
- In foreign policy, why did Progressives believe the world would become freer and more peaceful with the spread of democracy and international institutions?
- How did Progressives reframe the president as a visionary and rhetorical leader who sets the legislative agenda and guides general legislation through Congress?
- How did Theodore Roosevelt embrace Progressivism in his politics, in his presidential actions addressing the issues of the day, and in his foreign policy positions?
- To what extent did early Progressives seek to advance the civil rights of African Americans?
- What were the main ideas of W. E. B. DuBois? How were they both alike and different from those of other commentators on improving the condition of African Americans?
- How did the practice of eugenics fit with Progressives' ideas on human improvement, government, and rights?
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 5: How are changes made to the U.S. Constitution?
  - Question 32: Who elects U.S. senators?

KEYS TO THE LESSON

As America entered the 20th century, economic and social changes moved reformers toward new ideas, particularly about human nature, the purpose of government, and consequently the form of government institutions. Those who developed and adopted these beliefs worked to change American government. Their loosely coordinated social, political, and intellectual movement became known as Progressivism. Adherents to this new political philosophy explicitly critiqued in their own words some of the fundamental presumptions of the American Founders' political theory. Students should understand what challenges the Progressives sought to address, the substance of their new philosophy, and how they ultimately changed American government.

Teachers might best plan and teach The Progressive Era with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Review from the previous lesson the challenges that came with industrialization and urbanization during the Gilded Age. Many of these challenges were not new, but were, like so many other things, multiplied on a mass scale as the American economy rapidly grew and changed.
- Highlight those Progressives who did investigative and advocacy work, including muckraker journalists and those who served the poor, workers, and immigrants in charity.
- Briefly talk about the Progressive idea of Christianity as primarily a movement for social reform, especially through government action—a view best expressed by the term "the social gospel," which shaped public debate over religion for much of the 20th century.
- Clarify with students that many of the issues highlighted by Progressives—such as child labor, workplace and consumer safety, problems of conservation, and monopolies—were issues that many Founders also recognized as inappropriate or unjust in their own time. Progressives, however, believed the *federal* government should address these issues, instead of only *state* and

local governments, or private institutions (such as individuals, charities, businesses, consumers, churches, and civic associations), as many of the Founders generally maintained.

- Consider with students the similarities between the ideas of the French Revolution, Marxism, Hegelianism, and social Darwinism. As they themselves acknowledged, Progressives were influenced by certain elements of each of these political philosophies, either in their critiques of the Founding and the issues of the day or in their confidence in changing government and society. Included in this conversation should be the work of socialist and anarchist groups in the United States, which were distinct from Progressivism but shared many critiques of modern America and some ideas on how to address them.
- Introduce Woodrow Wilson as a key Progressive theorist. Include his biography and his writings during the 1880s and 1890s on these topics.
- Help students consider Progressivism's general critique of the Founders' theory of rights. The Progressives generally argued against the insistence that rights were natural, that they were part of what made one human, and that they existed only at the individual level. Instead, leading Progressive thinkers maintained that rights were conditioned on social circumstances and belonged to groups of people, usually organized by class. They feared that the Founding system of equally protected natural rights seemed to favor the wealthy and powerful. Progressives believed that government should redefine rights according to class or group, and should not necessarily protect rights equally when it came to the wealthy and other "special interests" if equality required it. Indeed, since rights were not based on natural personhood, they were instead derived from elsewhere, as determined, distributed, secured, and—if necessary—revoked by government. Students should consider the extent to which this position aligned or contrasted with leading Founders' understanding of unalienable rights grounded in human nature.
- Review with students the American Founders' understanding of human nature. In brief, leading Founders understood human nature to be fixed and unchanging, good but also flawed, and thus tending toward becoming corrupted by power. In response to these tendencies of human nature, government must guard against the opposite dangers of lawlessness and tyranny, accounting for the realities of human nature and rejecting the possibility of utopia. The Constitution, therefore, did not deny, demonize, or elevate human nature, but rather tried to channel human energy and interests into constructive institutions while mitigating man's baser tendencies. The Constitution was constructed on a deep understanding of fixed human nature and was born from the Founders' prudence, experience, and knowledge of history.
- Share with students that while both the Founders and Progressives believed in a moral foundation to politics, Progressives viewed the above-mentioned understanding of human nature and government as overly pessimistic and simplistic. Progressives generally thought of human nature not as fixed but as evolving toward betterment—the core idea from which the movement's name is derived. When looking at technological gains, improvements in the standard of living, and the general pace of scientific discovery, Progressives believed that these factors demonstrated that human beings, and even human nature itself, would also improve. Moreover, government ought to be a key agent in that improvement and perfection. Progressives, however, resisted the Founders' argument that government's primary purpose was to secure unchanging rights and maintain a framework for self-government. Instead, they held that the purpose of government was to keep up with evolving rights and constant social change.
- Explain to students how the Progressives departed from what they considered the negative understanding of rights and equality, i.e., that justice and morality require that the natural rights of individuals be equally protected. Instead, the Progressives viewed government as a positive force not only to protect rights but also to empower people and grant groups of people

special advantages in order to fulfill the potential outcomes of having certain rights. For example, it was not enough to be free to earn a living if there was no job by which to earn it. Government must not only preserve the right to have a job, but also supply the job itself if necessary.

- Emphasize for students how such a relatively idealistic philosophy and view of human nature might lead one to assume that the bad qualities of human nature (such as a desire for political power or human fallibility) are not a permanent problem, and that one thus need not worry as the Founders did about the accumulation of power in any one place. James Madison's concern that "[t]he accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hands, whether of one, a few, or many, and whether hereditary, self[-]appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny" (link) therefore becomes far less of a concern to Progressives than it was to the Founders. Were the Progressives right to see matters in this way?
- Make sure students appreciate the shift in the purpose and operation of government under such a view: government is no longer [1] the defender of certain fundamental rights, rights that exist prior to government itself; [2] limited in size to basic functions (lawmaking, executing law, and adjudicating law); and [3] limited in core responsibilities (such as maintaining courts of law and the nation's security). Rather, government is to be a central active force for change in America, bringing about personal fulfilment of individuals and progress for society. Moreover, these ends were meant to be attained not merely in domestic matters, but also on the world stage in foreign affairs.
- Talk about the Progressive vision for practical politics. A more optimistic view of human nature made them supportive of direct democratic rule. A prime example of this change was the 17th Amendment, which implemented the direct election of senators by the people. The use of initiative, referendum, and recall at the state level are other examples.
- Help students to understand the role of elected officials in this new paradigm. Elected officials were not merely to reflect consent and refine the views of the people, but rather to show (or convince) the people of what they should truly want through the effective use of rhetoric. Progressives were especially interested in making the president the national leader of popular opinion.
- Consider with students how this emphasis on direct democracy could be undermined by actual experience. "Politics" became about expressing general ideas and establishing popular support to get those ideas codified into law. Separate from the democratic process is the difficult task of turning these general ideas into actual governance. The Progressives (particularly Woodrow Wilson) called this task "administration."
- Explain how the Progressives argued that the technical and time-consuming work of actually carrying out the broad, general ideas of the law—detailing how it is to be done, implementing the laws, and making sure those laws are enforced to achieve their objectives—is not the work of Congress or even the president. Rather, a new body of experts and bureaucrats do the real work of governing (i.e., administration) apart from the realm of politics. Congress would *delegate* some of its lawmaking power to these bureaucrats, most of whom would exist under the executive branch and could thus execute the "laws" or regulations they made (for example, clean air and water experts would create the specific details of the respective laws). The president can also delegate his power to *enforce* the laws. The bureaucrats may also assume quasi-judicial powers and have their own *courts* to adjudicate claims against their own laws and regulations. This shift of legislative, executive, and judicial powers away from the branches in which these powers had been separately vested by the people through the Constitution, as well as the accumulation of unelected officials in various departments and agencies, both amounted to the second great shift in the Progressive worldview: government needed to be rearranged

through the creation of the administrative state in order to circumvent the Constitution's political checks and bring about "progress."

- Stress for students the importance of this shift away from government by representatives of the people to government by bureaucratic expertise. Ask them to consider the extent to which it is compatible with the principle of representative and limited self-government on which the Founders established the United States.
- Emphasize how the advent of the administrative state changed the Founders' careful arrangement in which powers were separated and dispersed through checks and balances and federalism. All three types of government power (legislative, executive, and judicial) are instead consolidated into bureaucratic agencies that are, in fact, removed from the people. This is done in the name of efficiency—trusting in improved human nature and scientific expertise to achieve higher aims via government than the Founding generation ever thought possible. The Progressives' confidence in expert knowledge, centralized planning, and improved human nature ensured that only just and effective regulations would be made, without the risk of corruption, incompetence, or tyranny.
- Teach students about the several pieces of Progressive legislation that were enacted at the federal level even before government institutions were adjusted, especially the Pendleton Civil Service Act that ushered in the permanent bureaucracy after the assassination of President James Garfield, the Sherman Antitrust Act, and the Interstate Commerce Act.
- With Theodore Roosevelt's presidency, note for students that the Progressive movement had adherents in both political parties. As for Roosevelt himself, discuss his colorful biography and captivating personality. When teaching his presidency, highlight his embrace of the Progressive view of "politics," his desire to use the power of government to regulate business, his efforts in conservation, and his keen interest in a more active foreign policy, including his "Roosevelt Corollary" to the Monroe Doctrine.
- Discuss certain famous regulations and busted trusts, such as the Pure Food and Drug Act, the Meat Inspection Act, and the breakups of the Standard Oil Company and the Northern Securities railroad trust.
- Explain the administration of William Howard Taft and the subsequently contentious election of 1912, in which Woodrow Wilson—a Progressive "mastermind," as it were—was elected president. After Republican critics of Progressivism blocked Theodore Roosevelt's nomination for the party, Roosevelt's formation of the Bull Moose third party split the Republican vote and allowed Wilson to win the election as a Democrat.
- Discuss the Niagara Movement and the work of W. E. B. DuBois: his appeal to a liberal education as part of the uplift of African Americans; his concept of the "talented tenth"; and the creation of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Compare these efforts and ideas to those of other African American leaders, such as Booker T. Washington.
- Have students explore the extent to which early Progressives, and especially Progressive leaders, sought to advance or hinder civil rights for African Americans and women.
- Mention how an aspect of Progressivism was its support for eugenics, based on its confidence that science and government could help society evolve past criminality and the need to support those whom they considered to be "undesirable." This movement was later partially backed by the Supreme Court, especially by Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr. in *Buck v. Bell* (1927), and led to the creation of groups such as the American Eugenics Society.
- Help students to understand the various changes the Progressives made to the functioning of the government. Include in this treatment the 16th and 17th Amendments, as well as the creation of the Federal Reserve System.

Strengthening Understanding: Post-Lesson Assignments

Assignment 1: Compare and contrast Progressive ideas with those of the American Founding (2-3 paragraphs).

Assignment 2: Describe examples of Progressive ideas being implemented during the Progressive era. Explain how these changes impacted American society (2-3 paragraphs).

Name_____ Date_____

Reading Quiz

The Turn of the Century | Lesson 2, Quiz #1
Land of Hope, Pages 240-249

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. Which term best describes the general Progressive attitude toward political and economic entities?

2. Which state became well-known for its implementation of Progressive government?

3. What societal issue demonstrated the Progressive tendency to act as a "social intelligence"?

4. Which Progressive intellectual emphasized the role of the society over the individual?

5. Which scientific/biological theory was widely promoted among Progressives?

Name_____ Date_____

Reading Quiz

The Turn of the Century | Lesson 2, Quiz #2
Land of Hope, Pages 249-258

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. What were the terms for the two Progressive understandings of economic action?

2. What important piece of regulatory legislation was passed by Congress in 1887?

3. Who succeeded William McKinley as president of the United States after his assassination in 1901?

4. Briefly summarize one aspect of Woodrow Wilson's Progressive political thought.

5. Who won the 1912 United States presidential election?

Name_____ Date_____

Unit 5 — Formative Quiz

The Turn of the Century | Lessons 1-2
10-15 minutes

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question in at least one complete sentence.

1. What sorts of technological changes were developed in the late 19th century? Which were the most important and why?

2. How did general incorporation laws come into existence in America in the Jacksonian era? How did they help larger American businesses expand in the late 19th century?

3. What were some of the characteristics of America's most successful companies and businessmen? In what ways were they similar and in what ways different?

4. What happened in the western United States with respect to relations between Native Americans and the U.S. government?

5. What were early 20th-century socialists' main suggestions for controlling what they perceived as the dangers of private businesses? What counterarguments were offered to their ideas?

6. What legal reforms did Progressives pursue to deal with problems of urbanization and industrialization?

7. What were the problems some argued would arise through centralized decisions made by knowledgeable yet unelected experts? How did these problems compare to those from decisions made by elected and accountable officials?

Lesson 3 — The Great War

1914–1919

4–5 classes

Lesson Objective

Students learn about the start of the Great War, America's neutrality and eventual declaration of war, the history of the war, and the Treaty of Versailles.

Teacher Preparation

Create a note outline based on the following:

Student Texts

Land of Hope	Pages 259–275
Primary Sources	See below.

Teacher Texts

A Teacher's Guide to Land of Hope	Pages 249–257
A Student Workbook for Land of Hope	Pages 155–159
A Short History of World War I	
Fighting the Great War	

Online.Hillsdale.edu

The Great American Story	Lectures 16–17
American Heritage	Lecture 9

Student Preparation

Assignment 1: Students read *Land of Hope*, pages 259–268, and either complete the reading questions handout in *A Student Workbook for Land of Hope* (pages 155–157) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Assignment 2: Students read *Land of Hope*, pages 268–275, and either complete the reading questions handout in *A Student Workbook for Land of Hope* (pages 157–159) or prepare for a reading quiz (provided below).

Core Content in This Lesson

Geography & Places

Alsace-Lorraine	Sarajevo
Austria-Hungary	Meuse River
Ottoman Empire	Ardennes Forest
Balkans	Soviet Union
Serbia	Argonne Forest

Persons

Orville and Wilbur Wright
Henry Ford
Franz Ferdinand
Wilhelm II
Nicholas II
Woodrow Wilson
Helmuth von Moltke
Paul von Hindenburg
Winston Churchill
John Pershing
Vladimir Lenin
Carrie Nation
Susan B. Anthony

Terms and Topics

airplane
Model T
assembly line
nationalism
militarism
balance of power
Triple Alliance
Triple Entente
Eastern Question
reserve system
industrial warfare
airplane
automobile
assembly line
mobilization schedules
"blank check"
ultimatum
Allied Powers
Central Powers
two-front war
Schlieffen Plan
Plan 17
Pact of London
Battle of Tannenberg
First Battle of the Marne
trench warfare
machine gun
barbed wire
No Man's Land
war of attrition
shell shock
gas attacks
U-Boats
unrestricted submarine warfare
Lusitania
Battle of Gallipoli
Battle of Verdun
Battle of the Somme
Armenian Genocide
Zimmerman Telegram
Bolshevik Revolution
Brest-Litovsk Treaty
War Industries Board
Sedition Act
Schenck v. United States
doughboys
tank
Battle of Belleau Wood
Second Battle of the Marne
Meuse-Argonne Offensive
Lost Battalion
Fourteen Points
Treaty of Versailles
League of Nations

Primary Sources

War Message to Congress, Woodrow Wilson
Fourteen Points, Woodrow Wilson
League of Nations Speech, Henry Cabot Lodge

To Know by Heart

"If there is ever another war in Europe, it will come out of some damned silly thing in the Balkans." —Otto von Bismarck (link)
"Dulce et Decorum Est" —Wilfred Owen
"The Soldier" —Rupert Brooke

"The world must be made safe for democracy." —Woodrow Wilson
"Over There" —George Cohan
"Break of Day" —Siegfried Sassoon
"In Flanders Fields" —John McCrae

Timeline

1914–1918	The Great War
June 28, 1914	Archduke Franz Ferdinand assassinated
1915	Battle of Gallipoli
1916	Battles of Verdun and the Somme; Woodrow Wilson reelected
1917	U.S. declaration of war; Bolshevik Revolution
1918	Hundred Days Offensive
November 11 (1918)	Veterans Day (Armistice Day)

Images

Historical figures and events
First flight and airplanes
First assembly lines
Union and Confederate veterans at Gettysburg in 1913
Images and uniforms of Allied and Central Powers officers and soldiers
Depictions and photographs of figures at various scenes and moments in battle
Video footage of soldiers
Trench warfare
Maps: alliances, overall strategies, specific battles
Military equipment and weaponry
War propaganda
Medical equipment
Reenactment photos
Facsimiles of documents and letters
Home front and factory production
Wounded veterans
Depictions of the sinking of the *Lusitania*
Destruction from the war
Postwar maps

Stories for the American Heart

- Orville Wright's account of the first flight
- Henry Ford's description of the first assembly line
- Borijove Jevtic's account of the assassination of Austria-Hungary Archduke Franz Ferdinand by the Serbian terrorist organization, the Black Hand
- Nicholas II's exaggerated support for Serbia against Austria-Hungary's ultimatum
- The Willy-Nicky Telegrams
- Helmuth von Moltke's deceptions of Wilhelm II regarding mobilization against France
- German atrocities in Belgium
- The French capture of a map of the Schlieffen Plan
- Alexander von Kluck's erroneous turn to the east of Paris
- Paris taxis taking reinforcements to the First Battle of the Marne

- Life in trenches and trench warfare, including firsthand accounts from any of the following figures: Leonard Thompson, Hugh Walpole, Oskar Kokoschka, Robert Graves, John Walker, H. H. Munro, William Pressey, Edwin Vaughan, et al.
- Enduring machine gun fire, artillery bombardments, and gas attacks
- The Christmas Truce
- Walther Schwieger's account of the sinking of the *Lusitania*
- The zeppelin bombing of London
- The Red Baron
- Eddie Rickenbacker's accounts of his dogfights
- Ernest Francis' account of the Battle of Jutland
- Grigori Rasputin and the Romanovs
- The February and Bolshevik Revolutions
- Bert Chaney's account of the first tanks at the Somme
- Pavel Medvedev's account of the assassination of the Romanovs
- The Lost Battalion
- Sergeant Alvin York
- Ambulance driver James McConnell
- Harry Truman's service commanding a field gun battery
- Elmer Sherwood's account of Americans in battle in 1918
- The Fighting Eighth Army Infantry and the Harlem Hellfighters
- Harold Nicolson's account of the signing of the Treaty of Versailles

Questions for the American Mind

- How did Germany's unification and military production affect the balance of power in Europe?
- What was the Eastern Question and its significance to Europe?
- What military and nationalist ideas emerged during the late 19th century in Europe?
- Why was rapid and decisive mobilization considered key to winning a modern industrialized war?
- How did European alliances change after the ascension of Kaiser Wilhelm II in Germany?
- Why was Franz Ferdinand assassinated?
- What were the key decisions that led from Franz Ferdinand's assassination to war a month later?
- What did the initial predictions about the war entail?
- Why did the Germans want to avoid a two-front war?
- How was the Schlieffen Plan supposed to work?
- Why did countries reject the idea that defensive warfare would be important?
- What did the Pact of London do and why did the Allies sign it?
- How did Russia's early attack, especially at Tannenberg, help their French allies in the First Battle of the Marne?
- How did German general Alexander von Kluck make a mistake that allowed for French victory in the First Battle of the Marne?
- Why did the Ottoman Empire join the Central Powers?
- How were the Americans, though neutral, really only helping the Allies?
- What three elements of trench warfare made attacking a position so deadly?
- Why did German U-boat *U-20* sink the British luxury liner *Lusitania*?
- Why did the Allies launch the Dardanelles Campaign? Why did it fail?

- Why did the pattern of artillery barrage followed by an infantry attack actually assist the defenders?
- For which reasons did generals continue the fight at Verdun and the Somme for months on end?
- Although the Germans technically won the Battle of Jutland, why was their victory a strategic loss?
- Why did the leaders of European nations and armies fight and continue to fight the Great War?
- What is unrestricted submarine warfare, and why did the Germans resume it in February 1917?
- For what two main reasons did the United States declare war on Germany in 1917?
- How did the February Revolution come about in Russia?
- What tactical innovations did the Allies test out in 1917?
- How did the tank eventually solve the problems of trench warfare?
- How did the October or Bolshevik Revolution come about?
- Who won the first half of 1918, and who won the second half?
- How did the Allies stop the German U-boat threat?
- For what reasons was the Allies' Hundred Days Offensive so successful?
- What were Woodrow Wilson's main ideas as outlined in his Fourteen Points?
- Why did the Allies win the second half of 1918?
- What were the negotiations like at the Versailles Peace Conference?
- Why did Woodrow Wilson struggle to gain American support for his League of Nations?
- What were three main ways that the Treaty of Versailles changed the map of Europe?
- In what ways did the Treaty of Versailles punish Germany?
- Why might it be said that Germany was "forced" to sign the Treaty of Versailles?
- Why did some argue that these terms were unjust to Germany?
- Compare and contrast Europe before and after the Great War, politically, physically (for individuals and in infrastructure), culturally, and philosophically.
- Questions from the U.S. Civics Test:
  - Question 100: Name one war fought by the United States in the 1900s.
  - Question 101: Why did the United States enter World War I?
  - Question 118: Name one example of an American innovation.

KEYS TO THE LESSON

The Great War (later known as the First World War or World War I) is one of the greatest tragedies of the 20th century, even in all of human history. It has been eclipsed in the collective memory of the world by World War II. But at the time it was fought, the Great War's beginnings, rate of slaughter, and lasting effects had no parallel (as that name implies), and its violence would prove arguably more senseless than that which followed it. The fact that the Great War appeared almost out of nowhere at a time when much of the Western world believed mankind was on the verge of a kind of utopian 20th century makes the war all the more remarkable to study. For the purposes of American history, the war would catapult the United States onto the world stage, forever changing its history and its role in the world. While this study focuses especially on American actions toward the belligerent powers and then on its own participation in the conflict, there is plenty for students to learn about Europe and the broader war to give the proper context to understand America and the Great War.

Teachers might best plan and teach The Great War with emphasis on the following approaches:

- Provide a brief background to European political history since the unifications of Italy and then, especially, Germany. In short, the unification of Germany following Prussia's resounding military defeat of France in 1871 upset Europe's post-Napoleonic balance of power. It meant that a sizeable German industrial powerhouse with a strong Prussian military organization was now anchored in the middle of Europe. Traditional rivalries with Russia and a vengeful France made for an uneasy peace across Europe. Meanwhile, the waning of the Ottoman Empire left a power vacuum in the Balkans, amid which Slavic nationalists appealed to their fellow Slavs in Russia against the encroachments of Germanic Austria-Hungary. Both Russia and Austria-Hungary sought ethnic influence in the Balkans, partly to stave off their own declines and internal troubles. Meanwhile, the industrialization of Europe was directed not only to peaceful goods but also to new industrial weapons by the millions, including a German navy that was racing to match the traditional top naval power, the United Kingdom. New military war colleges and generals believed this new technology and the proliferation of the Napoleonic reserve system would demand decisive, quick, and total war in order to achieve victory. Against the backdrop of decades of distrust among European leaders, alliances were discreetly made behind the scenes. In the end, these alliances wove Europe into one great tripwire with a very short fuse and plenty of powder. Contrary to the "great illusion" that war was impossible and a utopia was coming, we see in retrospect that all that was needed was one misstep in a seemingly isolated incident to unleash a war the likes of which the world had never experienced before.
- Review the achievements of the Gilded Age, especially those that improved the material standard of living of Americans and, in this case, Europeans. This should include new instruction on the Wright Brothers' invention of the airplane in 1903 and Henry Ford's assembly line system for mass-producing the automobile, begun in 1908. Add to this review Progressive ideas of ever-improving human nature, human knowledge, and government administration—ideas that were widely shared among elite ruling classes around the Western world. Many European and American thinkers believed the world was on the cusp of a utopian future, in which government power would not go astray and war was essentially impossible.
- Begin the war discussion with a careful account of the assassination of Franz Ferdinand, as well as the events from his death to the United Kingdom's eventual declaration of war almost two months later. Pay special attention to the roles of figures such as Kaiser Wilhelm II of Germany, the Russian General Staff, and German General Helmuth von Moltke. Dwell also on key decisions such as Germany's "blank check" to their fellow Germans in Austria-Hungary, Russia's mobilization of its army, and von Moltke's missteps—willful and otherwise—regarding German mobilization against France.
- Have students think through and compare the various advantages and disadvantages each side had at the outset of the war and how these shifted throughout its duration. Having students record simple notes in a "T-Chart" can be effective for this part of the lesson.
- Build students' familiarity with the style of warfare in 1914, and show them plenty of images to do so. Students need this foundation for their subsequent study of battles. This helps them to imagine and understand what happens in battle and to appreciate the courage of soldiers fighting on both sides.
- Present to students explanations of each side's strategy at various stages of the war and the tactics and battle plans employed in specific battles. Have students track strategic changes on a map of Europe during the Great War. Spend time especially covering the first presumptions and strategies of the war, including the beliefs that the war would be one of rapid movement, that artillery and the offensive would be keys to victory, and that the fighting would be over relatively quickly. This would change into a defensive war of attrition made possible by trenches,

barbed wire, and machine guns. Students should understand why these three modern features of warfare combined to form almost impregnable lines of defense.

- As with any conflict, dwell on the key contributions of both leaders and common soldiers in the war, especially Helmuth von Moltke, Wilhelm II, Nicholas II, Paul von Hindenburg, Douglas Haig, Winston Churchill, Woodrow Wilson, and John Pershing.
- Teach the war in some detail, especially the major battles and military campaigns. Students should understand how the battles came to be, the key stories, factors, and moments from the battle itself, and the significance of their various outcomes to subsequent events. Employ battle maps often, and have students track battles and campaigns on a map of Europe during the Great War. *A Short History of World War I* and *Fighting the Great War* are both great aids for teaching these battles; students may enjoy reading select accounts of battles from these works, too.
- Help students to note major themes that might loosely describe each year of the war: opening salvos, the near capture of Paris, and the race to the sea in 1914; stalemate in 1915; fruitless efforts to break the stalemate in 1916, constituting a war of attrition; the Russian upheaval and Allied experimentation in 1917; and the German offensive followed by American- and tank-led counterattacks in 1918 that ultimately led to the armistice.
- As the war devolved into trench warfare, consider with students the American position. As with the War of 1812, the Americans sought to trade with all parties possible while remaining neutral. The British blockade of largely landlocked Germany made this trading impossible for the Germans; as a result, American trade overwhelmingly benefited the British and the Allies. The Germans believed they were forced to disrupt this trade by sinking neutral ships sailing to the United Kingdom. After the sinking of the *Lusitania* in 1915, the ensuing outcry nearly led America to declare war, but Woodrow Wilson was able to convince Germany to halt "unrestricted submarine warfare." Wilson was committed to staying out of the war and campaigned on that pledge in 1916, winning reelection. But the resumption of unrestricted submarine warfare in early 1917, along with the intercepted Zimmerman Telegram, eventually brought the United States into the war. Despite his initial reluctance, Wilson saw America's entry into the war as an opportunity to apply his Progressive ideas to foreign policy and the world order. Study with students Wilson's stated reasons for going to war in his War Message to Congress, especially as reflecting his Progressive thought and echoing the opening characterization of the war as a "war to end all wars."
- While discussing America's entry into the war, be sure to distinguish between the February Revolution in Russia—in which democratic forces forced out the Russian monarchy—and the October/Bolshevik Revolution—in which Bolshevik communists overthrew the new democratic government via military coup. Abetted by Germany—who enabled Vladimir Lenin to return to Russia to seize power—the latter event removed Russia from the war, casting it into a multiyear civil war, while Germany was finally free to fight a one-front war just as American troops were arriving in meaningful numbers. Taking some time to study communism in action in Russia will be fruitful for teaching the rest of American history in subsequent units, especially noting that the Communists immediately looked to expand their revolution into the rest of Europe and beyond.
- Note with students how the first months of 1918 saw impressive German advances with Russia now absent, but the presence of tanks *en masse*, the perfection of the rolling barrage, and most importantly the American troops—with their freshness, daring, innovative form of fighting, and industrial backing—turned the war for the Allies.
- Read with students Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points and discuss his vision for a world after the "war to end all wars." Students should be asked to identify the Progressive tenets intrinsic to the Points, but also the paradoxical encouragement of nationalism through the idea of "self-

determination." Point out that the promises of the Fourteen Points were key to convincing the Germans to sign the armistice.

- Describe the Versailles peace negotiations, especially the vindictive desire of the United Kingdom and France to punish Germany, while Woodrow Wilson was largely sidelined. Back in the United States, discuss Wilson's campaign to attract support for the League of Nations, his unorthodox methods for doing so, and his ultimate failure and eventual debilitating stroke. In covering the terms of the Treaty of Versailles—which Germany was effectively forced to sign—discuss whether the terms accurately reflected the facts of the war's beginning or the extent to which Germany was actually defeated at its end. Note also the absence of many of Wilson's Fourteen Points—which the Germans had originally requested as a condition of halting the fighting—and the ongoing blockade of Germany. Does this raise questions of how free the Germans really were in signing a treaty that treated them as the clearly defeated and guilty power?
- Recap the war by considering major statistics, including the vast number of casualties and fatalities on each side, and how it transformed Europe and America in opposite ways. Overall, note the tremendous disillusionment with the idea of inevitable human progress, as well as with Europe's traditional heritage and institutions.
- Conclude the lesson with a conversation on why the war began and, perhaps more importantly, why it continued, focusing especially on the ideas of European leaders in light of the recent changes in philosophical thought.

Strengthening Understanding: Post-Lesson Assignments

Assignment 1: Explain how the Great War began, from the state of affairs in Europe prior to the assassination of Franz Ferdinand through the United Kingdom's declaration of war (2-3 paragraphs).

Assignment 2: Retell the history of the Great War, with particular focus on America's involvement and the terms of the Treaty of Versailles (3-4 paragraphs).

Name_____ Date_____

Reading Quiz

The Turn of the Century | Lesson 3, Quiz #1
Land of Hope, Pages 259-268

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. What event was the primary cause of World War I?

2. What event in 1915 contributed to America's eventual entry into World War I?

3. On what date did the United States officially enter World War I?

4. What two pieces of legislation drastically curtailed freedom of speech during World War I?

5. What influential 1910 essay began to shape the way Progressive thinkers considered the "positive" societal effects of World War I?

Name_____ Date_____

Reading Quiz

The Turn of the Century | Lesson 3, Quiz #2
Land of Hope, Pages 268-275

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question.

1. What was the name given to the American forces sent to fight in World War I?

2. What was the name of President Wilson's proposed peace plan for World War I?

3. What organization did President Wilson hope to create as a result of the negotiations for the Treaty of Versailles?

4. Who was the primary opponent of Wilson's World War I peace settlement?

5. Who won the 1920 United States presidential election?

APPENDIX A

Study Guide

Test

Writing Assignment

Study Guide—The Turn of the Century Test

Unit 5

Test on _____

Timeline

When given chronological dates, match events from a list to the years or dates that they happened.

1869	Transcontinental Railroad completed
1898	Spanish-American War
1901	Oil discovered in Beaumont, TX; William McKinley assassinated; Theodore Roosevelt becomes president
1908	William Howard Taft elected
1912	Woodrow Wilson defeats Taft and Roosevelt
1914–1918	The Great War
June 28, 1914	Archduke Franz Ferdinand assassinated
1915	Battle of Gallipoli
1916	Battles of Verdun and the Somme; Woodrow Wilson reelected
1917	U.S. declaration of war; Bolshevik Revolution
1918	Hundred Days Offensive
November 11 (1918)	Veterans Day (Armistice Day)

Geography and Places

Identify each on a map and/or tell where it is and explain its significance.

Promontory Point	Puerto Rico	Alsace-Lorraine
Ellis Island	Santiago Bay	Austria-Hungary
Coney Island	San Juan Hill	Ottoman Empire
Alaska	Philippines	Balkans
Hawaiian Islands	Manila Bay	Serbia
Spain	China	Sarajevo
Cuba	Panama Canal	Soviet Union

Persons

Identify each, provide biographical details, and explain what he or she thought or did in specific periods or events.

Thomas Edison	Samuel Gompers	Sitting Bull
Cornelius Vanderbilt	Booker T. Washington	Rutherford B. Hayes
Andrew Carnegie	George Washington Carver	James A. Garfield
John D. Rockefeller	Winslow Homer	Chester A. Arthur
J. Pierpont Morgan	George Armstrong Custer	Grover Cleveland

Benjamin Harrison
William Jennings Bryan
William McKinley
Theodore Roosevelt
Eugene V. Debs
John Dewey
Woodrow Wilson
W. E. B. DuBois
William Howard Taft
Orville and Wilbur Wright
Henry Ford
Franz Ferdinand
Wilhelm II
Nicholas II
Helmuth von Moltke
Paul von Hindenburg
Winston Churchill
Vladimir Lenin
Carrie Nation
Susan B. Anthony

Terms and Topics

Identify each and explain its significance to the period of history studied.

railroads
Transcontinental Railroad
industrialization
oil refining
Standard Oil Co.
mass production
division of labor
vertical integration
monopoly
urbanization
immigration
tenement
Chinese Exclusion Act
Tuskegee Institute
Plessy v. Ferguson
frontier
Plains Indians
Dawes Act
Battle of Little Bighorn
Wounded Knee
political boss
labor unions
Populist Party
Cross of Gold
Great White Fleet
USS *Maine*
Spanish-American War
The Communist Manifesto
Hegelianism
social Darwinism
socialism
Progressivism
living Constitution
experts
bureaucracy
administration
Pendleton Civil Service Act
Interstate Commerce Act
The Square Deal
conservationism
Roosevelt Corollary
Bull Moose Party
The New Freedom
Election of 1912
Niagara Movement
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)
Baltimore redlining
Black Wall Street
eugenics
Buck v. Bell
16th Amendment
17th Amendment
nationalism
militarism
balance of power
Triple Alliance
Triple Entente
reserve system
industrial warfare
"blank check"
Allied Powers
Central Powers
Schlieffen Plan
Plan 17
Pact of London
trench warfare
machine gun
barbed wire
gas attacks
unrestricted submarine warfare
Lusitania
Zimmerman Telegram
Bolshevik Revolution
tank
Fourteen Points
Treaty of Versailles
League of Nations

Primary Sources

Based on annotations and notes from seminar conversations, be able to answer questions on each primary source. While you will not necessarily be asked why each primary source was created, what it did or argued, and what its effects were, being able to answer these kinds of questions will make you well prepared.

"Surrender," Chief Joseph
"Wealth," Andrew Carnegie
"The Triumph of America," Andrew Carnegie
"The Mission of the Populist Party," William A. Peffer
"The Cross of Gold," William Jennings Bryan
"The March of the Flag," Albert Beveridge
Platform, American Anti-Imperialist League
Atlanta Exposition Address, Booker T. Washington
"The Significance of the Frontier in American History," Frederick Jackson Turner
"What Is Progress?", Woodrow Wilson
"Natural Law," Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr.
"The Presidency," Theodore Roosevelt
"The Study of Administration," Woodrow Wilson
"The Talented Tenth," *The Souls of Black Folk*, W. E. B. DuBois
War Message to Congress, Woodrow Wilson
Fourteen Points, Woodrow Wilson
League of Nations Speech, Henry Cabot Lodge

To Know by Heart

Fill in missing words and/or identify the speaker and context.

"The cause of freedom is not the cause of a race or a sect, a party or a class—it is the cause of human kind, the very birthright of humanity." —Anna Julia Cooper
"Pledge of Allegiance" —Francis Bellamy
"America the Beautiful" —Katharine Lee Bates
"I aimed for the public's heart, and … hit it in the stomach." —Upton Sinclair
"Speak softly and carry a big stick." —Theodore Roosevelt
"If there is ever another war in Europe, it will come out of some damned silly thing in the Balkans." —Otto von Bismarck
"The world must be made safe for democracy." —Woodrow Wilson
"Over There" —George Cohan
"In Flanders Fields" —John McCrae

Stories for the American Heart

In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be middle school students.

- Biographies and the roles of Cornelius Vanderbilt, Andrew Carnegie, John D. Rockefeller, J. Pierpont Morgan, Samuel Gompers, Booker T. Washington, William Jennings Bryan, William McKinley, and Theodore Roosevelt
- Immigrant stories
- Chief White Bull's account of Custer's Last Stand at Little Bighorn
- Black Elk's account of the massacre at Wounded Knee
- William Jennings Bryan's "Cross of Gold" speech
- The explosion of the USS *Maine*

- Biographies and the roles of Woodrow Wilson, Theodore Roosevelt, and William Howard Taft
- Stories of working conditions within various industries
- Orville Wright's account of the first flight
- Henry Ford's description of the first assembly line
- Borijove Jevtic's account of the assassination of Austria-Hungary Archduke Franz Ferdinand by the Serbian terrorist organization, the Black Hand
- Life in trenches and trench warfare, including firsthand accounts from any of the following figures: Leonard Thompson, Hugh Walpole, Oskar Kokoschka, Robert Graves, John Walker, H. H. Munro, William Pressey, Edwin Vaughan, et al.
- The February and Bolshevik Revolutions
- Harold Nicolson's account of the signing of the Treaty of Versailles

Questions for the American Mind

Based on notes from lessons and seminar conversations, answer each of the following.

Lesson 1 | The Gilded Age

- ☐ How did America change after the Civil War with respect to the agrarian makeup of its economy, workforce, and population distribution?
- ☐ What sorts of technological changes were developed in the late 19th century? Which were the most important and why?
- ☐ Why were the railroads so significant to the transformation of the American economy?
- ☐ What are some of the beneficial developments produced during the Gilded Age?
- ☐ What were some of the characteristics of America's most successful companies and businessmen? In what ways were they similar and in what ways different?
- ☐ In what ways might America's leading businessmen be considered "captains of industry," and in what ways might they be considered "robber barons"?
- ☐ Why did so many people immigrate to the United States in the late 19th century?
- ☐ To what extent did immigrants assimilate into the American populace? What are the advantages and disadvantages of this situation?
- ☐ What was life like for African Americans in the late 19th century?
- ☐ What were Booker T. Washington's ideas for improving conditions for African Americans?
- ☐ What did the U.S. Supreme Court rule in *Plessy v. Ferguson*?
- ☐ What happened in the western United States with respect to relations between Native Americans and the U.S. government?
- ☐ How did the idea of a more active foreign policy and imperialism contend with the American founding and foreign policy precedent?
- ☐ How did the Spanish-American War begin, and why was it fought?

