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DBQ: Puritanism In Early America

In the year 1620, a band of disgruntled, anxious, and religiously committed people sailed from Plymouth, England toward the New World. They had hope of fleeing the autocratic rule of 16th century Church of England and the oppressive divine right monarchy controlled by the house of Stuart. Their settlement in “New England” would in turn eventually set an unprecedented influence, which would later, form the basis and shape of our society today in America. This largely middle-class movement was known as Puritanism. They were followers of Jean Calvin. It was their goal to purify their lives as a whole society and themselves on personal basis. This would prove most difficult in a time where no one was certain as to how things would end up. This was especially true in a society, which they themselves created on new philosophical tenets and governed with no previous experience, precedent, nor proven leaders!

This unique ensemble of individuals was comprised of a “variety of groups sharing a common theology, which was basically, Calvinistic in doctrine and origins.” (Doc-A) One of the major Calvinist beliefs was the concept of predestination [meaning that “God knew even before the creation whether or not man would be saved”]. It centered on the “doctrine of original sin,” which stressed that “the fall of Adam had corrupted man’s nature;” (thus) “only by God’s selection were the souls of a few mortals would be predestined to Heaven upon Christ’s Atonement. (Doc-B). Consequently, the Puritans led a life of uncertainty and fear”, for one “could never be sure just who was predestined for salvation” and who wasn’t. There was also the doctrine of good works that tended to confuse Puritans. Their customs and way of life centered on this very belief. One was supposedly damned. “God usually saved those who led decent lives, attended church, and strove constantly for goodness” (Doc-A) Puritans put an enormous stress on hard laborious work and strict diligent study of not only the Bible but other subjects as well. Thus, education played a critical role throughout almost everyone’s life--those who were already supposedly “saved” probably did not put as much emphasis on education, for no matter how much wrong doing a “saved” person did, he would still go to heaven as a consequence of God’s Grace.

“Despite its preoccupation with learning, the New England mind was gripped with a superstitious fear of the supernatural.” (Doc-E) This xenophobia in the 17th century turned into witchcraft both in England and America. For a period of four years, (1688-1692), “witchcraft hysteria spread throughout the colonies, but only in New England [specifically Salem, Mass] where 20 witches were actually executed. (Doc-E) The Puritan government was a theocratic oligarchy where church and state were fused. Thus, when something like the Salem hysteria arises, there was no separation of church and state to debate the issue—everything was simply intermingled. Therefore, “one should not under estimate the powerful role of the religious ideas and practices among the colony and community leaders” that held such staunch positions. (Doc-G)
Returning to the concept of education, the reading and studying of the Bible inadvertently forced Puritan children and parents to read and write in a productive manner and become largely self-educated. It was no wonder that these Puritans were the first to open public schools. Along with public education came advanced education. The Puritans threw up institutions of higher education everywhere they settled. College after college was established in New England beginning in 1636 with Harvard and ending with Dartmouth and Kings Colleges [Columbia University]. Other colleges included Yale, Princeton, Penn, Cornell, and Brown universities. They were taught, “that the glory of God was intelligence, and that a man in order to be saved, must acquire more and greater learning of the world in which he lives. (John Winthrop) Every Puritan town had its school—the chapel or church served for primary education. Mothers were taught and told that it was their responsibility to educate a child—whether in school or at home. Secondary schools were built for the best of students. Such examples off secondary academies included: Andover, Groton, Exeter, & Lawrenceville. Today, most of those Puritan colleges and schools exist and are some of the most prestigious schools in the United States. The question can put forward, were all the colleges set up for a few impassioned scholars? The answer is, “No!”

The Puritan’s idea of limited government has undoubtedly influenced the greatest number of Americans—Puritans and non-Puritans. Limited government forms the basis on how modern government works and how it is set up. Alexander Hamilton, speaking to the Founding Fathers in 1787 he said, “Since men are not angels and do not govern by principles and ethics alone, this new republic must have limited government.” (OSI) The Massachusetts Bay leaders had a "genuine distrust of arbitrary power" They believed that “man was too sinful to be trusted with too much power; hence, the power was distributed accordingly so that no one man could dominated an entire society by himself. Hand in hand with the system of limited government came the concept and idea of self-government sometimes referred to as free agency! (OSI) The concept that self-government was developed so man could be an agent of “initiative and self-reliance within the body of the community.” (Doc-F) Without self-reliance, the government would collapse. (Doc-F)

Puritanism, was “a middle-class movement that had economic and political implications and overtones, as well? Although the Puritans never thought of their of their religion in economic terms, they did emphasize the fact that man could serve God…by following an occupation or calling that served the world.” To be self-sufficient and have money was a virtue. Successively, “This emphasis on industry and enterprise appealed to the middle class in a [lurid] way that could appeal to the peasantry nor to the nobility. (Doc-C) Gradually this “casual relationship between capitalism and Puritanism tended to move closer together due to the affinity and attraction of each toward the other. Undoubtedly Puritan and capitalist ideas went into the formation of the American doctrine of **Laissez-faire capitalism and individualism**—a theory was destined to have momentous repercussions on subsequent economic, social, cultural, and political developments. (Doc-C)

American public society has been both directly and indirectly affected in deep and dramatic ways by Puritan morals. They have been the foundation of American morality as well as the cardinal core of New England values. “Since the world was a continual place of temptation, the Puritans had to be constantly on guard;” (Doc-E) consequently, within these strict traditions and rules of Puritan thinking, there were bound to be several areas in which “rule breaking” would become evident. For example, the subject of prohibition was considered a fairly stringent law and the
Puritan people “were suspicious of frivolous behavior and would not tolerate, drunkenness, dishonesty, or sexual promiscuity.” They believed “the Drunkard is from the Devil” they also thought, “Wine is from God.” A primary center of social activity 6 days of the week was the “Ale House” (Otherwise known today a beer hall.) Records of beer, cider, and rum consumption at weddings and other celebrations in Puritan Massachusetts are said to make contemporary college drinking parties look like temperance meetings!”(OSI) Cider production was carried on in every colonial home. Smoking was crude but among the lower classes it was prevalent.

One of the most interesting contradictions was the dichotomy pertaining to religious freedom. These people advocated, taught, and sought religious freedom but didn’t practice it! Therefore, when Anne Hutchinson and Roger Williams sought manifest their religious independence, the Puritans didn’t need to even think about granting it. They just banished both for challenging the doctrines and practices of theocratic clergy of Massachusetts.

And perhaps the largest and most common area of “rule-breaking” was in the arena of “wholesale violations of the sexual codes.” (Doc-D) Ironically, this particular subject stressed to the greatest degree also produced the greatest number of legal convictions. Professor Edmund S. Morgan points out, that when you examine the New England court records, the most common offenses by far were violations of the sexual codes. “Although cases of adultery” (and premarital sex) “occurred every year, the legal penalty of death was not known to have been applied more than three times. The Puritans not only dealt with these cases leniently, they took every precaution to prevent them from occurring.” (Doc-D) “One precaution was to see that children got married as soon as possible. The way to avoid, fornication, adultery, masturbation, and perversion was for parents to provide suitable husbands and wives for their children.” (Doc-D) Childhood marriage laws were legal at 14 for girls and 16 for boys. My instructor supplied information to the effect that under the rule of English Law, “women were property” of either their fathers or their husbands. (OSI) The question boils down to, “Why did the Puritans establish these codes of demanding perfection, while at the same time knowing perfectly well that frail human beings—even since the fall of Adam—could never live up to such a code? (Doc-D)

With all its contradictions, one cannot help but wonder if these Puritan laws were for real? Were they as stringent and inflexible as they were thought to be? Nevertheless, there were indeed many Puritan traditions that unquestionably influenced and contributed in the making of our society the way it is; the emphasis on education, type of government, capitalistic ideas, and plain old Puritan ethics on morality. Morality encompassed a wide field of values including honesty, sobriety, personal responsibility, hard work, and sexual chastity before marriage and sexual fidelity after marriage. All of these values have survived in 17th, 18th, 19th, and 20th century America as the standards of public and private honor and legal respect. (OSI) But over time, and continuously since in a changing world Puritanism has left us all when some significant thoughts to ponder. This was a fascinating and enduring culture that has influence mankind ever since. Puritans set the unprecedented standard in living for all of us to follow and imitate to some degree. Unfortunately, it was also a model that man could never in his wildest imaginations, render neither successfully to himself nor to his society! It’s philosophical ideals, values, and practices are the bedrock of moral law in our society today. Our institutions of education are Puritan in origin and practice. Our economic philosophy of free enterprise is thoroughly Puritan. Our concept of limited government and protection of the rights of the minorities are also Puritan. Because America is a nation of
immigrants, the nation’s values and traditions could have come from many lands and sources, yet, under scrutiny, we know they had their antecedents in Puritanism. What we ascribe to as the American way of moral and ethical standards are Puritan over and over again.