Lesson 2 | The Progressive Era

- ☐ What ideas relating to democracy, the general will, class identity and struggle, human nature, government, and the processes of historical change (from sources including the French Revolution, Karl Marx, George Hegel, and Charles Darwin) influenced the thought of American Progressives?
- ☐ What contributions did Woodrow Wilson make to Progressivism, both as a thinker and as president?

- ☐ How did Progressives come to view human nature, history, and government in "Darwinian" terms, as a continual process of evolutionary improvement? Why did these ideas lead to a partial critique of the Declaration of Independence, natural rights, and social contract theory?
- ☐ What did Progressives mean by *equality*, and why did they believe equality of opportunity and dignity for ordinary citizens necessitated a powerfully activist government?
- ☐ How did Progressives critique individualism and the power of special interests, monopolies, and the wealthy in politics?
- ☐ In what ways did Progressives critique the Constitution as being too slow, mechanical, and at odds with itself, as presented in their critique of the separation of powers and of checks and balances?
- ☐ In what ways did Progressives promote direct democracy, and how was this concept to solve the problems posed by the influence of special interests? What limits, if any, did Progressives place on the role of the people in making laws?
- ☐ What was "government by expertise," and why did the Progressives argue for it?
- ☐ What were the problems some argued would arise through centralized decisions made by knowledgeable yet unelected experts? How did they compare to problems arising through dispersed decisions made by elected and accountable officials?
- ☐ How did Theodore Roosevelt embrace Progressivism in his politics, in his presidential actions addressing the issues of the day, and in his foreign policy positions?
- ☐ What were the main ideas of W. E. B. DuBois? How were they both alike and different from those of other commentators on improving the condition of African Americans?
- ☐ How did the practice of eugenics fit with Progressives' ideas on human improvement, government, and rights?

Lesson 3 | The Great War

- ☐ Why was Franz Ferdinand assassinated?
- ☐ What were the key decisions that led from Franz Ferdinand's assassination to war a month later?
- ☐ Why did the Ottoman Empire join the Central Powers?
- ☐ How were the Americans, though neutral, really only helping the Allies?
- ☐ What three elements of trench warfare made attacking a position so deadly?
- ☐ Why did German U-boat *U-20* sink the British luxury liner *Lusitania*?
- ☐ Why did the leaders of European nations and armies fight and continue to fight the Great War?
- ☐ For what two main reasons did the United States declare war on Germany in 1917?
- ☐ How did the February Revolution come about in Russia?
- ☐ How did the October or Bolshevik Revolution come about?
- ☐ What were Woodrow Wilson's main ideas as outlined in his "Fourteen Points"?
- ☐ Why did Woodrow Wilson struggle to gain American support for his League of Nations?
- ☐ In what ways did the Treaty of Versailles punish Germany?
- ☐ Compare and contrast Europe before and after the Great War, politically, physically (for individuals and in infrastructure), culturally, and philosophically.

Name_____ Date_____

Test — The Turn of the Century

Unit 5

Timeline

Write the letter of each event next to the date or years it took place.

1869	_____
1898	_____
1901	_____
1908	_____
1912	_____
1914-1918	_____
June 28, 1914	_____
1915	_____
1916	_____
1917	_____
1918	_____

A. Woodrow Wilson defeats William Howard Taft and Theodore Roosevelt
B. Battle of Gallipoli
C. Battles of Verdun and the Somme; Wilson reelected
D. Taft elected
E. Archduke Franz Ferdinand assassinated
F. Oil discovered in Beaumont, Texas; William McKinley assassinated; Roosevelt becomes president
G. Hundred Days Offensive
H. Spanish-American War
I. U.S. declaration of war; Bolshevik Revolution
J. Transcontinental Railroad completed
K. The Great War/World War I

Geography & Places

1. Name three countries that were on the side of the Allied Powers.

2. Name three countries that were on the side of the Central Powers.

3. Name at least one country that remained neutral during the war.

(Map from the Delaware Division of Historical and Cultural Affairs)

Persons, Terms, and Topics

Fill in the blanks.

4. The development of the _____ following the Civil War was the primary cause for America's economic and business expansion during that period.

5. _____ was the prominent American financier who had and wielded substantial influence in both private business and public financial policy in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

6. The control exerted by Standard Oil Company over the oil industry by the late 1870s is an example of a _____, which was a significant economic concern for many Americans.

7. _____ and _____ were two influential intellectuals who offered competing answers to the problems faced by African Americans following the Civil War and their gradual integration into American society.

8. The "_____" speech, given by William Jennings Bryan in 1896, typified the controversy over the United States' financial policies in the late 19th century.

9. The Republican president _____, whose most notable accomplishment was the Spanish-American War, was succeeded by his vice president, _____, who would go one to become one of the most domestically and internationally influential "modern" American presidents.

10. _____ is the term for the new American political philosophy that emerged in the late 19th and early 20th centuries as a radical alternative to the principles of the American Founding.

11. The popularity of the American socialist _____, in particular his 1912 presidential campaign, showed how the American people were increasingly open to meaningful change throughout American politics and society.

12. The Progressive emphasis on _____, or a body of intelligent officials detached from the everyday business and action of politics, was exemplified by the formation of the state and federal _____ that would later come to impose significant regulations on all aspects of American life.

13. _____ was not only the first academic to be a presidential candidate, but also was a dedicated Progressive who contributed to America's gradual acceptance of Progressive political theory.

14. Founded by former president Theodore Roosevelt, the _____ was a third party in the 1912 election that espoused a highly Progressive-leaning platform.

15. _____ was the third candidate in the 1912 election, running as the Republican Party nominee.

16. In the decades leading up to World War I, a primary cause of unrest plaguing Europe was _____, as various countries sought to assert or solidify their identity against empires such as Austria-Hungary and Russia.

17. The assassination of _____ was the primary catalyst for starting World War I, as it activated numerous international agreements that escalated the military situation.

18. The two opposing factions of World War I were the _____ and the _____.

19. Despite the controversy surrounding his role in the failed Dardanelles/Gallipoli campaign during World War I, _____ would go on to serve as British prime minister during World War II.

20. The primary goal of Wilson's "Fourteen Points" was the formation of the _____, which was an international body designed to prevent another war on the scale of World War I.

21. _____ led the October Revolution of 1917 in Russia, and later became dictator of the Communist government there.

Know by Heart

Fill in missing words and/or identify the speaker/author.

22. "Pledge of Allegiance"—_____

23. "_____"—Katharine Lee Bates

24. "_____ softly and carry _____."—Theodore Roosevelt

25. "The _____ must be made safe for _____."—Woodrow Wilson

26. "Over There"— _____

Stories for the American Heart

In your own words, retell each episode in narrative form. Consider your audience to be middle school students.

27. Tell the story of the explosion of the USS *Maine*.

28. Retell Orville Wright's account of the first flight *or* Henry Ford's description of the first assembly line.

QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN MIND

Answer each of the following. Complete sentences are not necessary, but correct spelling and writing should be employed, and responses must fully answer each question.

29. Why were the railroads so significant to the transformation of the American economy?

30. Why did so many people immigrate to the United States in the late 19th century?

31. What was life like for African Americans in the late 19th century?

32. What happened in the western United States with respect to relations between Native Americans and the U.S. government?

33. How did the idea of a more active and imperialist American foreign policy compare to the Founding's understanding of the concept?

34. How did the Spanish-American War begin, and why was it fought?

35. What contributions did Woodrow Wilson make to Progressivism, both as a thinker and as President?

36. In what ways did Progressives critique the Constitution as being too slow, mechanical, and at odds with itself, particularly with regard to separation of powers & checks and balances?

37. What was "government by expertise," and why did the Progressives argue for it?

38. How did Theodore Roosevelt embrace Progressivism in his politics, in his presidential actions addressing the issues of the day, and in his foreign policy positions?

39. What were the main ideas of W. E. B. DuBois? How were they both alike and different from those of other commentators on improving the condition of African Americans?

40. How did the practice of eugenics fit with Progressives' ideas on human improvement, government, and rights?

41. What were the key decisions made from June-August 1914 that ultimately led to World War I?

42. Why did the leaders of European nations and armies fight and continue to fight the Great War?

43. For what two main reasons did the United States finally declare war on Germany in World War I?

44. What were Woodrow Wilson's main ideas as outlined in his "Fourteen Points"?

45. In what ways did the Treaty of Versailles punish Germany?

46. Briefly compare and contrast Europe before and after the Great War as viewed politically, physically (for individuals and in infrastructure), culturally, or philosophically.

Writing Assignment — The Turn of the Century

Unit 5

Due on _____

DIRECTIONS

Citing events and primary sources in your argument, write an essay of 500–800 words answering the following question:

> How did America as a nation develop politically from after the Civil War to the Treaty of Versailles? (Limit your answer to one [1] aspect of either domestic or foreign policy.)

APPENDIX B

Primary Sources

Chief Joseph

Andrew Carnegie

William A. Peffer

William Jennings Bryan

Albert J. Beveridge

American Anti-Imperialist League

Booker T. Washington

Frederick Jackson Turner

Woodrow Wilson

Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr.

Theodore Roosevelt

W. E. B. DuBois

Henry Cabot Lodge

CHIEF JOSEPH

Surrender

DOCUMENT

October 5, 1877
Bears Paw Mountains | Montana

BACKGROUND

American westward expansion in the mid-19th century often brought settlers into contact with the native Indian tribes. Hin-mah-too-yah-lat-kekt, also known as Chief Joseph, was a leader of the Nez Percé tribe during this period. When the U.S. government attempted to remove the tribe forcibly from their ancestral lands in the late 19th century, Chief Joseph and his tribe resisted in what became known as the Nez Percé War in 1877. After months of violent conflict, Chief Joseph finally delivered this surrender document to his fellow chiefs and United States General Nelson A. Miles.

GUIDING QUESTION

Who was Chief Joseph primarily concerned with as indicated in his surrender, and why?

Taken from "Chief Joseph, the Nez Perce." C. E. S. Wood. Journal article, in *The Century: a Popular Quarterly* 28, no. 1 (May 1884): 151. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=coo.31924079630343&view= 1up&seq=135.

ANNOTATIONS **NOTES & QUESTIONS**

… I am tired of fighting. Our chiefs are killed; Looking-glass is dead. *Too-hul-hul-suit* is dead. The old men are all dead. It is the young men, now, who say 'yes' or 'no' [that is, vote in council]. He who led on the young men [Joseph's brother, Ollicut] is dead. It is cold, and we have no blankets. The little children are freezing to death. My people—some of them—have run away to the hills, and have no blankets, no food. No one knows where they are—perhaps freezing to death. I want to have time to look for my children, and see how many of them I can find; maybe I shall find them among the dead. Hear me, my chiefs; my heart is sick and sad. From where the sun *now* stands, I will fight no more forever!

ANDREW CARNEGIE

Wealth

ARTICLE

North American Review | June 1889

BACKGROUND

The Gilded Age marked a time of unprecedented industrial and economic growth in America. With the advent of many new industries, the possibility of amassing great wealth was open to those who were financially intelligent and shrewd. One of these figures was Andrew Carnegie, who rose out of poverty to create a massive fortune from his pioneering work in the steel industry. However, as he discusses in this article, Carnegie firmly advocated for not only the economic progress of the day, but also the duty of the wealthy to engage in philanthropy.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What does Carnegie say about the "good old times"?
2. What are the effects of equality and inequality in society?
3. What should the rich ultimately do with their money, according to Carnegie?
4. What does his ideal millionaire look like?
5. How does Carnegie tie wealth to Christianity?

Andrew Carnegie. "Wealth." Magazine article, *North American Review* CCCXCI [391], June 1889. From Swarthmore College. https://www.swarthmore.edu/SocSci/rbannis1/AIH19th/Carnegie.html.

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

The problem of our age is the proper administration of wealth, so that the ties of brotherhood may still bind together the rich and poor in harmonious relationship. The conditions of human life have not only been changed, but revolutionized, within the past few hundred years. In former days there was little difference between the dwelling, dress, food, and environment of the chief and those of his retainers. The Indians are to-day where civilized man then was. When visiting the Sioux, I was led to the wigwam of the chief. It was just like the others in external appearance, and even within the difference was trifling between it and those of the poorest of his braves. The contrast between the palace of the millionaire and the cottage of the laborer with us to-day measures the change which has come with civilization.

This change, however, is not to be deplored, but welcomed as highly beneficial. It is well, nay, essential for the progress of the race, that the houses of some should be homes for all that is highest and best in literature and the arts, and for all the refinements of civilization, rather than that none should be so. Much better this great irregularity than universal squalor. Without wealth there can be no Mæcenas. The "good old times" were not good old times. Neither master nor servant was as well situated then as to-day. A relapse to old conditions would be disastrous to both—not the least so to him who serves—and would {sweep} away civilization with it. But whether the change be for good or ill, it is upon us, beyond our power to alter, and therefore to be accepted and made the best of. It is a waste of time to criticise the inevitable.

It is easy to see how the change has come. One illustration will serve for almost every phase of the cause. In the manufacture of products we have the whole story. It applies to all combinations of human industry, as stimulated and enlarged by the inventions of this scientific age. Formerly articles {were} manufactured at the domestic hearth or in small shops which formed part of the household. The master and his apprentices worked side by side, the latter living with the master, and therefore subject to the same conditions. When these apprentices rose to be masters, there was little or no change in their mode of life, and they, in turn, educated in the same routine succeeding apprentices. There was, substantially social equality, and even political equality, for those engaged in industrial pursuits had then little or no political voice in the State.

But the inevitable result of such a mode of manufacture was crude articles at high prices. To-day the world obtains commodities of excellent quality at prices which even the generation preceding this would have deemed incredible. In the commercial world similar causes have produced similar results, and the race is benefited thereby. The poor enjoy what the rich could not before afford. What were the luxuries have become the necessaries of life. The laborer has now more comforts than the landlord had a few generations ago. The farmer has more luxuries than the landlord had, and is more richly clad and better housed. The landlord has books and pictures rarer, and appointments more artistic, than the King could then obtain.

The price we pay for this salutary change is, no doubt, great. We assemble thousands of operatives in the factory, in the mine, and in the counting-house, of whom the employer can know little or nothing, and to whom the employer is little better than a myth. All intercourse between them is at an end. Rigid Castes are formed, and, as usual, mutual ignorance breeds mutual distrust. Each Caste is without sympathy for the other, and ready to credit anything disparaging in regard to it. Under the law of competition, the employer of thousands is forced into the strictest economies, among which the rates paid to labor figure prominently, and often there is friction between the employer and the employed, between capital and labor, between rich and poor. Human society loses homogeneity.

The price which society pays for the law of competition, like the price it pays for cheap comforts and luxuries, is also great; but the advantage of this law are {*sic*} also greater still, for it is to this law that we owe our wonderful material development, which brings improved conditions in its train. But, whether the law be benign or not, we must say of it, as we say of the change in the conditions of men to which we have referred: It is here; we cannot evade it; no substitutes for it have been found; and while the law may be sometimes hard for the individual, it is best for the race, because it insures the survival of the fittest in every department. We accept and welcome therefore, as conditions to which we must accommodate ourselves, great inequality of environment, the concentration of business, industrial and commercial, in the hands of a few, and the law

of competition between these, as being not only beneficial, but essential for the future progress of the race. Having accepted these, it follows that there must be great scope for the exercise of special ability in the merchant and in the manufacturer who has to conduct affairs upon a great scale. That this talent for organization and management is rare among men is proved by the fact that it invariably secures for its possessor enormous rewards, no matter where or under what laws or conditions. The experienced in affairs always rate the MAN whose services can be obtained as a partner as not only the first consideration, but such as to render the question of his capital scarcely worth considering, for such men soon create capital; while, without the special talent required, capital soon takes wings. Such men become interested in firms or corporations using millions; and estimating only simple interest to be made upon the capital invested, it is inevitable that their income must exceed their expenditures, and that they must accumulate wealth. Nor is there any middle ground which such men can occupy, because the great manufacturing or commercial concern which does not earn at least interest upon its capital soon becomes bankrupt. It, must either go forward or fall behind: to stand still is impossible. It is a condition essential for its successful operation that it should be thus far profitable, and even that, in addition to interest on capital, it should make profit. It is a law, as certain as any of the others named, that men possessed of this peculiar talent for affair, under the free play of economic forces, must, of necessity, soon be in receipt of more revenue than can be judiciously expended upon themselves; and this law is as beneficial for the race as the others.

Objections to the foundations upon which society is based are not in order, because the condition of the race is better with these than it has been with any others which have been tried. Of the effect of any new substitutes proposed we cannot be sure. The Socialist or Anarchist who seeks to overturn present conditions is to be regarded as attacking the foundation upon which civilization itself rests, for civilization took its start from the day that the capable, industrious workman said to his incompetent and lazy fellow, “If thou dost {not} sow, thou shalt {not} reap,” and thus ended primitive Communism by separating the drones from the bees. One who studies this subject will soon be brought face to face with the conclusion that upon the sacredness of property civilization itself depends--the right of the laborer to his hundred dollars in the savings bank, and equally

the legal right of the millionaire to his millions. To these who propose to substitute Communism for this intense Individualism the answer, therefore, is: The race has tried that. All progress from that barbarous day to the present time has resulted from its displacement. Not evil, but good, has come to the race from the accumulation of wealth by those who have the ability and energy that produce it. But even if we admit for a moment that it might be better for the race to discard its present foundation, Individualism,--that it is a nobler ideal that man should labor, not for himself alone, but in and for a brotherhood of his fellows, and share with them all in common, realizing Swedenborg's idea of Heaven, where, as he says, the angels derive their happiness, not from laboring for self, but for each other,--even admit all this, and a sufficient answer is, This is not evolution, but revolution. It necessitates the changing of human nature itself a work of oeons, even if it were good to change it, which we cannot know. It is not practicable in our day or in our age. Even if desirable theoretically, it belongs to another and long-succeeding sociological stratum. Our duty is with what is practicable now; with the next step possible in our day and generation. It is criminal to waste our energies in endeavoring to uproot, when all we can profitably or possibly accomplish is to bend the universal tree of humanity a little in the direction most favorable to the production of good fruit under existing circumstances. We might as well urge the destruction of the highest existing type of man because he failed to reach our ideal as favor the destruction of Individualism, Private Property, the Law of Accumulation of Wealth, and the Law of Competition; for these are the highest results of human experience, the soil in which society so far has produced the best fruit. Unequally or unjustly, perhaps, as these laws sometimes operate, and imperfect as they appear to the Idealist, they are, nevertheless, like the highest type of man, the best and most valuable of all that humanity has yet accomplished.

We start, then, with a condition of affairs under which the best interests of the race are promoted, but which inevitably gives wealth to the few. Thus far, accepting conditions as they exist, the situation can be surveyed and pronounced good. The question then arises, --and, if the foregoing be correct, it is the only question with which we have to deal, --What is the proper mode of administering wealth after the laws upon which civilization is founded have thrown it into the hands of the few? And it is of this great

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

question that I believe I offer the true solution. It will be understood that *fortunes* are here spoken of, not moderate sums saved by many years of effort, the returns on which are required for the comfortable maintenance and education of families. This is not *wealth,* but only *competence* which it should be the aim of all to acquire.

There are but three modes in which surplus wealth can be disposed of. It call {*sic*} be left to the families of the decedents; or it can be bequeathed for public purposes; or, finally, it can be administered during their lives by its possessors. Under the first and second modes most of the wealth of the world that has reached the few has hitherto been applied. Let us in turn consider each of these modes. The first is the most injudicious. In monarchical countries, the estates and the greatest portion of the wealth are left to the first son, that the vanity of the parent may be gratified by the thought that his name and title are to descend to succeeding generations unimpaired. The condition of this class in Europe to-day teaches the futility of such hopes or ambitions. The successors have become impoverished through their follies or from the fall in the value of land. Even in Great Britain the strict law of entail has been found inadequate to maintain the status of an hereditary class. Its soil is rapidly passing into the hands of the stranger. Under republican institutions the division of property among the children is much fairer, but the question which forces itself upon thoughtful men in all lands is: Why should men leave great fortunes to their children? If this is done from affection, is it not misguided affection? Observation teaches that, generally speaking, it is not well for the children that they should be so burdened. Neither is it well for the state. Beyond providing for the wife and daughters moderate sources of income, and very moderate allowances indeed, if any, for the sons, men may well hesitate, for it is no longer questionable that great {sums} bequeathed oftener work more for the injury than for the good of the recipients. Wise men will soon conclude that, for the best interests of the members of their families and of the state, such bequests are an improper use of their means.

It is not suggested that men who have failed to educate their sons to earn a livelihood shall cast them adrift in poverty. If any man has seen fit to rear his sons with a view to their living idle lives, or, what is highly commendable, has instilled in them the sentiment

that they are in a position to labor for public ends without reference to pecuniary considerations, then, of course, the duty of the parent is to see that such are provided for *moderation*. There are instances of millionaires' sons unspoiled by wealth, who, being rich, still perform great services in the community. Such are the very salt of the earth, as valuable as, unfortunately, they are rare; still it is not the exception, but the rule, that men must regard, and, looking at the usual result of enormous sums conferred upon legatees, the thoughtful man must shortly say, "I would as soon leave to my son a curse as the almighty dollar," and admit to himself that it is not the welfare of the children, but family pride, which inspires these enormous legacies.

As to the second mode, that of leaving wealth at death for public uses, it may be said that this is only a means for the disposal of wealth, provided a man is content to wait until he is dead before it becomes of much good in the world. Knowledge of the results of legacies bequeathed is not calculated to inspire the brightest hopes of much posthumous good being accomplished. The cases are not few in which the real object sought by the testator is not attained, nor are they few in which his real wishes are thwarted. In many cases the bequests are so used as to become only monuments of his folly. It is well to remember that it requires the exercise of not less ability than that which acquired the wealth to use it so as to be really beneficial to the community. Besides this, it may fairly be said that no man is to be extolled for doing what he cannot help doing, nor is he to be thanked by the community to which he only leaves wealth at death. Men who leave vast sums in this way may fairly be thought men who would not have left it at all, had they been able to take it with them. The memories of such cannot be held in grateful remembrance, for there is no grace in their gifts. It is not to be wondered at that such bequests seem so generally to lack the blessing. –

The growing disposition to tax more and more heavily large estates left at death is a cheering indication of the growth of a salutary change in public opinion. The State of Pennsylvania now takes--subject to some exceptions--one-tenth of the property left by its citizens. The budget presented in the British Parliament the other day proposes to increase the death-duties; and, most significant of all, the new tax is to be a graduated one. Of all forms of taxation, this seems the wisest. Men who continue hoarding great

sums all their lives, the proper use of which for - public ends would work good to the community, should be made to feel that the community, in the form of the state, cannot thus be deprived of its proper share. By taxing estates heavily at death the state marks its condemnation of the selfish millionaire's unworthy life.

It is desirable; that nations should go much further in this direction. Indeed, it is difficult to set bounds to the share of a rich man's estate which should go at his death to the public through the agency of the state, and by all means such taxes should be graduated, beginning at nothing upon moderate sums to dependents, and increasing rapidly as the amounts swell, until of the millionaire's hoard, as of Shylock's, at least

"_____ The other half
Comes to the privy coffer of the state."

This policy would work powerfully to induce the rich man to attend to the administration of wealth during his life, which is the end that society should always have in view, as being that by far most fruitful for the people. Nor need it be feared that this policy would sap the root of enterprise and render men less anxious to accumulate, for to the class whose ambition it is to leave great fortunes and be talked about after their death, it will attract even more attention, and, indeed, be a somewhat nobler ambition to have enormous sums paid over to the state from their fortunes.

There remains, then, only one mode of using great fortunes; but in this we have the true antidote for the temporary unequal distribution of wealth, the reconciliation of the rich and the poor--a reign of harmony--another ideal, differing, indeed, from that of the Communist in requiring only the further evolution of existing conditions, not the total overthrow of our civilization. It is founded upon the present most intense individualism, and the race is projected to put it in practice by degree whenever it pleases. Under its sway we shall have an ideal state, in which the surplus wealth of the few will become, in the best sense the property of the many, because administered for the common good, and this wealth, passing through the hands of the few, can be made a much more potent force for the elevation of our race than if it had been distributed in small sums to the people themselves. Even the poorest can be made to see this, and to agree that great sums

gathered by some of their fellow-citizens and spent for public purposes, from which the masses reap the principal benefit, are more valuable to them than if scattered among them through the course of many years in trifling amounts.

If we consider what results flow from the Cooper Institute, for instance, to the best portion of the race in New York not possessed of means, and compare these with those which would have arisen for the good of the masses from an equal sum distributed by Mr. Cooper in his lifetime in the form of wages, which is the highest form of distribution, being for work done and not for charity, we can form some estimate of the possibilities for the improvement of the race which lie embedded in the present law of the accumulation of wealth. Much of this sum if distributed in small quantities among the people, would have been wasted in the indulgence of appetite, some of it in excess, and it may be doubted whether even the part put to the best use, that of adding to the comforts of the home, would have yielded results for the race, as a race, at all comparable to those which are flowing and are to flow from the Cooper Institute from generation to generation. Let the advocate of violent or radical change ponder well this thought.

We might even go so far as to take another instance, that of Mr. Tilden's bequest of five millions of dollars for a free library in the city of New York, but in referring to this one cannot help saying involuntarily, how much better if Mr. Tilden had devoted the last years of his own life to the proper administration of this immense sum; in which case neither legal contest nor any other cause of delay could have interfered with his aims. But let us assume that Mr. Tilden's millions finally become the means of giving to this city a noble public library, where the treasures of the world contained in books will be open to all forever, without money and without price. Considering the good of that part of the race which congregates in and around Manhattan Island, would its permanent benefit have been better promoted had these millions been allowed to circulate in small sums through the hands of the masses? Even the most strenuous advocate of Communism must entertain a doubt upon this subject. Most of those who think will probably entertain no doubt whatever.

Poor and restricted are our opportunities in this life; narrow our horizon; our best work most imperfect; but rich men should be thankful for one inestimable boon. They have it in their power during their lives to busy themselves in organizing benefactions from which the masses of their fellows will derive lasting advantage, and thus dignify their own lives. The highest life is probably to be reached, not by such imitation of the life of Christ as Count Tolstoi gives us, but, while animated by Christ's spirit, by recognizing the changed conditions of this age, and adopting modes of expressing this spirit suitable to the changed conditions under which we live; still laboring for the good of our fellows, which was the essence of his life and teaching, but laboring in a different manner.

This, then, is held to be the duty of the man of Wealth: First, to set an example of modest, unostentatious living, shunning display or extravagance; to provide moderately for the legitimate wants of those dependent upon him; and after doing so to consider all surplus revenues which come to him simply as trust funds, which he is called upon to administer, and strictly bound as a matter of duty to administer in the manner which, in his judgment, is best calculated to produce the most beneficial results for the community--the man of wealth thus becoming the mere agent and trustee for his poorer brethren, bringing to their service his superior wisdom, experience and ability to administer, doing for them better than they would or could do for themselves.

We are met here with the difficulty of determining what are moderate sums to leave to members of the family; what is modest, unostentatious living; what is the test of extravagance. There must be different standards for different conditions. The answer is that it is as impossible to name exact amounts or actions as it is to define good manners, good taste, or the rules of propriety; but, nevertheless, these are verities, well known although undefinable. Public sentiment is quick to know and to feel what offends these. So in the case of wealth. The rule in regard to good taste in the dress of men or women applies here. Whatever makes one conspicuous offends the canon. If any family be chiefly known for display, for extravagance in home, table, equipage, for enormous sums ostentatiously spent in any form upon itself, if these be its chief distinctions, we have no difficulty in estimating its nature or culture. So likewise in regard to the use or abuse of its surplus wealth, or to generous, freehanded cooperation in good public uses, or to

unabated efforts to accumulate and hoard to the last, whether they administer or bequeath. The verdict rests with the best and most enlightened public sentiment. The community will surely judge and its judgments will not often be wrong.

The best uses to which surplus wealth can be put have already been indicated. These who, would administer wisely must, indeed, be wise, for one of the serious obstacles to the improvement of our race is indiscriminate charity. It were better for mankind that the millions of the rich were thrown in to the sea than so spent as to encourage the slothful, the drunken, the unworthy. Of every thousand dollars spent in so called charity to-day, it is probable that $950 is unwisely spent; so spent, indeed as to produce the very evils which it proposes to mitigate or cure. A well-known writer of philosophic books admitted the other day that he had given a quarter of a dollar to a man who approached him as he was coming to visit the house of his friend. He knew nothing of the habits of this beggar; knew not the use that would be made of this money, although he had every reason to suspect that it would be spent improperly. This man professed to be a disciple of Herbert Spencer; yet the quarter-dollar given that night will probably work more injury than all the money which its thoughtless donor will ever be able to give in true charity will do good. He only gratified his own feelings, saved himself from annoyance—and this was probably one of the most selfish and very worst actions of his life, for in all respects he is most worthy.

In bestowing charity, the main consideration should be to help those who will help themselves; to provide part of the means by which those who desire to improve may do so; to give those who desire to use the aids by which they may rise; to assist, but rarely or never to do all. Neither the individual nor the race is improved by alms-giving. Those worthy of assistance, except in rare cases, seldom require assistance. The really valuable men of the race never do, except in cases of accident or sudden change. Every one has, of course, cases of individuals brought to his own knowledge where temporary assistance can do genuine good, and these he will not overlook. But the amount which can be wisely given by the individual for individuals is necessarily limited by his lack of knowledge of the circumstances connected with each. He is the only true reformer who is as careful and as anxious not to aid the unworthy as he is to aid the worthy, and, perhaps, even

more so, for in alms-giving more injury is probably done by rewarding vice than by relieving virtue.

The rich man is thus almost restricted to following the examples of Peter Cooper, Enoch Pratt of Baltimore, Mr. Pratt of Brooklyn, Senator Stanford, and others, who know that the best means of benefiting the community is to place within its reach the ladders upon which the aspiring can rise—parks, and means of recreation, by which men are helped in body and mind; works of art, certain to give pleasure and improve the public taste, and public institutions of various kinds, which will improve the general condition of the people; —in this manner returning their surplus wealth to the mass of their fellows in the forms best calculated to do them lasting good.

Thus is the problem of Rich and Poor to be solved. The laws of accumulation will be left free; the laws of distribution free. Individualism will continue, but the millionaire will be but a trustee for the poor; {entrusted} for a season with a great part of the increased wealth of the community, but administering it for the community far better than it could or would have done for itself. The best minds will thus have reached a stage in the development of the race which it is clearly seen that there is no mode of disposing of surplus wealth creditable to thoughtful and earnest men into whose hands it flows save by using it year by year for the general good. This day already dawns. But a little while, and although, without incurring the pity of their fellows, men may die sharers in great business enterprises from which their capital cannot be or has not been withdrawn, and is left chiefly at death for public uses, yet the man who dies leaving behind many millions of available wealth, which was his to administer during life, will pass away "unwept, unhonored, and unsung," no matter to what uses he leaves the dross which he cannot take with him. Of such as these the public verdict will then be: "The man who dies thus rich dies disgraced."

Such, in my opinion, is the true Gospel concerning Wealth, obedience to which is destined some day to solve the problem of the Rich and the Poor, and to bring "Peace on earth, among men Good-Will."

ANDREW CARNEGIE

The Triumph of America

ESSAY EXCERPTS

1885

BACKGROUND

In this essay, the famous steel magnate Andrew Carnegie explores the many reasons behind America's cultural, political, and economic successes up to the late 19th century.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What does Carnegie see as the future of America from the perspective of 1885?
2. What does Carnegie understand to be the impact of race on America's development?
3. How does Carnegie see the American continent itself as beneficial to the nation?
4. How does Carnegie see politics as key to America's continued progress?
5. What does Carnegie see as the role of education in America?

Andrew Carnegie. "The Triumph of America." Essay excerpts, 1885. From Teaching American History. https://teachingamericanhistory.org/document/the-triumph-of-america/.

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

The old nations of the earth creep on at a snail's pace; the Republic thunders past with the rush of the express. The United States, the growth of a single century, has already reached the foremost rank among nations, and is destined soon to out-distance all others in the race. In population, in wealth, in annual savings, and in public credit; in freedom from debt, in agriculture, and in manufactures, America already leads the civilized world{.} …

Into the distant future of this giant nation we need not seek to peer; but if we cast a glance forward, as we have done backward, for only fifty years, and assume that in that short interval no serious change will occur, the astounding fact startles us that in 1935, fifty years from now, when many in manhood will still be living, one hundred and eighty millions of English-speaking republicans will exist under one flag and possess more than two hundred and fifty thousand millions of dollars, or fifty thousand millions sterling of national wealth. Eighty years ago the whole of America and Europe did not contain so many people; and, if Europe and America continue their normal growth, it will be little more than another eighty years ere the mighty Republic may boast as many loyal citizens as all the rulers of Europe combined, for before the year 1980 Europe and America will each have a population of about six hundred millions.

The causes which have led to the rapid growth and aggrandizement of this latest addition to the family of nations constitute one of the most interesting problems in the social history of mankind. What has brought about such stupendous results — so unparalleled a development of a nation within so ethnic character of the people, the topographical and climatic conditions under which they developed, and the influence of political institutions founded upon the equality of the citizen.

Certain writers in the past have maintained that the ethnic type of a people has less influence upon its growth as a nation than the conditions of life under which it is developing. The modern ethnologist knows better. We have only to imagine what America would be today if she had fallen, in the beginning, into the hands of any other people than the colonizing British, to see how vitally important is this question of race. America was indeed fortunate in the seed planted upon her soil. With the exception of a

few Dutch and French it was wholly British; and … the American of today remains true to this noble strain and is four-fifths British. The special aptitude of this race for colonization, its vigor and enterprise, and its capacity for governing, although brilliantly manifested in all parts of the world, have never been shown to such advantage as in American. Freed here from the pressure of feudal institutions no longer fitted to their present development, and freed also from the dominion of the upper classes, which have kept the people at home from effective management of affairs and sacrificed the nation's interest for their own, as is the nature of classes, these masses of the lower ranks of Britons, called upon to found a new state, have proved themselves possessors of a positive genius for political administration.

The second, and perhaps equally important factor in the problem of the rapid advancement of this branch of the British race, is the superiority of the conditions under which it has developed. The home which has fallen to its lot, a domain more magnificent than has cradled any other race in the history of the world, presents no obstructions to unity — to the thorough amalgamation of its dwellers, North, South, East, and West, into one homogeneous mass — for the conformation of the American continent differs in important respects from that of every other great division of the globe. In Europe the Alps occupy a central position, forming on each side watersheds of rivers which flow into opposite seas. In Asia the Himalaya, the Hindu Kush, and the Altai Mountains divide the continent, rolling from their sides many great rivers which pour their floods into widely separated oceans. But in North America the mountains rise up on each coast, and from them the land slopes gradually together in one valley, offering to commerce many thousand miles of navigable streams. The map thus proclaims the unity of North America, for in this great central basin, three million square miles in extent, free from impassable rivers or mountain barriers great enough to hider free intercourse, political integration is a necessity and consolidation a certainty{.} …

The unity of the American people is further powerfully promoted by the foundation upon which the political structure rests, the equality of the citizen. There is not one shred of privilege to be met with anywhere in all the laws. One man's right is every man's right. The flag is the guarantor and symbol of equality. The people are not emasculated by being made to feel that their own country decrees their inferiority, and holds them unworthy

of privileges accorded to others. No ranks, no titles, no hereditary dignities, and therefore no classes. Suffrage is universal, and votes are of equal weight. Representatives are paid, and political life and usefulness thereby thrown open to all. Thus there is brought about a community of interests and aims which a Briton, accustomed to monarchial and aristocratic institutions, dividing the people into classes with separate interests, aims, thoughts, and feelings, can only with difficulty understand.

The free common school system of the land is probably, after all, the greatest single power in the unifying process which is producing the new American race. Through the crucible of a good common English education, furnished free by the State, pass the various racial elements — children of Irishmen, Germans, Italians, Spaniards, and Swedes, side by side with the native American, all to be fused into one, in language, in thought, in feeling, and in patriotism. The Irish boy loses his brogue, and the German child learns English. The sympathies suited to the feudal systems of Europe, which they inherit from their fathers, pass off as dross, leaving behind the pure gold of the only noble political creed: "All men are created free and equal." Taught now to live and work for the common weal, and not for the maintenance of a royal family or an overbearing aristocracy, not for the continuance of a social system which ranks them beneath an arrogant class of drones, children of Russian and German serfs, of Irish evicted tenants, Scotch crofters, and other victims of feudal tyranny, are translated into republican Americans, and are made in one love for a country which provides equal rights and privileges for all her children. There is no class so intensely patriotic, so wildly devoted to the Republic as the naturalized citizen and his child, for little does the native-born citizen know of the value of rights which have never been denied. Only the man born abroad, like myself, under institutions which insult him at his birth, can know the full meaning of Republicanism{.} …

It is these causes which render possible the growth of a great homogeneous nation, alike in race, language, literature, interest, patriotism — an empire of such overwhelming power and proportions as to require neither army nor navy to ensure its safety, and a people so educated and advanced as to value the victories of peace.

ANNOTATIONS

NOTES & QUESTIONS

The student of American affairs today sees no influences at work save those which make for closer and closer union. The Republic has solved the problem of governing large areas by adopting the federal, or home-rule system, and has proved to the world that the freest self-government of the parts produces the strongest government of the whole.