Modern Americans do not think of themselves as Puritans. I didn’t think I was before I wrote this paper. However, I am now prepared to admit that anything we call American is more Puritan than it could be from any other single source. We are a product of our heritage, environment, and values; but rest assured, there will be those who rebel and reject that which entitles them to the protection of the law and clean, clear, and calm conscience is also Puritan! There is nothing wrong with being loyal, patriotic, hard working, chaste, well educated, and benevolent and looking for the welfare ones fellow man, which is exactly what Puritanism was all about. I am not sure that we have achieved John Winthrop’s lofty status as a “City Upon A Hill and An Ensign Unto The Nations!” but we are the leader of the free world, with democracy, with laissez-faire capitalism, and we are subject to limitations and we have our own personal foibles.

COMMENT: This young man wrote this essay in my class at Fountain Valley High School in a 90 minute period using an IBM computer and Microsoft “Word” as the software
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Throughout the colonial period in North America, the colonies experienced great tension. As time passed and mere survival became easier, both the English and Spanish colonies began to look towards making a profit. In the Spanish colonies throughout what is now California, New Mexico, and Texas, the Native Americans were used as a labor force in order to increase profit. Similarly, in the Southern English colonies, African slaves were imported to plantations to be used as a similar work force. The Pueblo Revolt in New Mexico and the Stono Rebellion in the Carolinas reflect the social tension of the subordinate classes, the political tension demonstrated in the inability of the government to stop the revolts and the economic tension that was expression in the pressures the colonial masters applied because of their mercantilist policies.

Both rebellions were led by slave leaders who represented the anger of their exploited class and therefore the social tension of colonial society. The Pueblo revolt was lead by a charismatic leader, Popé, who was able to unify the oppressed under class, the native workers, into a rebellion. The natives of New Mexico had been subdued by the technological superiority of the Spanish and were forced to work in a manner similar to slaves in the English colonies. The native New Mexicans were also forced to abandon many of their cultural beliefs because of the proselytizing efforts of the Spanish Catholics. The combination of cultural and economic exploitation led to a class tension, which was a contributing factor in both revolts. In the Stono rebellion, the slave class was made up of African slaves who had been bought after the failure of the indentured servant system. The damaging effects of the Middle Passage, including severe disease, were compounded by the difficult life of laboring in the hot climate of the Carolinas. In addition to the tension caused by lowered health, the slaves became part of genteel culture, which dictated that the more slaves a man owned, the higher his social class. This system compounded class tension by combining the highest and lowest denominators. In both rebellions the slaves or natives exploitation by foreigners caused class tension, which led
to the rebellion. The fact that these rebellions occurred proves the social tension of the time, but the outcome of each illustrates and reflects the political tension caused by the government’s ineptitude.

Both revolts illustrate the political tension in that the governments were either unable to adequately quell the revolt or were dependent upon private citizens to end the violent outbreaks. In the Pueblo revolt the natives succeeded in that the Spanish recognized an increase in the rights of the natives. The fact that the government was not able to quell the revolt and maintain the same social order, illustrates the failings of the Spanish method of colonization. Because Spain never intended to form lasting settlements in New Mexico, the colonies that did exist there suffered from political tension as illustrated in the handling of the revolt. In the case of the Stono rebellion, while the slaves did not succeed the result of the rebellion is still significant. The fact that the slaves could even access weapons demonstrates a failure of regulation, however, the larger failing is that the government relied on private citizens to end the violence. This demonstrates the inability of the government to deal with problems quickly and the tension that derives from private citizens having more political control than actual officials. The conclusion of both revolts not only expresses the political tension but also the tension placed on each colony by the mother country in order to increase prosperity.

Neither rebellion would have occurred had it not been for the economic tension of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. The policy of mercantilism held that a country would succeed economically by accumulating wealth. As a part of this process, the country would acquire colonies, which allowed the mother country to maintain a favorable trade balance at the expense of the colony. Both Spain and Britain, the mother countries of the colonies in which the revolts took place, followed the policies of mercantilism, placing economic strain on the colonies. This strain is shown in both rebellions. In the Stono rebellion, the slaves were overburdened because the colony needed to produce enough to maintain prosperity and because the low standard of living and fight for land against Native Americans led to a sense of urgency to turn a profit quickly. If a farmer failed to produce a profit, he would fall into debt. This tension caused him to over work his slaves leading a rebellion. In the Pueblo revolt, the Spanish owners were hurt by Spain’s dwindling international importance, which made prosperity more urgent. If the Spanish colonies could find something useful to Spain, Spain could gain back some influence that had been lost to England. The tension caused by this urgency led to the commandeering of Native Americans as a work force, which led to the eventual revolution. The Pueblo and Stono revolts were the byproduct of economic tension and serve as good examples of the difficulties faced by a colonial society.
The Pueblo Revolt of 1680 and the Stono Rebellion of 1739 reflect the social tensions of colonial North America in that they were revolts of the subordinated classes. Each revolt also serves as an example of the political tensions of society because they either slightly weakened the government, the case of the Spanish, or revealed the reliance of the government on specific plantation owners in the case of the rebellion in the Carolinas. In either case a stronger government, which creates less political tension would have had greater success in preventing or combating the minor revolts. Both rebellions also serve as examples of economic tension because they are the result of an overburdened lower class, which was worked to excess because of economic motives.

I, Jennifer Dannals, give permission to John A Braithwaite to utilize this essay for the American History Institute in Salt Lake City.
QUESTION: “To what extent did economic issues provoke the American Revolution?”

“The Revolution was in the hearts and minds of the people,” wrote John Adams in 1818 about the Americans revolt against Britain. The actual rebellion occurred for several reasons. Socially, the populace rebelled long before the war by moving away from England for clear economic reasons. The war, however, was largely a political response to serious economic provocations on the part of Britain, which in turn produced enormous social changes period 1777-1800. The American populace originally rebelled against the English culture of 1608 when the first Puritans immigrated to America from both England and Holland. The raw New World offered land to anyone who would work for it. Few restrictions applied to farming, commerce, manufacturing by artisans; furthermore, the colonials possessed a great deal of social mobility. The class structure, so intense in England (and so absolutely economically determent there) only partially transferred to the New World many “Old World practices” were dissolved. In America, under Puritan influence a man could be educated and rise as far as that education—and self determination—would take him.

The English enacted a policy of colonial regulation and restraint in the famous Navigation Acts of 1660. Subsequently, the English enacted a policy of Salutary Neglect towards the colonies. There were mercantilist policies, specifically the Navigation Laws, limited America’s exports and imports to Britain, thereby profiting the mother country. The colonials did not at first mind the restrictions for three reasons: First, the policy allowed Americans to gain a profit. Tobacco, the major cash crop, provided high profits in England, and the Parliament had outlawed the growth of it in other colonies. Ergo, the Americans had a monopoly over the British market. Secondly, if the Americans preferred to (tobacco) to other countries, they could easily smuggle both imports and exports with little chance of being caught or punished. Finally, the English navy provided shelter for America’s ships. Only after 1763, would the American be subjected to harsh British regulation and restraint, thus causing Americans
to rebel against this economic theory and practice. After all, *Salutary neglect*, had provided them uncontrolled freedom, profit, and motivation for nearly 150 years. But after 1763, British regulation became absolute and enforced which led their path toward an inevitable conflict, war, and revolution. 1763 brought the Treaty of Paris, ending the French and Indian War. Prime Minister George Grenville recognized a serious fiscal deficit incurred from the fighting on both continents, and from the lack of income from the colonies. Responding to this, he ordered enforcement of the hated Navigation Laws and the strict enforcement of the concept of mercantilism. The acts placed a limit on trade which American merchants loathed; however, because it was not a direct tax, it caused little stirring at first on the North American continent.

Successful in his enforcement of the Navigation Acts, Greenville proposed the Sugar Act the following year. A duty on West Indian sugar, it became the first direct tax placed upon the colonies. This issue was very bad because of the English issue of precedence. Once done, in one place more could be done in another location. The colonials created an uproar; Grenville eventually backed down and lowered the tax. Economic issues evoked the fervor; politics (in America) responded and let it die down. Grenville, in the end, resigned because of his ineffectiveness.

The next Prime Minister of England was Lord Townshend, who promised to pluck the colonial “goose feathers” with a minimum of squawking. He initiated two acts: collectively known as the Townshend Acts on paint and ancillary items, as well as, the Quartering Act. Townshend recognized that 10,000 British soldiers were stationed in the Americas, and the colonies paid nothing for their protection. He initiated and act far less severe than those in England, where two generations had paid harsher taxes. The Americans did not want the soldiers; they wanted to return to the days prior to the French and Indian War under *Salutary Neglect* when only the states had the power to tax the people. Upon the day the Stamp Act should have gone into effect, every English tax collector had been forced to resign by fierce colonial mobs. The colonials responded to the tax with rebellion, and they succeeded (with Ben Franklin’s help) of getting the Stamp Act repealed.

The Stamp Act (under Grenville) brought more political organization than any previous British law of regulation. Twenty-five delegates from nine states met to form the Stamp Act Congress, which asked the Prime Minister to consider the American point of view and repeal the law. The reaction in Parliament was contempt at first because England was paying for colonial defense with no income.
While this had little effect upon King George III, it served to break down sectional barriers in America and provide for colonial unity. The Stamp Act Congress paved the way for the larger meeting of the Continental Congress.

Townshend realized that only £295 of £170,000 paying for the troops had been supplied by the Americans. Its lack of effectiveness caused Townshend the act; however, he (George III) attempted a vague political gain with the Declaratory Act. This law stated that “Parliament could tax the colonies in all cases whatsoever.” Which was much bigger threat to colonial government and economic than the previous acts of regulation and restraint.

The Articles of Confederation were initiated as the government of the Revolution. It too had to deal with issues economic concern such as taxes, western lands, and financing the Revolution. The Articles successfully negotiated the peace Treaty of 1783 and dealt with the issue of the Northwest Territories dividing and adding new states to the Union. There were both economic issues and political consequences of enormous dimensions. It also dealt with social issues of the post war era.

Finally, the Constitution of the United States comes during the 1780’s it was the “brilliant solution” to the economic, political, and social problems of the Confederation. There are historians who see the Constitution as a document of economic determinism (Charles Beard), yet, others, like Douglass Adair among many others who see it as a document of 18th century political theory opening up social opportunities. Abigail Adams admonished her husband “not to forget the ladies” which brought forth republican motherhood there was the slave issue involved in the 3/5’s compromise and the economic issue was dealt with the commerce compromise. But the economic victory of the Constitution came with the implementation of the brilliant Hamiltonian plan—bill of assumption, financing at par value, whiskey tax, provision for a national debt as a blessing, and the development of necessary and proper clause—or loose construction! Hamilton’s Reports on Banking, Public Credit, and Manufacturers became the main stay of the Federalist policies of Gen. George Washington who carried them out in 1790’s with the help of Robert Morris and Alexander Hamilton the financial geniuses who saved the nation. The development of political parties and discussion of manumission were enormous social developments.

The American Revolution was a unique and engaging event. It had long roots and shadows back into the colonial history of Britain in America in the New World. It was a manifestation of the
revolutionary temper of the late 18th Century. Moreover, it was an event that played into the brilliant hands of men (Franklin, Adams, Washington, Henry & Jefferson to name just a few) who had long since lost their connections to Britain as loyalists and “Englander’s”. The American Revolution was the signal manifestation of rising nationalism that would sweep the US and the countries of the Latin America in the years to come. The Revolution in a broad sense was far more than just the War of Independence, which brings me back to the Adams quotation with which I began, that “the American Revolution was in the hearts and minds of the people, long before the war broke out!”.

I, Jennifer Gruenenfelder, give and grant to my teacher, John A. Braithwaite the right to print and publish this essay which I wrote in 1988.

Signed: Dr. Jennifer Gruenenfelder, M.D.

Sloan-Kettering Institute of Medicine
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Causes of the American Revolution

Historians have been disputing for years over the real causes of the American Revolution. Some scholars see it as a social revolt (Jamieson), others see it rooted in economic factors (Hacker and Beard), still others hold on to political issues of the 18th century and claim it was product of the time (Adair & Berkin), finally historian Gordon Wood has advanced the claim that the Revolution was an age of radicalism and republicanism. In light of my studies, it is clear that economic issues provoked the Revolutionary War, while the response to those economic issues was largely a political challenge to Britain. There were of course, many and varied causes of the revolution. But the great revolutionary himself—John Adams claimed—“that the Revolution was in the hearts and minds of the people long before the war broke out!” So Adams, in a broad sense, is correct. The military phase was narrow and tricky for the Americans.

Firstly, England followed the mercantile system which as a policy was a harsh disadvantage to the American colonies. Based on this policy of mercantilism; the English further angered and adjudicated the colonists by regulating their trade and commerce. The final economic issue seemed to be taxation issue upon the colonies without representation. These three issues aroused much discontent in America. Under such leaders as Samuel Adams, Patrick Henry, John Adams, and Thomas Jefferson, the Americans reacted strongly in political ways responding to England’s regulation and restraint policies. Britain did not realize that the Americans would respond so hotly.
Mercantilism had been the policy for almost every European nation during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Basically it held that gold and silver were the measure of a nation’s wealth; related to the colonies it provided that they (the colonies) existed for the good of the mother country. To England, this was the basis to become the richest nation by exploiting the American colonies which were the richest in the world. For the colonies, mercantilism was abhorrent! Furthermore, all their wealth went to England, therefore, they had nothing to keep and prosper. This fact clearly shows the reality how England was retarding and preventing the American colonies from maturing. Men such as Thomas Paine began to realize how extensive the exploitation was, and he railed against it. In writing “Common Sense” he opened the eyes of the people and forcefully called the malady to their attention. As a result, much antagonism was raised against the British; later, Patrick Henry and Thomas Jefferson would join the propaganda crusade against England. Other writers such as Adam Smith, Edmund Burke, and John Locke began to give voice to the latent desires for complete independence—politically, socially, intellectually, and even culturally—even though many Americans still did regard themselves as Brits. The colonies wanted to mature, prosper, and expand; they wanted freedom. There were no direct political causes at first. These came in time as reactions to Britain controlling economic regulations. In my view, it was England’s regulation of economic issues that spurred the colonists into political turmoil and ultimate independence.

The system of regulation and restraint of the colonies was a direct result of the mercantile system. Forcing the American colonies to trade only with the mother country, through the enforcement of the Navigation Laws and Acts of Parliament during the decade of the 1760’s the colonials realized the extent of exploitation. For Americans, England was reaping the benefits while Americans saw themselves as
being raped! The colonies were hurt by falling prices and the losses they suffered when trading with other nations under contraband act of what England considered as piracy. The colonies sometimes bought more than they sold. Numerous other acts such as Townshend Acts, the Declaratory Act, and the Intolerable Acts all contributed to England’s tight policy of regulation and restraint. The American colonies began responding by forming vigilante groups, boycotts, and resorting to propaganda such as the Committees of Correspondence. These groups grew stronger and more influential.

“Taxation without representation” became the watch cry! Then there was the vilification of Grenville, Townshend and Lord North. The infamous Stamp Act turned the Americans into armed mobs such as Sons of Liberty. Boycotts such as the Association were set up and finally the military phase came in April of 1775 to defend our way of life. There were skirmishes like the Boston Tea Party and the Boston Massacre. These acts of radicalism based upon new ideas of political free agency were justified in the eyes of the Americans.

Thus, economic issues precipitated the movement. But surely, as John Adams said looking backward to issues like the Zenger Trial and Roger Williams detected revolutionary independence much earlier than coming military movement which today we know was the war of independence. Thus, historians quibble about the definition of terms. Revolution was much more than the war. Gordon Wood has pointed out that the Americans were far more radical than previously believed. The radicalism extended to include intellectual ideas of republicanism and social contract government by the majority. Consequently, the causes of the American Revolution were many, multi-dimensional, and long in the making. The American Revolution was the final expression of their political sentiments aroused by the unwise economic calculations of 18th century British leaders who seemed to be too dull to see what was coming.
It was the strength of the opposition forces, both liberal and conservative, rather than the ineptitude and stubbornness of President Wilson that led to the Senate defeat of the Treaty of Versailles. Using the documents and your knowledge of the period 1917-1921, assess the validity of this statement.

Woodrow Wilson, through his tenure as President of Princeton University, as Governor of New Jersey, and then in his two presidential terms, demonstrated strong broad based leadership. Although political ineptness and a lack of charisma sometimes marked his career, Wilson generally, compensated with a pervading morality and intellect. So it was with his greatest achievement, the Fourteen Points—and most especially—the League of Nations to which he committed his life after 1918-1919. Yet, in an era in which the Congress fiercely guarded its war powers, the Senate, was under the powerful Republican influence. The failure of the US in joining the League is attributable to the power of both the liberal and conservative opposition.