WILLIAM A. PEFFER

The Mission of the Populist Party

ARTICLE EXCERPTS

North American Review | December 31, 1893

BACKGROUND

The rapid changes caused by the Gilded Age produced negative as well as positive benefits for American society. The American people responded to the drawbacks of this advancement by calling for many reforms, especially in the economic sphere. One manifestation of this reform spirit was the creation of the People's (or Populist) Party, which sought to fight the economic corruption of the Gilded Age by calling for the dismantling of monopolies, the regulation of railroads, and the granting of legislative power to the people via electoral initiative and referendum. In 1890, William Peffer of Kansas was the first Populist Party member elected to the Senate (there would eventually be 6), and wrote this article three years later explaining the principles behind the Party.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What is the purpose of government, according to Peffer?
2. What are the four points that define the mission of the Populist Party?
3. What does Peffer say about the Party's views on monetary policy?
4. What is the Party's view of American railroads?
5. According to Peffer, how do banks and excessive wealth undermine American government?

William A. Peffer. "The Mission of the Populist Party." Article excerpts, *North American Review*, December 31, 1893. From Teaching American History. https://teachingamericanhistory.org/document/ the-mission-of-the-populist-party/.

ANNOTATIONS **NOTES & QUESTIONS**

The Populist Party is an organized demand that the functions of government shall be exercised only for the mutual benefit of all the people. It asserts that government is useful only to the extent that it serves to advance the common weal. Believing that the public good is paramount to private interests, it protests against the delegation of sovereign powers to private agencies. Its motto is: "Equal rights to all; special privileges to none." Its creed is written in a single line of the Declaration of Independence—"All men are created equal." Devoted to the objects for which the Constitution of the United States was adopted, it proposes to "form a more perfect union" by cultivating a national sentiment among the people; to "insure domestic tranquility" by securing to every man and woman what they earn; to "establish justice" by procuring an equitable distribution of the products and profits of labor; to "provide for the common defence" by interesting every citizen in the ownership of his home; to "promote the general welfare" by abolishing class legislation and limiting the government to its proper functions; and to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity" by protecting the producing masses against the spoliation of speculators and usurers.

The Populist claims that the mission of his party is to emancipate labor. He believes that men are not only created equal, but that they are equally entitled to the use of natural resources in procuring means of subsistence and comfort. He believes that an equitable distribution of the products and profits of labor is essential to the highest form of civilization; that taxation should only be for public purposes, and that all moneys raised by taxes should go into the public treasury; that public needs should be supplied by public agencies, and that the people should be served equally and alike.

The party believes in popular government. Its demands may be summarized fairly to be—

1. An exclusively national currency in amount amply sufficient for all the uses for which money is needed by the people, to consist of gold and silver coined on equal terms, and government paper, each and all legal tender in payment of debts of whatever nature or amount, receivable for taxes and all public dues.

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

2. That rates of interest for the use of money be reduced to the level of average net profits in productive industries.

3. That the means of public transportation be brought under public control, to the end that carriage shall not cost more than it is reasonably worth, and that charges may be made uniform.

4. That large private land-holdings be discouraged by law. …

The Populist Party is the only party that honestly favors good money. … We have seven different kinds of money, and only one of them is good, according to the determination of the Treasury officials. Bank notes are not legal tender, neither are silver certificates, nor gold certificates. Treasury notes are not legal tender in cases where another kind of money is expressed in the contract, and United States notes (greenbacks) will not pay either principal or interest on any government bond. None of our paper money is taxable. Silver dollars are by law full legal tender in payment of debts to any amount whatever, but the Treasury does not pay them out on any obligation unless they are specially requested. In practice, we have but one full legal tender money—gold coin; and Republicans and Democrats are agreed on continuing that policy; while Populists demand gold, silver, and paper money, all equally full legal tender.

The fact that we have now out about $700,000,000 in paper is proof that our stock of coin is utterly inadequate to perform all the money duty required in the people's business transactions. The discontinuance of silver coinage stops the supply from that source. It is believed by men best informed on the subject that the gold used in the arts has reached an amount about equal to the annual output of the mines. Then the world's stock of gold coin will not be increased unless the arts are drawn upon, and that can be done successfully only at a price above the money value of the coin. Russia, Austria, Italy, and the United States all want more gold. Where is it to come from? And what will it cost the purchaser? Are we to drop back to Roman methods of procuring treasure? When all the nations set out on gold-hunting expeditions, who will be the victor and what will become of the spoils?

ANNOTATIONS

NOTES & QUESTIONS

It is evident that we must have more money, and Congress alone is authorized to prepare it. States are prohibited by the Constitution of the United States from making anything but gold and silver coin a legal tender in payment of debts, and nothing is money that is not a tender. The people can rely only on Congress for a safe circulating medium.

Populists demand not only a sufficiency of money, but a reduction of interest rates at least as low as the general level of the people's savings. They aver that with interest at present legal and actual rates, an increase in the volume of money in the country would be of little permanent benefit, for bankers and brokers would control its circulation, just as they do now. But with interest charges reduced to 3 or 2 percent, the business of the money-lender would be no more profitable than that of the farmer—and why should it be? …

… The rate of interest ought to be what, with prudent management through a reasonable number of average seasons, he [the farmer] can pay yearly, with part of the principal, until he has paid out and has the farm left.

Three percent, compounded annually is a fair average the world over for labor's saving. It has been a little more in the United States, but a gold basis will soon bring us to the general level, and that will settle lower as population and trade increase.

While the Populist Party favors government ownership and control of railroads, it wisely leaves for future consideration the means by which such ownership and control can best be brought about. The conditions which seem to make necessary such a change in our transportation system preclude all probability of its ever being practicable, if it were desirable, to purchase existing railway lines. The total capitalization of railroads in the United States in 1890 was put at $9,871,378,389—nearly ten thousand million dollars. It would be putting the figures high to say that the roads are worth one-half the amount of their capital stock. This leaves a fictitious value of $5,000,000,000 which the people must maintain for the roads by transportation charges twice as high as they would be if the capitalization were only half as much. It is the excessive capitalization

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

which the people have to maintain that they complain about. It would be an unbusinesslike proceeding for the people to purchase roads when they could build better ones just where and when they are needed for less than half the money that would be required to clear these companies' books. It is conceded that none of the highly capitalized railroad corporations expect to pay their debts. If they can keep even on interest account, they do well, and that is all they are trying to do. While charges have been greatly reduced, they are still based on capitalization, and courts have held that the companies are entitled to reasonable profits on their investment. The people have but one safe remedy—to construct their own roads as needed, and then they will "own and control" them.

This is not a new doctrine. A select committee of the Senate of the United States, at the head of which was Hon. William Windom, then a senator and afterward secretary of the Treasury appointed in December 1872, reported among other recommendations one proposing the construction of a "government freight railway," for the purpose of effectively regulating interstate commerce. A government freight railway would have no capitalization, no debt, bonded or otherwise; its charges would be only what it would cost to handle the traffic and keep the road in repair. That would reduce cost of carriage to a minimum, and nothing else will.

Populists complain of legislation in the interest of favored classes. At the very time when the homestead law was passed a scheme was hatching to absorb the public lands by railway corporations. Scarcely had the great war begun when a plan was laid to establish a system of national banking based on the people's debts; and while customs duties were raised to increase the public revenues, cheap foreign labor was brought in under contract to man the factories. Banks have been specially favored.

When it was to their interest to withdraw their notes it was done with impunity. They have been permitted to openly violate the law that authorizes their existence, and this without rebuke.

The U.S. Senate shields them from exposure. When the Treasury was flush, public moneys were lavishly left with the banks to use without interest, and when the great

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

banks in New York City needed funds to relieve the stringency in the "money market" there, they had only to ask and they received. And now that the Treasury is running short in gold reserves, there is a demand for more bonds to purchase more gold to be used in redeeming Treasury notes which the law requires to be redeemed in silver, thus again reducing the reserves, making another bond issue necessary to procure more gold; and so on, as the "money market" may require. These "Napoleons of Finance" are playing a bold game. …

Rapid accumulation of wealth by a few citizens, as we have seen it in the United States during the last thirty years, is evidence of morbidly abnormal conditions. It is inconsistent with free institutions. It is breeding anarchy and trouble. No man can honestly take to himself what he does not earn; and if he does no more than that, riches will come to him slowly. It is only when he gets what he does not earn that his "success" attracts attention. Fortunes running into millions of dollars must be made up of property and profits mostly produced and earned by persons other than those who claim them.

No man ever earned a million dollars. If he was moved to great undertakings, nature's God inspired him. And if, in the play of his ambition he marshaled effective forces, his equipment cost him little. To a great mind success is compensation. The value of its labor cannot be measured with money. A strong man's intellect moves as easily as a blacksmith's arm. Both are gifts.

The best men are content with little. Vast enterprises that move the world are maintained by contributions from the labor of the poor. Leaders do but organize and direct; the rank and file do all the rest. Apply the "iron law of wages" equally to all that work and you scale down the salaries of many useless people. If the Republic is to endure we must encourage the average man.

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN

The Cross of Gold

SPEECH EXCERPTS

July 9, 1896
Chicago Coliseum | Chicago, IL

BACKGROUND

The spirit of reform championed by the Populist Party found moderate success in the last quarter of the 19th century. However, their greatest triumph would occur in the 1896 presidential election, albeit under the auspices of the Democratic Party. Former Nebraska Congressman William Jennings Bryan, the Democrat (as well as Populist) nominee, was a firm advocate for retaining silver as well as gold for the monetary standard in America, rather than using gold alone. At the Democratic National Convention that year, Bryan gave this speech which garnered massive support for his campaign, but he ultimately lost to William McKinley.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What is the "paramount issue," according to Bryan?
2. Does Bryan agree that the government should be able to impose an income tax?
3. How does Bryan explain the relationship between banks and government?
4. Why does he object to the gold standard?
5. What are the "two ideas of government" that Bryan describes?

William Jennings Bryan. "The Cross of Gold Speech." Speech, July 9, 1896. From George Mason University. https://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/5354/.

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

I would be presumptuous, indeed, to present myself against the distinguished gentlemen to whom you have listened if this were but a measuring of ability; but this is not a contest among persons. The humblest citizen in all the land when clad in the armor of a righteous cause is stronger than all the whole hosts of error that they can bring. I come to speak to you in defense of a cause as holy as the cause of liberty—the cause of humanity. When this debate is concluded, a motion will be made to lay upon the table the resolution offered in commendation of the administration and also the resolution in condemnation of the administration. I shall object to bringing this question down to a level of persons. The individual is but an atom; he is born, he acts, he dies; but principles are eternal; and this has been a contest of principle.

Never before in the history of this country has there been witnessed such a contest as that through which we have passed. Never before in the history of American politics has a great issue been fought out as this issue has been by the voters themselves.

On the 4th of March, 1895, a few Democrats, most of them members of Congress, issued an address to the Democrats of the nation asserting that the money question was the paramount issue of the hour; asserting also the right of a majority of the Democratic Party to control the position of the party on this paramount issue; concluding with the request that all believers in free coinage of silver in the Democratic Party should organize and take charge of and control the policy of the Democratic Party. Three months later, at Memphis, an organization was perfected, and the silver Democrats went forth openly and boldly and courageously proclaiming their belief and declaring that if successful they would crystallize in a platform the declaration which they had made; and then began the conflict with a zeal approaching the zeal which inspired the crusaders who followed Peter the Hermit. Our silver Democrats went forth from victory unto victory, until they are assembled now, not to discuss, not to debate, but to enter up the judgment rendered by the plain people of this country.

But in this contest, brother has been arrayed against brother, and father against son. The warmest ties of love and acquaintance and association have been disregarded. Old leaders have been cast aside when they refused to give expression to the sentiments of those

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

whom they would lead, and new leaders have sprung up to give direction to this cause of freedom. Thus has the contest been waged, and we have assembled here under as binding and solemn instructions as were ever fastened upon the representatives of a people.

We do not come as individuals. Why, as individuals we might have been glad to compliment the gentleman from New York [Senator Hill], but we knew that the people for whom we speak would never be willing to put him in a position where he could thwart the will of the Democratic Party. I say it was not a question of persons; it was a question of principle; and it is not with gladness, my friends, that we find ourselves brought into conflict with those who are now arrayed on the other side. The gentleman who just preceded me [Governor Russell] spoke of the old state of Massachusetts. Let me assure him that not one person in all this convention entertains the least hostility to the people of the state of Massachusetts.

But we stand here representing people who are the equals before the law of the largest cities in the state of Massachusetts. When you come before us and tell us that we shall disturb your business interests, we reply that you have disturbed our business interests by your action. We say to you that you have made too limited in its application the definition of a businessman. The man who is employed for wages is as much a businessman as his employer. The attorney in a country town is as much a businessman as the corporation counsel in a great metropolis. The merchant at the crossroads store is as much a businessman as the merchant of New York. The farmer who goes forth in the morning and toils all day, begins in the spring and toils all summer, and by the application of brain and muscle to the natural resources of this country creates wealth, is as much a businessman as the man who goes upon the Board of Trade and bets upon the price of grain. The miners who go 1,000 feet into the earth or climb 2,000 feet upon the cliffs and bring forth from their hiding places the precious metals to be poured in the channels of trade are as much businessmen as the few financial magnates who in a backroom corner the money of the world.

We come to speak for this broader class of businessmen. Ah. my friends, we say not one word against those who live upon the Atlantic Coast; but those hardy pioneers who

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

braved all the dangers of the wilderness, who have made the desert to blossom as the rose—those pioneers away out there, rearing their children near to nature's heart, where they can mingle their voices with the voices of the birds—out there where they have erected schoolhouses for the education of their children and churches where they praise their Creator, and the cemeteries where sleep the ashes of their dead—are as deserving of the consideration of this party as any people in this country.

It is for these that we speak. We do not come as aggressors. Our war is not a war of conquest. We are fighting in the defense of our homes, our families, and posterity. We have petitioned, and our petitions have been scorned. We have entreated, and our entreaties have been disregarded. We have begged, and they have mocked when our calamity came.

We beg no longer; we entreat no more; we petition no more. We defy them!

The gentleman from Wisconsin has said he fears a Robespierre. My friend, in this land of the free you need fear no tyrant who will spring up from among the people. What we need is an Andrew Jackson to stand as Jackson stood, against the encroachments of aggregated wealth.

They tell us that this platform was made to catch votes. We reply to them that changing conditions make new issues; that the principles upon which rest Democracy are as everlasting as the hills; but that they must be applied to new conditions as they arise. Conditions have arisen and we are attempting to meet those conditions. They tell us that the income tax ought not to be brought in here; that is not a new idea. They criticize us for our criticism of the Supreme Court of the United States. My friends, we have made no criticism. We have simply called attention to what you know. If you want criticisms, read the dissenting opinions of the Court. That will give you criticisms.

They say we passed an unconstitutional law. I deny it. The income tax was not unconstitutional when it was passed. It was not unconstitutional when it went before the Supreme Court for the first time. It did not become unconstitutional until one judge

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

changed his mind; and we cannot be expected to know when a judge will change his mind.

The income tax is a just law. It simply intends to put the burdens of government justly upon the backs of the people. I am in favor of an income tax. When I find a man who is not willing to pay his share of the burden of the government which protects him, I find a man who is unworthy to enjoy the blessings of a government like ours.

He says that we are opposing the national bank currency. It is true. If you will read what Thomas Benton said, you will find that he said that in searching history he could find but one parallel to Andrew Jackson. That was Cicero, who destroyed the conspiracies of Cataline and saved Rome. He did for Rome what Jackson did when he destroyed the bank conspiracy and saved America.

We say in our platform that we believe that the right to coin money and issue money is a function of government. We believe it. We believe it is a part of sovereignty and can no more with safety be delegated to private individuals than can the power to make penal statutes or levy laws for taxation.

Mr. Jefferson, who was once regarded as good Democratic authority, seems to have a different opinion from the gentleman who has addressed us on the part of the minority. Those who are opposed to this proposition tell us that the issue of paper money is a function of the bank and that the government ought to go out of the banking business. I stand with Jefferson rather than with them, and tell them, as he did, that the issue of money is a function of the government and that the banks should go out of the governing business.

They complain about the plank which declares against the life tenure in office. They have tried to strain it to mean that which it does not mean. What we oppose in that plank is the life tenure that is being built up in Washington which establishes an office-holding class and excludes from participation in the benefits the humbler members of our society.

…

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

Let me call attention to two or three great things. The gentleman from New York says that he will propose an amendment providing that this change in our law shall not affect contracts which, according to the present laws, are made payable in gold. But if he means to say that we cannot change our monetary system without protecting those who have loaned money before the change was made, I want to ask him where, in law or in morals, he can find authority for not protecting the debtors when the act of 1873 was passed when he now insists that we must protect the creditor. He says he also wants to amend this platform so as to provide that if we fail to maintain the parity within a year that we will then suspend the coinage of silver. We reply that when we advocate a thing which we believe will be successful we are not compelled to raise a doubt as to our own sincerity by trying to show what we will do if we are wrong.

I ask him, if he will apply his logic to us, why he does not apply it to himself. He says that he wants this country to try to secure an international agreement. Why doesn't he tell us what he is going to do if they fail to secure an international agreement. There is more reason for him to do that than for us to expect to fail to maintain the parity. They have tried for thirty years—thirty years—to secure an international agreement, and those are waiting for it most patiently who don't want it at all.

Now, my friends, let me come to the great paramount issue. If they ask us here why it is we say more on the money question than we say upon the tariff question, I reply that if protection has slain its thousands the gold standard has slain its tens of thousands. If they ask us why we did not embody all these things in our platform which we believe, we reply to them that when we have restored the money of the Constitution, all other necessary reforms will be possible, and that until that is done there is no reform that can be accomplished.

Why is it that within three months such a change has come over the sentiments of the country? Three months ago, when it was confidently asserted that those who believed in the gold standard would frame our platforms and nominate our candidates, even the advocates of the gold standard did not think that we could elect a President; but they had

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

good reasons for the suspicion, because there is scarcely a state here today asking for the gold standard that is not within the absolute control of the Republican Party.

But note the change. Mr. McKinley was nominated at St. Louis upon a platform that declared for the maintenance of the gold standard until it should be changed into bimetallism by an international agreement. Mr. McKinley was the most popular man among the Republicans; and everybody three months ago in the Republican Party prophesied his election. How is it today? Why, that man who used to boast that he looked like Napoleon, that man shudders today when he thinks that he was nominated on the anniversary of the Battle of Waterloo. Not only that, but as he listens he can hear with ever increasing distinctness the sound of the waves as they beat upon the lonely shores of St. Helena.

Why this change? Ah, my friends. is not the change evident to anyone who will look at the matter? It is because no private character, however pure, no personal popularity, however great, can protect from the avenging wrath of an indignant people the man who will either declare that he is in favor of fastening the gold standard upon this people, or who is willing to surrender the right of self-government and place legislative control in the hands of foreign potentates and powers. …

We go forth confident that we shall win. Why? Because upon the paramount issue in this campaign there is not a spot of ground upon which the enemy will dare to challenge battle. Why, if they tell us that the gold standard is a good thing, we point to their platform and tell them that their platform pledges the party to get rid of a gold standard and substitute bimetallism. If the gold standard is a good thing, why try to get rid of it? If the gold standard, and I might call your attention to the fact that some of the very people who are in this convention today and who tell you that we ought to declare in favor of international bimetallism and thereby declare that the gold standard is wrong and that the principles of bimetallism are better—these very people four months ago were open and avowed advocates of the gold standard and telling us that we could not legislate two metals together even with all the world.

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

I want to suggest this truth, that if the gold standard is a good thing we ought to declare in favor of its retention and not in favor of abandoning it; and if the gold standard is a bad thing, why should we wait until some other nations are willing to help us to let it go?

Here is the line of battle. We care not upon which issue they force the fight. We are prepared to meet them on either issue or on both. If they tell us that the gold standard is the standard of civilization, we reply to them that this, the most enlightened of all nations of the earth, has never declared for a gold standard, and both the parties this year are declaring against it. If the gold standard is the standard of civilization, why, my friends, should we not have it? So if they come to meet us on that, we can present the history of our nation. More than that, we can tell them this, that they will search the pages of history in vain to find a single instance in which the common people of any land ever declared themselves in favor of a gold standard. They can find where the holders of fixed investments have.

Mr. Carlisle said in 1878 that this was a struggle between the idle holders of idle capital and the struggling masses who produce the wealth and pay the taxes of the country; and my friends, it is simply a question that we shall decide upon which side shall the Democratic Party fight. Upon the side of the idle holders of idle capital, or upon the side of the struggling masses? That is the question that the party must answer first; and then it must be answered by each individual hereafter. The sympathies of the Democratic Party, as described by the platform, are on the side of the struggling masses, who have ever been the foundation of the Democratic Party.

There are two ideas of government. There are those who believe that if you just legislate to make the well-to-do prosperous, that their prosperity will leak through on those below. The Democratic idea has been that if you legislate to make the masses prosperous their prosperity will find its way up and through every class that rests upon it.

You come to us and tell us that the great cities are in favor of the gold standard. I tell you that the great cities rest upon these broad and fertile prairies. Burn down your cities and

ANNOTATIONS

NOTES & QUESTIONS

leave our farms, and your cities will spring up again as if by magic. But destroy our farms and the grass will grow in the streets of every city in the country.

My friends, we shall declare that this nation is able to legislate for its own people on every question without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation on earth, and upon that issue we expect to carry every single state in the Union.

I shall not slander the fair state of Massachusetts nor the state of New York by saying that when citizens are confronted with the proposition, "Is this nation able to attend to its own business?"—I will not slander either one by saying that the people of those states will declare our helpless impotency as a nation to attend to our own business. It is the issue of 1776 over again. Our ancestors, when but 3 million, had the courage to declare their political independence of every other nation upon earth. Shall we, their descendants, when we have grown to 70 million, declare that we are less independent than our forefathers? No, my friends, it will never be the judgment of this people. Therefore, we care not upon what lines the battle is fought. If they say bimetallism is good but we cannot have it till some nation helps us, we reply that, instead of having a gold standard because England has, we shall restore bimetallism, and then let England have bimetallism because the United States have.

If they dare to come out in the open field and defend the gold standard as a good thing, we shall fight them to the uttermost, having behind us the producing masses of the nation and the world. Having behind us the commercial interests and the laboring interests and all the toiling masses, we shall answer their demands for a gold standard by saying to them, you shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns. You shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold.

ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE

The March of the Flag

SPEECH EXCERPTS

September 16, 1898
Indianapolis, IN

BACKGROUND

Following the conclusion of the Spanish-American War in 1898, Spain handed over its territories of Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines to the United States. Having these new lands under American control raised many questions among the people, many of whom were unsure if the United States should be so involved abroad. Senator Albert Beveridge, running for reelection in Indiana, argued in this speech that it was indeed America's mission to expand itself to those islands—perhaps even beyond—and to spread its principles across the world.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. How does Beveridge describe America?
2. What is America's mission to the world?
3. What are the limitations to rule by consent?
4. What is the "march of the flag"?
5. What opposition does Beveridge face? How does he respond to it?
6. What is the "greatest fact of the future"?

Albert J. Beveridge. "The March of the Flag." Speech excerpts, September 16, 1898. From Teaching American History. https://teachingamericanhistory.org/document/the-march-of-the-flag-campaign-speech/.

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

Fellow citizens, it is a noble land that God has given us; a land that can feed and clothe the world; a land whose coastlines would enclose half the countries of Europe; a land set like a sentinel between the two imperial oceans of the globe, a greater England with a nobler destiny. It is a mighty people that He has planted on this soil; a people sprung from the most masterful blood of history; a people perpetually revitalized by the virile, man-producing working-folk of all the earth; a people imperial by virtue of their power, by right of their institutions, by authority of their heaven-directed purposes—the propagandists and not the misers of liberty. It is a glorious history our God has bestowed upon His chosen people; a history whose keynote was struck by [the] Liberty Bell; a history heroic with faith in our mission and our future; a history of statesmen who flung the boundaries of the Republic out into unexplored lands and savage wildernesses; a history of soldiers who carried the flag across the blazing deserts and through the ranks of hostile mountains, even to the gates of sunset; a history of a multiplying people who overran a continent in half a century; a history of prophets who saw the consequences of evils inherited from the past and of martyrs who died to save us from them; a history divinely logical, in the process of whose tremendous reasoning we find ourselves today.

Therefore, in this campaign, the question is larger than a party question. It is an American question. It is a world question. Shall the American people continue their resistless march toward the commercial supremacy of the world? Shall free institutions broaden their blessed reign as the children of liberty wax in strength, until the empire of our principles is established over the hearts of all mankind?

Have we no mission to perform, no duty to discharge to our fellow man? Has God endowed us with gifts beyond our deserts and marked us as the people of His peculiar favor, merely to rot in our own selfishness, as men and nations must, who take cowardice for their companion and self for their deity as China has, as India has, as Egypt has? Shall we be as the man who had one talent and hid it, or as he who had ten talents and used them until they grew to riches? And shall we reap the reward that waits on the discharge of our high duty as the sovereign power of earth; shall we occupy new markets for what our farmers raise, new markets for what our factories make, new

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

markets for what our merchants sell—aye, and, please God, new markets for what our ships shall carry? Shall we avail ourselves of new sources of supply of what we do not raise or make, so that what are luxuries today will be necessities to-morrow? …

… For William McKinley is continuing the policy that Jefferson began, Monroe continued, Seward advanced, Grant promoted, Harrison championed, and the growth of the Republic has demanded. Hawaii is ours; Puerto Rico is to be ours; at the prayer of the people Cuba will finally be ours; in the islands of the east, even to the gates of Asia, coaling stations are to be ours; at the very least the flag of a liberal government is to float over the Philippines, and it will be the stars and stripes of glory. And the burning question of this campaign is, whether the American people will accept the gifts of events; whether they will rise, as lifts their soaring destiny; whether they will proceed upon the lines of national development surveyed by the statesmen of our past; or whether, for the first time, the American people doubt their mission, question fate, prove apostate to the spirit of their race, and halt the ceaseless march of free institutions?

The opposition tells us that we ought not to govern a people without their consent. I answer, the rule of liberty that all just government derives its authority from the consent of the governed, applies only to those who are capable of self-government. We govern the Indians without their consent, we govern our territories without their consent, we govern our children without their consent. How do they know what our government would be without their consent? Would not the people of the Philippines prefer the just, humane, civilizing government of this Republic to the savage, bloody rule of pillage and extortion from which we have rescued them? Do not the blazing fires of joy and the ringing bells of gladness in Puerto Rico prove the welcome of our flag? And, regardless of this formula of words made only for enlightened, self-governing peoples, do we owe no duty to the world? Shall we turn these peoples back to the reeking hands from which we have taken them? Shall we abandon them to their fate with the wolves of conquest all about them? Shall we save them from those nations, to give them a self-rule of tragedy? It would be like giving a razor to a babe and telling

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

it to shave itself. It would be like giving a typewriter to an Eskimo and telling him to publish one of the great dailies of the world.

They ask us how we will govern these new possessions. I answer: out of local conditions and the necessities of the case methods of government will grow. If England can govern foreign lands so can America. If Germany can govern foreign lands so can America. If they can supervise protectorates so can America. Why is it more difficult to administer Hawaii than New Mexico or California? Both had a savage and an alien population; both were more remote from the seat of government when they came under our dominion than Hawaii is today. Will you say by your vote that American ability to govern has decayed, that you are an infidel to American vigor and practical sense? Or that we are of the ruling race of the world; that ours is the blood of government; ours the heart of dominion; ours the brain and the genius of administration? We do but what our fathers did—but pitch the tents of liberty farther westward, farther southward—we only continue the march of the flag.

The march of the flag! In 1789 the flag of the Republic waved over 4 million souls in thirteen States, and their savage territory which stretched to the Mississippi, to Canada, to the Floridas. The timid minds of that day said that no new territory was needed, and, for the hour, they were right. But Jefferson … acquired the territory which swept from the Mississippi to the mountains, from Texas to the British possessions, and the march of the flag began. The infidels to the gospel of liberty raved, but the flag swept on. The title to that noble land out of which Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana have been carved was uncertain; Jefferson … obeyed the Anglo-Saxon impulse within him … and another empire was added to the Republic and the march of the flag went on. Those who deny the power of free institutions to expand urged every argument, and more, that we hear today, but the march of the flag went on. A screen of land from New Orleans to Florida shut us from the gulf, and over this and the Everglade Peninsula waved the saffron flag of Spain. Andrew Jackson seized both, the American people stood at his back, and under Monroe the Floridas came under the dominion of the Republic, and the march of the flag went on. The Cassandras prophesied every prophecy of despair we hear today, but the march of the flag went on. Then Texas

responded to the bugle calls of liberty and the march of the flag went on. And at last we waged war with Mexico and the flag swept over the Southwest, over peerless California, past the Gate of Gold to Oregon on the north, and from ocean to ocean its folds of glory blazed. And now, obeying the same voice that Jefferson heard and obeyed, that Jackson heard and obeyed, that Seward heard and obeyed, that Grant and Harrison heard and obeyed, William McKinley plants the flag over the islands of the sea, outposts of commerce, citadels of national security, and the march of the flag goes on. …

Distance and oceans are no arguments. The fact that all the territory our fathers bought and seized is contiguous is no argument. In 1819 Florida was farther from New York than Puerto Rico is from Chicago today; Texas farther from Washington in 1845 than Hawaii is from Boston in 1898; California more inaccessible in 1847 than the Philippines are now. Gibraltar is farther from London than Havana is from Washington; Melbourne is farther from Liverpool than Manila is from San Francisco. The ocean does not separate us from the lands of our duty and desire—the ocean joins us, a river never to be dredged, a canal never to be repaired. Steam joins us; electricity joins us—the very elements are in league with our destiny. Cuba not contiguous! Puerto Rico not contiguous! Hawaii and the Philippines not contiguous! Our navy will make them contiguous. Dewey and Sampson and Schley have made them contiguous and American speed, American guns, American heart and brain and nerve will keep them contiguous forever.

But the opposition is right—there is a difference. We did not need the western Mississippi Valley when we acquired it, nor Florida, nor Texas, nor California, nor the royal provinces of the far Northwest. We had no emigrants to people this imperial wilderness, no money to develop it, even no highways to cover it. No trade awaited us in its savage fastnesses. Our productions were not greater than our internal trade. There was not one reason for the land lust of our statesmen from Jefferson to Grant, other than the prophet and the Saxon within them. But, today, we are raising more than we can consume. Today, we are making more than we can use. … Therefore, we must find new markets for our produce, new occupation for our capital, new work for our labor. And so, while we did not need the territory taken during the past century at the time it was acquired, we do need what we have taken in 1898, and we need it now. Think of

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

the thousands of Americans who will pour into Hawaii and Puerto Rico when the Republic's laws cover those islands with justice and safety. Think of the tens of thousands of Americans who will invade the Philippines when a liberal government, protected and controlled by this Republic, if not the government of the Republic itself, shall establish order and equity there. Think of the hundreds of thousands of Americans who will build a soap-and-water, common school civilization of energy and industry in Cuba, when a government of law replaces the double reign of anarchy and tyranny. Think of the prosperous millions that empress of islands will support when, obedient to the law of political gravitation, her people ask for the highest honor liberty can bestow—the sacred order of the stars and stripes, the citizenship of the great Republic!

What does all this mean for every one of us? It means opportunity for all the glorious young manhood of the Republic. … It means that the resources and the commerce of these immensely rich dominions will be increased as much as American energy is greater than Spanish sloth; for Americans, henceforth, will monopolize those resources and that commerce. In Cuba, alone, there are 15 million acres of forest unacquainted with the ax. There are exhaustless mines of iron. There are priceless deposits of manganese. … There are millions of acres yet unexplored. The resources of Puerto Rico have only been trifled with. The riches of the Philippines have hardly been touched by the fingertips of modern methods. And they produce what we cannot, and they consume what we produce—the very predestination of reciprocity. … And William McKinley intends that their trade shall be ours. … It means … an opportunity for the rich man to do something with his money, besides hoarding it or lending it. It means occupation for every workingman in the country at wages which the development of new resources, the launching of new enterprises, the monopoly of new markets always brings. Cuba is as large as Pennsylvania, and is the richest spot on all the globe. Hawaii is as large as New Jersey; Puerto Rico half as large as Hawaii; the Philippines larger than all New England, New York, New Jersey, and Delaware. All these are larger than the British Isles, larger than France, larger than Germany, larger than Japan. The trade of these islands, developed as we will develop it, … monopolized as we will monopolize

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

it, will set every reaper in this Republic singing, every spindle whirling, every furnace spouting the flames of industry. …

… The commercial empire of the Republic! That is the greatest fact of the future. And that is why these islands involve considerations larger than their own commerce. The commercial supremacy of the Republic means that this nation is to be the sovereign factor in the peace of the world. For the conflicts of the future are to be conflicts of trade—struggles for markets—commercial wars for existence. And the golden rule of peace is impregnability of position and invincibility of preparation. So we see England, the greatest strategist of history, plant her flag and her cannon on Gibraltar, at Quebec, the Bermudas, Vancouver—everywhere—until from every point of vantage her royal banner flashes in the sun. So Hawaii furnishes us a naval base in the heart of the Pacific; the Ladrones another, a voyage further into the region of sunset and commerce; Manila, another, at the gates of Asia—Asia, to the trade of whose hundreds of millions American merchants, American manufacturers, American farmers have as good a right as those of Germany, or France, or Russia, or England; Asia, whose commerce with England alone amounts to billions of dollars every year; Asia, to whom Germany looks to take the surplus of her factories, and foundries, and mills; Asia, whose doors shall not be shut against American trade!

Within two decades the bulk of Oriental commerce will be ours—the richest commerce in the world. In the light of that golden future our chain of new-won stations rise like ocean sentinels from the night of waters—Puerto Rico, a nobler Gibraltar; the Isthmian canal, a greater Suez; Hawaii, the Ladrones, the Philippines, commanding the Pacific! Ah! as our commerce spreads, the flag of liberty will circle the globe and the highways of the ocean-carrying trade of all mankind be guarded by the guns of the Republic. And, as their thunders salute the flag, benighted peoples will know that the voice of Liberty is speaking, at last, for them; that civilization is dawning, at last for them—Liberty and Civilization, those children of Christ's gospel, who follow and never precede the preparing march of commerce! It is the tide of God's great purposes made manifest in the instincts of our race, whose present phase is our personal profit, but

ANNOTATIONS **NOTES & QUESTIONS**

whose far-off end is the redemption of the world and the Christianization of mankind. {…}

… Shall this future of the race be left with those who, under God, began this career of sacred duty and immortal glory; or, shall we risk it to those who would build a dam in the current of destiny's large designs{?} …

Fellow Americans, we are God's chosen people. Yonder at Bunker Hill and Yorktown His providence was above us. At New Orleans and on ensanguined seas His hand sustained us. Abraham Lincoln was His minister; and His was the altar of freedom, the boys in blue set on a hundred smoking battlefields. His power directed Dewey in the East, and He delivered the Spanish fleet into our hands on the eve of Liberty's natal day as He delivered the elder Armada into the hands of our English sires two centuries ago. His great purposes are revealed in the progress of the flag, which surpasses the intentions of Congresses and cabinets, and leads us, like a holier pillar of cloud by day and pillar of fire by night, into situations unforeseen by finite wisdom and duties unexpected by the unprophetic heart of selfishness. The American people cannot use a dishonest medium of exchange; it is ours to set the world its example of right and honor. We cannot fly from our world duties; it is ours to execute the purpose of a fate that has driven us to be greater than our small intentions. We cannot retreat from any soil where Providence has unfurled our banner; it is ours to save that soil for liberty and civilization. For liberty and civilization and God's promises fulfilled, the flag must henceforth be the symbol and the sign to all mankind. …

THE AMERICAN ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE

Platform of the American Anti-Imperialist League

PARTY PLATFORM

1899

BACKGROUND

Founded in 1899 by Andrew Carnegie and William James, the American Anti-Imperialist League was a response to the United States' occupation of Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippine Islands following the Spanish-American War. This platform expressed their fundamental differences with American expansion. (Note the contrasts to the previous speech of Sen. Beveridge defending the islands' possession by the United States.)

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Where does the League say imperialism often leads a nation?
2. What does the League condemn?
3. How does 1899 compare to 1861, according to the League?
4. Does it say citizens should always support their government?
5. What does the League say about self-government?

The American Anti-Imperialist League. "Platform of the American Anti-Imperialist League." Public document, 1899. From Teaching American History. https://teachingamericanhistory.org/document/ platform-of-american-anti-imperialist-league/.

ANNOTATIONS **NOTES & QUESTIONS**

We hold that the policy known as imperialism is hostile to liberty and tends toward militarism, an evil from which it has been our glory to be free. We regret that it has become necessary in the land of Washington and Lincoln *to* {italics original} reaffirm that all men, of whatever race or color, are entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. We maintain that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. We insist that the subjugation of any people is "criminal aggression" and open disloyalty to the distinctive principles of our Government.

We earnestly condemn the policy of the present National Administration in the Philippines. It seeks to extinguish the spirit of 1776 in those islands. We deplore the sacrifice of our soldiers and sailors, whose bravery deserves admiration even in an unjust war. We denounce the slaughter of the Filipinos as a needless horror. We protest against the extension of American sovereignty by Spanish methods.

We demand the immediate cessation of the war against liberty, begun by Spain and continued by us. We urge that Congress be promptly convened to announce to the Filipinos our purpose to concede to them the independence for which they have so long fought and which of right is theirs.

The United States have always protested against the doctrine of international law which permits the subjugation of the weak by the strong. A self-governing state cannot accept sovereignty over an unwilling people. The United States cannot act upon the ancient heresy that might makes right.

Imperialists assume that with the destruction of self-government in the Philippines by American hands, all opposition here will cease. This is a grievous error. Much as we abhor the war of "criminal aggression" in the Philippines, greatly as we regret that the blood of the Filipinos is on American hands, we more deeply resent the betrayal of American institutions at home. The real firing line is not in the suburbs of Manila. The foe is of our own household. The attempt of 1861 was to divide the country. That of 1899 is to destroy its fundamental principles and noblest ideals.