Leading the opposition forces was the Massachusetts Republican Henry Cabot Lodge, an adherent to Theodore Roosevelt, and chair of the Foreign Relations Committee. Both men were scholars and prior to his election to Congress, Lodge, a Harvard Ph D. had written six credible and significant books. Wilson and Lodge shared a view that the US was intended for greatness in the global arena. Lodge was Wilson’s intellectual equal. However, it is precisely here that the two men diverged. Lodge represented the liberal
opposition, the faction known as the reservationists, who were willing to ratify the Treaty if Wilson would compromise on one key issue. Article X. Article X as the backbone of the League arranged the international institutional institution to be the mediator in global conflicts and allowed or enforceable collective security, the idea that an attack against one nation is an attack against all free nations by the aggressor.

William Borah—an Idaho Senator leading the other faction—the irreconcilables (or conservatives) who supported the isolationist view that vehemently resisted American involvement in the affairs of the world, especially Europe! He articulated a similar fear shared by the reservationists, the fear that “those matters which are of vital importance to our people shall be submitted to a tribunal created other than by our people” [Doc. A] Thus, the senatorial opposition depicts Wilson’s efforts for an international association as the sacrifice of America’s freedom of action, or as one cartoonist envisioned it, the US as a bridegroom submitting his freedoms for a marital bond to a foreign entanglements bride. [Doc. E].

Ironically, Borah and other irreconcilables such Wisconsin Senator Robert LaFollette Jr. were progressives, supporting direction election of senators, a national income tax, and other political reforms like referendum, initiative petition, and recall. Borah also opposed the Espionage Act and even lobbied for Eugene Debs’ exoneration, and thus, one can infer that the senator’s anti-Wilson sentiment was born several years prior to the debate over the Treaty. Significantly, domestic reformers were not necessarily progressives in diplomacy, and progressive organizations such as Jane Addams’s “The Woman’s Peace Party” often, “found [their] Branches fairly divided upon the
subject” of an international organization [Doc. I]. Nonetheless, the progressive senators had major influence in the Senate and therefore held seats on committees such as the Foreign Relations Committee that were critical to the defeat of the Treaty.

In contrast to the popular image of Wilson as an inept politician, Wilson did practice prudence, if not somewhat desperate, politics during his campaign for the ratification by turning to the people. In 1918, Wilson engaged in an unprecedented tour by train of the nation. He stressed the importance of the treaty as the key to preventing the deaths of future American soldiers, poignantly recapturing the rapport with voters had once enjoyed [Doc. G] typifies such a speech, although, it was presented after the aforementioned tour. The tour culminated in a powerful speech in the twelfth city of the tour, Pueblo, Colorado, following which Wilson suffered a devastating stroke. The stroke seemed to accentuate the President’s stubborn qualities, further complicating relations with the Senate.

Document “C” can be construed as the President demonstrating his shortcomings in politics, his steadfast resolution to keep Article X. Truly, Wilson’s first major mistake was not inviting one of the major Republican congressmen such as Lodge to attend the peace proceedings in Paris. But in truth, the excerpt reveals Wilson’s true motive for the issue. The idealist radiates from Wilson’s words in the allusions to “the boys who went across the water to fight,” and it is evident that he truly believed that a cause as prodigious as preserving world peace would somehow render a nonpartisan act of approval from Congress. [which was a colossal miscalculation of Wilson, given the men who were in the Senate!] Naturally then, Wilson would wanted
Article X included at all costs [Document C]. *However, his failure to reconcile political reality leaves Wilson in a state of diplomatic wanting!*

Many members of the opposition were advocates of Theodore Roosevelt’s big stick policy, politicians fearful of losing control over US actions in foreign affairs, especially concerning American diplomacy in Latin America. Thus, it is stubbornness so very strong from the Senate opposition that allows the failure of the Treaty meant for the common good that tolls the death knell for American involvement in the League of Nations. *Who was responsible? It was Wilson, it was the egos of the Senators (left and right), it was the isolationism of the times, and the clamor of the people. Scapegoating is a popular pastime of history but it does not adequately fix the blame, explain the historical reality, nor square off with the facts and truth of the events.*

I, Michael McKenna, give and grant authorization to John Braithwaite to publish my essay written in February of 2003.

Signed: Michael McKenna
Intellectual, charismatic, vibrant, and progressive, are all words that denote President Theodore Roosevelt. With his love of nature, admiration of war heroes, and sharp intellect, Roosevelt epitomized the Progressive era, which was consequently reflected in both his domestic and foreign politics. Roosevelt’s depth makes it impossible to sum up the man in merely one word. He was a complex individual with many different aspects to his character. Therefore, Theodore Roosevelt was a “realist, romanticist, and pragmatist,” who served as an exemplum of Progressive reform in the United States.

The wave of Progressive reform that swept the country at the beginning of the twentieth century made its way into national politics through the Presidency. Theodore Roosevelt grew up in a wealthy New York family, was educated at Harvard, and quickly entered the New York State legislature. Prior to his election to the Presidency, TR was convinced that the government had the power, and responsibility, to improve the lives of the American people. Due to his political zeal, Roosevelt was placed in a position which was considered a “dead end” job. Roosevelt was the Vice President of William McKinley. However, due to a twist of fate, Roosevelt became President after McKinley’s assassination. Roosevelt had the power to influence the country, as well as much of the Western Hemisphere, with Progressive reforms. He brought many new qualities to the White House, and a will to mediate disputes and above all, uphold the public interest of the United States (Doc. F).
A major aspect of Roosevelt was his realism, meaning his inclination to truth and practicality. TR knew what needed to be done in order to help the people of the United States. He also knew that laws in Congress would not always insure justice. Therefore, he took many problems into his own hands. Roosevelt’s intervention in the coal strike of 1902 showed much about his political views. He knew that there were no grounds for federal intervention; however he also was aware that without it, the strike would have escalated to greater heights. Therefore, TR brought representatives together at the White House, which was unprecedented. When that still did not solve the problem, Roosevelt appointed an arbitration commission to rule on the issues. Roosevelt changed the federal government’s role from one of passivity, to one that is primarily concerned with the “welfare of the people,” and does not hesitate to intervene when necessary (Doc. I).

A major component of Roosevelt’s politics was his differentiation between “good” and “bad.” Roosevelt commonly distinguished between good and bad men, good and bad groups, and good and bad trusts. Roosevelt launched an assault on big business and large trusts, and soon became known as a “trust buster,” who personally decided the value and integrity of each trust, and tried to root out the “grave evils” in both business and social life (Doc. N). Roosevelt was in no way against business, he merely felt that the country as a whole would be much more productive without the corruption of dishonest trusts. This shows his pragmatism, because he judged trusts by their influence and results, in order to determine their value to society. Roosevelt’s views were encompassed in his “square deal,” which he promised to all Americans. Roosevelt’s response to the trusts and labor unions showed that he was willing to take control of any situation (Doc. A).

Theodore Roosevelt’s expansionist side was evident during the events leading up to the construction of the Panama Canal. The creation of a canal at the Panama isthmus was practical, because it would drastically abbreviate the sailing distance from one side of the U.S. to the other.
This was mainly a measure of national security, which also showed realism on TR’s part. Roosevelt was determined to build that canal, and therefore did not hesitate to help Panama revolt against Columbia, in order to negotiate with the people of the new country of Panama. Naturally, this angered the Columbians who lost the area of Panama because of TR. However, Roosevelt was determined to create the canal, regardless of Columbian resentment (Doc. H). Another important aspect of Roosevelt’s foreign policy was his saying, “Speak softly and carry a big stick” reflecting his view that a strong navy (big stick) was essential to the success of a country. TR used his power and influence in the Caribbean in order to ensure the strength of his navy (Doc. D). This, once again, was realistic because many European nations, such as Britain and Germany, were putting a greater emphasis on their navy. However, TR was not to be outdone by any country.

In addition to being a realistic President, Roosevelt was a romanticist. This made him very appealing to many citizens, because it shaped his bright personality. Roosevelt loved reading and the arts, and was very fascinated by the beauty of nature. TR was a voracious reader, reading at least one book a day (Doc. K). A major facet of romanticism is the departure from established rules, which was obvious from the numerous unprecedented acts of TR. Romanticism was linked to Progressivism, and therefore it was only natural that Roosevelt was a romanticist. He believed that an occasional war was healthy for a country, and he loved the splendors of being a war hero. The bright anecdotes concerning war surrounding Roosevelt serve as an example of his progressive ideology and love and appreciation for life.

In conclusion, President Theodore Roosevelt was depicted in many ways, and described in numerous fashions because of his complex, dynamic personality, and unique political policies. He brought a sense of Progressive reform to the white house, which would continue until World War I. Teddy Roosevelt was a realist and pragmatist, who knew what the country needed to insure growth, and was unwilling to compromise. He was a romanticist, who loved that beauty
of life, and the glory of war. And most importantly, he was a Progressive, who introduced reforms that shaped America, and aimed to protect the “honest laboring man” (Doc. B).