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

Whether the ruthless slaughter of the Filipinos shall end next month or next year is but an incident in a contest that must go on until the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States are rescued from the hands of their betrayers. Those who dispute about standards of value while the foundation of the Republic is undermined will be listened to as little as those who would wrangle about the small economies of the household while the house is on fire. The training of a great people for a century, the aspiration for liberty of a vast immigration are forces that will hurl aside those who in the delirium of conquest seek to destroy the character of our institutions.

We deny that the obligation of all citizens to support their Government in times of grave National peril applies to the present situation. If an Administration may with impunity ignore the issues upon which it was chosen, deliberately create a condition of war anywhere on the face of the globe, debauch the civil service for spoils to promote the adventure, organize a truth suppressing censorship and demand of all citizens a suspension of judgment and their unanimous support while it chooses to continue the fighting, representative government itself is imperiled.

We propose to contribute to the defeat of any person or party that stands for the forcible subjugation of any people. We shall oppose for reelection all who in the White House or in Congress betray American liberty in pursuit of un-American ends. We still hope that both of our great political parties will support and defend the Declaration of Independence in the closing campaign of the century.

We hold, with Abraham Lincoln, that "no man is good enough to govern another man without that other's consent. When the white man governs himself, that is self-government, but when he governs himself and also governs another man, that is more than self-government-that is despotism." "Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men in all lands. Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and under a just God cannot long retain it."

ANNOTATIONS **NOTES & QUESTIONS**

We cordially invite the cooperation of all men and women who remain loyal to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

BOOKER T. WASHINGTON

Atlanta Exposition Address

SPEECH

September 18, 1895
Cotton States and International Exposition | Atlanta, GA

BACKGROUND

Following the Civil War, African Americans—many of whom were former slaves—struggled to be fully accepted into American society due to white racial prejudice in the North and South alike, despite the presence of the Reconstruction Amendments to the Constitution. Thus, different schools of thought developed in the African American community as to how best to address this issue given the present circumstances. Booker T. Washington, himself a former slave, gave his views on the subject and the problems facing a changing America in this speech at the Cotton States and International Exposition.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. How does Washington say friendship can grow between the two races?
2. By what means does he suggest blacks can improve their position in American society?
3. For what reason does Washington believe that blacks will find success even in the South?
4. What public activity does he say most African Americans would consider ill-advised?
5. What virtue does Washington say is crucial to making progress in racial relationships?

Booker T. Washington. "Atlanta Exposition Address." Speech, September 18, 1895. From Teaching American History. https://teachingamericanhistory.org/document/atlanta-exposition-address-2/.

ANNOTATIONS **NOTES & QUESTIONS**

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Board of Directors and Citizens:

One-third of the population of the South is of the Negro race. No enterprise seeking the material, civil, or moral welfare of this section can disregard this element of our population and reach the highest success. I but convey to you, Mr. President and Directors, the sentiment of the masses of my race when I say that in no way have the value and manhood of the American Negro been more fittingly and generously recognized than by the managers of this magnificent exposition at every stage of its progress. It is a recognition that will do more to cement the friendship of the two races than any occurrence since the dawn of our freedom.

Not only this, but the opportunity here afforded will awaken among us a new era of industrial progress. Ignorant and inexperienced, it is not strange that in the first years of our new life we began at the top instead of at the bottom; that a seat in Congress or the state legislature was more sought than real estate or industrial skill; that the political convention or stump speaking had more attractions than starting a dairy farm or truck garden.

A ship lost at sea for many days suddenly sighted a friendly vessel. From the mast of the unfortunate vessel was seen a signal: “Water, water; we die of thirst.” The answer from the friendly vessel at once came back: “Cast down your bucket where you are.” A second time the signal, “Water, water, send us water!” ran up from the distressed vessel, and was answered: “Cast down your bucket where you are.” And a third and fourth signal for water was answered: “Cast down your bucket where you are.” The captain of the distressed vessel, at last heeding the injunction, cast down his bucket, and it came up full of fresh, sparkling water from the mouth of the Amazon River.

To those of my race who depend on bettering their condition in a foreign land or who underestimate the importance of cultivating friendly relations with the southern white man, who is their next-door neighbor, I would say: Cast down your bucket where you are; cast it down in making friends, in every manly way, of the people of all races by whom we are surrounded. Cast it down in agriculture, mechanics, in commerce, in

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

domestic service, and in the professions. And in this connection it is well to bear in mind that whatever other sins the South may be called to bear, when it comes to business, pure and simple, it is in the South that the Negro is given a man's chance in the commercial world, and in nothing is this exposition more eloquent than in emphasizing this chance.

Our greatest danger is that, in the great leap from slavery to freedom, we may overlook the fact that the masses of us are to live by the productions of our hands and fail to keep in mind that we shall prosper in proportion as we learn to dignify and glorify common labor, and put brains and skill into the common occupations of life; shall prosper in proportion as we learn to draw the line between the superficial and the substantial, the ornamental gewgaws of life and the useful. No race can prosper till it learns that there is as much dignity in tilling a field as in writing a poem. It is at the bottom of life we must begin, and not at the top. Nor should we permit our grievances to overshadow our opportunities.

To those of the white race who look to the incoming of those of foreign birth and strange tongue and habits for the prosperity of the South, were I permitted I would repeat what I say to my own race, "Cast down your bucket where you are." Cast it down among the 8 million Negroes whose habits you know, whose fidelity and love you have tested in days when to have proved treacherous meant the ruin of your firesides. Cast down your bucket among these people who have, without strikes and labor wars, tilled your fields, cleared your forests, built your railroads and cities, and brought forth treasures from the bowels of the earth and helped make possible this magnificent representation of the progress of the South. Casting down your bucket among my people, helping and encouraging them as you are doing on these grounds, and, with education of head, hand, and heart, you will find that they will buy your surplus land, make blossom the waste places in your fields, and run your factories.

While doing this, you can be sure in the future, as in the past, that you and your families will be surrounded by the most patient, faithful, law-abiding, and unresentful people that the world has seen. As we have proved our loyalty to you in the past, in nursing

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

your children, watching by the sickbed of your mothers and fathers, and often following them with tear-dimmed eyes to their graves, so in the future, in our humble way, we shall stand by you with a devotion that no foreigner can approach, ready to lay down our lives, if need be, in defense of yours; interlacing our industrial, commercial, civil, and religious life with yours in a way that shall make the interests of both races one. In all things that are purely social we can be as separate as the fingers, yet one as the hand in all things essential to mutual progress.

There is no defense or security for any of us except in the highest intelligence and development of all. If anywhere there are efforts tending to curtail the fullest growth of the Negro, let these efforts be turned into stimulating, encouraging, and making him the most useful and intelligent citizen. Effort or means so invested will pay a thousand percent interest. These efforts will be twice blessed—"blessing him that gives and him that takes."

There is no escape, through law of man or God, from the inevitable:

> The laws of changeless justice bind
> Oppressor with oppressed;
> And close as sin and suffering joined
> We march to fate abreast.

Nearly 16 million hands will aid you in pulling the load upward, or they will pull against you the load downward. We shall constitute one-third and more of the ignorance and crime of the South, or one-third its intelligence and progress; we shall contribute one-third to the business and industrial prosperity of the South, or we shall prove a veritable body of death, stagnating, depressing, retarding every effort to advance the body politic.

Gentlemen of the exposition, as we present to you our humble effort at an exhibition of our progress, you must not expect overmuch. Starting thirty years ago with ownership here and there in a few quilts and pumpkins and chickens (gathered from miscellaneous sources), remember: the path that has led from these to the invention and production of agricultural implements, buggies, steam engines, newspapers, books,

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

statuary, carving, paintings, the management of drugstores and banks, has not been trodden without contact with thorns and thistles. While we take pride in what we exhibit as a result of our independent efforts, we do not for a moment forget that our part in this exhibition would fall far short of your expectations but for the constant help that has come to our educational life, not only from the southern states but especially from northern philanthropists who have made their gifts a constant stream of blessing and encouragement.

The wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremest folly, and that progress in the enjoyment of all the privileges that will come to us must be the result of severe and constant struggle rather than of artificial forcing. No race that has anything to contribute to the markets of the world is long in any degree ostracized. It is important and right that all privileges of the law be ours, but it is vastly more important that we be prepared for the exercise of those privileges. The opportunity to earn a dollar in a factory just now is worth infinitely more than the opportunity to spend a dollar in an opera house.

In conclusion, may I repeat that nothing in thirty years has given us more hope and encouragement and drawn us so near to you of the white race as this opportunity offered by the exposition; and here bending, as it were, over the altar that represents the results of the struggles of your race and mine, both starting practically empty-handed three decades ago, I pledge that, in your effort to work out the great and intricate problem which God has laid at the doors of the South, you shall have at all times the patient, sympathetic help of my race; only let this be constantly in mind that, while from representations in these buildings of the product of field, of forest, of mine, of factory, letters, and art, much good will come—yet far above and beyond material benefits will be that higher good, that let us pray God will come, in a blotting out of sectional differences and racial animosities and suspicions, in a determination to administer absolute justice, in a willing obedience among all classes to the mandates of law. This, coupled with our material prosperity, will bring into our beloved South a new heaven and a new earth.

FREDERICK JACKSON TURNER

The Significance of the Frontier in American History

ESSAY EXCERPTS

1893

BACKGROUND

The open expanse of the American West provided substantial room for settlement, national growth, and exploration even before the Civil War. By the close of the 19th century, however, due to continued expansion and the relegation of the Indians to comparatively small reservations, the Western frontier could be said to have faded into irrelevancy—there was simply not as much (if anything) left to explore. In 1890, the U.S. Census Bureau itself officially declared that the frontier no longer existed. In response, American scholar Frederick Jackson Turner published this essay exploring the tangible, lasting effects of the Western frontier's exploration on the United States.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. How does Turner describe the Western frontier?
2. What are the multiple "frontiers" that have existed throughout American history?
3. How did economic development influence the settlement of the West, according to Turner?
4. How does he describe the evolution of Western farming and its effects?
5. Whom does Turner say presented the biggest potential obstacle to Western expansion?
6. In what ways does he say the West shaped the rest of America both culturally and politically?

Frederick Jackson Turner. "The Significance of the Frontier in American History." Essay excerpts, 1893. From the American Historical Association. https://www.historians.org/about-aha-and-membership/aha-history-and-archives/historical-archives/the-significance-of-the-frontier-in-american-history-(1893).

In a recent bulletin of the Superintendent of the Census for 1890 appear these significant words: "Up to and including 1880 the country had a frontier of settlement, but at present the unsettled area has been so broken into by isolated bodies of settlement that there can hardly be said to be a frontier line. In the discussion of its extent, its westward movement, etc., it can not, therefore, any longer have a place in the census reports." This brief official statement marks the closing of a great historic movement. Up to our own day American history has been in a large degree the history of the colonization of the Great West. The existence of an area of free land, its continuous recession, and the advance of American settlement westward, explain American development.

Behind institutions, behind constitutional forms and modifications, lie the vital forces that call these organs into life and shape them to meet changing conditions. The peculiarity of American institutions is, the fact that they have been compelled to adapt themselves to the changes of an expanding people—to the changes involved in crossing a continent, in winning a wilderness, and in developing at each area of this progress out of the primitive economic and political conditions of the frontier into the complexity of city life. Said Calhoun in 1817, "We are great, and rapidly—I was about to say fearfully—growing!" [1] So saying, he touched the distinguishing feature of American life. All peoples show development; the germ theory of politics has been sufficiently emphasized. In the case of most nations, however, the development has occurred in a limited area; and if the nation has expanded, it has met other growing peoples whom it has conquered. But in the case of the United States we have a different phenomenon. Limiting our attention to the Atlantic coast, we have the familiar phenomenon of the evolution of institutions in a limited area, such as the rise of representative government; the differentiation of simple colonial governments into complex organs; the progress from primitive industrial society, without division of labor, up to manufacturing civilization. But we have in addition to this a recurrence of the process of evolution in each western area reached in the process of expansion. Thus American development has exhibited not merely advance along a single line, but a return to primitive conditions on a continually advancing frontier line, and a new development for that area. American social development has been continually beginning over again on the frontier. This perennial rebirth, this fluidity of American life, this expansion westward with its new opportunities,

its continuous touch with the simplicity of primitive society, furnish the forces dominating American character. The true point of view in the history of this nation is not the Atlantic coast, it is the great West. Even the slavery struggle, which is made so exclusive an object of attention by writers like Prof. von Holst, occupies its important place in American history because of its relation to westward expansion.

In this advance, the frontier is the outer edge of the wave—the meeting point between savagery and civilization. Much has been written about the frontier from the point of view of border warfare and the chase, but as a field for the serious study of the economist and the historian it has been neglected.

The American frontier is sharply distinguished from the European frontier—a fortified boundary line running through dense populations. The most significant thing about the American frontier is, that it lies at the hither edge of free land. In the census reports it is treated as the margin of that settlement which has a density of two or more to the square mile. The term is an elastic one, and for our purposes does not need sharp definition. We shall consider the whole frontier belt, including the Indian country and the outer margin of the "settled area" of the census reports. This paper will make no attempt to treat the subject exhaustively; its aim is simply to call attention to the frontier as a fertile field for investigation, and to suggest some of the problems which arise in connection with it.

In the settlement of America we have to observe how European life entered the continent, and how America modified and developed that life and reacted on Europe. Our early history is the study of European germs developing in an American environment. Too exclusive attention has been paid by institutional students to the Germanic origins, too little to the American factors. The frontier is the line of most rapid and effective Americanization. The wilderness masters the colonist. It finds him a European in dress, industries, tools, modes of travel, and thought. It takes him from the railroad car and puts him in the birch canoe. It strips off the garments of civilization and arrays him in the hunting shirt and the moccasin. It puts him in the log cabin of the Cherokee and Iroquois and runs an Indian palisade around him. Before long he has gone to planting Indian corn and plowing with a sharp stick; he shouts the war cry and takes the scalp in

orthodox Indian fashion. In short, at the frontier the environment is at first too strong for the man. He must accept the conditions which it furnishes, or perish, and so he fits himself into the Indian clearings and follows the Indian trails. Little by little he transforms the wilderness; but the outcome is not the old Europe, not simply the development of Germanic germs, any more than the first phenomenon was a case of reversion to the Germanic mark. The fact is, that here is a new product that is American. At first, the frontier was the Atlantic coast. It was the frontier of Europe in a very real sense. Moving westward, the frontier became more and more American. As successive terminal moraines result from successive glaciations, so each frontier leaves its traces behind it, and when it becomes a settled area the region still partakes of the frontier characteristics. Thus the advance of the frontier has meant a steady movement away from the influence of Europe, a steady growth of independence on American lines. And to study this advance, the men who grew up under these conditions, and the political, economic, and social results of it, is to study the really American part of our history.

Stages of Frontier Advance

In the course of the seventeenth century the frontier was advanced up the Atlantic river courses, just beyond the "fall line," and the tidewater region became the settled area. In the first half of the eighteenth century another advance occurred. Traders followed the Delaware and Shawnese Indians to the Ohio as early as the end of the first quarter of the century. [2] Gov. Spotswood, of Virginia, made an expedition in 1714 across the Blue Ridge. The end of the first quarter of the century saw the advance of the Scotch-Irish and the Palatine Germans up the Shenandoah Valley into the western part of Virginia, and along the Piedmont region of the Carolinas. [3] The Germans in New York pushed the frontier of settlement up the Mohawk to German Flats. [4] In Pennsylvania the town of Bedford indicates the line of settlement. Settlements had begun on New River, a branch of the Kanawha, and on the sources of the Yadkin and French Broad. [5] The King attempted to arrest the advance by his proclamation of 1763, [6] forbidding settlements beyond the sources of the rivers flowing into the Atlantic; but in vain. In the period of the Revolution the frontier crossed the Alleghanies into Kentucky and Tennessee, and the upper waters of the Ohio were settled. [7] When the first census was taken in 1790, the continuous settled area was bounded by a line which ran near the coast of Maine, and

included New England except a portion of Vermont and New Hampshire, New York along the Hudson and up the Mohawk about Schenectady, eastern and southern Pennsylvania, Virginia well across the Shenandoah Valley, and the Carolinas and eastern Georgia. [8] Beyond this region of continuous settlement were the small settled areas of Kentucky and Tennessee, and the Ohio, with the mountains intervening between them and the Atlantic area, thus giving a new and important character to the frontier. The isolation of the region increased its peculiarly American tendencies, and the need of transportation facilities to connect it with the East called out important schemes of internal improvement, which will be noted farther on. The "West," as a self-conscious section, began to evolve.

From decade to decade distinct advances of the frontier occurred. By the census of 1820, [9] the settled area included Ohio, southern Indiana and Illinois, southeastern Missouri, and about one-half of Louisiana. This settled area had surrounded Indian areas, and the management of these tribes became an object of political concern. The frontier region of the time lay along the Great Lakes, where Astor's American Fur Company operated in the Indian trade, [10] and beyond the Mississippi, where Indian traders extended their activity even to the Rocky Mountains; Florida also furnished frontier conditions. The Mississippi River region was the scene of typical frontier settlements. [11]

The rising steam navigation [12] on western waters, the opening of the Erie Canal, and the westward extension of cotton [13] culture added five frontier states to the Union in this period. Grund, writing in 1836, declares: "It appears then that the universal disposition of Americans to emigrate to the western wilderness, in order to enlarge their dominion over inanimate nature, is the actual result of an expansive power which is inherent in them, and which by continually agitating all classes of society is constantly throwing a large portion of the whole population on the extreme confines of the State, in order to gain space for its development. Hardly is a new State or Territory formed before the same principle manifests itself again and gives rise to a further emigration; and so is it destined to go on until a physical barrier must finally obstruct its progress." [14]

In the middle of this century the line indicated by the present eastern boundary of Indian Territory, Nebraska, and Kansas marked the frontier of the Indian country. [15] Minnesota and Wisconsin still exhibited frontier conditions, [16] but the distinctive frontier of the period is found in California, where the gold discoveries had sent a sudden tide of adventurous miners, and in Oregon, and the settlements in Utah. [17] As the frontier has leaped over the Alleghanies, so now it skipped the Great Plains and the Rocky Mountains; and in the same way that the advance of the frontiersmen beyond the Alleghanies had caused the rise of important questions of transportation and internal improvement, so now the settlers beyond the Rocky Mountains needed means of communication with the East, and in the furnishing of these arose the settlement of the Great Plains and the development of still another kind of frontier life. Railroads, fostered by land grants, sent an increasing tide of immigrants into the far West. The United States Army fought a series of Indian wars in Minnesota, Dakota, and the Indian Territory.

By 1880 the settled area had been pushed into northern Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, along Dakota rivers, and in the Black Hills region, and was ascending the rivers of Kansas and Nebraska. The development of mines in Colorado had drawn isolated frontier settlements into that region, and Montana and Idaho were receiving settlers. The frontier was found in these mining camps and the ranches of the Great Plains. The superintendent of the census for 1890 reports, as previously stated, that the settlements of the West lie so scattered over the region that there can no longer be said to be a frontier line.

In these successive frontiers we find natural boundary lines which have served to mark and to affect the characteristics of the frontiers, namely: The “fall line;” the Alleghany Mountains; the Mississippi; the Missouri, where its direction approximates north and south; the line of the arid lands, approximately the ninety-ninth meridian; and the Rocky Mountains. The fall line marked the frontier of the seventeenth century; the Alleghanies that of the eighteenth; the Mississippi that of the first quarter of the nineteenth; the Missouri that of the middle of this century (omitting the California movement); and the belt of the Rocky Mountains and the arid tract, the present frontier. Each was won by a series of Indian wars.

The Frontier Furnishes a Field for Comparative Study of Social Development

At the Atlantic frontier one can study the germs of processes repeated at each successive frontier. We have the complex European life sharply precipitated by the wilderness into the simplicity of primitive conditions. The first frontier had to meet its Indian question, its question of the disposition of the public domain, of the means of intercourse with older settlements, of the extension of political organization, of religious and educational activity. And the settlement of these and similar questions for one frontier served as a guide for the next. {…} Each frontier has made similar contributions to American character, as will be discussed farther on.

But with all these similarities there are essential differences, due to the place element and the time element. It is evident that the farming frontier of the Mississippi Valley presents different conditions from the mining frontier of the Rocky Mountains. The frontier reached by the Pacific Railroad, surveyed into rectangles, guarded by the United States Army, and recruited by the daily immigrant ship, moves forward at a swifter pace and in a different way than the frontier reached by the birch canoe or the pack horse. The geologist traces patiently the shores of ancient seas, maps their areas, and compares the older and the newer. It would be a work worth the historian's labors to mark these various frontiers and in detail compare one with another. Not only would there result a more adequate conception of American development and characteristics, but invaluable additions would be made to the history of society. {…}

The Atlantic frontier was compounded of fisherman, far trader, miner, cattle-raiser, and farmer. Excepting the fisherman, each type of industry was on the march toward the West, impelled by an irresistible attraction. Each passed in successive waves across the continent. {…} The unequal rate of advance compels us to distinguish the frontier into the trader's frontier, the rancher's frontier, or the miner's frontier, and the farmer's frontier. When the mines and the cow pens were still near the fall line the traders' pack trains were tinkling across the Alleghanies, and the French on the Great Lakes were fortifying their posts, alarmed by the British trader's birch canoe. When the trappers scaled the Rockies, the farmer was still near the mouth of the Missouri.

The Indian Trader's Frontier

Why was it that the Indian trader passed so rapidly across the continent? What effects followed from the trader's frontier? The trade was coeval with American discovery{.} {…}
All along the coast from Maine to Georgia the Indian trade opened up the river courses. Steadily the trader passed westward, utilizing the older lines of French trade. The Ohio, the Great Lakes, the Mississippi, the Missouri, and the Platte, the lines of western advance, were ascended by traders. They found the passes in the Rocky Mountains and guided Lewis and Clarke, [24] Fremont, and Bidwell. The explanation of the rapidity of this advance is connected with the effects of the trader on the Indian. The trading post left the unarmed tribes at the mercy of those that had purchased fire-arms—a truth which the Iroquois Indians wrote in blood, and so the remote and unvisited tribes gave eager welcome to the trader. "The savages," wrote La Salle, "take better care of us French than of their own children; from us only can they get guns and goods." This accounts for the trader's power and the rapidity of his advance. Thus the disintegrating forces of civilization entered the wilderness. Every river valley and Indian trail became a fissure in Indian society, and so that society became honeycombed. Long before the pioneer farmer appeared on the scene, primitive Indian life had passed away. The farmers met Indians armed with guns. The trading frontier, while steadily undermining Indian power by making the tribes ultimately dependent on the whites, yet, through its sale of guns, gave to the Indians increased power of resistance to the farming frontier. French colonization was dominated by its trading frontier; English colonization by its farming frontier. There was an antagonism between the two frontiers as between the two nations. {…}

And yet, in spite of this opposition of the interests of the trader and the farmer, the Indian trade pioneered the way for civilization. The buffalo trail became the Indian trail, and this because the trader's "trace;" the trails widened into roads, and the roads into turnpikes, and these in turn were transformed into railroads. The same origin can be shown for the railroads of the South, the far West, and the Dominion of Canada. [25] The trading posts reached by these trails were on the sites of Indian villages which had been placed in positions suggested by nature; and these trading posts, situated so as to command the water systems of the country, have grown into such cities as Albany,

Pittsburg, Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis, Council Bluffs, and Kansas City. Thus civilization in America has followed the arteries made by geology, pouring an ever richer tide through them, until at last the slender paths of aboriginal intercourse have been broadened and interwoven into the complex mazes of modern commercial lines; the wilderness has been interpenetrated by lines of civilization growing ever more numerous. It is like the steady growth of a complex nervous system for the originally simple, inert continent. If one would understand why we are to-day one nation, rather than a collection of isolated states, he must study this economic and social consolidation of the country. In this progress from savage conditions lie topics for the evolutionist. [26]

The effect of the Indian frontier as a consolidating agent in our history is important. {…} The Indian was a common danger, demanding united action. {…}

The Rancher's Frontier

It would not be possible in the limits of this paper to trace the other frontiers across the continent. Travelers of the eighteenth century found the "cowpens" among the canebrakes and peavine pastures of the South, and the "cow drivers" took their droves to Charleston, Philadelphia, and New York. [27] Travelers at the close of the War of 1812 met droves of more than a thousand cattle and swine from the interior of Ohio going to Pennsylvania to fatten for the Philadelphia market. [28] The ranges of the Great Plains, with ranch and cowboy and nomadic life, are things of yesterday and of to-day. The experience of the Carolina cowpens guided the ranchers of Texas. One element favoring the rapid extension of the rancher's frontier is the fact that in a remote country lacking transportation facilities the product must be in small bulk, or must be able to transport itself, and the cattle raiser could easily drive his product to market. The effect of these great ranches on the subsequent agrarian history of the localities in which they existed should be studied.

The Farmer's Frontier

The maps of the census reports show an uneven advance of the farmer's frontier, with tongues of settlement pushed forward and with indentations of wilderness. In part this is due to Indian resistance, in part to the location of river valleys and passes, in part to the unequal force of the centers of frontier attraction. Among the important centers of

attraction may be mentioned the following: fertile and favorably situated soils, salt springs, mines, and army posts.

Army Posts

The frontier army post, serving to protect the settlers from the Indians, has also acted as a wedge to open the Indian country, and has been a nucleus for settlement. [29] In this connection mention should also be made of the Government military and exploring expeditions in determining the lines of settlement. But all the more important expeditions were greatly indebted to the earliest pathmakers, the Indian guides, the traders and trappers, and the French voyageurs, who were inevitable parts of governmental expeditions from the days of Lewis and Clarke. [30] Each expedition was an epitome of the previous factors in western advance.

Salt Springs

In an interesting monograph, Victor Hehn [31] has traced the effect of salt upon early European development, and has pointed out how it affected the lines of settlement and the form of administration. A similar study might be made for the salt springs of the United States. The early settlers were tied to the coast by the need of salt, without which they could not preserve their meats or live in comfort. Writing in 1752, Bishop Spangenburg says of a colony for which he was seeking lands in North Carolina, "They will require salt & other necessaries which they can neither manufacture nor raise. Either they must go to Charleston, which is 300 miles distant * * * Or else they must go to Boling's Point in Va on a branch of the James & is also 300 miles from here * * * Or else they must go down the Roanoke—I know not how many miles—where salt is brought up from the Cape Fear." [32] This may serve as a typical illustration. An annual pilgrimage to the coast for salt thus became essential. Taking flocks or furs and ginseng root, the early settlers sent their pack trains after seeding time each year to the coast. [33] This proved to be an important educational influence, since it was almost the only way in which the pioneer learned what was going on in the East. But when discovery was made of the salt springs of the Kanawha, and the Holston, and Kentucky, and central New York, the West began to be freed from dependence on the coast. It was in part the effect of finding these salt springs that enabled settlement to cross the mountains.

From the time the mountains rose between the pioneer and the seaboard, a new order of Americanism arose. The West and the East began to get out of touch of each other. The settlements from the sea to the mountains kept connection with the rear and had a certain solidarity. But the overmountain men grew more and more independent. The East took a narrow view of American advance, and nearly lost these men. Kentucky and Tennessee history bears abundant witness to the truth of this statement. The East began to try to hedge and limit westward expansion. Though Webster could declare that there were no Alleghanies in his politics, yet in politics in general they were a very solid factor.

Land

The exploitation of the beasts took hunter and trader to the west, the exploitation of the grasses took the rancher west, and the exploitation of the virgin soil of the river valleys and prairies attracted the farmer. Good soils have been the most continuous attraction to the farmer's frontier. The land hunger of the Virginians drew them down the rivers into Carolina, in early colonial days; the search for soils took the Massachusetts men to Pennsylvania and to New York. As the eastern lands were taken up migration flowed across them to the west. {…}

The farmer's advance came in a distinct series of waves. In Peck's New Guide to the West, published in Boston in 1837, occurs this suggestive passage:

Generally, in all the western settlements, three classes, like the waves of the ocean, have rolled one after the other. First comes the pioneer, who depends for the subsistence of his family chiefly upon the natural growth of vegetation, called the "range," and the proceeds of hunting. His implements of agriculture are rude, chiefly of his own make, and his efforts directed mainly to a crop of corn and a "truck patch." The last is a rude garden for growing cabbage, beans, corn for roasting ears, cucumbers, and potatoes. A log cabin, and, occasionally, a stable and corn-crib, and a field of a dozen acres, the timber girdled or "deadened," and fenced, are enough for his occupancy. It is quite immaterial whether he ever becomes the owner of the soil. He is the occupant for the time being, pays no rent, and feels as independent as the "lord of the manor." With a horse, cow, and one or two breeders of swine, he strikes into the woods with his family, and becomes the founder of a new county, or perhaps state. He builds his cabin, gathers around him a few other families of similar tastes and habits, and occupies till the range is somewhat subdued, and hunting a little precarious, or, which is more frequently the case, till the neighbors crowd around, roads, bridges, and fields annoy him, and he lacks elbow room.

The preemption law enables him to dispose of his cabin and cornfield to the next class of emigrants; and, to employ his own figures, he "breaks for the high timber," "clears out for the New Purchase," or migrates to Arkansas or Texas, to work the same process over.

The next class of emigrants purchase the lands, add field to field, clear out the roads, throw rough bridges over the streams, put up hewn log houses with glass windows and brick or stone chimneys, occasionally plant orchards, build mills, schoolhouses, court-houses, etc., and exhibit the picture and forms of plain, frugal, civilized life.

Another wave rolls on. The men of capital and enterprise come. The settler is ready to sell out and take the advantage of the rise in property, push farther into the interior and become, himself, a man of capital and enterprise in turn. The small village rises to a spacious town or city; substantial edifices of brick, extensive fields, orchards, gardens, colleges, and churches are seen. Broadcloths, silks, leghorns, crapes, and all the refinements, luxuries, elegancies, frivolities, and fashions are in vogue. Thus wave after wave is rolling westward; the real Eldorado is still farther on.

A portion of the two first classes remain stationary amidst the general movement, improve their habits and condition, and rise in the scale of society.

The writer has traveled much amongst the first class, the real pioneers. He has lived many years in connection with the second grade; and now the third wave is sweeping over large districts of Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri. Migration has become almost a habit in the west. Hundreds of men can be found, not over 50 years of age, who have settled for the fourth, fifth, or sixth time on a new spot. To sell out and remove only a few hundred miles makes up a portion of the variety of backwoods life and manners. [35]

Omitting those of the pioneer farmers who move from the love of adventure, the advance of the more steady farmer is easy to understand. Obviously the immigrant was attracted by the cheap lands of the frontier, and even the native farmer felt their influence strongly. Year by year the farmers who lived on soil whose returns were diminished by unrotated crops were offered the virgin soil of the frontier at nominal prices. Their growing families demanded more lands, and these were dear. The competition of the unexhausted, cheap, and easily tilled prairie lands compelled the farmer either to go west and continue the exhaustion of the soil on a new frontier, or to adopt intensive culture. {…}

Having now roughly outlined the various kinds of frontiers, and their modes of advance, chiefly from the point of view of the frontier itself, we may next inquire what were the

influences on the East and on the Old World. A rapid enumeration of some of the more noteworthy effects is all that I have time for.

Composite Nationality

First, we note that the frontier promoted the formation of a composite nationality for the American people. The coast was preponderantly English, but the later tides of continental immigration flowed across to the free lands. This was the case from the early colonial days. The Scotch Irish and the Palatine Germans, or "Pennsylvania Dutch," furnished the dominant element in the stock of the colonial frontier. With these peoples were also the freed indented servants, or redemptioners, who at the expiration of their time of service passed to the frontier. Governor Spottswood of Virginia writes in 1717, "The inhabitants of our frontiers are composed generally of such as have been transported hither as servants, and, being out of their time, settle themselves where laud is to be taken up and that will produce the necessarys of life with little labour." [36] Very generally these redemptioners were of non-English stock. In the crucible of the frontier the immigrants were Americanized, liberated, and fused into a mixed race, English in neither nationality or characteristics. The process has gone on from the early days to our own. Burke and other writers in the middle of the eighteenth century believed that Pennsylvania [37] was "threatened with the danger of being wholly foreign in language, manners, and perhaps even inclinations." The German and Scotch-Irish elements in the frontier of the South were only less great. In the middle of the present century the German element in Wisconsin was already so considerable that leading publicists looked to the creation of a German state out of the commonwealth by concentrating their colonization. [38] Such examples teach us to beware of misinterpreting the fact that there is a common English speech in America into a belief that the stock is also English.

Industrial Independence

In another way the advance of the frontier decreased our dependence on England. The coast, particularly of the South, lacked diversified industries, and was dependent on England for the bulk of its supplies. In the South there was even a dependence on the Northern colonies for articles of food. Governor Glenn, of South Carolina, writes in the middle of the eighteenth century: "Our trade with New York and Philadelphia was of this

sort, draining us of all the little money and bills we could gather from other places for their bread, flour, beer, hams, bacon, and other things of their produce, all which, except beer, our new townships begin to supply us with, which are settled with very industrious and thriving Germans. This no doubt diminishes the number of shipping and the appearance of our trade, but it is far from being a detriment to us." [39] Before long the frontier created a demand for merchants. As it retreated from the coast it became less and less possible for England to bring her supplies directly to the consumer's wharfs, and carry away staple crops, and staple crops began to give way to diversified agriculture for a time. The effect of this phase of the frontier action upon the northern section is perceived when we realize how the advance of the frontier aroused seaboard cities like Boston, New York, and Baltimore, to engage in rivalry for what Washington called "the extensive and valuable trade of a rising empire."

Effects on National Legislation

The legislation which most developed the powers of the National Government, and played the largest part in its activity, was conditioned on the frontier. Writers have discussed the subjects of tariff, land, and internal improvement, as subsidiary to the slavery question. But when American history comes to be rightly viewed it will be seen that the slavery question is an incident. In the period from the end of the first half of the present century to the close of the civil war slavery rose to primary, but far from exclusive, importance. {…} The growth of nationalism and the evolution of American political institutions were dependent on the advance of the frontier. {…}

{…} The pioneer needed the goods of the coast, and so the grand series of internal improvement and railroad legislation began, with potent nationalizing effects. Over internal improvements occurred great debates, in which grave constitutional questions were discussed. Sectional groupings appear in the votes, profoundly significant for the historian. Loose construction increased as the nation marched westward. [40] But the West was not content with bringing the farm to the factory. Under the lead of Clay—"Harry of the West"—protective tariffs were passed, with the cry of bringing the factory to the farm. The disposition of the public lands was a third important subject of national legislation influenced by the frontier.

The Public Domain

The public domain has been a force of profound importance in the nationalization and development of the Government. The effects of the struggle of the landed and the landless States, and of the ordinance of 1787, need no discussion. [41] Administratively the frontier called out some of the highest and most vitalizing activities of the General Government. The purchase of Louisiana was perhaps the constitutional turning point in the history of the Republic, inasmuch as it afforded both a new area for national legislation and the occasion of the downfall of the policy of strict construction. But the purchase of Louisiana was called out by frontier needs and demands. As frontier States accrued to the Union the national power grew. In a speech on the dedication of the Calhoun monument Mr. Lamar explained: "In 1789 the States were the creators of the Federal Government; in 1861 the Federal Government was the creator of a large majority of the States."

When we consider the public domain from the point of view of the sale and disposal of the public lands we are again brought face to face with the frontier. The policy of the United States in dealing with its lands is in sharp contrast with the European system of scientific administration. Efforts to make this domain a source of revenue, and to withhold it from emigrants in order that settlement might be compact, were in vain. The jealousy and the fears of the East were powerless in the face of the demands of the frontiersmen. John Quincy Adams was obliged to confess: "My own system of administration, which was to make the national domain the inexhaustible fund for progressive and unceasing internal improvement, has failed." The reason is obvious; a system of administration was not what the West demanded; it wanted land. Adams states the situation as follows: "The slaveholders of the South have bought the cooperation of the western country by the bribe of the western lands, abandoning to the new Western States their own proportion of the public property and aiding them in the design of grasping all the lands into their own hands." {…}

"No subject," said Henry Clay, "which has presented itself to the present, or perhaps any preceding, Congress, is of greater magnitude than that of the public lands." When we

consider the far-reaching effects of the Government's land policy upon political, economic, and social aspects of American life, we are disposed to agree with him. But this legislation was framed under frontier influences, and under the lead of Western statesmen like Benton and Jackson. {…}

National Tendencies of the Frontier

It is safe to say that the legislation with regard to land, tariff, and internal improvements—the American system of the nationalizing Whig party—was conditioned on frontier ideas and needs. But it was not merely in legislative action that the frontier worked against the sectionalism of the coast. The economic and social characteristics of the frontier worked against sectionalism. The men of the frontier had closer resemblances to the Middle region than to either of the other sections. Pennsylvania had been the seed-plot of frontier emigration, and, although she passed on her settlers along the Great Valley into the west of Virginia and the Carolinas, yet the industrial society of these Southern frontiersmen was always more like that of the Middle region than like that of the tide-water portion of the South, which later came to spread its industrial type throughout the South.

The Middle region, entered by New York harbor, was an open door to all Europe. The tide-water part of the South represented typical Englishmen, modified by a warm climate and servile labor, and living in baronial fashion on great plantations; New England stood for a special English movement—Puritanism. The Middle region was less English than the other sections. It had a wide mixture of nationalities, a varied society, the mixed town and county system of local government, a varied economic life, many religious sects. In short, it was a region mediating between New England and the South, and the East and the West. It represented that composite nationality which the contemporary United States exhibits, that juxtaposition of non-English groups, occupying a valley or a little settlement, and presenting reflections of the map of Europe in their variety. It was democratic and nonsectional, if not national; "easy, tolerant, and contented;" rooted strongly in material prosperity. It was typical of the modern United States. It was least sectional, not only because it lay between North and South, but also because with no barriers to shut out its frontiers from its settled region, and with a system of connecting

waterways, the Middle region mediated between East and West as well as between North and South. Thus it became the typically American region. {…}

The spread of cotton culture into the interior of the South finally broke down the contrast between the "tide-water" region and the rest of the State, and based Southern interests on slavery. Before this process revealed its results the western portion of the South, which was akin to Pennsylvania in stock, society, and industry, showed tendencies to fall away from the faith of the fathers into internal improvement legislation and nationalism. {…}

It was this nationalizing tendency of the West that transformed the democracy of Jefferson into the national republicanism of Monroe and the democracy of Andrew Jackson. The West of the war of 1812, the West of Clay, and Benton, and Harrison, and Andrew Jackson, shut off by the Middle States and the mountains from the coast sections, had a solidarity of its own with national tendencies. [44] On the tide of the Father of Waters, North and South met and mingled into a nation. Interstate migration went steadily on—a process of cross-fertilization of ideas and institutions. The fierce struggle of the sections over slavery on the western frontier does not diminish the truth of this statement; it proves the truth of it. Slavery was a sectional trait that would not down, but in the West it could not remain sectional. It was the greatest of frontiersmen who declared: "I believe this Government can not endure permanently half slave and half free. It will become all of one thing or all of the other." Nothing works for nationalism like intercourse within the nation. Mobility of population is death to localism, and the western frontier worked irresistibly in unsettling population. The effects reached back from the frontier and affected profoundly the Atlantic coast and even the Old World.

Growth of Democracy

But the most important effect of the frontier has been in the promotion of democracy here and in Europe. As has been indicated, the frontier is productive of individualism. Complex society is precipitated by the wilderness into a kind of primitive organization based on the family. The tendency is anti-social. It produces antipathy to control, and particularly to any direct control. The tax-gatherer is viewed as a representative of

oppression. {…} The frontier individualism has from the beginning promoted democracy.

The frontier States that came into the Union in the first quarter of a century of its existence came in with democratic suffrage provisions, and had reactive effects of the highest importance upon the older States whose peoples were being attracted there. An extension of the franchise became essential. It was western New York that forced an extension of suffrage in the constitutional convention of that State in 1821; and it was western Virginia that compelled the tide-water region to put a more liberal suffrage provision in the constitution framed in 1830, and to give to the frontier region a more nearly proportionate representation with the tide-water aristocracy. The rise of democracy as an effective force in the nation came in with western preponderance under Jackson and William Henry Harrison, and it meant the triumph of the frontier—with all of its good and with all of its evil elements. [46] An interesting illustration of the tone of frontier democracy in 1830 comes from the same debates in the Virginia convention already referred to. A representative from western Virginia declared:

> But, sir, it is not the increase of population in the West which this gentleman ought to fear. It is the energy which the mountain breeze and western habits impart to those emigrants. They are regenerated, politically I mean, sir. They soon become working politicians; and the difference, sir, between a talking and a working politician is immense. The Old Dominion has long been celebrated for producing great orators; the ablest metaphysicians in policy; men that can split hairs in all abstruse questions of political economy. But at home, or when they return from Congress, they have negroes to fan them asleep. But a Pennsylvania, a New York, an Ohio, or a western Virginia statesman, though far inferior in logic, metaphysics, and rhetoric to an old Virginia statesman, has this advantage, that when he returns home he takes off his coat and takes hold of the plow. This gives him bone and muscle, sir, and preserves his republican principles pure and uncontaminated.

So long as free land exists, the opportunity for a competency exists, and economic power secures political power. But the democracy born of free land, strong in selfishness and individualism, intolerant of administrative experience and education, and pressing individual liberty beyond its proper bounds, has its dangers as well as it benefits. Individualism in America has allowed a laxity in regard to governmental affairs which has rendered possible the spoils system and all the manifest evils that follow from the

lack of a highly developed civic spirit. In this connection may be noted also the influence of frontier conditions in permitting lax business honor, inflated paper currency and wild-cat banking. The colonial and revolutionary frontier was the region whence emanated many of the worst forms of an evil currency. [47] The West in the war of 1812 repeated the phenomenon on the frontier of that day, while the speculation and wild-cat banking of the period of the crisis of 1837 occurred on the new frontier belt of the next tier of States. Thus each one of the periods of lax financial integrity coincides with periods when a new set of frontier communities had arisen, and coincides in area with these successive frontiers, for the most part. The recent Populist agitation is a case in point. Many a State that now declines any connection with the tenets of the Populists, itself adhered to such ideas in an earlier stage of the development of the State. A primitive society can hardly be expected to show the intelligent appreciation of the complexity of business interests in a developed society. The continual recurrence of these areas of paper-money agitation is another evidence that the frontier can be isolated and studied as a factor in American history of the highest importance. [48]

Attempts to Check and Regulate the Frontier

The East has always feared the result of an unregulated advance of the frontier, and has tried to check and guide it. The English authorities would have checked settlement at the headwaters of the Atlantic tributaries and allowed the "savages to enjoy their deserts in quiet lest the peltry trade should decrease." This called out Burke's splendid protest:

> If you stopped your grants, what would be the consequence? The people would occupy without grants. They have already so occupied in many places. You cannot station garrisons in every part of these deserts. If you drive the people from one place, they will carry on their annual tillage and remove with their flocks and herds to another. Many of the people in the back settlements are already little attached to particular situations. Already they have topped the Appalachian mountains. From thence they behold before them an immense plain, one vast, rich, level meadow; a square of five hundred miles. Over this they would wander without a possibility of restraint; they would change their manners with their habits of life; would soon forget a government by which they were disowned; would become hordes of English Tartars; and, pouring down upon your unfortified frontiers a fierce and irresistible cavalry, become masters of your governors and your counselers, your collectors and comptrollers, and of all the slaves that adhered to them. Such would, and in no long time must, be the effect of attempting to forbid as a crime and to suppress as an evil the command and blessing of Providence, "Increase and

multiply." Such would be the happy result of an endeavor to keep as a lair of wild beasts that earth which God, by an express charter, has given to the children of men.

But the English Government was not alone in its desire to limit the advance of the frontier and guide its destinies. Tidewater Virginia [49] and South Carolina [50] gerrymandered those colonies to insure the dominance of the coast in their legislatures. Washington desired to settle a State at a time in the Northwest; Jefferson would reserve from settlement the territory of his Louisiana purchase north of the thirty-second parallel, in order to offer it to the Indians in exchange for their settlements east of the Mississippi. "When we shall be full on this side," he writes, "we may lay off a range of States on the western bank from the head to the mouth, and so range after range, advancing compactly as we multiply." Madison went so far as to argue to the French minister that the United States had no interest in seeing population extend itself on the right bank of the Mississippi, but should rather fear it. When the Oregon question was under debate, in 1824, Smyth, of Virginia, would draw an unchangeable line for the limits of the United States at the outer limit of two tiers of States beyond the Mississippi, complaining that the seaboard States were being drained of the flower of their population by the bringing of too much land into market. Even Thomas Becton, the man of widest views of the destiny of the West, at this stage of his career declared that along the ridge of the Rocky mountains "the western limits of the Republic should be drawn, and the statue of the fabled god Terminus should be raised upon its highest peak, never to be thrown down." [51] But the attempts to limit the boundaries, to restrict land sales and settlement, and to deprive the West of its share of political power were all in vain. Steadily the frontier of settlement advanced and carried with it individualism, democracy, and nationalism, and powerfully affected the East and the Old World.

Missionary Activity

The most effective efforts of the East to regulate the frontier came through its educational and religious activity, exerted by interstate migration and by organized societies. Speaking in 1835, Dr. Lyman Beecher declared: "It is equally plain that the religious and political destiny of our nation is to be decided in the West," and he pointed out that the population of the West "is assembled from all the States of the Union and from all the

nations of Europe, and is rushing in like the waters of the flood, demanding for its moral preservation the immediate and universal action of those institutions which discipline the mind and arm the conscience, and the heart. And so various are the opinions and habits, and so recent and imperfect is the acquaintance, and so sparse are the settlements of the West, that no homogeneous public sentiment can be formed to legislate immediately into being the requisite institutions. And yet they are all needed immediately in their utmost perfection and power. A nation is being 'born in a day.' * * * But what will become of the West if her prosperity rushes up to such a majesty of power, while those great institutions linger which are necessary to form the mind and the conscience and the heart of that vast world. It must not be permitted. * * * Let no man at the East quiet himself and dream of liberty, whatever may become of the West. * * * Her destiny is our destiny." [52]

With the appeal to the conscience of New England, he adds appeals to her fears lest other religious sects anticipate her own. The New England preacher and school-teacher left their mark on the West. The dread of Western emancipation from New England's political and economic control was paralleled by her fears lest the West cut loose from her religion. Commenting in 1850 on reports that settlement was rapidly extending northward in Wisconsin, the editor of the Home Missionary writes: "We scarcely know whether to rejoice or mourn over this extension of our settlements. While we sympathize in whatever tends to increase the physical resources and prosperity of our country, we can not forget that with all these dispersions into remote and still remoter corners of the land the supply of the means of grace is becoming relatively less and less." Acting in accordance with such ideas, home missions were established and Western colleges were erected. As seaboard cities like Philadelphia, New York, and Baltimore strove for the mastery of Western trade, so the various denominations strove for the possession of the West. Thus an intellectual stream from New England sources fertilized the West. Other sections sent their missionaries; but the real struggle was between sects. The contest for power and the expansive tendency furnished to the various sects by the existence of a moving frontier must have had important results on the character of religious organization in the United States. The multiplication of rival churches in the little

frontier towns had deep and lasting social effects. The religious aspects of the frontier make a chapter in our history which needs study.

Intellectual Traits

From the conditions of frontier life came intellectual traits of profound importance. The works of travelers along each frontier from colonial days onward describe certain common traits, and these traits have, while softening down, still persisted as survivals in the place of their origin, even when a higher social organization succeeded. The result is that to the frontier the American intellect owes its striking characteristics. That coarseness and strength combined with acuteness and inquisitiveness; that practical, inventive turn of mind, quick to find expedients; that masterful grasp of material things, lacking in the artistic but powerful to effect great ends; that restless, nervous energy; [53] that dominant individualism, working for good and for evil, and withal that buoyancy and exuberance which comes with freedom—these are traits of the frontier, or traits called out elsewhere because of the existence of the frontier. Since the days when the fleet of Columbus sailed into the waters of the New World, America has been another name for opportunity, and the people of the United States have taken their tone from the incessant expansion which has not only been open but has even been forced upon them. He would be a rash prophet who should assert that the expansive character of American life has now entirely ceased. Movement has been its dominant fact, and, unless this training has no effect upon a people, the American energy will continually demand a wider field for its exercise. But never again will such gifts of free land offer themselves. For a moment, at the frontier, the bonds of custom are broken and unrestraint is triumphant. There is not tabula rasa. The stubborn American environment is there with its imperious summons to accept its conditions; the inherited ways of doing things are also there; and yet, in spite of environment, and in spite of custom, each frontier did indeed furnish a new field of opportunity, a gate of escape from the bondage of the past; and freshness, and confidence, and scorn of older society, impatience of its restraints and its ideas, and indifference to its lessons, have accompanied the frontier. What the Mediterranean Sea was to the Greeks, breaking the bond of custom, offering new experiences, calling out new institutions and activities, that, and more, the ever retreating frontier has been to the United States directly, and to the nations of Europe more

remotely. And now, four centuries from the discovery of America, at the end of a hundred years of life under the Constitution, the frontier has gone, and with its going has closed the first period of American history.

Notes {from original document, abridged here}

Since the meeting of the American Historical Association, this paper has also been given as an address to the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, December 14, 1893. I have to thank the Secretary of the Society, Mr. Reuben G. Thwaites, for securing valuable material for my use in the preparation of the paper.

1. Abridgment of Debates of Congress, v., p. 706.
2. Bancroft (1860 ed.), III, pp. 344, 345, citing Logan MSS.; [Mitchell] Contest in America, etc. (1752), p. 237.
3. Kercheval, History of the Valley; Bernheim, German Settlements in the Carolinas; Winsor, Narrative and Critical History of America, V, p. 304; Colonial Records of North Carolina, IV, p. xx; Weston, Documents Connected with the History of South Carolina, p. 82; Ellis and Evans, History of Lancaster County, Pa., chs. iii, xxvi.
4. Parkman, Pontiac, II; Griffis, Sir William Johnson, p. 6; Simms's Frontiersmen of New York.
5. Monette, Mississippi Valley, I, p. 311.
6. Wis. Hist. Cols., XI, p. 50; Hinsdale, Old Northwest, p. 121; Burke, "Oration on Conciliation," Works (1872 ed.), I, p. 473.
7. Roosevelt, Winning of the West, and citations there given; Cutler's Life of Cutler.
8. Scribner's Statistical Atlas, xxxviii, pl. 13; MacMaster, Hist. of People of U. S., I, pp. 4, 60, 61; Imlay and Filson, Western Territory of America (London, 1793); Rochefoucault-Liancourt, Travels Through the United States of North America (London, 1799); Michaux's "Journal," in Proceedings American Philosophical Society, XXVI, No. 129; Forman, Narrative of a Journey Down the Ohio and Mississippi in 1780–'90 (Cincinnati, 1888); Bartram, Travels Through North Carolina, etc. (London, 1792); Pope, Tour Through the Southern and Western Territories, etc. (Richmond, 1792); Weld, Travels Through the States of North America (London, 1799); Baily, Journal of a Tour in the Unsettled States of North America, 1796–'97 (London, 1856); Pennsylvania Magazine of History, July, 1886; Winsor, Narrative and Critical History of America, VII, pp. 491, 492, citations.
9. Scribner's Statistical Atlas, xxxix.
10. Turner, Character and Influence of the Indian Trade in Wisconsin (Johns Hopkins University Studies, Series IX), pp. 61 ff.
11. Monette, History of the Mississippi Valley, II; Flint, Travels and Residence in Mississippi; Flint, Geography and History of the Western States; Abridgment of Debates of Congress, VII, pp. 397, 398, 404; Holmes, Account of the U. S.; Kingdom, America and the British Colonies (London, 1820); Grund, Americans, II, chs. i, iii, vi (although writing, in 1836, he treats of conditions that grew out of western advance from the era of 1820 to that time); Peck, Guide for Emigrants (Boston, 1831); Darby, Emigrants' Guide to Western and Southwestern States and Territories; Dana, Geographical Sketches in the Western Country; Kinzie, Waubun; Keating, Narrative of Long's Expedition; Schoolcraft, Discovery of the Sources of the Mississippi River, Travels in the Central Portions of the Mississippi Valley, and Lead Mines of the Missouri; Andreas, History of Illinois, I, 86-99; Hurlbut, Chicago Antiquities; McKenney, Tour to the Lakes; Thomas, Travels through the Western Country, etc. (Auburn, N. Y., 1819).
12. Darby, Emigrants' Guide, pp. 272 ff.; Benton, Abridgment of Debates, VII, p, 397.
13. De Bow's Review, IV, p. 254; XVII, p. 428
14. Grund, Americans, II, p. 8.
15. Peck, New Guide to the West (Cincinnati, 1848), ch. IV; Parkman, Oregon Trail; Hall, The West (Cincinnati, 1848); Pierce, Incidents of Western Travel; Murray, Travels in North America; Lloyd, Steamboat Directory (Cincinnati, 1856); "Forty Days in a Western Hotel" (Chicago), in Putnam's Magazine, December, 1894; Mackay, The Western World, II, ch. II, III; Meeker, Life in the West; Bogen, German in America (Boston, 1851); Olmstead, Texas Journey; Greeley, Recollections of a Busy Life; Schouler, History of the United States, V, 261–267; Peyton, Over the Alleghanies and Across the Prairies (London, 1870); Loughborough, The Pacific Telegraph and Railway (St. Louis, 1849); Whitney, Project for a Railroad to the Pacific (New York, 1849); Peyton, Suggestions on Railroad Communication with the Pacific, and the Trade of China and the Indian Islands; Benton, Highway to the Pacific (a speech delivered in the U. S, Senate, December 16, 1850).

16. A writer in The Home Missionary (1850), p. 239, reporting Wisconsin conditions, exclaims: "Think of this, people of the enlightened East. What an example, to come from the very frontiers of civilization!" But one of the missionaries writes: "In a few years Wisconsin will no longer be considered as the West, or as an outpost of civilization, any more than western New York, or the Western Reserve."
17. Bancroft (H. H.), History of California, History of Oregon, and Popular Tribunals; Shinn, Mining Camps.

{…}

24. But Lewis and Clarke were the first to explore the route from the Missouri to the Columbia.
25. Narrative and Critical History of America, VIII, p.10; Sparks' Washington Works, IX, pp. 303, 327; Logan, History of Upper South Carolina, I; McDonald, Life of Kenton, p. 72; Cong. Record, XXIII, p. 57.
26. On the effect of the fur trade in opening the routes of migration, see the author's Character and Influence of the Indian Trade in Wisconsin.
27. Lodge, English Colonies, p. 152 and citations; Logan, Hist. of Upper South Carolina, I, p. 151.
28. Flint, Recollections, p. 9.
29. See Monette, Mississippi, I, p. 344.
30. Cones', Lewis and Clarke's Expedition, I, pp. 2, 253–259; Benton, in Cong. Record, XXIII, p. 57.
31. Hehn, Das Salz (Berlin, 1873).
32. Col. Records of N. C., V, p. 3.
33. Findley, History of the Insurrection in the Four Western Counties of Pennsylvania in the Year 1,794 (Philadelphia, 1796), p. 35.

{…}

35. Compare Baily, Tour in the Unsettled Parts of North America (London, 1856), pp. 217–219, where a similar analysis is made for 1796. See also Collot, Journey in North America (Paris, 1826), p. 109; Observations on the North American Land Company (London, 1796), pp. XV, 144; Logan, History of Upper South Carolina.
36. "Spottswood Papers," in Collections of Virginia Historical Society, I, II.
37. [Burke], European Settlements, etc. (1765 ed.), II, p. 200.
38. Everest, in Wisconsin Historical Collections, XII, pp. 7 ff.
39. Weston, Documents connected with History of South Carolina, p. 61.
40. See, for example, the speech of Clay, in the House of Representatives, January 30, 1824.
41. See the admirable monograph by Prof. H. B. Adams, Maryland's Influence on the Land Cessions; and also President Welling, in Papers American Historical Association, III, p. 411.

{…}

44. Compare Roosevelt, Thomas Benton, ch. i.

{…}

46. Compare Wilson, Division and Reunion, pp. 15, 24.
47. On the relation of frontier conditions to Revolutionary taxation, see Sumner, Alexander Hamilton, Ch. iii.
48. I have refrained from dwelling on the lawless characteristics of the frontier, because they are sufficiently well known. The gambler and desperado, the regulators of the Carolinas and the vigilantes of California, are types of that line of scum that the waves of advancing civilization bore before them, and of the growth of spontaneous organs of authority where legal authority was absent. Compare Barrows, United States of Yesterday and To-morrow; Shinn, Mining Camps; and Bancroft, Popular Tribunals. The humor, bravery, and rude strength, as well as the vices of the frontier in its worst aspect, have left traces on American character, language, and literature, not soon to be effaced.
49. Debates in the Constitutional Convention, 1829–1830.
50. [McCrady] Eminent and Representative Men of the Carolinas, I, p.43; Calhoun's Works, I, pp. 401–406.
51. Speech in the Senate, March 1, 1825; Register of Debates, I, 721.
52. Plea for the West (Cincinnati, 1835), pp. 11 ff.
53. Colonial travelers agree in remarking on the phlegmatic characteristics of the colonists. It has frequently been asked how such a people could have developed that strained nervous energy now characteristic of them. Compare Sumner, Alexander Hamilton, p. 98, and Adams's History of the United States, I, p. 60; IX, pp. 240, 241. The transition appears to become marked at the close of the war of 1812, a period when interest centered upon the development of the West, and the West was noted for restless energy. Grund, Americans, II., ch. i.

WOODROW WILSON

What is Progress?

CAMPAIGN SPEECH EXCERPTS

1912/December 31, 1913

BACKGROUND

As noted in previous selections, the Gilded Age produced a variety of new problems and issues that Americans were initially unprepared to solve. However, the rise of the "new" political philosophy of Progressivism promised to provide a blueprint guaranteeing not only solutions to America's current problems, but also the nation's future development. Woodrow Wilson, the governor of New Jersey—as well as the former president of Princeton University and one of the earliest Progressives—ran his 1912 American presidential campaign on a promise to reform America's ideals and structures to meet the challenges of the ever-changing political landscape. Such rhetoric is typified by this campaign speech of Wilson's, published after he had won the presidency.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. With what parable does Wilson begin his speech?
2. What does it mean to be Progressive?
3. What is "progress," according to Wilson?
4. Does he consider change to always be good?
5. What does Wilson say about the American Founding?
6. How does he think modern Americans should understand the Constitution?

Woodrow Wilson. "What Is Progress?" Speech excerpts, December 31, 1913. From Teaching American History. https://teachingamericanhistory.org/document/what-is-progress-3/.

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

In that sage and veracious chronicle, Alice through the Looking-Glass, it is recounted how, on a noteworthy occasion, the little heroine is seized by the Red Chess Queen, who races her off at a terrific pace. They run until both of them are out of breath; then they stop, and Alice looks around her and says, "Why, we are just where we were when we started!" "Oh, yes," says the Red Queen; "you have to run twice as fast as that to get anywhere else."

That is a parable of progress. The laws of this country have not kept up with the change of economic circumstances in this country; they have not kept up with the change of political circumstances; and therefore we are not even where we were when we started. We shall have to run, not until we are out of breath, but until we have caught up with our own conditions, before we shall be where we were when we started; when we started this great experiment which has been the hope and the beacon of the world. And we should have to run twice as fast as any rational program I have seen in order to get anywhere else.

I am, therefore, forced to be a progressive, if for no other reason, because we have not kept up with our changes of conditions, either in the economic field or in the political field. We have not kept up as well as other nations have. We have not kept our practices adjusted to the facts of the case, and until we do, and unless we do, the facts of the case will always have the better of the argument; because if you do not adjust your laws to the facts, so much the worse for the laws, not for the facts, because law trails along after the facts. Only that law is unsafe which runs ahead of the facts and beckons to it and makes it follow the will-o'-the-wisps of imaginative projects. …

Politics in America is in a case which sadly requires attention. The system set up by our law and our usage doesn't work—or at least it can't be depended on; it is made to work only by a most unreasonable expenditure of labor and pains. The government, which was designed for the people, has got into the hands of bosses and their employers, the special interests. An invisible empire has been set up above the forms of democracy. …

ANNOTATIONS **NOTES & QUESTIONS**

Now, movement has no virtue in itself. Change is not worth while for its own sake. I am not one of those who love variety for its own sake. If a thing is good today, I should like to have it stay that way tomorrow. Most of our calculations in life are dependent upon things staying the way they are. For example, if, when you got up this morning, you had forgotten how to dress, if you had forgotten all about those ordinary things which you do almost automatically, which you can almost do half awake, you would have to find out what you did yesterday. I am told by the psychologists that if I did not remember who I was yesterday, I should not know who I am today, and that, therefore, my very identity depends upon my being able to tally today with yesterday. If they do not tally, then I am confused; I do not know who I am, and I have to go around and ask somebody to tell me my name and where I came from.

I am not one of those who wish to break connection with the past; I am not one of those who wish to change for the mere sake of variety. The only men who do that are the men who want to forget something, the men who filled yesterday with something they would rather not recollect today, and so go about seeking diversion, seeking abstraction in something that will blot out recollection, or seeking to put something into them which will blot out all recollection. Change is not worth while unless it is improvement. If I move out of my present house because I do not like it, then I have got to choose a better house, or build a better house, to justify the change. …

Progress! Did you ever reflect that that word is almost a new one? No word comes more often or more naturally to the lips of modern man, as if the thing it stands for were almost synonymous with life itself, and yet men through many thousand years never talked or thought of progress. They thought in the other direction. Their stories of heroisms and glory were tales of the past. The ancestor wore the heavier armor and carried the larger spear. "There were giants in those days." Now all that has altered. We think of the future, not the past, as the more glorious time in comparison with which the present is nothing. Progress, development—those are modern words. The modern idea is to leave the past and press onward to something new.

ANNOTATIONS **NOTES & QUESTIONS**

But what is progress going to do with the past, and with the present? How is it going to treat them? With ignominy, or respect? Should it break with them altogether, or rise out of them, with its roots still deep in the older time? What attitude shall progressives take toward the existing order, toward those institutions of conservatism, the Constitution, the laws, and the courts?

Are those thoughtful men who fear that we are now about to disturb the ancient foundations of our institutions justified in their fear? If they are, we ought to go very slowly about the processes of change. If it is indeed true that we have grown tired of the institutions which we have so carefully and sedulously built up, then we ought to go very slowly and very carefully about the very dangerous task of altering them. We ought, therefore, to ask ourselves, first of all, whether thought in this country is tending to do anything by which we shall retrace our steps, or by which we shall change the whole direction of our development?

I believe, for one, that you cannot tear up ancient rootages and safely plant the tree of liberty in soil which is not native to it. I believe that the ancient traditions of a people are its ballast; you cannot make a *tabula rasa* upon which to write a political program. You cannot take a new sheet of paper and determine what your life shall be tomorrow. You must knit the new into the old. You cannot put a new patch on an old garment without ruining it; it must be not a patch, but something woven into the old fabric, of practically the same pattern, of the same texture and intention. If I did not believe that to be progressive was to preserve the essentials of our institutions, I for one could not be a progressive.

One of the chief benefits I used to derive from being president of a university was that I had the pleasure of entertaining thoughtful men from all over the world. I cannot tell you how much has dropped into my granary by their presence. I had been casting around in my mind for something by which to draw several parts of my political thought together when it was my good fortune to entertain a very interesting Scotsman who had been devoting himself to the philosophical thought of the seventeenth century. His talk was so engaging that it was delightful to hear him speak of anything,

ANNOTATIONS

NOTES & QUESTIONS

and presently there came out of the unexpected region of his thought the thing I had been waiting for. He called my attention to the fact that in every generation all sorts of speculation and thinking tend to fall under the formula of the dominant thought of the age. For example, after the Newtonian theory of the universe had been developed, almost all thinking tended to express itself in the analogies of the Newtonian theory, and since the Darwinian theory has reigned amongst us, everybody is likely to express whatever he wishes to expound in terms of development and accommodation to environment.

Now, it came to me, as this interesting man talked, that the Constitution of the United States had been made under the dominion of the Newtonian theory. You have only to read the papers of *The Federalist* to see that fact written on every page. They speak of the "checks and balances" of the Constitution, and use to express their idea the simile of the organization of the universe, and particularly of the solar system—how by the attraction of gravitation the various parts are held in their orbits; and then they proceed to represent Congress, the judiciary, and the president as a sort of imitation of the solar system.

They were only following the English Whigs, who gave Great Britain its modern constitution. Not that those Englishmen analyzed the matter, or had any theory about it; Englishmen care little for theories. It was a Frenchman, Montesquieu, who pointed out to them how faithfully they had copied Newton's description of the mechanism of the heavens.

The makers of our federal Constitution read Montesquieu with true scientific enthusiasm. They were scientists in their way—the best way of their age—those fathers of the nation. Jefferson wrote of "the laws of Nature"—and then by way of afterthought—"and of Nature's God." And they constructed a government as they would have constructed an orrery—to display the laws of nature. Politics in their thought was a variety of mechanics. The Constitution was founded on the law of gravitation. The government was to exist and move by virtue of the efficacy of "checks and balances."

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

The trouble with the theory is that government is not a machine but a living thing. It falls not under the theory of the universe, but under the theory of organic life. It is accountable to Darwin, not to Newton. It is modified by its environment, necessitated by its tasks, shaped to its functions by the sheer pressure of life. No living thing can have its organs offset against each other, as checks, and live. On the contrary, its life is dependent upon their quick cooperation, their ready response to the commands of instinct or intelligence, their amicable community of purpose. Government is not a body of blind forces; it is a body of men, with highly differentiated functions, no doubt, in our modern day, of specialization, with a common task and purpose. Their cooperation is indispensable, their warfare fatal. There can be no successful government without the intimate, instinctive coordination of the organs of life and action. This is not theory, but fact, and displays its force as fact, whatever theories may be thrown across its track. Living political constitutions must be Darwinian in structure and in practice. Society is a living organism and must obey the laws of life, not of mechanics; it must develop.

All that progressives ask or desire is permission—in an era when "development," "evolution," is the scientific word—to interpret the Constitution according to the Darwinian principle; all they ask is recognition of the fact that a nation is a living thing and not a machine.

Some citizens of this country have never got beyond the Declaration of Independence, signed in Philadelphia, July 4th, 1776. Their bosoms swell against George III, but they have no consciousness of the war for freedom that is going on today.

The Declaration of Independence did not mention the questions of our day. It is of no consequence to us unless we can translate its general terms into examples of the present day and substitute them in some vital way for the examples it itself gives, so concrete, so intimately involved in the circumstances of the day in which it was conceived and written. It is an eminently practical document, meant for the use of practical men; not a thesis for philosophers, but a whip for tyrants; not a theory of government, but a

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

program of action. Unless we can translate it into the questions of our own day, we are not worthy of it, we are not the sons of the sires who acted in response to its challenge.

What form does the contest between tyranny and freedom take today? What is the special form of tyranny we now fight? How does it endanger the rights of the people, and what do we mean to do in order to make our contest against it effectual? What are to be the items of our new declaration of independence?

By tyranny, as we now fight it, we mean control of the law, of legislation and adjudication, by organizations which do not represent the people, by means which are private and selfish. We mean, specifically, the conduct of our affairs and the shaping of our legislation in the interest of special bodies of capital and those who organize their use. We mean the alliance, for this purpose, of political machines with selfish business. We mean the exploitation of the people by legal and political means. We have seen many of our governments under these influences cease to be representative governments, cease to be governments representative of the people, and become governments representative of special interests, controlled by machines, which in their turn are not controlled by the people. …

Well, we have started now at all events. The procession is under way. The stand-patter doesn't know there is a procession. He is asleep in the back part of his house. He doesn't know that the road is resounding with the tramp of men going to the front. And when he wakes up, the country will be empty. He will be deserted, and he will wonder what has happened. Nothing has happened. The world has been going on. The world has a habit of going on. The world has a habit of leaving those behind who won't go with it. The world has always neglected stand-patters. And, therefore, the stand-patter does not excite my indignation; he excites my sympathy. He is going to be so lonely before it is all over. And we are good fellows, we are good company; why doesn't he come along? We are not going to do him any harm. We are going to show him a good time. We are going to climb the slow road until it reaches some upland where the air is fresher, where the whole talk of mere politicians is stilled, where men can look in each other's faces and see that there is nothing to conceal, that all they have to talk about

ANNOTATIONS

NOTES & QUESTIONS

they are willing to talk about in the open and talk about with each other; and whence, looking back over the road, we shall see at last that we have fulfilled our promise to mankind. We had said to all the world, "America was created to break every kind of monopoly, and to set men free, upon a footing of equality, upon a footing of opportunity, to match their brains and their energies." And now we have proved that we meant it.

OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES JR.

Natural Law

JOURNAL ARTICLE

Harvard Law Review | November 1918

BACKGROUND

One of the most well-known Supreme Court justices, Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr., served on the Court from 1902 to 1932, and wrote opinions for many famous cases during that time. As a lawyer and judge, one of his philosophical positions was arguing against natural law—the bedrock of Western civilization's thinking since its very inception. This article by Holmes summarizes well his position on the issue.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What does Holmes say his view of truth used to be?
2. What is his opinion of absolute truth?
3. How does Holmes tie truth to civilization generally?
4. How does he view teleology?
5. Does Holmes think man is capable of truly understanding the universe in a philosophical sense?

Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr. "Natural Law." Journal article, *Harvard Law Review* 32, no. 1 (November 1918). From Teaching American History. https://teachingamericanhistory.org/document/natural-law/. See also: https://www.jstor.org/stable/1327676.

ANNOTATIONS **NOTES & QUESTIONS**

It is not enough for the knight of romance that you agree that his lady is a very nice girl—if you do not admit that she is the best that God ever made or will make, you must fight. There is in all men a demand for the superlative, so much so that the poor devil who has no other way of reaching it attains it by getting drunk. It seems to me that this demand is at the bottom of the philosopher's effort to prove that truth is absolute and of the jurist's search for criteria of universal validity which he collects under the head of natural law.

I used to say when I was young, that truth was the majority vote of that nation that could lick all others. Certainly we may expect that the received opinion about the present war will depend a good deal upon which side wins (I hope with all my soul it will be mine), and I think that the statement was correct insofar as it implied that our test of truth is a reference to either a present or an imagined future majority in favor of our view. If … the truth may be defined as the system of my (intellectual) limitations, what gives it objectivity is the fact that I find my fellow man to a greater or less extent (never wholly) subject to the same *Can't Helps*. If I think that I am sitting at a table I find that the other persons present agree with me; so if I say that the sum of the angles of a triangle is equal to two right angles. If I am in a minority of one they send for a doctor or lock me up; and I am so far able to transcend the to me convincing testimony of my sense or my reason as to recognize that if I am alone probably something is wrong with my works.

Certitude is not the test of certainty. We have been cocksure of many things that were not so. If I may quote myself again, property, friendship, and truth have a common root in time. One cannot be wrenched from the rocky crevices into which one has grown for many years without feeling that one is attacked in one's life. What we most love and revere generally is determined by early associations. I love granite rocks and barberry bushes, no doubt because with them were my earliest joys that reach back through the past eternity of my life. But while one's experience thus makes certain preferences dogmatic for oneself, recognition of how they came to be so leaves one able to see that others, poor souls, may be equally dogmatic about something else. And this again means skepticism. Not that one's belief or love does not remain. Not that we

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

would not fight and die for it if important—we all, whether we know it or not, are fighting to make the kind of a world that we should like—but that we have learned to recognize that others will fight and die to make a different world, with equal sincerity or belief. Deep-seated preferences cannot be argued about—you cannot argue a man into liking a glass of beer—and therefore, when differences are sufficiently far reaching, we try to kill the other man rather than let him have his way. But that is perfectly consistent with admitting that, so far as appears, his grounds are just as good as ours.

The jurists who believe in natural law seem to me to be in that naïve state of mind that accepts what has been familiar and accepted by all men everywhere. No doubt it is true that, so far as we can see ahead, some arrangements and the rudiments of familiar institutions seem to be necessary elements in any society that may spring from our own and that would seem to us to be civilized—some form of permanent association between the sexes—some residue of property individually owned—some mode of binding oneself to specified future conduct—at the bottom of all, some protection for the person. But without speculating whether a group is imaginable in which all but the last of these might disappear and the last be subject to qualifications that most of us would abhor, the question remains as to the *Ought* of natural law.

It is true that beliefs and wishes have a transcendental basis in the sense that their foundation is arbitrary. You cannot help entertaining and feeling them, and there is an end of it. As an arbitrary fact people wish to live, and we say with various degrees of certainty that they can do so only on certain conditions. To do it they must eat and drink. That necessity is absolute. It is a necessity of less degree but practically general that they should live in society. If they live in society, so far as we can see, there are further conditions. Reason working on experience does tell us, no doubt, that if our wish to live continues, we can do it only on those terms. But that seems to me the whole of the matter. I see no *a priori* duty to live with others and in that way, but simply a statement of what I must do if I wish to remain alive. If I do live with others they tell me that I must do and abstain from doing various things or they will put the screws on to me. I believe that they will, and being of the same mind as to their conduct I not only accept the rules but come in time to accept them with sympathy and emotional

affirmation and begin to talk about duties and rights. But for legal purposes a right is only the hypostasis of a prophecy—the imagination of a substance supporting the fact that the public force will be brought to bear upon those who do things said to contravene it—just as we talk of the force of gravitation accounting for the conduct of bodies in space. One phrase adds no more than the other to what we know without it. No doubt behind these legal rights is the fighting will of the subject to maintain them, and the spread of his emotions to the general rules by which they are maintained; but that does not seem to me the same thing as the supposed *a priori* discernment of a duty or the assertion of a preexisting right. A dog will fight for his bone.

The most fundamental of the supposed preexisting rights—the right to life—is sacrificed without a scruple not only in war, but whenever the interest of society, that is, of the predominant power in the community, is thought to demand it. Whether that interest is the interest of mankind in the long run no one can tell, and as, in any event, to those who do not think with Kant and Hegel it is only an interest, the sanctity disappears. I remember a very tender-hearted judge being of opinion that closing a hatch to stop a fire and the destruction of a cargo was justified even if it was known that doing so would stifle a man below. It is idle to illustrate further, because to those who agree with me I am uttering commonplaces and to those who disagree I am ignoring the necessary foundations of thought. The *a priori* men generally call the dissentients superficial. But I do agree with them in believing that one's attitude on these matters is closely connected with one's general attitude toward the universe. Proximately, as has been suggested, it is determined largely by early associations and temperament, coupled with the desire to have an absolute guide. Men to a great extent believe what they want to—although I see in that no basis for a philosophy that tells us what we should want to want.

Now when we come to our attitude toward the universe I do not see any rational ground for demanding the superlative—for being dissatisfied unless we are assured that our truth is cosmic truth, if there is such a thing—that the ultimates of a little creature on this little earth are the last word of the unimaginable whole. If a man sees no reason for believing that significance, consciousness and ideals are more than marks of the

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

finite, that does not justify what has been familiar in French skeptics; getting upon a pedestal and professing to look with haughty scorn upon a world in ruins. The real conclusion is that the part cannot swallow the whole—that our categories are not, or may not be, adequate to formulate what we cannot know. If we believe that we come out of the universe, not it out of us, we must admit that we do not know what we are talking about when we speak of brute matter. We do know that a certain complex of energies can wag its tail and another can make syllogisms. These are among the powers of the unknown, and if, as may be, it has still greater powers that we cannot understand, as Fabre in his studies of instinct would have us believe, studies that gave Bergson one of the strongest strands for his philosophy and enabled Maeterlinck to make us fancy for a moment that we heard a clang from behind phenomena—if this be true, why should we not be content? Why should we employ the energy that is furnished to us by the cosmos to defy it and shake our fist at the sky? It seems to me silly.