Permission granted to John A. Braithwaite for use in summer institute and consultations.
Signed: Brendan McGeehin
February 10, 2004
Malvern Academy of Philadelphia
Sectionalism DBQ

In the period of 1851-1861, the United States was dividing in the greatest manner for the first time in its history. This separation was occurring between the Northern and Southern states of the Union, which had differing economic and social systems. The North, which had become greatly industrialized, supported a free labor system, and possessed an entrepreneurial group supported by a labor class. The South, on the other hand, was upheld by the plantation economy, which required the use of slave labor. Thus, the class system was more rigid, and included an aristocratic landowning gentry, a group of poorer white laborers, and slaves, which provided the basis for labor. These differences also entered the political scene, as the fate of slave or free state had to be chosen for new states entering the Union, and the government was racked by a fight for voting power between the free North and slave-holding South. As the Northern and Southern ways of life and views became more incompatible, the Constitution became weak to provide harmony in the face of conflict because it did not provide enough guidance for the concerns in question. The Constitution, originally created as an instrument for national unity, became a source of sectional discord that ultimately contributed to the Union’s failure, because it was not specific on the issues of slavery and secession which became subject to Northern and Southern interpretation.

The Constitution became a source of disagreement because it did not include specifications on the issue of slavery which was interpreted differently by Northern and Southern states. Because no provision in the Constitution took an explicit stance on the morality or legality of the institution, the North chose to explain the document in a way that forbade slavery. Northern states were generally opposed to slavery, because they made use of a free labor system that did not employ slavery. Through industrialization, the North became a true manufacturing center, came to replace man power with machine power, and did not need to rely on slave labor in agriculture. Some in the North were abolitionists, those who demanded the immediate emancipation of all slaves. These men included William Lloyd Harrison, Ralph Waldo Emerson and others who voiced their opinions in such publications as the abolitionist newspaper the
“Liberator.” Abolitionists spurned slavery on the basis that it was an immoral institution that unjustly subjugated one group of people for the betterment of another. Abolitionists also interpreted the Constitution in a way that proved the immorality of slavery. For instance, William Lloyd Garrison, in a critique on the US Constitution, recognized the lack of directness of the Constitution when stating that “other words were used, intelligently and specifically, to meet the necessities of slavery” (Doc E). However, Garrison said, this “was never intended to give any protection or countenance to the slave system.” Garrison went on to say that slaves were regarded as chattel instead of as human beings, and suffered from the injustices of the Union. He echoed the desire of all abolitionists to overthrow the institution and to free slaves from this oppression. Another abolitionist, Ralph Waldo Emerson, in his address on the Fugitive Slave Law (Doc D), expanded on this idea, stating that “a man’s right to liberty is as inalienable as his right to life.” Thus, while the Constitution did not specifically state that slavery was unjust by the laws of nature, Emerson drew from the language of the Constitution that protected the right to life, to prove that liberty of all men, including blacks, was just as necessary as their right to live. Another group that was opposed to slavery in the North was the free-soilers. They were not true proponents for the emancipation of all slaves. Instead, they believed that all citizens had the right to own property and control their own labor. Because the slave labor system which the South used to perpetuate its landed aristocracy endangered this democratic right, free-soilers desired to combat the dominion of the South by fighting the spread of slavery. Both groups, thus, were opposed to slavery spreading to new territories applying for statehood in the Union. In addition, they were also opposed to strict Southern fugitive slave laws, which required that Southern slaves that had escaped to the North be found and returned to their masters. Resistance to these laws is exemplified in a flyer cautioning blacks against watchmen and police officers of Boston (Doc C). The anti-slavery North resisted this law by instructing African Americans to avoid public officers of Boston for they were acting as kidnappers. Northerners often hid blacks from kidnappers, and abolitionists aided in their escape, especially by facilitating the Underground Railroad, a system that enabled escaping slaves to hide in abolitionist homes as they made their way up North. Emerson defended breaking the law in such a manner in his address on the Fugitive Slave Law (Doc D), when he stated that the Constitution could only be upheld as long as its laws were just. As the Constitution supported slavery, which was an immoral institution, the law could be broken. Hence, Northerners who argued against slavery believed that it was not permitted by the Constitution and any law that tolerated the institution ought not to be abided.
On the Other hand, the South was strongly in favor of maintaining slavery. The South depended on the slave labor system because of its plantation economy. Slaves were important for preparing cash crops which were later exported to the rest of the US or abroad. The well established landed gentry that held most political and economic power believed that slavery was an indispensable part of the economy. In their view, if slavery was done away with, so was their economy. Poorer whites also supported slavery because it provided their class with social stability, as they knew that one class was lower than them yet. Furthermore, the institution of slavery allowed them more freedom and opportunity in government and the economy by exempting them from being the exploited class. Both poorer whites and the gentry were enraged when the North openly disobeyed the Fugitive Slave Law, for in their eyes this was a direct violation of a law that had to be followed by all. Once again, as the Constitution lacked specificity on slavery, the South manipulated its meaning to be more in support of the institution. In “Plain Words for the North”, for instance, an Anonymous Georgian stated that “the recognition of slavery where the people choose it and the remedy for fugitive slaves” were not addressed by the Constitution (Doc B). The writer also warned that the North would soon exclude the interests of the South from the Union unless slavery was extended through the newly acquired territories to the West in order to maintain a balance between free and slave states. Finally, the author stated that while the Constitution did not directly recognize slavery, slaves should be permitted to travel with their masters to new territories because the Constitution protected property.

Although the North and the South were at opposite ends on the issue of slavery, attempts were made at compromise. One of the most important examples of reconciliation was the Compromise of 1850. As see on the map of the Compromise of 1850 (Doc A), the negotiation recognized the existence of free states to the north of the Missouri Compromise Line of 36° 30’ and slave states south of the line. In addition, California was allowed to join the Union as a free state, and new territories would be allowed to vote on the issue of slavery through popular sovereignty. Both the Missouri and Compromise of 1850 were not necessarily Constitutional, but nothing in the Constitution allowed for an intermediate term settlement to the problem, either. Unfortunately, this Compromise could not hold the Union together for long, as conflict broke out over states that were drawn to one side or the other. Without guidance from the Constitution, the government had to devise its own methods of dealing with the issue of slavery. All the while, the nation was polarized into two camps, which eventually contributed to the failure of the Union when the South seceded and the conflict for the Civil War was established.
The Constitution also became a source of discord because it did not address the issue of secession about which different conclusions were formed by the North and the South. The North was opposed to secession because its major concern was to be committed to maintaining the Union. To the North, the Union was the most sacred entity that was to be preserved at all costs. It could not accept the departure of states from the Union on the basis of irreconcilable differences, in this case, the division caused by slavery. The North believed that just because the South was unwilling to give up slavery and could not resolve this problem with the North, did not allow it the right to separate from the rest of the US. Because the Constitution did not specify if secession was a legitimate political tool, the North worked their opinion of secession into their interpretation of the Constitution. For instance, while William Lloyd Garrison was an abolitionist who believed that there should be “no Union with Slaveholders” he was committed to keeping the Union together at all costs, and working within the framework of the country to “hasten the downfall of slavery in America.” (Doc E). Abraham Lincoln was equally dedicated to maintaining unity and battling secession. In his Message to Congress (Doc 1), he affirmed that no state should be allowed to withdraw from the Union lawfully. Lincoln rebuffed the idea that states possessed some “sacred supremacy” to the Federal Union, and stated that they had only the powers reserved to them in the Union by the Constitution. States could not secede because no state had ever existed outside of the Union, and states lacked the power to separate from and destroy the Union. While the Constitution never stated this, Lincoln interpreted the principle of states’ rights in the Union and the history of states to rebuke the notion of secession with excellent logic. Overall, the North saw the power of secession as the power to destroy, for if one area of the country to was to remove itself from the Union, any disagreement would be cause for fragmentation.

In contrast the South was a strong proponent of secession. The South had a history of support for states’ rights over federal ones. Southerners believed that the Constitution arose from a compact among states, and if laws were injurious to a state, the state had a right to nullify those laws. If no solution towards amending the law could be reached, the state had the right to secede. Because the South disagreed with the North on the issue of slavery, it was being pressured by the North to abolish the institution, faced a loss of power in the House of Representatives, and the Compromise of 1850 already seemed to divide the nation, it seemed appropriate that the South form its own nation. The South interpreted the Constitution in order to support these claims. In 1860, James Buchanan expressed such views in his message to Congress (Doc G). He stated that if the North was denying the South the right to own slaves, this was denying a provision of the
Constitution that protected domestic security and happiness of the remainder. In addition, according to the Constitution, the government had no right to wage war against a state. Thus, if a state wanted to secede, the federal government had no power to forcefully prevent it from doing so. Finally, Buchanan threatened that if the right to maintain slavery and the fugitive slave law were not in some way added to the Constitution, the result would be southern secession. Buchanan was also a supporter of slavery, as he demonstrated with his support for the Dred Scott Case, and reasoned that this difference with the North was yet another cause for secession.

Similarly, Jefferson Davis, the President of the Confederacy, protected Southern interests in his address to the Confederate Congress (Doc H). Davis stated that the Constitution was drafted by delegates chosen by states and was maintained by a compact of states. No where in the Constitution was it maintained that the national government was superior to the states. Thus, if a state found it harmful to abide by the laws of the national government, it had the right to break out of its compact and secede. With these two opposing views on secession, the North and South were both again at odds with one another. The results of these differences were finally crystallized in the election of 1860, when Lincoln was elected president. His election signaled to white Southerners that their interests in the Union would be stifled and that there was no common ground to be kept with the North. Without any guidance from the Constitution, the South decided that secession was the best solution and in 1860 seven states began to dismantle the Union.

The Constitution’s lack of specificity on the issues of slavery and secession was a source of sectional discord which ultimately served to fragment the Union, as the North and the South interpreted the document for their own benefit. The North used the Constitution to support the notion that slavery was both immoral and not permitted under the federal government, secession could not be allowed based on ideological differences and if permitted, would undermine the Union. In contrast, the South believed that slavery was necessary for upholding the plantation economy and a stratified social structure. Because the South differed so greatly on this issue from the North it was a champion of secession from the Union if irreconcilable differences arose. Both sides made at least some attempt to reach a compromise on the issues of slavery and secession and prevent the disintegration of the Union. However, as it became clear that both sides had developed in two very different directions the South was convinced that secession was the only way to maintain its way of life. The debate over the Constitution resulted in the polarization of the nation and set the stage for the Civil War, the bloodiest conflict in American history.
I, ROBERT LOUGHLIN, give and grant to John A. Braithwaite the right to use and publish the essay above which I wrote during the school year 2003-2004. Signed: Robert Loughlin.
Nationalism and sectionalism both were dominant and over-arching influences during the period of 1815 to 1858. Nationalism dominated the first part of this period; but later, sectionalism became the major focus in the United States. These two grandiose forces collided at many levels throughout the country as they met and created barriers that seemed impenetrable to people involved in this struggle. These two forces made so many barriers that finally the country couldn’t take any more and Civil War ensued. Both of these forces collided on different levels and at the same time were a dominating force in the country. The two forces coexisted during the pre-Civil War years but they did so fighting with each other during the whole period.

Nationalism was the feeling of national pride that swept the United States right at the end of the War of 1812. People took pride in being citizens in this great land even though they didn’t see eye to eye on every issue that arose (i.e. slavery). Everyone was united together and they took pride in being American. Clay’s *American System* that manifested the economic side of nationalism and it brought the country even closer together as it called for internal improvements (such as roads, canals, turnpikes, and railroads) not only in the North but also in the South and West. People felt so united that most of the country supported Andrew Jackson as their President in 1828. People in the country also united together to create strong national currency that stimulated the growth of national banks instead of sectional (or local) banks. People also decided that they finally should be proud that their country had
established itself and it had shown the rest of the world that they couldn’t push the United States around and get away with. This manifestation came with the formation of the Monroe Doctrine and reaffirmed the American idea of them being an international super power and that nobody else could push them around. National culture was manifest in the symbols—uncle Sam, the Liberty bell, and the composition of the “The Star Spangled Banner”.

Sectionalism was always present even when nationalism was the dominating force. New England decided that they would support the War of 1812 and isolated themselves with radical ideas of secession and other radical actions or ideas that came from meetings of New England—namely the Hartford Convention. They were the only section of the United States that did not unanimously vote in favor for Jackson in the election of 1828. This also happened as the South felt that their freedoms were being imposed on as abolition became a big issue and the South turned bitter over the pressure they were feeling from all around the country. The Dred Scott decision fueled sectional feelings against slavery. The Missouri Compromise in 1820 was another sectional separator because it essentially carved the country into two halves, one for slavery and the other for free states. The geography also separated the country as the South got the short side of the stick when it came to building natural waterways, navigable river improvement, and internal improvements all of which the North experienced. Even though the South was the majority grower of crops in the country, they did not even close to the diversity of products the North was producing. This was yet another sectional wedge that drove the country apart.

Nationalism and sectionalism collided along the lines of geography. Geographically, the country was divided into three major areas: the North, the South, and the West. All of these sections had their unique advantages what they could offer to the country. The North had the ability to become an industrial and technological area because of their many navigable rivers and natural waterways that could power
new machinery and facilitate the invention and incorporation of new ideas. The South was the area of agrarianism and cash crops. The South had the best soil and the bests climate for growing things and they had the best rainfall for farming. The West had the new land for people to move on to. The many purchases and cessions were there. It was also the area of mining and forests.

Politics was another place where the two forces opposed each other in such a big way. Andrew Jackson was elected using the idea of nationalism to his advantage. He took the idea of uniting the American people into one group and he won the election. The compromises that were made regarding slavery were the governmental decisions trying to ameliorate the conflicts of nationalism and sectionalism when they collided. The Missouri Compromise split the country into two parts because it drew a line through the country saying where slavery was legal and where it wasn’t. The Compromise of 1850 was where a fragile balance of power would come to exist between the states and allow them to decide on the slavery issue. This was a problem that showed Kansas as a pro-slavery, to which Missourians flooded in hopes that they could get it as a slave state by using the issue of popular sovereignty. This showed how politics was succumbing to sectional feelings that fostered the new legislation in the government.

Economics were another major issue separated between nationalism and sectionalism. The American System proposed by Henry Clay was one idea that promoted nationalism because it built canals, railroads, and a network of national roads. It also called for a much stronger banking system and he also wanted a protective tariff for the American markets. Andrew Jackson and his fight started to cause some sectionalism because he felt that the national bank was unconstitutional. Troubles with tariffs also caused problems in Congress. One reason was the South thought that the proposed tariffs would reduce the market or damage the market for cotton which was the South’s major export. The “Market Revolution” also fostered
sectionalism. The North became increasingly industrialized and the South remained agricultural. The South got left out in the cold as they stayed with their agrarian economy and did not join the frenzy of a technological society and industrialized market.

Diplomacy was another point along the way which the two powers fought for control. The Monroe Doctrine was diplomatic statement of hemispheric nationalism. The doctrine was written as if every one in the United States had written the document together. Yet, there were later issues, like the Ostend Manifesto that were clearly diplomatic statement of sectionalism. This statement was written by three American diplomats in Europe, opining on the issue of Cuba and statehood. This caused a huge uproar in the U.S. Northern abolitionists were enraged that their own foreign diplomats were interested in bring a Caribbean Island in a slave state. Thus, even diplomatic issues were subject to debate along the lines of sectional cleavage.

Constitutional fights were affected by nationalistic sectional feelings. The Supreme Court [under Marshall] was strongly nationalistic; however, the Chief Justice who succeeded Marshall was the southerner Roger Taney. He allowed sectional interpretations of the law to come forward in the courts. The clear contrast of cases pitted McCulloch vs Maryland a strong interpretation of nationalism, against, Dred Scott vs Sanford, which ruled slavery constitutional. This was sectionalism at it best.

Sectionalism and nationalism fought at even more levels than the ones stated. They coexisted as peacefully as they could, until the Kansas-Nebraska Act and Dred Scott case. In the middle 1850’s, and beyond, sectionalism led the country into Civil War.