That the universe has in it more than we understand, that the private soldiers have not been told the plan of campaign, or even that there is one, rather than some vaster unthinkable to which every predicate is an impertinence, has no bearing upon our conduct. We still shall fight—all of us because we want to live, some, at least, because we want to realize our spontaneity and prove our powers, for the joy of it, and we may leave to the unknown the supposed final valuation of that which in any event has value to us. It is enough for us that the universe has produced us and has within it, as less than it, all that we believe and love. If we think of our existence not as that of a little god outside, but as that of a ganglion within, we have the infinite behind us. It gives us our only but our adequate significance. A grain of sand has the same, but what competent person supposes that he understands a grain of sand? That is as much beyond our grasp as man. If our imagination is strong enough to accept the vision of ourselves as parts inseverable from the rest, and to extend our final interest beyond the boundary of our skins, it justifies the sacrifice even of our lives for ends outside of ourselves. The motive, to be sure, is the common wants and ideals that we find in man. Philosophy does not furnish motives, but it shows men that they are not fools for doing what they already want to do. It opens to the forlorn hopes on which we throw

ANNOTATIONS **NOTES & QUESTIONS**

ourselves away, the vista of the farthest stretch of human thought, the chords of a harmony that breathes from the unknown.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT

The Presidency; Making an Old Party Progressive

BOOK CHAPTER

1913

BACKGROUND

Following the assassination of President William McKinley in September 1901, his vice president Theodore Roosevelt assumed office. A relatively young and energetic president, Roosevelt enacted many reforms and Progressive-leaning policies during his administration, including food safety protections, natural conservation laws, and legislation aimed at "trust busting." After failing to secure the presidency for a third term as the Republican (and then Progressive Party) nominee in 1912, Roosevelt published his autobiography the following year. The chapter excerpted below (Chapter 10) details the aftermath of his first accession to the presidency.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What does Roosevelt generally do upon succeeding McKinley?
2. What does he see as the good and bad aspects of the Republican Party of his day?
3. Who are examples Roosevelt cites as excellent politicians of his time?
4. What does he imply is a major reason for his presidency's success?
5. How does Roosevelt understand executive power?
6. What two broad schools of American political thought does he discuss?

Theodore Roosevelt. "The Presidency; Making an Old Party Progressive." Book chapter, Ch. 10 of *Theodore Roosevelt: An Autobiography*, 1913. From Teaching American History. https://teachingamericanhistory.org/document/the-presidency-making-an-old-party-progressive/.

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

On September 6, 1901, President McKinley was shot by an Anarchist in the city of Buffalo. I went to Buffalo at once. The President's condition seemed to be improving, and after a day or two we were told that he was practically out of danger. I then joined my family, who were in the Adirondacks, near the foot of Mount Tahawus. A day or two afterwards we took a long tramp through the forest, and in the afternoon I climbed Mount Tahawus. After reaching the top I had descended a few hundred feet to a shelf of land where there was a little lake, when I saw a guide coming out of the woods on our trail from below. I felt at once that he had bad news, and, sure enough, he handed me a telegram saying that the President's condition was much worse and that I must come to Buffalo immediately. It was late in the afternoon, and darkness had fallen by the time I reached the clubhouse where we were staying. It was some time afterwards before I could get a wagon to drive me out to the nearest railway station, North Creek, some forty or fifty miles distant.

The roads were the ordinary wilderness roads and the night was dark. But we changed horses two or three times – when I say "we" I mean the driver and I, as there was no one else with us – and reached the station just at dawn, to learn from Mr. Loeb, who had a special train waiting, that the President was dead. That evening I took the oath of office, in the house of Ansley Wilcox, at Buffalo.

On three previous occasions the Vice-President had succeeded to the Presidency on the death of the President. In each case there had been a reversal of party policy, and a nearly immediate and nearly complete change in the personnel of the higher offices, especially the Cabinet. I had never felt that this was wise from any standpoint. If a man is fit to be President, he will speedily so impress himself in the office that the policies pursued will be his anyhow, and he will not have to bother as to whether he is changing them or not; while as regards the offices under him, the important thing for him is that his subordinates shall make a success in handling their several departments. The subordinate is sure to desire to make a success of his department for his own sake, and if he is a fit man, whose views on public policy are sound, and whose abilities entitle him to his position, he will do excellently under almost any chief with the same purposes.

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

I at once announced that I would continue unchanged McKinley's policies for the honor and prosperity of the country, and I asked all the members of the Cabinet to stay. There were no changes made among them save as changes were made among their successors whom I myself appointed. I continued Mr. McKinley's policies, changing and developing them and adding new policies only as the questions before the public changed and as the needs of the public developed. Some of my friends shook their heads over this, telling me that the men I retained would not be "loyal to me," and that I would seem as if I were "a pale copy of McKinley." I told them that I was not nervous on this score, and that if the men I retained were loyal to their work they would be giving me the loyalty for which I most cared; and that if they were not, I would change them anyhow; and that as for being "a pale copy of McKinley," I was not primarily concerned with either following or not following in his footsteps, but in facing the new problems that arose; and that if I were competent I would find ample opportunity to show my competence by my deeds without worrying myself as to how to convince people of the fact.

For the reasons I have already given in my chapter on the Governorship of New York, the Republican party, which in the days of Abraham Lincoln was founded as the radical progressive party of the Nation, had been obliged during the last decade of the nineteenth century to uphold the interests of popular government against a foolish and illjudged mock-radicalism. It remained the Nationalist as against the particularist or State's rights party, and in so far it remained absolutely sound; for little permanent good can be done by any party which worships the State's rights fetish or which fails to regard the State, like the county or the municipality, as merely a convenient unit for local self-government, while in all National matters, of importance to the whole people, the Nation is to be supreme over State, county, and town alike. But the State's rights fetish, although still effectively used at certain times by both courts and Congress to block needed National legislation directed against the huge corporations or in the interests of workingmen, was not a prime issue at the time of which I speak. In 1896, 1898, and 1900 the campaigns were waged on two great moral issues: (1) the imperative need of a sound and honest currency; (2) the need, after 1898, of meeting in manful and straightforward fashion the extraterritorial problems arising from the Spanish War. On these great moral issues the Republican party was right, and the men who were opposed to it, and who claimed to be

the radicals, and their allies among the sentimentalists, were utterly and hopelessly wrong. This had, regrettably but perhaps inevitably, tended to throw the party into the hands not merely of the conservatives but of the reactionaries; of men who, sometimes for personal and improper reasons, but more often with entire sincerity and uprightness of purpose, distrusted anything that was progressive and dreaded radicalism. These men still from force of habit applauded what Lincoln had done in the way of radical dealing with the abuses of his day; but they did not apply the spirit in which Lincoln worked to the abuses of their own day. Both houses of Congress were controlled by these men. Their leaders in the Senate were Messrs. Aldrich and Hale. The Speaker of the House when I became President was Mr. Henderson, but in a little over a year he was succeeded by Mr. Cannon, who, although widely differing from Senator Aldrich in matters of detail, represented the same type of public sentiment. There were many points on which I agreed with Mr. Cannon and Mr. Aldrich, and some points on which I agreed with Mr. Hale. I made a resolute effort to get on with all three and with their followers, and I have no question that they made an equally resolute effort to get on with me. We succeeded in working together, although with increasing friction, for some years, I pushing forward and they hanging back. Gradually, however, I was forced to abandon the effort to persuade them to come my way, and then I achieved results only by appealing over the heads of the Senate and House leaders to the people, who were the masters of both of us. I continued in this way to get results until almost the close of my term; and the Republican party became once more the progressive and indeed the fairly radical progressive party of the Nation. When my successor was chosen, however, the leaders of the House and Senate, or most of them, felt that it was safe to come to a break with me, and the last or short session of Congress, held between the election of my successor and his inauguration four months later, saw a series of contests between the majorities in the two houses of Congress and the President,-myself,- quite as bitter as if they and I had belonged to opposite political parties. However, I held my own. I was not able to push through the legislation I desired during these four months, but I was able to prevent them doing anything I did not desire, or undoing anything that I had already succeeded in getting done.

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

There were, of course, many Senators and members of the lower house with whom up to the very last I continued to work in hearty accord, and with a growing understanding. I have not the space to enumerate, as I would like to, these men. For many years Senator Lodge had been my close personal and political friend, with whom I discussed all public questions, that arose, usually with agreement; and our intimately close relations were of course unchanged by my entry into the White House. He was of all our public men the man who had made the closest and wisest study of our foreign relations, and more clearly than almost any other man he understood the vital fact that the efficiency of our navy conditioned our national efficiency in foreign affairs. Anything relating to our international relations, from Panama and the navy to the Alaskan boundary question, the Algeciras negotiations, or the peace of Portsmouth, I was certain to discuss with Senator Lodge and also with certain other members of Congress, such as Senator Turner of Washington and Representative Hitt of Illinois. Anything relating to labor legislation and to measures for controlling big business or efficiently regulating the giant railway systems, I was certain to discuss with Senator Dolliver or Congressman Hepburn or Congressman Cooper. With men like Senator Beveridge, Congressman (afterwards Senator) Dixon, and Congressman Murdock, I was apt to discuss pretty nearly everything relating to either our internal or our external affairs[.] There were many, many others. The present President of the Senate, Senator Clark, of Arkansas, was as fearless and high-minded a representative of the people of the United States as I ever dealt with. He was one of the men who combined loyalty to his own State with an equally keen loyalty to the people of all the United States. He was politically opposed to me; but when the interests of the country were at stake, he was incapable of considering party differences; and this was especially his attitude in international matters – including certain treaties which most of his party colleagues, with narrow lack of patriotism, and complete subordination of National to factional interest, opposed. I have never anywhere met finer, more faithful, more disinterested, and more loyal public servants than Senator O. H. Platt, a Republican, from Connecticut, and Senator Cockrell, a Democrat, from Missouri. They were already old men when I came to the Presidency; and doubtless there were points on which I seemed to them to be extreme and radical; but eventually they found that our motives and beliefs were the same, and they did all in their power to help any movement that was for the interest of our people as a whole. I had met them when I was Civil Service

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

Commissioner and Assistant Secretary of the Navy. All I ever had to do with either was to convince him that a given measure I championed was right, and he then at once did all he could to have it put into effect. If I could not convince them, why! that was my fault, or my misfortune; but if I could convince them, I never had to think again as to whether they would or would not support me. There were many other men of mark in both houses with whom I could work on some points, whereas on others we had to differ. There was one powerful leader – a burly, forceful man, of admirable traits – who had, however, been trained in the post-bellum school of business and politics, so that his attitude towards life, quite unconsciously, reminded me a little of Artemus Ward's view of the Tower of London – "If I like it, I'll buy it." There was a big governmental job in which this leader was much interested, and in reference to which he always wished me to consult a man whom he trusted, whom I will call Pitt Rodney. One day I answered him, "The trouble with Rodney is that he misestimates his relations to cosmos"; to which he responded, "Cosmos – Cosmos? Never heard of him. You stick to Rodney. He's your man!" Outside of the public servants there were multitudes of men, in newspaper offices, in magazine offices, in business or the professions or on farms or in shops, who actively supported the policies for which I stood and did work of genuine leadership which was quite as effective as any work done by men in public office. Without the active support of these men I would have been powerless. In particular, the leading newspaper correspondents at Washington were as a whole a singularly able, trustworthy, and public-spirited body of men, and the most useful of all agents in the fight for efficient and decent government.

As for the men under me in executive office, I could not overstate the debt of gratitude I owe them. From the heads of the departments, the Cabinet officers, down, the most striking feature of the Administration was the devoted, zealous, and efficient work that was done as soon as it became understood that the one bond of interest among all of us was the desire to make the Government the most effective instrument in advancing the interests of the people as a whole, the interests of the average men and women of the United States and of their children. I do not think I overstate the case when I say that most of the men who did the best work under me felt that ours was a partnership, that we all stood on the same level of purpose and service, and that it mattered not what

position anyone of us held so long as in that position he gave the very best that was in him. We worked very hard; but I made a point of getting a couple of hours off each day for equally vigorous play. The men with whom I then played, whom we laughingly grew to call the "Tennis Cabinet," have been mentioned in a previous chapter of this book in connection with the gift they gave me at the last breakfast which they took at the White House. There were many others in the public service under me with whom I happened not to play, but who did their share of our common work just as effectively as it was done by us who did play. Of course nothing could have been done in my Administration if it had not been for the zeal, intelligence, masterful ability, and downright hard labor of these men in countless positions under me. I was helpless to do anything except as my thoughts and orders were translated into action by them; and, moreover, each of them, as he grew specially fit for his job, used to suggest to me the right thought to have, and the right order to give, concerning that job. It is of course hard for me to speak with cold and dispassionate partiality of these men, who were as close to me as were the men of my regiment. But the outside observers best fitted to pass judgment about them felt as I did. At the end of my Administration Mr. Bryce, the British Ambassador, told me that in a long life, during which he had studied intimately the government of many different countries, he had never in any country seen a more eager, high-minded, and efficient set of public servants, men more useful and more creditable to their country, than the men then doing the work of the American Government in Washington and in the field. I repeat this statement with the permission of Mr. Bryce.

At about the same time, or a little before, in the spring of 1908, there appeared in the English Fortnightly Review an article, evidently by a competent eye witness, setting forth more in detail the same views to which the British Ambassador thus privately gave expression. It was in part as follows:

"Mr. Roosevelt has gathered around him a body of public servants who are nowhere surpassed, I question whether they are anywhere equaled, for efficiency, self-sacrifice, and an absolute devotion to their country's interests. Many of them are poor men, without private means, who have voluntarily abandoned high professional ambitions and turned their backs on the rewards of business to serve their country on salaries that are not merely inadequate, but indecently so. There is not one of them who is not constantly assailed by offers of positions in the world of commerce, finance, and the law that would

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

satisfy every material ambition with which he began life. There is not one of them who could not, if he chose, earn outside Washington from ten to twenty times the income on which he economizes as a State official. But these men are as indifferent to money and to the power that money brings as to the allurements of Newport and New York, or to merely personal distinctions, or to the commercialized ideals which the great bulk of their fellow-countrymen accept without question. They are content, and more than content, to sink themselves in the National service without a thought of private advancement, and often at a heavy sacrifice of worldly honors, and to toil on … sustained by their own native impulse to make of patriotism an efficient instrument of public betterment."

The American public rarely appreciate the high quality of the work done by some of our diplomats – work, usually entirely unnoticed and unrewarded, which redounds to the interest and the honor of all of us. The most useful man in the entire diplomatic service, during my presidency, and for many years before, was Henry White; and I say this having in mind the high quality of work done by such admirable ambassadors and ministers as Bacon, Meyer, Straus, O'Brien, Rockhill, and Egan, to name only a few among many. When I left the presidency White was Ambassador to France; shortly afterwards he was removed by Mr. Taft, for reasons unconnected with the good of the service.

The most important factor in getting the right spirit in my Administration, next to the insistence upon courage, honesty, and a genuine democracy of desire to serve the plain people, was my insistence upon the theory that the executive power was limited only by specific restrictions and prohibitions appearing in the Constitution or imposed by the Congress under its Constitutional powers. My view was that every executive officer, and above all every executive officer in high position, was a steward of the people bound actively and affirmatively to do all he could for the people, and not to content himself with the negative merit of keeping his talents undamaged in a napkin. I declined to adopt the view that what was imperatively necessary for the Nation could not be done by the President unless he could find some specific authorization to do it. My belief was that it was not only his right but his duty to do anything that the needs of the Nation demanded unless such action was forbidden by the Constitution or by the laws. Under this interpretation of executive power I did and caused to be done many things not previously done by the President and the heads of the departments. I did not usurp power, but I did greatly broaden the use of executive power. In other words, I acted for the public welfare,

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

I acted for the common well-being of all our people, whenever and in whatever manner was necessary, unless prevented by direct constitutional or legislative prohibition. I did not care a rap for the mere form and show of power; I cared immensely for the use that could be made of the substance. The Senate at one time objected to my communicating with them in printing, preferring the expensive, foolish, and laborious practice of writing out the messages by hand. It was not possible to return to the outworn archaism of hand writing; but we endeavored to have the printing made as pretty as possible. Whether I communicated with the Congress in writing or by word of mouth, and whether the writing was by a machine, or a pen, were equally, and absolutely, unimportant matters. The importance lay in what I said and in the heed paid to what I said. So as to my meeting and consulting Senators, Congressmen, politicians, financiers, and labor men. I consulted all who wished to see me; and if I wished to see anyone, I sent for him; and where the consultation took place was a matter of supreme unimportance. I consulted every man with the sincere hope that I could profit by and follow his advice; I consulted every member of Congress who wished to be consulted, hoping to be able to come to an agreement of action with him; and I always finally acted as my conscience and common sense bade me act.

About appointments I was obliged by the Constitution to consult the Senate; and the long-established custom of the Senate meant that in practice this consultation was with individual Senators and even with big politicians who stood behind the Senators. I was only one-half the appointing power; I nominated; but the Senate confirmed. In practice, by what was called "the courtesy of the Senate," the Senate normally refused to confirm any appointment if the Senator from the State objected to it. In exceptional cases, where I could arouse public attention, I could force through the appointment in spite of the opposition of the Senators; in all ordinary cases this was impossible. On the other hand, the Senator could of course do nothing for any man unless I chose to nominate him. In consequence the Constitution itself forced the President and the Senators from each State to come to a working agreement on the appointments in and from that State.

My course was to insist on absolute fitness, including honesty, as a prerequisite to every appointment; and to remove only for good cause, and, where there was such cause, to

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

refuse even to discuss with the Senator in interest the unfit servant's retention. Subject to these considerations, I normally accepted each Senator's recommendations for offices of a routine kind, such as most post-offices and the like, but insisted on myself choosing the men for the more important positions. I was willing to take any good man for postmaster; but in the case of a Judge or District Attorney or Canal Commissioner or Ambassador, I was apt to insist either on a given man or else on any man with a given class of qualifications. If the Senator deceived me, I took care that he had no opportunity to repeat the deception.

I can perhaps best illustrate my theory of action by two specific examples. In New York Governor Odell and Senator Platt sometimes worked in agreement and sometimes were at swords' points, and both wished to be consulted. To a friendly Congressman, who was also their friend, I wrote as follows on July 22, 1903:

> "I want to work with Platt. I want to work with Odell. I want to support both and take the advice of both. But of course ultimately I must be the judge as to acting on the advice given. When, as in the case of the judgeship, I am convinced that the advice of both is wrong, I shall act as I did when I appointed Holt. When I can find a friend of Odell's like Cooley, who is thoroughly fit for the position I desire to fill, it gives me the greatest pleasure to appoint him. When Platt proposes to me a man like Hamilton Fish, it is equally a pleasure to appoint him."

This was written in connection with events which led up to my refusing to accept Senator Platt's or Governor Odell's sug[g]estions as to a Federal Judgeship and a Federal District Attorneyship, and insisting on the appointment, first of Judge Hough and later of District Attorney Stimson; because in each case I felt that the work to be done was of so high an order that I could not take an ordinary man.

The other case was that of Senator Fulton, of Oregon. Through Francis Heney I was prosecuting men who were implicated in a vast network of conspiracy against the law in connection with the theft of public land in Oregon. I had been acting on Senator Fulton's recommendations for office, in the usual manner. Heney had been insisting that Fulton was in league with the men we were prosecuting, and that he had recommended unfit men. Fulton had been protesting against my following Heney's advice, particularly as

regards appointing Judge Wolverton as United States Judge. Finally Heney laid before me a report which convinced me of the truth of his statements. I then wrote to Fulton as follows, on November 20, 1905:

"My dear Senator Fulton: I inclose you herewith a copy of the report made to me by Mr. Heney. I have seen the originals of the letters from you and Senator Mitchell quoted therein. I do not at this time desire to discuss the report itself, which of course I must submit to the Attorney-General. But I have been obliged to reach the painful conclusion that your own letters as therein quoted tend to show that you recommended for the position of District Attorney B when you had good reason to believe that he had himself been guilty of fraudulent conduct; that you recommended C for the same position simply because it was for B's interest that he should be so recommended, and, as there is reason to believe, because he had agreed to divide the fees with B if he were appointed; and that you finally recommended the reappointment of H with the knowledge that if H were appointed he would abstain from prosecuting B for criminal misconduct, this being why B advocated H's claims for reappointment. If you care to make any statement in the matter, I shall of course be glad to hear it. As the District Judge of Oregon I shall appoint Judge Wolverton."

In the letter I of course gave in full the names indicated above by initials. Senator Fulton gave no explanation. I therefore ceased to consult him about appointments under the Department of Justice and the Interior, the two departments in which the crookedness had occurred – there was no question of crookedness in the other offices in the State, and they could be handled in the ordinary manner. Legal proceedings were undertaken against his colleague in the Senate, and one of his colleagues in the lower house, and the former was convicted and sentenced to the penitentiary.

In a number of instances the legality of executive acts of my Administration was brought before the courts. They were uniformly sustained. For example, prior to 1907 statutes relating to the disposition of coal lands had been construed as fixing the flat price at $10 to $20 per acre. The result was that valuable coal lands were sold for wholly inadequate prices, chiefly to big corporations. By executive order the coal lands were withdrawn and not opened for entry until proper classification was placed thereon by Government agents. There was a great clamor that I was usurping legislative power; but the acts were not assailed in court until we brought suits to set aside entries made by persons and associations to obtain larger areas than the statutes authorized. This position was opposed on the ground that the restrictions imposed were illegal; that the executive

orders were illegal. The Supreme Court sustained the Government. In the same way our attitude in the water power question was sustained, the Supreme Court holding that the Federal Government had the rights we claimed over streams that are or may be declared navigable by Congress. Again, when Oklahoma became a State we were obliged to use the executive power to protect Indian rights and property, for there had been an enormous amount of fraud in the obtaining of Indian lands by white men. Here we were denounced as usurping power over a State as well as usurping power that did not belong to the executive. The Supreme Court sustained our action.

In connection with the Indians, by the way, it was again and again necessary to assert the position of the President as steward of the whole people. I had a capital Indian Commissioner, Francis E. Leupp. I found that I could rely on his judgment not to get me into fights that were unnecessary, and therefore I always backed him to the limit when he told me that a fight was necessary. On one occasion, for example, Congress passed a bill to sell to settlers about half a million acres of Indian land in Oklahoma at one and a half dollars an acre. I refused to sign it, and turned the matter over to Leupp. The bill was accordingly withdrawn, amended so as to safeguard the welfare of the Indians, and the minimum price raised to five dollars an acre. Then I signed the bill. We sold that land under sealed bids, and realized for the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians more than four million dollars – three millions and a quarter more than they would have obtained if I had signed the bill in its original form. In another case, where there had been a division among the Sac and Fox Indians, part of the tribe removing to Iowa, the Iowa delegation in Congress, backed by two Iowans who were members of my Cabinet, passed a bill awarding a sum of nearly a half million dollars to the Iowa seceders. They had not consulted the Indian Bureau. Leupp protested against the bill, and I vetoed it. A subsequent bill was passed on the lines laid down by the Indian Bureau, referring the whole controversy to the courts, and the Supreme Court in the end justified our position by deciding against the Iowa seceders and awarding the money to the Oklahoma stay-at-homes.

As to all action of this kind there have long been two schools of political thought, upheld with equal sincerity The division has not normally been along political, but

temperamental, lines. The course I followed, of regarding the executive as subject only to the people, and, under the Constitution, bound to serve the people affirmatively in cases where the Constitution does not explicitly forbid him to render the service, was substantially the course followed by both Andrew Jackson and Abraham Lincoln. Other honorable and well-meaning Presidents, such as James Buchanan, took the opposite and, as it seems to me, narrowly legalistic view that the President is the servant of Congress rather than of the people, and can do nothing, no matter how necessary it be to act, unless the Constitution explicitly commands the action. Most able lawyers who are past middle age take this view, and so do large numbers of well-meaning, respectable citizens. My successor in office took this, the Buchanan, view of the President's powers and duties.

For example, under my Administration we found that one of the favorite methods adopted by the men desirous of stealing the public domain was to carry the decision of the Secretary of the Interior into court. By vigorously opposing such action, and only by so doing, we were able to carry out the policy of properly protecting the public domain. My successor not only took the opposite view, but recommended to Congress the passage of a bill which would have given the courts direct appellate power over the Secretary of the Interior in these land matters. This bill was reported favorably by Mr. Mondell, Chairman of the House Committee on public lands, a Congressman who took the lead in every measure to prevent the conservation of our natural resources and the preservation of the National domain for the use of home-seekers. Fortunately, Congress declined to pass the bill. Its passage would have been a veritable calamity.

I acted on the theory that the President could at any time in his discretion withdraw from entry any of the public lands of the United States and reserve the same for forestry, for water-power sites, for irrigation, and other public purposes. Without such action it would have been impossible to stop the activity of the land thieves. No one ventured to test its legality by lawsuit. My successor, however, himself questioned it, and referred the matter to Congress. Again Congress showed its wisdom by passing a law which gave the President the power which he had long exercised, and of which my successor had shorn himself.

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

Perhaps the sharp difference between what may be called the Lincoln-Jackson and the Buchanan-Taft schools, in their views of the power and duties of the President, may be best illustrated by comparing the attitude of my successor toward his Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ballinger, when the latter was accused of gross misconduct in office, with my attitude towards my chiefs of department and other subordinate officers. More than once while I was President my officials were attacked by Congress, generally because these officials did their duty well and fearlessly. In every such case I stood by the official and refused to recognize the right of Congress to interfere with me excepting by impeachment or in other Constitutional manner. On the other hand, wherever I found the officer unfit for his position I promptly removed him, even although the most influential men in Congress fought for his retention. The Jackson-Lincoln view is that a President who is fit to do good work should be able to form his own judgment as to his own subordinates, and, above all, of the subordinates standing highest and in closest and most intimate touch with him. My secretaries and their subordinates were responsible to me, and I accepted the responsibility for all their deeds. As long as they were satisfactory to me I stood by them against every critic or assailant, within or without Congress; and as for getting Congress to make up my mind for me about them, the thought would have been inconceivable to me. My successor took the opposite, or Buchanan, view when he permitted and requested Congress to pass judgment on the charges made against Mr. Ballinger as an executive officer. These charges were made to the President; the President had the facts before him and could get at them at any time, and he alone had power to act if the charges were true. However, he permitted and requested Congress to investigate Mr. Ballinger. The party minority of the committee that investigated him, and one member of the majority, declared that the charges were well founded and that Mr. Ballinger should be removed. The other members of the majority declared the charges ill founded. The President abode by the view of the majority. Of course believers in the Jackson-Lincoln theory of the Presidency would not be content with this town meeting majority and minority method of determining by another branch of the Government what it seems the especial duty of the President himself to determine for himself in dealing with his own subordinate in his own department.

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

There are many worthy people who reprobate the Buchanan method as a matter of history, but who in actual life reprobate still more strongly the Jackson-Lincoln method when it is put into practice. These persons conscientiously believe that the President should solve every doubt in favor of inaction as against action, that he should construe strictly and narrowly the Constitutional grant of powers both to the National Government, and to the President within the National Government. In addition, however, to the men who conscientiously believe in this course from high, although as I hold misguided, motives, there are many men who affect to believe in it merely because it enables them to attack and to try to hamper, for partisan or personal reasons, an executive whom they dislike. There are other men in whom, especially when they are themselves in office, practical adherence to the Buchanan principle represents not well-thought-out devotion to an unwise course, but simple weakness of character and desire to avoid trouble and responsibility. Unfortunately, in practice it makes little difference which class of ideas actuates the President, who by his action sets a cramping precedent. Whether he is high minded and wrongheaded or merely infirm of purpose, whether he means well feebly or is bound by a mischievous misconception of the powers and duties of the National Government and of the President, the effect of his actions is the same. The President's duty is to act so that he himself and his subordinates shall be able to do efficient work for the people, and this efficient work he and they cannot do if Congress is permitted to undertake the task of making up his mind for him as to how he shall [perform] what is clearly his sole duty[.]

WOODROW WILSON

The Study of Administration

JOURNAL ARTICLE EXCERPTS

Political Science Quarterly | June 1887

BACKGROUND

Prior to seeking elected office as governor of New Jersey and then president, Woodrow Wilson had a distinguished career in academia, culminating in his presidency of Princeton University from 1902-1910. In his academic career, Wilson espoused Progressive beliefs and frequently discussed them in his works. In this especially famous article, Wilson distinguishes between "politics" and "administration," and discusses the implications for the American political system.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What does Wilson say is "the object of administrative study"?

2. How does Wilson tie the evolution of government to the development of administration?

3. How does he criticize Anglo-American political philosophy with regard to administration?

4. What is the relationship between administration and public opinion? Between administration and politics generally?

5. Does Wilson express concern over the expansion of a future American bureaucracy? Why or why not?

6. By what means does he suggest administration become successfully integrated into the American political system?

Woodrow Wilson. "The Study of Administration." Journal article excerpts, *Political Science Quarterly* 2, no. 2 (June 1887): 197-222. From *The U.S. Constitution: A Reader* (Hillsdale College) via Constituting America. https://constitutingamerica.org/the-study-of-administration-by-woodrow-wilson-reprinted-from-the-u-s-constitution-a-reader-published-by-hillsdale-college/. See also: https://www.jstor.org/stable/2139277.

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

{…} It is the object of administrative study to discover, first, what government can properly and successfully do, and, secondly, how it can do these proper things with the utmost possible efficiency and at the least possible cost either of money or of energy. On both these points there is obviously much need of light among us; and only careful study can supply that light.

Before entering on that study, however, it is needful:

1. To take some account of what others have done in the same line; that is to say, of the history of the study.
2. To ascertain just what is its subject-matter.
3. To determine just what are the best methods by which to develop it, and the most clarifying political conceptions to carry with us into it.

Unless we know and settle these things, we shall set out without chart or compass.

I

The science of administration is the latest fruit of that study of the science of politics which was begun some twenty-two hundred years ago. It is a birth of our own century, almost of our own generation.

Why was it so late in coming? Why did it wait till this too busy century of ours to demand attention for itself? Administration is the most obvious part of government; it is government in action; it is the executive, the operative, the most visible side of government, and is of course as old as government itself. It is government in action, and one might very naturally expect to find that government in action had arrested the attention and provoked the scrutiny of writers of politics very early in the history of systematic thought.

But such was not the case. No one wrote systematically of administration as a branch of the science of government until the present century had passed its first youth and had begun to put forth its characteristic flower of the systematic knowledge. Up to our own day all the political writers whom we now read had thought, argued, dogmatized only about the *constitution* of government; about the nature of the state, the essence and seat

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

of sovereignty, popular power and kingly prerogative; about the greatest meanings lying at the heart of government, and the high ends set before the purpose of government by man's nature and man's aims. The central field of controversy was that great field of theory in which monarchy rode tilt against democracy, in which oligarchy would have built for itself strongholds of privilege, and in which tyranny sought opportunity to make good its claim to receive submission from all competitors. Amidst this high warfare of principles, administration could command no pause for its own consideration. The question was always: Who shall make law, and what shall that law be? The other question, how law should be administered with enlightenment, with equity, with speed, and without friction, was put aside as "practical detail" which clerks could arrange after doctors had agreed upon principles.

That political philosophy took this direction was of course no accident, no chance preference or perverse whim of political philosophers. The philosophy of any time is, as Hegel says, "nothing but the spirit of that time expressed in abstract thought"; and political philosophy, like philosophy of every other kind, has only held up the mirror to contemporary affairs. The trouble in early times was almost altogether about the constitution of government; and consequently that was what engrossed men's thoughts. There was little or no trouble about administration,–at least little that was heeded by administrators. The functions of government were simple, because life itself was simple. Government went about imperatively and compelled men, without thought of consulting their wishes. There was no complex system of public revenues and public debts to puzzle financiers; there were, consequently, no financiers to be puzzled. No one who possessed power was long at a loss how to use it. The great and only question was: Who shall possess it? Populations were of manageable numbers; property was of simple sorts. There were plenty of farms, but no stocks and bonds: more cattle than vested interests. {…}

{…} The weightier debates of constitutional principle are even yet by no means concluded; but they are no longer of more immediate practical moment than questions of administration. It is getting to be harder to *run* a constitution than to frame one. {…}

There is scarcely a single duty of government which was once simple which is not now complex; government once had but a few masters; it now has scores of masters.

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

Majorities formerly only underwent government; they now conduct government. Where government once might follow the whims of a court, it must now follow the views of a nation.

And those views are steadily widening to new conceptions of state duty; so that, at the same time that the functions of government are every day becoming more complex and difficult, they are also vastly multiplying in number. Administration is everywhere putting its hands to new undertakings. The utility, cheapness, and success of the government's postal service, for instance, point towards the early establishment of governmental control of the telegraph system. Or, even if our government is not to follow the lead of the governments of Europe in buying or building both telegraph and railroad lines, no one can doubt that in some way it must make itself master of masterful corporations. The creation of national commissioners of railroads, in addition to the older state commissions, involves a very important and delicate extension of administrative functions. Whatever hold of authority state or federal governments are to take upon corporations, there must follow cares and responsibilities which will require not a little wisdom, knowledge, and experience. Such things must be studied in order to be well done. And these, as I have said, are only a few of the doors which are being opened to offices of government. The idea of the state and the consequent ideal of its duty are undergoing noteworthy change; and "the idea of the state is the conscience of administration." Seeing every day new things which the state ought to do, the next thing is to see clearly how it ought to do them.

This is why there should be a science of administration which shall seek to straighten the paths of government, to make its business less unbusinesslike, to strengthen and purify its organization, and to crown its duties with dutifulness. This is one reason why there is such a science.

But where has this science grown up? Surely not on this side {of} the sea. Not much impartial scientific method is to be discerned in our administrative practices. The poisonous atmosphere of city government, the crooked secrets of state administration, the confusion, sinecurism, and corruption ever and again discovered in the bureaux at

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

Washington forbid us to believe that any clear conceptions of what constitutes good administration are as yet very widely current in the United States. No; American writers have hitherto taken no very important part in the advancement of this science. It has found its doctors in Europe. It is not of our making; it is a foreign science, speaking very little of the language of English or American principle. It employs only foreign tongues; it utters none but what are to our minds alien ideas. Its aims, its examples, its conditions, are almost exclusively grounded in the histories of foreign races, in the precedents of foreign systems, in the lessons of foreign revolutions. It has been developed by French and German professors, and is consequently in all parts adapted to the needs of a compact state, and made to fit highly centralized forms of government; whereas, to answer our purposes, it must be adapted, not to a simple and compact, but to a complex and multiform state, and made to fit highly decentralized forms of government. If we would employ it, we must Americanize it, and that not formally, in language merely, but radically, in thought, principle, and aim as well. It must learn our constitutions by heart; must get the bureaucratic fever out of its veins; must inhale much free American air. {…}

{…} In speaking of European governments I do not, of course, include England. She has not refused to change with the times. She has simply tempered the severity of the transition from a polity of aristocratic privilege to a system of democratic power by slow measures of constitutional reform which, without preventing revolution, has confined it to paths of peace. But the countries of the continent for a long time desperately struggled against all change, and would have diverted revolution by softening the asperities of absolute government. They sought so to perfect their machinery as to destroy all wearing friction, so to sweeten their methods with consideration for the interests of the governed as to placate all hindering hatred, and so assiduously and opportunely to offer their aid to all classes of undertakings as to render themselves indispensable to the industrious. They did at last give the people constitutions and the franchise; but even after that they obtained leave to continue despotic by becoming paternal. They made themselves too efficient to be dispensed with, too smoothly operative to be noticed, too enlightened to be inconsiderately questioned, too benevolent to be suspected, too powerful to be coped with. All this has required study; and they have closely studied it.

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

On this side {of} the sea, we, the while, had known no great difficulties of government. With a new country, in which there was room and remunerative employment for everybody, with liberal principles of government and unlimited skill in practical politics, we were long exempted from the need of being anxiously careful about plans and methods of administration. We have naturally been slow to see the use or significance of those many volumes of learned research and painstaking examination into the ways and means of conducting government which the presses of Europe have been sending to our libraries. Like a lusty child, government with us has expanded in nature and grown great in stature, but has also become awkward in movement. The vigor and increase of its life has been altogether out of proportion to its skill in living. It has gained strength, but it has not acquired deportment. {…}

Judging by the constitutional histories of the chief nations of the modern world, there may be said to be three periods of growth through which government has passed in all the most highly developed of existing systems, and through which it promises to pass in all the rest. The first of these periods is that of absolute rulers, and of an administrative system adapted to absolute rule; the second is that in which constitutions are framed to do away with absolute rulers and substitute popular control, and in which administration is neglected for these higher concerns; and the third is that in which the sovereign people undertake to develop administration under this new constitution which has brought them into power.

Those governments are now in the lead in administrative practice which had rulers still absolute but also enlightened when those modern days of political illumination came in which it was made evident to all but the blind that governors are properly only the servants of the governed. In such governments administration has been organized to subserve the general weal with the simplicity and effectiveness vouchsafed only to the undertakings of a single will. {…}

{…} Almost the whole of the admirable system has {thus} been developed by kingly initiative. {…}

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

The recasting of French administration by Napoleon is {… another} example of the perfecting of civil machinery by the single will of an absolute ruler before the dawn of a constitutional era. No corporate, popular will could ever have effected arrangements such as those which Napoleon commanded. Arrangements so simple at the expense of local prejudice, so logical in their indifference to popular choice, might be decreed by a Constituent Assembly, but could be established only by the unlimited authority of a despot. {…}

The English race {…} has long and successfully studied the art of curbing executive power to the constant neglect of the art of perfecting executive methods. It has exercised itself much more in controlling than in energizing government. It has been more concerned to render government just and moderate than to make it facile, well-ordered, and effective. English and American political history has been a history, not of administrative development, but of legislative oversight,–not of progress in governmental organization, but of advance in law-making and political criticism.