Permission to publish granted to John A. Braithwaite. 2004 by Jacob Hatch.
DBQ on Abraham Lincoln

In December 1860, in order to deal with the problems of secession, both houses of Congress formed special committees. The House of Representatives created the Committee of Thirty-Three, while the Senate established the Committee of Thirteen. The Committee of Thirteen passed a rule that no proposal could be approved unless majorities of both the Republican and Democratic parties were in favor of it. This special committee then considered six constitutional amendments, which was known as the Crittenden proposal. However, at this time the Republican Party refused to compromise or concede anymore over the issue of the expansion of slavery. This proposal was rejected. Abraham Lincoln, who earned the nomination of the Republican Party, followed and believed this ideal of the party. Thus, the President-elect Abraham Lincoln and the platform of the Republican Party were responsible for the defeat of the Crittenden proposal on the territorial expansion of slavery. (Good accurate thesis)

The Republican Party was responsible for the defeat of the Crittenden proposal on territorial expansion of slavery. The Republicans believed “that the normal condition of all the territory of the United States is that of freedom” (Document A). The party was against any compromise about slavery and wanted to prevent “slavery from invading another inch of the free soil” of America (Document O). Although the Republicans were against the expansion of slavery, the main goal was the preservation of the Union. Thus, several Republicans believed in the extension of the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific (Document D). Other Republicans were trying to keep peace between both sides in order to settle the conflict without bloodshed.
Despite the efforts of some Republicans, the majority of the party refused to make any more compromises. The Republican senators believed they had “no concessions to make or compromises to offer” to the South (Document G). The Republicans were ready to stand firm on their opinion towards the expansion of slavery. The party believed “there must be no more compromises, no backing down” (Document M). Thus, the Crittenden proposal was rejected because one of the six amendments was the extension of the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific. This allowed for slavery in states south of this line but prohibited slavery north of the line. The other aspect of the Crittenden proposal was to guarantee the permanent existence of slavery in the slave states. The proposal would also assure the demands of the South over the issues of fugitive slaves and slavery in the District of Columbia. This compromise failed because all of the Republicans rejected it (Document T). This compromise was rejected because the Republicans refused to concede anymore to the South. The Republicans on this committee wanted to keep slavery contained to the South and would do everything in their power to prevent the spread of the “peculiar institution.” The compromise was doomed to fail because it was asking the Republicans to abandon their fundamental position, which was that slavery must not be allowed to expand. The Republicans sought to maintain the Union and did not want the South to part with the North. However, the Republicans would not compromise (Document K). After the failure of this proposal, William H. Seward, a member of this committee, said, “we came to no compromise; and we shall not” (Document U). The Republicans realized the immorality of slavery and refused to “agree to the proposition that slavery is a benign constitutional system” (Document N).

Abraham Lincoln, the President-elect, was also responsible for the failure of the Crittenden proposal on territorial expansion of slavery. Abraham Lincoln represented the beliefs of the Republican Party and thus, earned the nomination of the party. He was opposed to any
concession or compromise over the issue of expansion of slavery. Lincoln was able to win the presidency without winning a single Southern state and without the majority of the popular vote (Document B). His victory in the election represented the division that was apparent in the country during this time. Lincoln’s election was proof that slavery would not be extended into territories by any means (Document C). Lincoln’s firm opinions that “there be no compromise on the question of extending slavery,” caused the failure of the Crittenden proposal and other compromises (Document J). Lincoln also rejected the idea of Popular Sovereignty, which was the idea that the people of a territory would decide whether the territory was a free territory or a slave territory. Many criticized Lincoln and the Republican Party, believing that neither was listening to the needs of the people, which was that the people of the North and South sought to maintain the Union. The people would deplore the dissolution of the Union “as the greatest of earthly calamities, and a death blow to the cause of freedom throughout the world” (Document L). Therefore, many were against the election of Lincoln as President. Lincoln also had a strong influence on the Committee of Thirty-Three and played a large part in the failure of the Crittenden proposal (Document P). He was able to get his supporters to propose his resolutions and his ideas on the issue (Document R). Lincoln further created conflict by naming Senator William H. Seward as his Secretary of State. Seward was a Republican from New York and a member from the Committee of Thirteen, who sought to reach peace in order to maintain the Union. Some hoped that Senator Seward would extend the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific (Document F). Seward did not extend the line and only wished to direct the Committee of Thirteen. He was also against any further compromise over the issues of expansion of slavery. Lincoln’s appointment of Seward as his Secretary of State further reinforced that the Republicans, who now controlled the Federal government, would not compromise with the South. Therefore, once Lincoln and Seward were in power the failure of the Crittenden proposal was assured. With Lincoln and the Republicans in power, the South believed that the only way to
preserve its way of life was secession, and on December 20, 1860, South Carolina decreed the Union to be dissolved. South Carolina and the rest of South withdrew from the Union.

Therefore, both Abraham Lincoln and the platform of the Republican Party were responsible for the defeat of the Crittenden proposal on the territorial expansion of slavery. The Republicans refused to compromise over the issue of the expansion of slavery and Abraham Lincoln supported this opinion. This secured the failure of the Crittenden proposal, which was the last attempt for reconciliation between the North and South. What would have happened if the Republicans were willing to compromise, and the Crittenden proposal was passed? Would the South still have seceded from the Union? Would there still have been a Civil War?
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The Causes of World War I

War shows little regard for the innocent. When war breaks out it is the innocent who suffer the most. When WW I broke loose over the world, history was changed forever! Never before had all the major powers of the world come into such great conflict for a reason that was not truly evident. There is no justified reason for why all these great nations fell into such a bloody conflict. Even though the main reasons are not totally evident we will discuss the different aspects of what brought the war to pass. The different categories that will be discussed are the effect of diplomatic developments, social conditions, cultural identities, militaristic, economic, and political conditions.

Diplomatic events and developments reached far into the past but the formation of the Triple Alliance and Triple Entente were the two primary opposing camps that developed between Germanic Europe, and the Anglo-French cultures. Dating from the 1820’s to the time the war broke out in 1914, diplomatic developments led steadily toward world conflict. Among them were: the Congress of Vienna, the Ottoman Empire issue, the German problems—before and after—Bismarck Franco-Prussian showdown, Russo-Japanese War, and the Balkan crises. Long range causes that developed to cause the war included—nationalism, imperialism, militarism, propaganda, alliance systems, and fanaticism stemming from cultural, religious, and geo-political cleavages based in ancient cultural biases. The final act of fanatical action to precipitate war was the assassination of the Austrian Archduke in the Serbian capital of Sarajevo—a Muslin stronghold and teaming with anarchy.

Socially this is a war that had great effect on the people. People of similar backgrounds, ethnicity, language, and political ideas wanted to have their own country based upon national and religious affinities to govern themselves under their own rule. Countries like Germany and Italy excessive cultural nationalism that was being impressed upon them by the peoples within their geographic boundaries. This nationalistic power caused great stress for these countries even after they received their independence. Germany receiving its independence in 1871, and Italy receiving its independence in 1863. The social arena also consisted of leaders who were described as being “incapable leaders who falsified document gave lying stories of threats, and chauvinistic catchwords.” These leaders alone could have been those that you would be able to pin the whole war on “which in no way destined or inevitable”. I think a great deal of blame can be centered on the leaders of the nations who where driven by carelessness, surprise, and above all, mutual fear and phobias.

Culturally speaking, the culture was such that the people where largely being infected with imperialism due to the uprising of the industrial revolution. Great Britain’s industrial age began at the end of the 18th century, France came around in the early 19th century, and Germany in the 1870’s. Due to these increased manufacturing in these countries they were in greater need of foreign markets. Religion played a major cultural role, with the Catholic nations of Europe coming up against the Protestant nations,
although Germany was Lutheran/Catholic. Most of the entente nations derived religious affiliations from Calvinist doctrines and practices. Languages too, played a major cultural role. It was Germanic speaking peoples up against Latin and English speaking peoples. And in the case of all 19th century European nation’s cultural nationalism was a major issue because of arrogant self-righteousness, and even racist ideas and attitudes of leaders.

There were also factors that created and maintained national militarism. Each European country adopted “domestic measures and foreign policies that in turn steadily increased the danger of war” These measures required a steady increase in military numbers of men and spending of national resources. These measures required a steady increase in military that is “constantly replenished and augmented,” because every nation was concerned this would be the only way to protect their best interests (hence, the offensive—defensive arguments began.) During this time there were great advancements in military armament. For instance in the Russo-Japanese war they were able to prove the success of the long-range naval guns. The British also came out with the battleship called the “Dreadnaught” that was “noted for its heavy armament.” The Germans had advanced their war movements by the development of the U-boat (submarine). They were convinced that the war would be a naval war. The Germans, British, and Americans were stepping up the pace with the building of airplanes. Along with all the advancement in military powers all the countries started to build military alliances with each other to form the two gigantic alliances of power. One side featured: Germany, Austria, and Italy. The other was the Entente powers of Great Britain, France, and Russia, “these alliances in reality threatened the peace of the whole continent and world. If you can’t see that this isn’t composing a song for war then nothing will. The stage is being set for a colossal conflict between men and nations.”

Economics were the central vortex of the war. It took money to buy armaments. Some countries had invested so much in the military that “in time it would lead either to national bankruptcy or to war.” The manufacturing industry was so largely dependent upon war material that it affected the whole economic base of Europe. One of these rivalries was being played out in the conflict of Africa (imperialism) between Great Britain, France, and Germany. This conflict alone nearly precipitated war a decade earlier. Economic imperialism was beginning to be a huge problem. This imperialist view created by the Industrial revolution “intensified the desire of already fervid nationalists to acquire more lands and resources. It was the struggle for markets, and the rivalry for raw materials, and search for food supplies.” It comes down to the fact that each country was professing its superiority over the other. Each nation was deeply rooted in competition of “armies, navies, merchant marines, empires, and cultures.”