Consequently, we have reached a time when administrative study and creation are imperatively necessary to the well-being of our governments saddled with the habits of a long period of constitution-making. That period has practically closed, so far as the establishment of essential principles is concerned, but we cannot shake off its atmosphere. We go on criticizing when we ought to be creating. We have reached the third of the periods I have mentioned,–the period, namely, when the people have to develop administration in accordance with the constitutions they won for themselves in a previous period of struggle with absolute power; but we are not prepared for the tasks of the new period.

Such an explanation seems to afford the only escape from blank astonishment at the fact that, in spite of our vast advantages in point of political liberty, and above all in point of practical political skill and sagacity, so many nations are ahead of us in administrative organization and administrative skill. Why, for instance, have we but just begun purifying a civil service which was rotten full fifty years ago? To say that slavery diverted us is but to repeat what I have said–that flaws in our constitution delayed us.

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

Of course all reasonable preference would declare for this English and American course of politics rather than for that of any European country. We should not like to have had Prussia's history for the sake of having Prussia's administrative skill; and Prussia's particular system of administration would quite suffocate us. It is better to be untrained and free than to be servile and systematic. {…}

What, then, is there to prevent?

Well, principally, popular sovereignty. It is harder for democracy to organize administration than for monarchy. The very completeness of our most cherished political successes in the past embarrasses us. We have enthroned public opinion; and it is forbidden us to hope during its reign for any quick schooling of the sovereign in executive expertness or in the conditions of perfect functional balance in government. The very fact that we have realized popular rule in its fulness has made the task of *organizing* that rule just so much the more difficult. In order to make any advance at all we must instruct and persuade a multitudinous monarch called public opinion,–a much less feasible undertaking than to influence a single monarch called a king. An individual sovereign will adopt a simple plan and carry it out directly: he will have but one opinion, and he will embody that one opinion in one command. But this other sovereign, the people, will have a score of differing opinions. They can agree upon nothing simple: advance must be made through compromise, by a compounding of differences, by a trimming of plans and a suppression of too straightforward principles. There will be a succession of resolves running through a course of years, a dropping fire of commands running through a whole gamut of modifications.

In government, as in virtue, the hardest of hard things is to make progress. Formerly the reason for this was that the single person who was sovereign was generally either selfish, ignorant, timid, or a fool,–albeit there was now and again one who was wise. Nowadays the reason is that the many, the people, who are sovereign have no single ear which one can approach, and are selfish, ignorant, timid, stubborn, or foolish with the selfishness, the ignorances, the stubbornesses, the timidities, or the follies of several thousand

persons,–albeit there are hundreds who are wise. Once the advantage of the reformer was that the sovereign's mind had a definite locality, that it was contained in one man's head, and that consequently it could be gotten at; though it was his disadvantage that the mind learned only reluctantly or only in small quantities, or was under the influence of some one who let it learn only the wrong things. Now, on the contrary, the reformer is bewildered by the fact that the sovereign's mind has no definite locality, but is contained in a voting majority of several million heads; and embarrassed by the fact that the mind of this sovereign also is under the influence of favorites, who are none the less favorites in a good old-fashioned sense of the word because they are not persons by preconceived opinions; *i.e.*, prejudices which are not to be reasoned with because they are not the children of reason.

Wherever regard for public opinion is a first principle of government, practical reform must be slow and all reform must be full of compromises. For wherever public opinion exists it must rule. This is now an axiom half the world over, and will presently come to be believed even in Russia. Whoever would effect a change in a modern constitutional government must first educate his fellow-citizens to want *some* change. That done, he must persuade them to want the particular change he wants. He must first make public opinion willing to listen and then see to it that it listen to the right things. He must stir it up to search for an opinion, and then manage to put the right opinion in its way. {…}

Even if we had clear insight into all the political past, and could form out of perfectly instructed heads a few steady, infallible, placidly wise maxims of government into which all sound political doctrine would be ultimately resolvable, *would the country act on them*? That is the question. The bulk of mankind is rigidly unphilosophical, and nowadays the bulk of mankind votes. A truth must become not only plain but also commonplace before it will be seen by the people who go to their work very early in the morning; and not to act upon it must involve great and pinching inconveniences before these same people will make up their minds to act upon it.

And where is this unphilosophical bulk of mankind more multifarious in its composition than in the United States? To know the public mind of this country, one must know the

mind, not of Americans of the older stocks only, but also of Irishmen, of Germans, of negroes. In order to get a footing for new doctrine, one must influence minds cast in every mold of race, minds inheriting every bias of environment, warped by the histories of a score of different nations, warmed or chilled, closed or expanded by almost every climate of the globe. {…}

II

The field of administration is a field of business. It is removed from the hurry and strife of politics; it at most points stands apart even from the debatable ground of constitutional study. It is a part of political life only as the methods of the counting-house are a part of the life of society; only as machinery is part of the manufactured product. But it is, at the same time, raised very far above the dull level of mere technical detail by the fact that through its greater principles it is directly connected with the lasting maxims of political wisdom, the permanent truths of political progress.

The object of administrative study is to rescue executive methods from the confusion and costliness of empirical experiment and set them upon foundations laid deep in stable principle. {…}

Let me expand a little what I have said of the province of administration. Most important to be observed is the truth already so much and so fortunately insisted upon by our civil-service reformers; namely, that administration lies outside the proper sphere of *politics*. Administrative questions are not political questions. Although politics sets the tasks for administration, it should not be suffered to manipulate its offices.

This is distinction of high authority; eminent German writers insist upon it as of course. Bluntschli, for instance, bids us separate administration alike from politics and from law. Politics, he says, is state activity "in things great and universal," while "administration, on the other hand," is "the activity of the state in individual and small things. Politics is thus the special province of the statesman, administration of the technical official." "Policy does nothing without the aid of administration"; but administration is not therefore politics. {…}

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

There is another distinction which must be worked into all our conclusions, which, though but another side of that between administration and politics, is not quite so easy to keep sight of: I mean the distinction between *constitutional* and administrative questions, between those governmental adjustments which are essential to constitutional principle and those which are merely instrumental to the possibly changing purposes of a wisely adapting convenience.

One cannot easily make clear to every one just where administration resides in the various departments of any practicable government without entering upon particulars so numerous as to confuse and distinctions so minute as to distract. No lines of demarcation, setting apart administrative from non-administrative functions, can be run between this and that department of government without being run up hill and down dale, over dizzy heights of distinction and through dense jungles of statutory enactment, hither and thither around "ifs" and "buts," "whens" and "howevers," until they become altogether lost to the common eye not accustomed to this sort of surveying, and consequently not acquainted with the use of the theodolite of logical discernment. A great deal of administration goes about *incognito* to most of the world, being confounded now with political "management," and again with constitutional principle. {…}

{…} Liberty no more consists in easy functional movement than intelligence consists in the ease and vigor with which the limbs of a strong man move. The principles that rule within the man, or the constitution, are the vital springs of liberty or servitude. Because dependence and subjection are without chains, are lightened by every easy-working device of considerate, paternal government, they are not thereby transformed into liberty. Liberty cannot live apart from constitutional principle; and no administration, however perfect and liberal its methods, can give men more than a poor counterfeit of liberty if it rest upon illiberal principles of government.

A clear view of the difference between the province of constitutional law and the province of administrative function ought to leave no room for misconception; and it is possible to name some roughly definite criteria upon which such a view can be built. Public

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

administration is detailed and systematic execution of public law. Every particular application of general law is an act of administration. The assessment and raising of taxes, for instance, the hanging of a criminal, the transportation and delivery of the mails, the equipment and recruiting of the army and navy, *etc.*, are all obviously acts of administration; but the general laws which direct these things to be done are as obviously outside of and above administration. The broad plans of governmental action are not administrative; the detailed execution of such plans is administrative. {…}

{…} {T}he administrator should {thus} have and does have a will of his own in the choice of means for accomplishing his work. He is not and ought not to be a mere passive instrument. The distinction is between general plans and special means.

There is, indeed, one point at which administrative studies trench on constitutional ground–or at least upon what seems constitutional ground. The study of administration, philosophically viewed, is closely connected with the study of the proper distribution of constitutional authority. To be efficient it must discover the simplest arrangements by which responsibility can be unmistakably fixed upon officials; the best way of dividing authority without hampering it, and responsibility without obscuring it. And this question of the distribution of authority, when taken into the sphere of the higher, the originating functions of government, is obviously a central constitutional question. If administrative study can discover the best principles upon which to base such distribution, it will have done constitutional study an invaluable service. Montesquieu did not, I am convinced, say the last word on this head. {…}

And let me say that large powers and unhampered discretion seem to me the indispensable conditions of responsibility. Public attention must be easily directed, in each case of good or bad administration, to just the man deserving of praise or blame. There is no danger in power, if only it be not irresponsible. If it be divided, dealt out in shares to many, it is obscured; and if it be obscured, it is made irresponsible. But if it be centered in heads of the service and in heads of branches of the service, it is easily watched and brought to book. If to keep his office a man must achieve open and honest success, and if at the same time he feels himself intrusted with large freedom of discretion, the

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

greater his power the less likely is he to abuse it, the more is he nerved and sobered and elevated by it. The less his power, the more safely obscure and unnoticed does he feel his position to be, and the more readily does he relapse into remissness.

Just here we manifestly emerge upon the field of that still larger question,–the proper relations between public opinion and administration. {…}

The right answer seems to be, that public opinion shall play the part of authoritative critic.

But the *method* by which its authority shall be made to tell? Our peculiar American difficulty in organizing administration is not the danger of losing liberty, but the danger of not being able or willing to separate its essentials from its accidents. Our success is made doubtful by that besetting error of ours, the error of trying to do too much by vote. Self-government does not consist in having a hand in everything, any more than housekeeping consists necessarily in cooking dinner with one's own hands. The cook must be trusted with a large discretion as to the management of the fires and the ovens.

In those countries in which public opinion has yet to be instructed in its privileges, yet to be accustomed to having its own way, this question as to the province of public opinion is much more readily soluble than in this country, where public opinion is wide awake and quite intent upon having its own way anyhow. {…} It may be sluggish, but it will not be meddlesome. It will submit to be instructed before it tries to instruct. Its political education will come before its political activity. In trying to instruct our own public opinion, we are dealing with a pupil apt to think itself quite sufficiently instructed beforehand.

The problem is to make public opinion efficient without suffering it to be meddlesome. Directly exercised, in the oversight of the daily details and in the choice of the daily means of government, public criticism is of course a clumsy nuisance, a rustic handling delicate machinery. But as superintending the greater forces of formative policy alike in politics and administration, public criticism is altogether safe and beneficent, altogether

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

indispensable. Let administrative study find the best means for giving public criticism this control and for shutting it out from all other interference. {…}

{…} If we are to improve public opinion, which is the motive power of government, we must prepare better officials as the apparatus of government. If we are to put in new boilers and to mend the fires which drive our governmental machinery, we must not leave the old wheels and joints and valves and bands to creak and buzz and clatter on as best they may at bidding of the new force. We must put in new running parts wherever there is the least lack of strength or adjustment. {…}

But to fear the creation of a domineering, illiberal officialism as a result of the studies I am here proposing is to miss altogether the principle upon which I wish most to insist. That principle is, that administration in the United States must be at all points sensitive to public opinion. A body of thoroughly trained officials serving during good behavior we must have in any case: that is a plain business necessity. But the apprehension that such a body will be anything un-American clears away the moment it is asked. What is to constitute good behavior? For that question obviously carries its own answer on its face. Steady, hearty allegiance to the policy of the government they serve will constitute good behavior. That *policy* will have no taint of officialism about it. It will not be the creation of permanent officials, but of statesmen whose responsibility to public opinion will be direct and inevitable. Bureaucracy can exist only where the whole service of the state is removed from the common political life of the people, its chiefs as well as its rank and file. Its motives, its objects, its policy, its standards, must be bureaucratic. It would be difficult to point out any examples of impudent exclusiveness and arbitrariness on the part of officials doing service under a chief of department who really served the people, as all our chiefs of departments must be made to do. {… }

The ideal for us is a civil service cultured and self-sufficient enough to act with sense and vigor, and yet so intimately connected with the popular thought, by means of elections and constant public counsel, as to find arbitrariness of class spirit quite out of the question.

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

III

Having thus viewed in some sort the subject-matter and the objects of this study of administration, what are we to conclude as to the methods best suited to it–the points of view most advantageous for it?

Government is so near us, so much a thing of our daily familiar handling, that we can with difficulty see the need of any philosophical study of it, or the exact point of such study, should it be undertaken. We have been on our feet too long to study now the art of walking. We are a practical people, made so apt, so adept in self-government by centuries of experimental drill, that we are scarcely any longer capable of perceiving the awkwardness of the particular system we may be using, just because it is so easy for us to use any system. We do not study the art of governing: we govern. But mere unschooled genius for affairs will not save us from sad blunders in administration. Though democrats by long inheritance and repeated choice, we are still rather crude democrats. Old as democracy is, its organization on a basis of modern ideas and conditions is still an unaccomplished work. The democratic state has yet to be equipped for carrying those enormous burdens of administration which the needs of this industrial and trading age are so fast accumulating. Without comparative studies in government we cannot rid ourselves of the misconception that administration stands upon an essentially different basis in a democratic state from that on which it stands in a non-democratic state.

After such study we could grant democracy the sufficient honor of ultimately determining by debate all essential questions affecting the public weal, of basing all structures of policy upon the major will; but we would have found but one rule of good administration for all governments alike. So far as administrative functions are concerned, all governments have a strong structural likeness; more than that, if they are to be uniformly useful and efficient, they must have a strong structural likeness. A free man has the same bodily organs, the same executive parts, as the slave, however different may be his motives, his services, his energies. Monarchies and democracies, radically different as they are in other respects, have in reality much the same business to look to.

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

It is abundantly safe nowadays to insist upon this actual likeness of all governments, because these are days when abuses of power are easily exposed and arrested, in countries like our own, by a bold, alert, inquisitive, detective public thought and a sturdy popular self-dependence such as never existed before. We are slow to appreciate this; but it is easy to appreciate it. {…}

But, besides being safe, it is necessary to see that for all governments alike the legitimate ends of administration are the same, in order not to be frightened at the idea of looking into foreign systems of administration for instruction and suggestion; in order to get rid of the apprehension that we might perchance blindly borrow something incompatible with our principles. That man is blindly astray who denounces attempts to transplant foreign systems into this country. It is impossible: they simply would not grow here. But why should we not use such parts of foreign contrivances as we want, if they be in any way serviceable? We are in no danger of using them in a foreign way. We borrowed rice, but we do not eat it with chopsticks. We borrowed our whole political language from England, but we leave the words "king" and "lords" out of it. What did we ever originate, except the action of the federal government upon individuals and some of the functions of the federal supreme court?

We can borrow the science of administration with safety and profit if only we read all fundamental differences of condition into its essential tenets. We have only to filter it through our constitutions, only to put it over a slow fire of criticism and distil away its foreign gases.

I know that there is a sneaking fear in some conscientiously patriotic minds that studies of European systems might signalize some foreign methods as better than some American methods; and the fear is easily to be understood. But it would scarcely be avowed in any just company.

It is the more necessary to insist upon thus putting away all prejudices against looking anywhere in the world but at home for suggestions in this study{.} {…} We can never learn either our own weaknesses or our own virtues by comparing ourselves with

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

ourselves. We are too used to the appearance and procedure of our own system to see its true significance. Perhaps even the English system is too much like our own to be used to the most profit in illustration. It is best on the whole to get entirely away from our own atmosphere and to be most careful in examining such systems as those of France and Germany. Seeing our own institutions through such *media*, we see ourselves as foreigners might see us were they to look at us without preconceptions. Of ourselves, so long as we know only ourselves, we know nothing.

Let it be noted that it is the distinction, already drawn, between administration and politics which makes the comparative method so safe in the field of administration. When we study the administrative systems of France and Germany, knowing that we are not in search of *political* principles, we need not care a peppercorn for the constitutional or political reasons which Frenchmen or Germans give for their practices when explaining them to us. If I see a murderous fellow sharpening a knife cleverly, I can borrow his way of sharpening the knife without borrowing his probable intention to commit murder with it; and so, if I see a monarchist dyed in the wool managing a public bureau well, I can learn his business methods without changing one of my republican spots. He may serve his king; I will continue to serve the people; but I should like to serve my sovereign as well as he serves his. By keeping this distinction in view, –that is, by studying administration as a means of putting our own politics into convenient practice, as a means of making what is democratically politic towards all administratively possible towards each, –we are on perfectly safe ground, and can learn without error what foreign systems have to teach us. We thus devise an adjusting weight for our comparative method of study. We can thus scrutinize the anatomy of foreign governments without fear of getting any of their diseases into our veins; dissect alien systems without apprehension of blood-poisoning.

Our own politics must be the touchstone for all theories. The principles on which to base a science of administration for America must be principles which have democratic policy very much at heart. And, to suit American habit, all general theories must, as theories, keep modestly in the background, not in open argument only, but even in our own minds, –lest opinions satisfactory only to the standards of the library should be

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

dogmatically used, as if they must be quite as satisfactory to the standards of practical politics as well. Doctrinaire devices must be postponed to tested practices. Arrangements not only sanctioned by conclusive experience elsewhere but also congenial to American habit must be preferred without hesitation to theoretical perfection. In a word, steady, practical statesmanship must come first, closet doctrine second. The cosmopolitan what-to-do must always be commanded by the American how-to-do-it.

Our duty is, to supply the best possible life to a *federal* organization, to systems within systems; to make town, city, county, state, and federal governments live with a like strength and an equally assured healthfulness, keeping each unquestionably its own master and yet making all interdependent and cooperative, combining independence with mutual helpfulness. The task is great and important enough to attract the best minds. {…}

{…} The question for us is, how shall our series of governments within governments be so administered that it shall always be to the interest of the public officer to serve, not his superior alone but the community also, with the best efforts of his talents and the soberest service of his conscience? How shall such service be made to his commonest interest by contributing abundantly to his sustenance, to his dearest interest by furthering his ambition, and to his highest interest by advancing his honor and establishing his character? And how shall this be done alike for the local part and for the national whole? {…}

W. E. B. DuBois

The Talented Tenth

ESSAY EXCERPTS

September 1903

BACKGROUND

William Edward Burghardt DuBois was an early civil rights activist and the first African American to earn a doctorate from Harvard University. He realized that, even decades after the Emancipation Proclamation and the end of the Civil War, the integration of black and white communities was still greatly lacking. This famous essay of DuBois' highlights his belief that African Americans' societal development lay not exclusively in work, but also in education—a means both to better themselves as human beings and to prepare more readily for their future roles in American society. (Note the contrasts with Booker T. Washington's speech.)

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What history does DuBois tell?
2. What is "the Talented Tenth?"
3. What is the importance of education, according to DuBois?
4. What is the importance of work, according to him?
5. How does DuBois understand the relationship between education and work?
6. What does he say are the effects of well-developed African-American leadership?

W. E. B. DuBois. "The Talented Tenth." Essay excerpts, September 1903. From Teaching American History. https://teachingamericanhistory.org/document/the-talented-tenth/.

ANNOTATIONS **NOTES & QUESTIONS**

The Negro race, like all races, is going to be saved by its exceptional men. The problem of education, then, among Negroes must first of all deal with the Talented Tenth; it is the problem of developing the Best of this race that they may guide the Mass away from the contamination and death of the Worst, in their own and other races. Now the training of men is a difficult and intricate task. Its technique is a matter for educational experts, but its object is for the vision of seers. If we make money the object of man-training, we shall develop money-makers but not necessarily men; if we make technical skill the object of education, we may possess artisans but not, in nature, men. Men we shall have only as we make manhood the object of the work of the schools–intelligence, broad sympathy, knowledge of the world that was and is, and of the relation of men to it–this is the curriculum of that Higher Education which must underlie true life. On this foundation we may build bread winning, skill of hand and quickness of brain, with never a fear lest the child and man mistake the means of living for the object of life.

If this be true–and who can deny it–three tasks lay before me; first to show from the past that the Talented Tenth as they have risen among American Negroes have been worthy of leadership; secondly to show how these men may be educated and developed; and thirdly to show their relation to the Negro problem.

You misjudge us because you do not know us. From the very first it has been the educated and intelligent of the Negro people that have led and elevated the mass, and the sole obstacles that nullified and retarded their efforts were slavery and race prejudice; for what is slavery but the legalized survival of the unfit and the nullification of the work of natural internal leadership? Negro leadership therefore sought from the first to rid the race of this awful incubus that it might make way for natural selection and the survival of the fittest. In colonial days came Phillis Wheatley and Paul Cuffe striving against the bars of prejudice; and Benjamin Banneker, the almanac maker, voiced their longings when he said to Thomas Jefferson, “I freely and cheerfully acknowledge that I am of the African race and in colour which is natural to them, of the deepest dye; and it is under a sense of the most profound gratitude to the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, that I now confess to you that I am not under that state of tyrannical thraldom and inhuman captivity to which too many of my brethren are

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

doomed, but that I have abundantly tasted of the fruition of those blessings which proceed from that free and unequalled liberty with which you are favored, and which I hope you will willingly allow, you have mercifully received from the immediate hand of that Being from whom proceedeth every good and perfect gift.

"Suffer me to recall to your mind that time, in which the arms of the British crown were exerted with every powerful effort, in order to reduce you to a state of servitude; look back, I entreat you, on the variety of dangers to which you were exposed; reflect on that period in which every human aid appeared unavailable, and in which even hope and fortitude wore the aspect of inability to the conflict, and you cannot but be led to a serious and grateful sense of your miraculous and providential preservation, you cannot but acknowledge, that the present freedom and tranquility which you enjoy, you have mercifully received, and that a peculiar blessing of heaven.

"This, sir, was a time when you clearly saw into the injustice of a state of Slavery, and in which you had just apprehensions of the horrors of its condition. It was then that your abhorrence thereof was so excited, that you publicly held forth this true and invaluable doctrine, which is worthy to be recorded and remembered in all succeeding ages: "'We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed with certain inalienable rights, and that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.'"

Then came Dr. James Derham, who could tell even the learned Dr. Rush something of medicine, and Lemuel Haynes, to whom Middlebury College gave an honorary A. M. in 1804. These and others we may call the Revolutionary group of distinguished Negroes – they were persons of marked ability, leaders of a Talented Tenth, standing conspicuously among the best of their time. They strove by word and deed to save the color line from becoming the line between the bond and free, but all they could do was nullified by Eli Whitney and the Curse of Gold. So they passed into forgetfulness.

But their spirit did not wholly die; here and there in the early part of the century came other exceptional men. Some were natural sons of unnatural fathers and were given

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

often a liberal training and thus a race of educated mulattoes sprang up to plead for black men's rights. There was Ira Aldridge, whom all Europe loved to honor; there was that Voice crying in the Wilderness, David Walker, and saying:

"I declare it does appear to me as though some nations think God is asleep, or that he made the Africans for nothing else but to dig their mines and work their farms, or they cannot believe history sacred or profane. I ask every man who has a heart, and is blessed with the privilege of believing– Is not God a God of justice to all his creatures? Do you say he is? Then if he gives peace and tranquility to tyrants and permits them to keep our fathers, our mothers, ourselves and our children in eternal ignorance and wretchedness to support them and their families, would he be to us a God of Justice? I ask, O, ye Christians, who hold us and our children in the most abject ignorance and degradation that ever a people were afflicted with since the world began–I say if God gives you peace and tranquility, and suffers you thus to go on afflicting us, and our children, who have never given you the least provocation – would He be to us a God of Justice? If you will allow that we are men, who feel for each other, does not the blood of our fathers and of us, their children, cry aloud to the Lord of Sabaoth against you for the cruelties and murders with which you have and do continue to afflict us?"

This was the wild voice that first aroused Southern legislators in 1829 to the terrors of abolitionism.

In 1831 there met that first Negro convention in Philadelphia, at which the world gaped curiously but which bravely attacked the problems of race and slavery, crying out against persecution and declaring that "Laws as cruel in themselves as they were unconstitutional and unjust, have in many places been enacted against our poor, unfriended and unoffending brethren (without a shadow of provocation on our part), at whose bare recital the very savage draws himself up for fear of contagion–looks noble and prides himself because he bears not the name of Christian." Side by side this free Negro movement, and the movement for abolition, strove until they merged in to one strong stream. Too little notice has been taken of the work which the Talented Tenth among Negroes took in the great abolition crusade. From the very day that a Philadelphia colored man became the first subscriber to Garrison's "Liberator," to the day when Negro soldiers made the Emancipation Proclamation possible, black leaders worked shoulder to shoulder with white men in a movement, the success of which would have been impossible without them. There was Purvis and Remond, Pennington and Highland Garnett, Sojourner Truth and Alexander Crummel, and above, Frederick

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

Douglass–what would the abolition movement have been without them? They stood as living examples of the possibilities of the Negro race, their own hard experiences and well wrought culture said silently more than all the drawn periods of orators–they were the men who made American slavery impossible. As Maria Weston Chapman said, from the school of anti-slavery agitation, "a throng of authors, editors, lawyers, orators and accomplished gentlemen of color have taken their degree! It has equally implanted hopes and aspirations, noble thoughts, and sublime purposes, in the hearts of both races. It has prepared the white man for the freedom of the black man, and it has made the black man scorn the thought of enslavement, as does a white man, as far as its influence has extended. Strengthen that noble influence! Before its organization, the country only saw here and there in slavery some faithful Cudjoe or Dinah, whose strong natures blossomed even in bondage, like a fine plant beneath a heavy stone. Now, under the elevating and cherishing influence of the American Anti-slavery Society, the colored race, like the white, furnishes Corinthian capitals for the noblest temples."

Where were these black abolitionists trained? Some, like Frederick Douglass, were self-trained, but yet trained liberally; others, like Alexander Crummell and McCune Smith, graduated from famous foreign universities. Most of them rose up through the colored schools of New York and Philadelphia and Boston, taught by college-bred men like Russworm, of Dartmouth, and college-bred white men like Neau and Benezet.

After emancipation came a new group of educated and gifted leaders: Langston, Bruce and Elliot, Greener, Williams and Payne. Through political organization, historical and polemic writing and moral regeneration, these men strove to uplift their people. It is the fashion of to-day to sneer at them and to say that with freedom Negro leadership should have begun at the plow and not in the Senate–a foolish and mischievous lie; two hundred and fifty years that black serf toiled at the plow and yet that toiling was in vain till the Senate passed the war amendments; and two hundred and fifty years more the half-free serf of to-day may toil at his plow, but unless he have political rights and righteously guarded civic status, he will still remain the poverty-stricken and ignorant plaything of rascals, that he now is. This all sane men know even if they dare not say it.

ANNOTATIONS **NOTES & QUESTIONS**

And so we come to the present–a day of cowardice and vacillation, of strident wide-voiced wrong and faint hearted compromise; of double-faced dallying with Truth and Right. Who are to-day guiding the work of the Negro people? The "exceptions" of course. And yet so sure as this Talented Tenth is pointed out, the blind worshippers of the Average cry out in alarm: "These are exceptions, look here at death, disease and crime–these are the happy rule."

Of course they are the rule, because a silly nation made them the rule: Because for three long centuries this people lynched Negroes who dared to be brave, raped black women who dared to be virtuous, crushed dark-hued youth who dared to be ambitious, and encouraged and made to flourish servility and lewdness and apathy. But not even this was able to crush all manhood and chastity and aspiration from black folk. A saving remnant continually survives and persists, continually aspires, continually shows itself in thrift and ability and character. Exceptional it is to be sure, but this is its chiefest promise; it shows the capability of Negro blood, the promise of black men. Do Americans ever stop to reflect that there are in this land a million men of Negro blood, well-educated, owners of homes, against the honor of whose womanhood no breath was ever raised, whose men occupy positions of trust and usefulness, and who, judged by any standard, have reached the full measure of the best type of modern European culture? Is it fair, is it decent, is it Christian to ignore these facts of the Negro problem, to belittle such aspiration, to nullify such leadership and seek to crush these people back into the mass out of which by toil and travail, they and their fathers have raised themselves?

Can the masses of the Negro people be in any possible way more quickly raised than by the effort and example of this aristocracy of talent and character? Was there ever a nation on God's fair earth civilized from the bottom upward? Never; it is, ever was and ever will be from the top downward that culture filters. The Talented Tenth rises and pulls all that are worth the saving up to their vantage ground. This is the history of human progress; and the two historic mistakes which have hindered that progress were the thinking first that no more could ever rise save the few already risen; or second, that it would better the uprisen to pull the risen down.

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

How then shall the leaders of a struggling people be trained and the hands of the risen few strengthened? There can be but one answer: The best and most capable of their youth must be schooled in the colleges and universities of the land. We will not quarrel as to just what the university of the Negro should teach or how it should teach it–I willingly admit that each soul and each race-soul needs its own peculiar curriculum. But this is true: A university is a human invention for the transmission of knowledge and culture from generation to generation, through the training of quick minds and pure hearts, and for this work no other human invention will suffice, not even trade and industrial schools.

All men cannot go to college but some men must; every isolated group or nation must have its yeast, must have for the talented few centers of training where men are not so mystified and befuddled by the hard and necessary toil of earning a living, as to have no aims higher than their bellies, and no God greater than Gold. This is true training, and thus in the beginning were the favored sons of the freedmen trained. Out of the colleges of the North came, after the blood of war, Ware, Cravath, Chase, Andrews, Bumstead and Spence to build the foundations of knowledge and civilization in the black South. Where ought they to have begun to build? At the bottom, of course, quibbles the mole with his eyes in the earth. Aye! truly at the bottom, at the very bottom; at the bottom of knowledge, down in the very depths of knowledge there where the roots of justice strike into the lowest soil of Truth. And so they did begin; they founded colleges, and up from the colleges shot normal schools, and out from the normal schools went teachers, and around the normal teachers clustered other teachers to teach the public schools; the college trained in Greek and Latin and mathematics, 2,000 men; and these men trained full 50,000 others in morals and manners, and they in turn taught thrift and the alphabet to nine millions of men, who to-day hold $300,000,000 of property. It was a miracle – the most wonderful peace-battle of the 19th century, and yet to-day men smile at it, and in fine superiority tell us that it was all a strange mistake; that a proper way to found a system of education is first to gather the children and buy them spelling books and hoes; afterward men may look about for

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

teachers, if haply they may find them; or again they would teach men Work, but as for Life–why, what has Work to do with Life, they ask vacantly.

Was the work of these college founders successful; did it stand the test of time? Did the college graduates, with all their fine theories of life, really live? Are they useful men helping to civilize and elevate their less fortunate fellows? Let us see. Omitting all institutions which have not actually graduated students from a college course, there are to-day in the United States thirty-four institutions giving something above high school training to Negroes and designed especially for this race. {…}

… [The college-bred Negro] is, as he ought to be, the group leader, the man who sets the ideals of the community where he lives, directs its thoughts and heads its social movements. It need hardly be argued that the Negro people need social leadership more than most groups; that they have no traditions to fall back upon, no long established customs, no strong family ties, no well defined social classes. All these things must be slowly and painfully evolved. The preacher was, even before the war, the group leader of the Negroes, and the church their greatest social institution. Naturally this preacher was ignorant and often immoral, and the problem of replacing the older type by better educated men has been a difficult one. Both by direct work and by direct influence on other preachers, and on congregations, the college-bred preacher has an opportunity for reformatory work and moral inspiration, the value of which cannot be overestimated.

It has, however, been in the furnishing of teachers that the Negro college has found its peculiar function. Few persons realize how vast a work, how mighty a revolution has been thus accomplished. To furnish five millions and more of ignorant people with teachers of their own race and blood, in one generation, was not only a very difficult undertaking, but very important one, in that, it placed before the eyes of almost every Negro child an attainable ideal. It brought the masses of the blacks in contact with modern civilization, made black men the leaders of their communities and trainers of the new generation. In this work college-bred Negroes were first teachers, and then teachers of teachers. And here it is that the broad culture of college work has been of

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

peculiar value. Knowledge of life and its wider meaning, has been the point of the Negro's deepest ignorance, and the sending out of teachers whose training has not been simply for bread winning, but also for human culture, has been of inestimable value in the training of these men.

In earlier years the two occupations of preacher and teacher were practically the only ones open to the black college graduate. Of later years a larger diversity of life among his people, has opened new avenues of employment. Nor have these college men been paupers and spendthrifts; 557 college-bred Negroes owned in 1899, $1,342,862.50 worth of real estate (assessed value), or $2,411 per family. The real value of the total accumulations of the whole group is perhaps about $10,000,000, or $5,000 a piece. Pitiful is it not beside the fortunes of oil kings and steel trusts, but after all is the fortune of the millionaire the only stamp of true and successful living? Alas! it is, with many and there's the rub.

The problem of training the Negro is to-day immensely complicated by the fact that the whole question of the efficiency and appropriateness of our present systems of education, for any kind of child, is a matter of active debate, in which final settlement seems still afar off. Consequently it often happens that persons arguing for or against certain systems of education for Negroes, have these controversies in mind and miss the real question at issue. The main question, so far as the Southern Negro is concerned, is: What under the present circumstance, must a system of education do in order to raise the Negro as quickly as possible in the scale of civilization? The answer to this question seems to me clear: It must strengthen the Negro's character, increase his knowledge and teach him to earn a living. Now it goes without saying that it is hard to do all these things simultaneously or suddenly and that at the same time it will not do to give all the attention to one and neglect the others; we could give black boys trades, but that alone will not civilize a race of ex-slaves; we might simply increase their knowledge of the world, but this would not necessarily make them wish to use this knowledge honestly; we might seek to strengthen character and purpose, but to what end if this people have nothing to eat or to wear? A system of education is not one thing, nor does it have a single definite object, nor is it a mere matter of schools.

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

Education is that whole system of human training within and without the school house walls, which molds and develops men. If then we start out to train an ignorant and unskilled people with a heritage of bad habits, our system of training must set before itself two great aims–the one dealing with knowledge and character, the other part seeking to give the child the technical knowledge necessary for him to earn a living under the present circumstances. These objects are accomplished in part by the opening of the common schools on the one, and of the industrial schools on the other. But only in part, for there must also be trained those who are to teach these schools–men and women of knowledge and culture and technical skill who understand modern civilization, and have the training and aptitude to impart it to the children under them. There must be teachers, and teachers of teachers, and to attempt to establish any sort of a system of common and industrial school training, without *first* (and I say *first* advisedly) without *first* providing for the higher training of the very best teachers, is simply throwing your money to the winds. School houses do not teach themselves – piles of brick and mortar and machinery do not send out *men*. It is the trained, living human soul, cultivated and strengthened by long study and thought, that breathes the real breath of life into boys and girls and makes them human, whether they be black or white, Greek, Russian or American. Nothing, in these latter days, has so dampened the faith of thinking Negroes in recent educational movements, as the fact that such movements have been accompanied by ridicule and denouncement and decrying of those very institutions of higher training which made the Negro public school possible, and make Negro industrial schools thinkable. It was: Fisk, Atlanta, Howard and Straight, those colleges born of the faith and sacrifice of the abolitionists, that placed in the black schools of the South the 30,000 teachers and more, which some, who depreciate the work of these higher schools, are using to teach their own new experiments. If Hampton, Tuskegee and the hundred other industrial schools prove in the future to be as successful as they deserve to be, then their success in training black artisans for the South, will be due primarily to the white colleges of the North and the black colleges of the South, which trained the teachers who to-day conduct these institutions. There was a time when the American people believed pretty devoutly that a log of wood with a boy at one end and Mark Hopkins at the other, represented the highest ideal of human training. But in these eager days it would seem that we have

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

changed all that and think it necessary to add a couple of saw-mills and a hammer to this outfit, and, at a pinch, to dispense with the services of Mark Hopkins.

I would not deny, or for a moment seem to deny, the paramount necessity of teaching the Negro to work, and to work steadily and skillfully; or seem to depreciate in the slightest degree the important part industrial schools must play in the accomplishment of these ends, but I *do* say, and insist upon it, that it is industrialism drunk with its vision of success, to imagine that its own work can be accomplished without providing for the training of broadly cultured men and women to teach its own teachers, and to teach the teachers of the public schools.

But I have already said that human education is not simply a matter of schools; it is much more a matter of family and group life – the training of one's home, of one's daily companions, of one's social class. Now the black boy of the South moves in a black world – a world with its own leaders, its own thoughts, its own ideals. In this world he gets by far the larger part of his life training, and through the eyes of this dark world he peers into the veiled world beyond. Who guides and determines the education which he receives in his world? His teachers here are the group-leaders of the Negro people—the physicians and clergymen, the trained fathers and mothers, the influential and forceful men about him of all kinds; here it is, if at all, that the culture of the surrounding world trickles through and is handed on by the graduates of the higher schools. Can such culture training of group leaders be neglected? Can we afford to ignore it? Do you think that if the leaders of thought among Negroes are not trained and educated thinkers, that they will have no leaders? On the contrary a hundred half-trained demagogues will still hold the places they so largely occupy now, and hundreds of vociferous busy-bodies will multiply. You have no choice; either you must help furnish this race from within its own ranks with thoughtful men of trained leadership, or you must suffer the evil consequences of a headless misguided rabble.

I am an earnest advocate of manual training and trade teaching for black boys, and for white boys, too. I believe that next to the founding of Negro colleges the most valuable addition to Negro education since the war, has been industrial training for black boys.

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

Nevertheless, I insist that the object of all true education is not to make men carpenters, it is to make carpenters men; there are two means of making the carpenter a man, each equally important: the first is to give the group and community in which he works, liberally trained teachers and leaders to teach him and his family what life means; the second is to give him sufficient intelligence and technical skill to make him an efficient workman; the first object demands the Negro college and college-bred men–not a quantity of such colleges, but a few of excellent quality; not too many college-bred men, but enough to leaven the lump, to inspire the masses, to raise the Talented Tenth to leadership; the second object demands a good system of common schools, well-taught, conveniently located and properly equipped.

The Sixth Atlanta Conference truly said in 1901:

"We call the attention of the Nation to the fact that less than one million of the three million Negro children of school age, are at present regularly attending school, and these attend a session which lasts only a few months.

"We are to-day deliberately rearing millions of our citizens in ignorance, and at the same time limiting the rights of citizenship by educational qualifications. This is unjust. Half the black youth of the land have no opportunities open to them for learning to read, write and cipher. In the discussion as to the proper training of Negro children after they leave the public schools, we have forgotten that they are not yet decently provided with public schools.

"Propositions are beginning to be made in the South to reduce the already meagre school facilities of Negroes. We congratulate the South on resisting, as much as it has, this pressure, and on the many millions it has spent on Negro education. But it is only fair to point out that Negro taxes and the Negroes' share of the income from indirect taxes and endowments have fully repaid this expenditure, so that the Negro public school system has not in all probability cost the white taxpayers a single cent since the war.

"This is not fair. Negro schools should be a public burden, since they are a public benefit. The Negro has a right to demand good common school training at the hands of the States and the Nation since by their fault he is not in position to pay for this himself."

What is the chief need for the building up of the Negro public school in the South? The Negro race in the South needs teachers to-day above all else. This is the concurrent testimony of all who know the situation. For the supply of this great demand two things

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

are needed – institutions of higher education and money for school houses and salaries. It is usually assumed that a hundred or more institutions for Negro training are to-day turning out so many teachers and college-bred men that the race is threatened with an over-supply. This is sheer nonsense. There are to-day less than 3,000 living Negro college graduates in the United States, and less than 1,000 Negroes in college. Moreover, in the 164 schools for Negroes, 95 percent. of their students are doing elementary and secondary work, work which should be done in the public schools. Over half the remaining 2,157 students are taking high school studies. The mass of so-called "normal" schools for the Negro, are simply doing elementary common school work, or, at most, high school work, with a little instruction in methods. The Negro colleges and the post-graduate courses at other institutions are the only agencies for the broader and more careful training of teachers. The work of these institutions is hampered for lack of funds. It is getting increasingly difficult to get funds for training teachers in the best modern methods, and yet all over the South, from State Superintendents, county officials, city boards and school principals comes the wail, "We need TEACHERS!" and teachers must be trained. As the fairest minded of all white Southerners, Atticus G. Haygood, once said: "The defects of colored teachers are so great as to create an urgent necessity for training better ones. Their excellencies and their successes are sufficient to justify the best hopes of success in the effort, and to vindicate the judgment of those who make large investments of money and service, to give to colored students opportunity for thoroughly preparing themselves for the work of teaching children of their people."

The truth of this has been strikingly shown in the marked improvement of white teachers in the South. Twenty years ago the rank and file of white public school teachers were not as good as the Negro teachers. But they, by scholarships and good salaries, have been encouraged to thorough normal and collegiate preparation, while the Negro teachers have been discouraged by starvation wages and the idea that any training will do for a black teacher. If carpenters are needed it is well and good to train men as carpenters. But to train men as carpenters, and then set them to teaching is wasteful and criminal; and to train men as teachers and then refuse them living wages, unless they become carpenters, is rank nonsense. {…}

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

{…} We need Negro teachers for the Negro common schools, and we need first-class normal schools and colleges to train them. This is the work of higher Negro education and it must be done.

Further than this, after being provided with group leaders of civilization, and a foundation of intelligence in the public schools, the carpenter, in order to be a man, needs technical skill. This calls for trade schools. Now trade schools are not nearly such simple things as people once thought. The original idea was that the "Industrial" school was to furnish education, practically free, to those willing to work for it; it was to "do" things–i.e.: become a center of productive industry, it was to be partially, if not wholly, self-supporting, and it was to teach trades. Admirable as were some of the ideas underlying this scheme, the whole thing simply would not work in practice; it was found that if you were to use time and material to teach trades thoroughly, you could not at the same time keep the industries on a commercial basis and make them pay. Many schools started out to do this on a large scale and went into virtual bankruptcy. Moreover, it was found also that it was possible to teach a boy a trade mechanically, without giving him the full educative benefit of the process, and, vice versa, that there was a distinctive educative value in teaching a boy to use his hands and eyes in carrying out certain physical processes, even though he did not actually learn a trade. It has happened, therefore, in the last decade, that a noticeable change has come over the industrial schools. In the first place the idea of commercially remunerative industry in a school is being pushed rapidly to the background. There are still schools with shops and farms that bring an income, and schools that use student labor partially for the erection of their buildings and the furnishing of equipment. It is coming to be seen, however, in the education of the Negro, as clearly as it has been seen in the education of the youths the world over, that it is the *boy* and not the material product, that is the true object of education. Consequently the object of the industrial school came to be the thorough training of boys regardless of the cost of the training, so long as it was thoroughly well done.

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

Even at this point, however, the difficulties were not surmounted. In the first place modern industry has taken great strides since the war, and the teaching of trades is no longer a simple matter. Machinery and long processes of work have greatly changed the work of the carpenter, the ironworker and the shoemaker. A really efficient workman must be to-day an intelligent man who has had good technical training in addition to thorough common school, and perhaps even higher training. To meet this situation the industrial schools began a further development; they established distinct Trade Schools for the thorough training of better class artisans, and at the same time they sought to preserve for the purposes of general education, such of the simpler processes of elementary trade learning as were best suited therefor. In this differentiation of the Trade School and manual training, the best of the industrial schools simply followed the plain trend of the present educational epoch. A prominent educator tells us that, in Sweden, "In the beginning the economic conception was generally adopted, and everywhere manual training was looked upon as a means of preparing the children of the common people to earn their living. But gradually it came to be recognized that manual training has a more elevated purpose, and one, indeed, more useful in the deeper meaning of the term. It came to be considered as an educative process for the complete moral, physical and intellectual development of the child."

Thus, again, in the manning of trade schools and manual training schools we are thrown back upon the higher training as its source and chief support. There was a time when any aged and wornout carpenter could teach in a trade school. But not so to-day. Indeed the demand for college-bred men by a school like Tuskegee, ought to make Mr. Booker T. Washington the firmest friend of higher training. Here he has as helpers the son of a Negro senator, trained in Greek and the humanities, and graduated at Harvard; the son of a Negro congressman and lawyer, trained in Latin and mathematics, and graduated at Oberlin; he has as his wife, a woman who read Virgil and Homer in the same class room with me; he has as college chaplain, a classical graduate of Atlanta University; as teacher of science, a graduate of Fisk; as teacher of history, a graduate of Smith,–indeed some thirty of his chief teachers are college graduates, and instead of studying French grammars in the midst of weeds, or buying pianos for dirty cabins, they are at Mr. Washington's right hand helping him in a noble work. And yet one of

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

the effects of Mr. Washington's propaganda has been to throw doubt upon the expediency of such training for Negroes, as these persons have had.

Men of America, the problem is plain before you. Here is a race transplanted through the criminal foolishness of your fathers. Whether you like it or not the millions are here, and here they will remain. If you do not lift them up, they will pull you down. Education and work are the levers to uplift a people. Work alone will not do it unless inspired by the right ideals and guided by intelligence. Education must not simply teach work–it must teach Life. The Talented Tenth of the Negro race must be made leaders of thought and missionaries of culture among their people. No others can do this work and Negro colleges must train men for it. The Negro race, like all other races, is going to be saved by its exceptional men.

WOODROW WILSON

War Message to Congress

SPEECH

April 2, 1917
United States Congress | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

Although World War I began in mid-1914, the United States did not initially join the conflict, with President Woodrow Wilson opting instead to pursue neutrality. However, the 1915 sinking of the *Lusitania* and the 1917 resumption of unrestricted submarine warfare by Germany eventually drove the United States to side with the Allied Powers. Wilson gave this speech to a joint session of Congress in the latter year, advocating for a formal declaration of war against Germany and the Central Powers, but also explaining his radically different reasons for the United States' fighting in the war.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What policy is not "constitutionally permissible" for Wilson to enact alone?
2. What is his primary grievance against Germany?
3. Why does Wilson advocate for joining World War I?
4. How does he say America should materially fight the war?
5. What does Wilson say are America's objectives in fighting World War I?

Woodrow Wilson. "War Message to Congress." Speech, April 2, 1917. From Teaching American History. https://teachingamericanhistory.org/document/war-message-to-congress/.

ANNOTATIONS **NOTES & QUESTIONS**

Gentlemen of the Congress:

I have called the Congress into extraordinary session because there are serious, very serious, choices of policy to be made, and made immediately, which it was neither right nor constitutionally permissible that I should assume the responsibility of making.

On the third of February last I officially laid before you the extraordinary announcement of the Imperial German Government that on and after the first day of February it was its purpose to put aside all restraints of law or of humanity and use its submarines to sink every vessel that sought to approach either the ports of Great Britain and Ireland or the western coasts of Europe or any of the ports controlled by the enemies of Germany within the Mediterranean. That had seemed to be the object of the German submarine warfare earlier in the war, but since April of last year the Imperial Government had somewhat restrained the commanders of its undersea craft in conformity with its promise then given to us that passenger boats should not be sunk and that due warning would be given to all other vessels which its submarines might seek to destroy when no resistance was offered or escape attempted, and care taken that their crews were given at least a fair chance to save their lives in their open boats. The precautions taken were meager and haphazard enough, as was proved in distressing instance after instance in the progress of the cruel and unmanly business, but a certain degree of restraint was observed. The new policy has swept every restriction aside. Vessels of every kind, whatever their flag, their character, their cargo, their destination, their errand, have been ruthlessly sent to the bottom: without warning and without thought of help or mercy for those on board, the vessels of friendly neutrals along with those of belligerents. Even hospital ships and ships carrying relief to the sorely bereaved and stricken people of Belgium, though the latter were provided with safe conduct through the proscribed areas by the German Government itself and were distinguished by unmistakable marks of identity, have been sunk with the same reckless lack of compassion or of principle. I was for a little while unable to believe that such things would in fact be done by any government that had hitherto subscribed to the humane practices of civilized nations. International law had its origin in the attempt to set up some law which would be respected and observed upon the seas, where no nation had

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

right of dominion and where lay the free highways of the world. … This minimum of right the German Government has swept aside under the plea of retaliation and necessity and because it had no weapons which it could use at sea except these which it is impossible to employ as it is employing them without throwing to the winds all scruples of humanity or of respect for the understandings that were supposed to underlie the intercourse of the world. I am not now thinking of the loss of property involved, immense and serious as that is, but only of the wanton and wholesale destruction of the lives of noncombatants, men, women, and children, engaged in pursuits which have always, even in the darkest periods of modern history, been deemed innocent and legitimate. Property can be paid for; the lives of peaceful and innocent people cannot be. The present German submarine warfare against commerce is a warfare against mankind.

It is a war against all nations. American ships have been sunk, American lives taken, in ways which it has stirred us very deeply to learn of, but the ships and people of other neutral and friendly nations have been sunk and overwhelmed in the waters in the same way. There has been no discrimination. The challenge is to all mankind. Each nation must decide for itself how it will meet it. The choice we make for ourselves must be made with a moderation of counsel and a temperateness of judgment befitting our character and our motives as a nation. We must put excited feeling away. Our motive will not be revenge or the victorious assertion of the physical might of the nation, but only the vindication of right, of human right, of which we are only a single champion.

When I addressed the Congress on the twenty-sixth of February last I thought that it would suffice to assert our neutral rights with arms, our right to use the seas against unlawful interference, our right to keep our people safe against unlawful violence. But armed neutrality, it now appears, is impracticable. Because submarines are in effect outlaws when used as the German submarines have been used against merchant shipping, it is impossible to defend ships against their attacks as the law of nations has assumed that merchantmen would defend themselves against privateers or cruisers, visible craft giving chase upon the open sea. It is common prudence in such circumstances, grim necessity indeed, to endeavor to destroy them before they have

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

shown their own intention. They must be dealt with upon sight, if dealt with at all. The German Government denies the right of neutrals to use arms at all within the areas of the sea which it has proscribed, even in the defense of rights which no modern publicist has ever before questioned their right to defend. The intimation is conveyed that the armed guards which we have placed on our merchant ships will be treated as beyond the pale of law and subject to be dealt with as pirates would be. Armed neutrality is ineffectual enough at best; in such circumstances and in the face of such pretensions it is worse than ineffectual: it is likely only to produce what it was meant to prevent; it is practically certain to draw us into the war without either the rights or the effectiveness of belligerents. There is one choice we cannot make, we are incapable of making: we will not choose the path of submission and suffer the most sacred rights of our Nation and our people to be ignored or violated. The wrongs against which we now array ourselves are no common wrongs; they cut to the very roots of human life.

With a profound sense of the solemn and even tragical character of the step I am taking and of the grave responsibilities which it involves, but in unhesitating obedience to what I deem my constitutional duty, I advise that the Congress declare the recent course of the Imperial German Government to be in fact nothing less than war against the government and people of the United States; that it formally accept the status of belligerent which has thus been thrust upon it, and that it take immediate steps not only to put the country in a more thorough state of defense but also to exert all its power and employ all its resources to bring the Government of the German Empire to terms and end the war.

What this will involve is clear. It will involve the utmost practicable cooperation in counsel and action with the governments now at war with Germany, and, as incident to that, the extension to those governments of the most liberal financial credit, in order that our resources may so far as possible be added to theirs. It will involve the organization and mobilization of all the material resources of the country to supply the materials of war and serve the incidental needs of the Nation in the most abundant and yet the most economical and efficient way possible. It will involve the immediate full equipment of the navy in all respects but particularly in supplying it with the best means of dealing with the enemy's submarines. It will involve the immediate addition

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

to the armed forces of the United States already provided for by law in case of war at least five hundred thousand men, who should, in my opinion, be chosen upon the principle of universal liability to service, and also the authorization of subsequent additional increments of equal force so soon as they may be needed and can be handled in training. It will involve also, of course, the granting of adequate credits to the Government, sustained, I hope, so far as they can equitably be sustained by the present generation, by well conceived taxation. I say sustained so far as may be equitable by taxation because it seems to me that it would be most unwise to base the credits which will now be necessary entirely on money borrowed. It is our duty, I most respectfully urge, to protect our people so far as we may against the very serious hardships and evils which would be likely to arise out of the inflation which would be produced by vast loans.

In carrying out the measures by which these things are to be accomplished we should keep constantly in mind the wisdom of interfering as little as possible in our own preparation and in the equipment of our own military forces with the duty—for it will be a very practical duty—of supplying the nations already at war with Germany with the materials which they can obtain only from us or by our assistance. They are in the field and we should help them in every way to be effective there.

I shall take the liberty of suggesting, through the several executive departments of the Government, for the consideration of your committees, measures for the accomplishment of the several objects I have mentioned. I hope that it will be your pleasure to deal with them as having been framed after very careful thought by the branch of the Government upon which the responsibility of conducting the war and safeguarding the Nation will most directly fall.

While we do these things, these deeply momentous things, let us be very clear, and make very clear to all the world what our motives and our objects are. My own thought has not been driven from its habitual and normal course by the unhappy events of the last two months, and I do not believe that the thought of the Nation has been altered or clouded by them. I have exactly the same things in mind now that I had in mind

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

when I addressed the Senate on the twenty—second of January last, the same that I had in mind when I addressed the Congress on the third of February and on the twenty-sixth of February. Our object now, as then, is to vindicate the principles of peace and justice in the life of the world as against selfish and autocratic power and to set up amongst the really free and selfgoverned peoples of the world such a concert of purpose and of action as will henceforth insure the observance of those principles Neutrality is no longer feasible or desirable where the peace of the world is involved and the freedom of its peoples, and the menace to that peace and freedom lies in the existence of autocratic governments backed by organized force which is controlled wholly by their will, not by the will of their people. We have seen the last of neutrality in such circumstances. We are at the beginning of an age in which it will be insisted that the same standards of conduct and of responsibility for wrong done shall be observed among nations and their governments that are observed among the individual citizens of civilized states.

We have no quarrel with the German people. We have no feeling towards them but one of sympathy and friendship. It was not upon their impulse that their government acted in entering this war. It was not with their previous knowledge or approval. It was a war determined upon as wars used to be determined upon in the old, unhappy days when peoples were nowhere consulted by their rulers and wars were provoked and waged in the interest of dynasties or of little groups of ambitious men who were accustomed to use their fellow men as pawns and tools.

Selfgoverned nations do not fill their neighbor states with spies or set the course of intrigue to bring about some critical posture of affairs which will give them an opportunity to strike and make conquest. Such designs can be successfully worked out only under cover and where no one has the right to ask questions. Cunningly contrived plans of deception or aggression, carried, it may be, from generation to generation, can be worked out and kept from the light only within the privacy of courts or behind the carefully guarded confidences of a narrow and privileged class. They are happily impossible where public opinion commands and insists upon full information concerning all the nation's affairs.

ANNOTATIONS **NOTES & QUESTIONS**

A steadfast concert for peace can never be maintained except by a partnership of democratic nations. No autocratic government could be trusted to keep faith within it or observe its covenants. It must be a league of honor, a partnership of opinion. Intrigue would eat its vitals away; the plottings of inner circles who could plan what they would and render account to no one would be a corruption seated at its very heart. Only free peoples can hold their purpose and their honor steady to a common end and prefer the interests of mankind to any narrow interest of their own.

Does not every American feel that assurance has been added to our hope for the future peace of the world by the wonderful and heartening things that have been happening within the last few weeks in Russia? Russia was known by those who knew it best to have been always in fact democratic at heart, in all the vital habits of her thought, in all the intimate relationships of her people that spoke their natural instinct, their habitual attitude towards life. The autocracy that crowned the summit of her political structure, long as it had stood and terrible as was the reality of its power, was not in fact Russian in origin, character, or purpose; and now it has been shaken off and the great, generous Russian people have been added in all their naive majesty and might to the forces that are fighting for freedom in the world, for justice, and for peace. Here is a fit partner for a League of Honor.

One of the things that has served to convince us that the Prussian, autocracy was not and could never be our friend is that from the very outset of the present war it has filled our unsuspecting communities and even our offices of government with spies and set criminal intrigues everywhere afoot against our national unity of counsel, our peace Within and without, our industries and our commerce. Indeed it is now evident that its spies were here even before the war began; and it is unhappily not a matter of conjecture but a fact proved in our courts of justice that the intrigues which have more than once come perilously near to disturbing the peace and dislocating the industries of the country have been carried on at the instigation, with the support, and even under the personal direction of official agents of the Imperial Government accredited to the Government of the United States. Even in checking these things and trying to extirpate

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

them we have sought to put the most generous interpretation possible upon them because we knew that their source lay, not in any hostile feeling or purpose of the German people towards us (who were, no doubt, as ignorant of them as we ourselves were), but only in the selfish designs of a Government that did what it pleased and told its people nothing. But they have played their part in serving to convince us at last that that Government entertains no real friendship for us and means to act against our peace and security at its convenience. That it means to stir up enemies against us at our very doors the intercepted note to the German Minister at Mexico City is eloquent evidence.

We are accepting this challenge of hostile purpose because we know that in such a Government, following such methods, we can never have a friend; and that in the presence of its organized power, always lying in wait to accomplish we know not what purpose, there can be no assured security for the democratic Governments of the world. We are now about to accept gauge of battle with this natural foe to liberty and shall, if necessary, spend the whole force of the nation to check and nullify its pretensions and its power. We are glad, now that we see the facts with no veil of false pretense about them to fight thus for the ultimate peace of the world and for the liberation of its peoples, the German peoples included: for the rights of nations great and small and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of life and of obedience. The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty. We have no selfish ends to serve.

We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make. We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind. We shall be satisfied when those rights have been made as secure as the faith and the freedom of nations can make them. Just because we fight without rancor and without selfish object, seeking nothing for ourselves but what we shall wish to share with all free peoples, we shall, I feel confident, conduct our operations as belligerents without passion and ourselves observe with proud punctilio the principles of right and of fair play we profess to be fighting for.

ANNOTATIONS **NOTES & QUESTIONS**

I have said nothing of the Governments allied with the Imperial Government of Germany because they have not made war upon us or challenged us to defend our right and our honor. The Austro-Hungarian Government has, indeed, avowed its unqualified endorsement and acceptance of the reckless and lawless submarine warfare adopted now without disguise by the Imperial German Government, and it has therefore not been possible for this Government to receive Count Tarnowski, the Ambassador recently accredited to this Government by the Imperial and Royal Government of Austria-Hungary; but that Government has not actually engaged in warfare against citizens of the United States on the seas, and I take the liberty, for the present at least, of postponing a discussion of our relations with the authorities at Vienna. We enter this war only where we are clearly forced into it because there are no other means of defending our rights.

It will be all the easier for us to conduct ourselves as belligerents in a high spirit of right and fairness because we act without animus, not in enmity towards a people or with the desire to bring any injury or disadvantage upon them, but only in armed opposition to an irresponsible government which has thrown aside all considerations of humanity and of right and is running amuck. We are, let me say again, the sincere friends of the German people, and shall desire nothing so much as the early reestablishment of intimate relations of mutual advantage between us, — however hard it may be for them, for the time being, to believe that this is spoken from our hearts. We have borne with their present Government through all these bitter months because of that friendship, —exercising a patience and forbearance which would otherwise have been impossible. We shall, happily, still have an opportunity to prove that friendship in our daily attitude and actions towards the millions of men and women of German birth and native sympathy who live amongst us and share our life, and we shall be proud to prove it towards all who are in fact loyal to their neighbors and to the Government in the hour of test. They are, most of them, as true and loyal Americans as if they had never known any other fealty or allegiance. They will be prompt to stand with us in rebuking and restraining the few who may be of a different mind and purpose. If there should be disloyalty, it will be dealt with a firm hand of stern repression; but, if it lifts its head at

ANNOTATIONS

NOTES & QUESTIONS

all, it will lift it only here and there and without countenance except from a lawless and malignant few.

It is a distressing and oppressive duty, Gentlemen of the Congress, which I have performed in thus addressing you. There are, it may be many months of fiery trial and sacrifice ahead of us. It is a fearful thing to lead this great peaceful people into war, into the most terrible and disastrous of all wars, civilization itself seeming to be in the balance.

But the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts,—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own Governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free. To such a task we can dedicate our lives and our fortunes, every thing that we are and everything that we have, with the pride of those who know that the day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace which she has treasured. God helping her, she can do no other.

WOODROW WILSON

Fourteen Points

SPEECH

January 8, 1918
United States Congress | Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

With the United States' entry into World War I in April 1917, the stalemate in Europe was finally broken, and the Allies at last defeated the Central Powers in November 1918. However, President Woodrow Wilson—motivated by his Progressive political philosophy—sought to make the subsequent peace lasting and beneficial for the world as a whole. This speech, delivered before a joint session of Congress prior to the war's end, saw Wilson outline his vision of the terms of peace, and how the world would be better for accepting them.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What event does Wilson cite as a key development in the war effort?
2. What was the purpose of the war, according to him?
3. Why does Wilson suggest his plan for peace should be followed by other nations above all others?
4. What are the titular "Fourteen Points" he gives?
5. How does Wilson view the defeated Germany?

Woodrow Wilson. "'Fourteen Points' Message." Speech, January 8, 1918. From Teaching American History. https://teachingamericanhistory.org/document/fourteen-points/.

ANNOTATIONS **NOTES & QUESTIONS**

Gentlemen of the Congress, —

Once more, as repeatedly before, the spokesmen of the Central Empires have indicated their desire to discuss the objects of the war and the possible basis of a general peace. Parleys have been in progress at Brest-Litovsk between representatives of the Central Powers to which the attention of all the belligerents has been invited for the purpose of ascertaining whether it may be possible to extend these parleys into a general conference with regard to terms of peace and settlement.

The Russian representatives presented not only a perfectly definite statement of the principles upon which they would be willing to conclude peace, but also an equally definite program of the concrete application of those principles. The representatives of the Central Powers, on their part, presented an outline of settlement which, if much less definite, seemed susceptible of liberal interpretation until their specific program of practical terms was added. That program proposed no concessions at all either to the sovereignty of Russia or to the preferences of the populations with whose fortunes it dealt, but meant, in a word, that the Central Empires were to keep every foot of territory their armed forces had occupied, — every province, every city, every point of vantage, — as a permanent addition to their territories and their power. It is a reasonable conjecture that the general principles of settlement which they at first suggested originated with the more liberal statesmen of Germany and Austria, the men who have begun to feel the force of their own peoples' thought and purpose, while the concrete terms of actual settlement came from the military leaders who have no thought but to keep what they have got. The negotiations have been broken off. The Russian representatives were sincere and in earnest. They cannot entertain such proposals of conquest and domination.

The whole incident is full of significance. It is also full of perplexity. With whom are the Russian representatives dealing? For whom are the representatives of the Central Empires speaking? Are they speaking for the majorities of their respective parliaments or for the minority parties, that military and imperialistic minority which has so far dominated their whole policy and controlled the affairs of Turkey and of the Balkan

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

states which have felt obliged to become their associates in this war? The Russian representatives have insisted, very justly, very wisely, and in the true spirit of modern democracy, that the conferences they have been holding with the Teutonic and Turkish statesmen should be held within open, not closed doors, and all the world has been audience, as was desired.

To whom have we been listening, then? To those who speak the spirit and intention of the Resolutions of the German Reichstag on the 9th of July last, the spirit and intention of the liberal leaders and parties of Germany, or to those who resist and defy that spirit and intention and insist upon conquest and subjugation? Or are we listening, in fact, to both, unreconciled and in open and hopeless contradiction? These are very serious and pregnant questions. Upon the answer to them depends the peace of the world. But, whatever the results of the parleys at Brest-Litovsk, whatever the confusions of counsel and of purpose in the utterances of the spokesmen of the Central Empires, they have again attempted to acquaint the world with their objects in the war and have again challenged their adversaries to say what their objects are and what sort of settlement they would deem just and satisfactory. There is no good reason why that challenge should not be responded to, and responded to with the utmost candor. We did not wait for it. Not once, but again and again, we have laid our whole thought and purpose before the world, not in general terms only, but each time with sufficient definition to make it clear what sort of definitive terms of settlement must necessarily spring out of them.

Within the last week Mr. Lloyd George has spoken with admirable candor and in admirable spirit for the people and Government of Great Britain. There is no confusion of counsel among the adversaries of the Central Powers, no uncertainty of principle, no vagueness of detail. The only secrecy of counsel, the only lack of fearless frankness, the only failure to make definite statement of the objects of the war, lies with Germany and her Allies. The issues of life and death hang upon these definitions. No statesman who has the least conception of his responsibility ought for a moment to permit himself to continue this tragical and appalling outpouring of blood and treasure unless he is sure beyond a peradventure that the objects of the vital sacrifice are part and parcel of

ANNOTATIONS NOTES & QUESTIONS

the very life of Society and that the people for whom he speaks think them right and imperative as he does.

There is, moreover, a voice calling for these definitions of principle and of purpose which is, it seems to me, more thrilling and more compelling than any of the many moving voices with which the troubled air of the world is filled. It is the voice of the Russian people. They are prostrate and all but helpless, it would seem, before the grim power of Germany, which has hitherto known no relenting and no pity. Their power, apparently, is shattered. And yet their soul is not subservient. They will not yield either in principle or in action. Their conception of what is right, of what is humane and honorable for them to accept, has been stated with a frankness, a largeness of view, a generosity of spirit, and a universal human sympathy which must challenge the admiration of every friend of mankind; and they have refused to compound their ideals or desert others that they themselves may be safe.

They call to us to say what it is that we desire, — in what, if in anything, our purpose and our spirit differ from theirs; and I believe that the people of the United States would wish me to respond, with utter simplicity and frankness. Whether their present leaders believe it or not, it is our heartfelt desire and hope that some way may be opened whereby we may be privileged to assist the people of Russia to attain their utmost hope of liberty and ordered peace.

It will be our wish and purpose that the processes of peace, when they are begun, shall be absolutely open and that they shall involve and permit henceforth no secret understandings of any kind. The day of conquest and aggrandizement is gone by; so is also the day of secret covenants entered into in the interest of particular governments and likely at some unlooked-for moment to upset the peace of the world. It is this happy fact, now clear to the view of every public man whose thoughts do not still linger in an age that is dead and gone, which makes it possible for every nation whose purposes are consistent with justice and the peace of the world to avow now or at any other time the objects it has in view.

ANNOTATIONS **NOTES & QUESTIONS**

We entered this war because violations of right had occurred which touched us to the quick and made the life of our own people impossible unless they were corrected and the world secured once for all against their recurrence. What we demand in this war, therefore, is nothing peculiar to ourselves. It is that the world be made fit and safe to live in; and particularly that it be made safe for every peace-loving nation which, like our own, wishes to live its own life, determine its own institutions, be assured of justice and fair dealing by the other peoples of the world as against force and selfish aggression. All the peoples of the world are in effect partners in this interest, and for our own part we see very clearly that unless justice be done to others it will not be done to us.

The program of the world's peace, therefore, is our program; and that program, the only possible program, as we see it, is this:

1. Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.

2. Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas, outside territorial waters, alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants.

3. The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance.

4. Adequate guarantees given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety.

5. A free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims, based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty the interests of the populations concerned must have equal weight with the equitable claims of the government whose title is to be determined.

ANNOTATIONS **NOTES & QUESTIONS**

6. The evacuation of all Russian territory and such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia as will secure the best and freest cooperation of the other nations of the world in obtaining for her an unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development and national policy and assure her of a sincere welcome into the society of free nations under institutions of her own choosing; and, more than a welcome, assistance also of every kind that she may need and may herself desire. The treatment accorded Russia by her sister nations in the months to come will be the acid test of their good will, of their comprehension of her needs as distinguished from their own interests, and of their intelligent and unselfish sympathy.

7. Belgium, the whole world will agree, must be evacuated and restored, without any attempt to limit the sovereignty which she enjoys in common with all other free nations. No other single act will serve as this will serve to restore confidence among the nations in the laws which they have themselves set and determined for the government of their relations with one another. Without this healing act the whole structure and validity of international law is forever impaired.

8. All French territory should be freed and the invaded portions restored, and the wrong done to France by Prussia in 1871 in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine, which has unsettled the peace of the world for nearly fifty years, should be righted, in order that peace may once more be made secure in the interests of all.

9. A readjustment of the frontiers of Italy should be effected along clearly recognizable lines of nationality.

10. The peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development.

11. Rumania, Serbia, and Montenegro should be evacuated; occupied territories restored; Serbia accorded free and secure access to the sea; and the relations of the several Balkan states to one another determined by friendly counsel along

ANNOTATIONS **NOTES & QUESTIONS**

historically established lines of allegiance and nationality; and international guarantees of the political and economic independence and territorial integrity of the several Balkan states should be entered into.

12. The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development, and the Dardanelles should be permanently opened as a free passage to the ships and commerce of all nations under international guarantees.

13. An independent Polish state should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations, which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant.

14. A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike.

In regard to these essential rectifications of wrong and assertions of right we feel ourselves to be intimate partners of all the governments and peoples associated together against the Imperialists. We cannot be separated in interest or divided in purpose. We stand together until the end.

For such arrangements and covenants we are willing to fight and to continue to fight until they are achieved; but only because we wish the right to prevail and desire a just and stable peace such as can be secured only by removing the chief provocations to war, which this program does remove. We have no jealousy of German greatness, and there is nothing in this program that impairs it. We grudge her no achievement or distinction of learning or of pacific enterprise, such as have made her record very bright and very enviable. We do not wish to injure her or to block in any way her legitimate influence or power. We do not wish to fight her either with arms or with hostile

ANNOTATIONS **NOTES & QUESTIONS**

arrangements of trade if she is willing to associate herself with us and the other peace-loving nations of the world in covenants of justice and law and fair dealing. We wish her only to accept a place of equality among the peoples of the world, — the new world in which we now live, — instead of a place of mastery.

Neither do we presume to suggest to her any alteration or modification of her institutions. But it is necessary, we must frankly say, and necessary as a preliminary to any intelligent dealings with her on our part, that we should know whom her spokesmen speak for when they speak to us, whether for the Reichstag majority or for the military party and the men whose creed is imperial domination.

We have spoken now, surely, in terms too concrete to admit of any further doubt or question. An evident principle runs through the whole program I have outlined. It is the principle of justice to all peoples and nationalities, and their right to live on equal terms of liberty and safety with one another, whether they be strong or weak.

Unless this principle be made its foundation no part of the structure of international justice can stand. The people of the United States could act upon no other principle; and to the vindication of this principle they are ready to devote their lives, their honor, and everything they possess. The moral climax of this the culminating and final war for human liberty has come, and they are ready to put their own strength, their own highest purpose, their own integrity and devotion to the test.

HENRY CABOT LODGE

League of Nations Speech

SPEECH

August 12, 1919
Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND

In President Woodrow Wilson's "Fourteen Points" (see previous selection), his last was the creation of a "League of Nations" that he believed would prevent another conflict like World War I from occurring in the future. Following the conclusion of the war and the signing of the Treaty of Versailles (which helped to formalize the League), Wilson returned to the United States to attract support for America's membership in the new organization. However, many members of Congress, including Senator Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts, strongly opposed the League because they feared increased American involvement in overseas affairs would ultimately be detrimental to the nation. This speech by Lodge echoes many sentiments of future Americans on foreign policy.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What does Lodge say is "more precious to ourselves … [and] the world than any single possession"?

2. Why does he say the United States' international independence should be maintained?

3. To what does Lodge give his highest loyalty?

4. What does he compare "internationalism" to?

5. What does Lodge say is the primary result of the United States joining the League of Nations?

6. What ultimate consequences does he warn against?

Henry Cabot Lodge. "League of Nations Speech." Speech, August 12, 1919. From California State University, Northridge. https://www.csun.edu/~twd61312/485/Lodge%20League%20Speeches.pdf.

ANNOTATIONS **NOTES & QUESTIONS**

Mr. President:

The independence of the United States is not only more precious to ourselves but to the world than any single possession. Look at the United States today. We have made mistakes in the past. We have had shortcomings. We shall make mistakes in the future and fall short of our own best hopes. But none the less is there any country today on the face of the earth which can compare with this in ordered liberty, in peace, and in the largest freedom?

I feel that I can say this without being accused of undue boastfulness, for it is the simple fact, and in making this treaty and taking on these obligations{,} all that we do is in a spirit of unselfishness and in a desire for the good of mankind. But it is well to remember that we are dealing with nations{,} every one of which has a direct individual interest to serve, and there is grave danger in an unshared idealism.

Contrast the United States with any country on the face of the earth today and ask yourself whether the situation of the United States is not the best to be found. I will go as far as anyone in world service, but the first step to world service is the maintenance of the United States.

I have always loved one flag and I cannot share that devotion [with] a mongrel banner created for a League.

You may call me selfish if you will, conservative or reactionary, or use any other harsh adjective you see fit to apply, but an American I was born, an American I have remained all my life. I can never be anything else but an American, and I must think of the United States first, and when I think of the United States first in an arrangement like this I am thinking of what is best for the world, for if the United States fails, the best hopes of mankind fail with it.

I have never had but one allegiance - I cannot divide it now. I have loved but one flag and I cannot share that devotion and give affection to the mongrel banner invented for a

ANNOTATIONS **NOTES & QUESTIONS**

league. Internationalism, illustrated by the Bolshevik and by the men to whom all countries are alike provided they can make money out of them, is to me repulsive.

National I must remain, and in that way I like all other Americans can render the amplest service to the world. The United States is the world's best hope, but if you fetter her in the interests and quarrels of other nations, if you tangle her in the intrigues of Europe, you will destroy her power for good and endanger her very existence. Leave her to march freely through the centuries to come as in the years that have gone.

Strong, generous, and confident, she has nobly served mankind. Beware how you trifle with your marvellous inheritance, this great land of ordered liberty, for if we stumble and fall freedom and civilization everywhere will go down in ruin.

We are told that we shall 'break the heart of the world' if we do not take this league just as it stands. I fear that the hearts of the vast majority of mankind would beat on strongly and steadily and without any quickening if the league were to perish altogether. If it should be effectively and beneficently changed the people who would lie awake in sorrow for a single night could be easily gathered in one not very large room but those who would draw a long breath of relief would reach to millions.

We hear much of visions and I trust we shall continue to have visions and dream dreams of a fairer future for the race. But visions are one thing and visionaries are another, and the mechanical appliances of the rhetorician designed to give a picture of a present which does not exist and of a future which no man can predict are as unreal and short-lived as the steam or canvas clouds, the angels suspended on wires{,} and the artificial lights of the stage.

They pass with the moment of effect and are shabby and tawdry in the daylight. Let us at least be real. Washington's entire honesty of mind and his fearless look into the face of all facts are qualities which can never go out of fashion and which we should all do well to imitate.

ANNOTATIONS **NOTES & QUESTIONS**

Ideals have been thrust upon us as an argument for the league until the healthy mind which rejects cant revolts from them. Are ideals confined to this deformed experiment upon a noble purpose, tainted, as it is, with bargains and tied to a peace treaty which might have been disposed of long ago to the great benefit of the world if it had not been compelled to carry this rider on its back? 'Post equitem sedet atra cura {Behind the rider sits a black care},' Horace tells us, but no blacker care ever sat behind any rider than we shall find in this covenant of doubtful and disputed interpretation as it now perches upon the treaty of peace.

No doubt many excellent and patriotic people see a coming fulfillment of noble ideals in the words 'league for peace.' We all respect and share these aspirations and desires, but some of us see no hope, but rather defeat, for them in this murky covenant. For we, too, have our ideals, even if we differ from those who have tried to establish a monopoly of idealism.

Our first ideal is our country, and we see her in the future, as in the past, giving service to all her people and to the world. Our ideal of the future is that she should continue to render that service of her own free will. She has great problems of her own to solve, very grim and perilous problems, and a right solution, if we can attain to it, would largely benefit mankind.

We would have our country strong to resist a peril from the West, as she has flung back the German menace from the East. We would not have our politics distracted and embittered by the dissensions of other lands. We would not have our country's vigour exhausted or her moral force abated, by everlasting meddling and muddling in every quarrel, great and small, which afflicts the world.

Our ideal is to make her ever stronger and better and finer, because in that way alone, as we believe, can she be of the greatest service to the world's peace and to the welfare of mankind.