The fact remains that the political entities were solely responsible for the building up to the war and the beginning of the war. Those political organizations had full responsibility in the building of their military and stiff competitions for foreign lands. Every political leader was waiting and ready for a good cause or excuse to go to war. That opportunity came when the Austrian Archduke was assassinated by supposed Serbian movement. The Austro-Hungarian government concluded that a military action must halt the Serbian movement. At this point, everyone was becoming involved; including the Russians, Brits, and the US. All did not go well with the ultimatum made to Serbia on July 28. Austria declared war on Serbia and every else jumped in. Russia mobilized against Austria, Germany declared on Russia.
This movement caused the French to move in on the Germans and from that point on every one would to war.

The German Foreign Minister Alfred Zimmermann was once asked, if he knew what caused the war? His response was “If we only knew!” Everything about the 1st World War were classic examples of how a war starts. There were signs of militarism, nationalism, and imperialism. Each alone could escalate to a war of any kind. This war did not have to happen. It was matter of egos, national cultures, and jealousies unrestrained. A small very insignificant event grew to uncontrollable level. Due to the great levels of competition that already were in place. One other huge factor was the alliances that had been built. Each (nation) was willing to go to war for the other. This was the greatest lesson to be learned about this war even after the fighting was done; the war was not over and the conflict was not settled. There were still many wounds, mainly in Germany, that did not heal but fester into a sore that would explode into a more war—WW II.
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DBQ: Robber Barons

QUESTION: Were the industrialists of the late nineteenth century, “Robber Barons” or “Captains of Industry”? On the whole, were their methods and actions justifiable or simply selfish?

The climax of sectionalism and the Civil War vaulted industry to exceptional levels, where industrial national product exceeded its agricultural counterpart for the first time. It created a scenario for unprecedented entrepreneurship, particularly in railroads. Vicious competition launched big business, and a new class of elite industrials. Their method was blemished with significant social consequences, but was revolutionary to American economic centralization: greed and tycoonism built America’s industrial economy because of the American capability to bring the essential elements together that create industrialism—namely, natural resources, labor, markets, capital, technology, transportation (railroads), and profits.

Horatio Alger glamorized the “rags to riches” success story, inspired by true self-made men such as John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, and J.P. Morgan: to many such figures represented the capacity for social and economic mobility, lending a degree of hope to the impoverished, or new immigrant individual. Russell H. Cornwell’s “Acres of Diamonds” (Doc-I) emphasized human potential: “it is your duty to be rich...money is power, and it ought to be in the hands of good men.” As the main advocate of The Gospel of Wealth, Carnegie idealized the responsibilities of the “man of wealth” (Doc-J): “to set an example of modest...living and “hold his fortune ‘in trust’ for the community and use it for philanthropic and charitable purposes” –
Carnegie himself donated over $350 million to fund and found schools, universities, libraries, museums, and concert halls. He thus hoped to create a model of the “proper administration of wealth” to “bind together the rich and poor in harmonious relationship.”

Such a social gospel still stressed however, that the man of wealth become “the mere trustee and agent for the poorer brethren, bringing to their service his superior wisdom, experience, and ability” (Doc-J), so recognizing an inherent superiority in the successful. In such, many wealthy advocates were simply tycoons eager to justify their extravagant and grossly excessive lives of personal luxury (for example, the Vanderbilt family), and their deeper conceptions of Social Darwinism; it only further widened social and economic inequality.

Central to this ideology was the law of competition—the law to which “we owe our wonderful material growth” (Doc-H). Even as Darwin’s “survival of the fittest” was considered “the working-out law of nature and a law of God,” so was Social Darwinism applied to big business, comparable to the “American Beauty Rose ... whose splendor and fragrance...bring cheer... only by sacrificing the early buds which grow up around it.”(Doc-G). So the industrialists portrayed the great combinations as elegant, with the need to sacrifice or absorb weaker competition to thrive. Carnegie went further to suggest “great inequality of environment, the concentration of business, industrial and commercial, in the hands of a few...(is) essential for the future progress of the race.(Doc-H).

So evolved the trust (perfected by financier J.P. Morgan), and industrial combination, concluded to be, the US Industrial Commission’s report on the same in Document A, (in spite and in lieu of bias), “a necessity” responsibility for the genesis of modern business administration, managerial hierarchy, and efficacy of practice. Moreover, these mechanisms of economic centralization and expansion, and their resource and “command of necessary capital” crucial to industrial enterprise and
success, were viewed as a tremendous benefit to the consumer market: paying dividends while lowering prices, increasing availability and quality and quality of goods, and enlisting labor. To the idealist, the elite industrialist of society represented the best interests of the producer’s economy, distributor’s thrift, a consumer market. They “blessed the world” and “enriched the nation” (Doc-I). Consequently, such pragmatists, when ignorant of social effects, justify the fortunes gained by the tycoon as “no earnings which are more legitimate or for which greater services are rendered to the “whole industrial body” (Doc-K) were those “who have the ability and energy to produce (wealth)” In such, these “captains of industry” (Doc-K) were those ‘who have the ability and energy to produce it (wealth)” (Doc-J), and so capable of generating capital to profit not only themselves, but also the millions of laborers subservient to their influence. Thus the industrialist profits, and created wealth rather than appropriating it “out of common stock” (Doc-K). He was the force by which industrial economy was created in America, enabling emergence as a power in the twentieth century.

But reality differed far from scattered ideal patterns. The tycoons exhibited a complete disregard for public benefit: William H. Vanderbilt exclaimed (Doc-D) “the railroads...are built by the men who invest their money and expect to get a fair percentage on the same...the public be dammed!” Corporate power even cause the government’s inadequacy in the 1870’s through to 1890’s in public service: ‘Laissez-faire’ had long dictated national government inaction in the economy, and industrial supremacy. Bending to popular demand, in July 1890 Congress passed the Sherman Antitrust Law which declared illegal “every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy in restraint of commerce.” But in the Supreme Court ruling in US vs E. C. Knight Co (1895), government response to a 98% sugar production monopoly demonstrated the clear weakness of anti-trust: although apparently in favor of “free course of trade” and against “an illegal combination whose
business extends throughout the whole country,...by the law...an enemy to the interests” (Doc-O), the judgment was mostly symbolic for public approval. It merely created a Judicial Antitrust Division, and concluded “if the national power extends to all contracts and combinations in...productive industries,...(the) ultimate result may affect external commerce” (Doc-N), leaving such interstate commerce to state control; state legislatures in New Jersey and Delaware would remain favorable, without dissent, to incorporation and the industrial monopoly. Consequently, the ruling severely impaired enforcement of the Sherman Antitrust Law, and placed monopolies beyond federal regulation. The law itself was actually used against American Railway Union members during the Pullman Strike and other notorious labor strikes, as a restraint of trade, and so actually protected the monopoly. Such manipulation of legislation effectively crushed efforts of all labor unions, particularly the AFL, while widespread media owned by tycoons’ potently portrayed unions as composed of violent vagrants, destroying their image and popularity.

In aversion to their image, industrials (once in “secure control of a given line of business,” and ascended to wealth and power) favored the monopoly, “organized to destroy competition and restrain trade”(Doc-E). As “masters of the situation (they) can dictate to...the producer of the raw materials and consumer of the finished product.” In truth, the monopolistic industry favored only the combination itself: despite the “cry of ‘overproduction’, “ assert the right...to regulate the consumption by the people of the necessities of life... not by the needs of humanity, but by the desires of a few dividends,” (Doc-F) and a substantial profit. They forced many, particularly lowly immigrant laborers, into tenement housing, slum conditions. Industrialists declared the anti-monopoly movement “inspired by a set of fools and black-mailers” (Doc-D), while in reality it was “demand for the social control (Doc-F) of combination. Abuses of gigantic corporate power were further exacerbated by illegal method: “the main weapon of the trusts are the threats, intimidation, bribery, fraud, wreck, and pillage”
Even government was involved in accepting “an appealing state of corruption” (Doc-C); industrialists bragged openly of their ability to “buy up any politician” (Doc-D) at will, with complete disregard for law. Still, even the Carnegie’s were involved in “secret peace enclaves...inaugurating monopoly prices” (Doc-B) forming limited pool agreements in violation of the 1887 Interstate Commerce Act, evidence only of paper legislation to make “every unjust and unreasonable charge...prohibited and declared unlawful” as was the “pooling of freights” (Doc-M), common among vertically integrated industrialists. Another device was to “ingratiate the railroad purchasing agents” with commissions on freight loads, enabling Carnegie himself to “win secret rebates for his steel shipments.” (Doc-B).

Truly, America endured a powerful industrial mechanization. However, the economy itself was not affected adversely. Despite misconceptions, rapid expansion incurred a vicious cycle of boom and bust, climaxing in August 1893 during the deepest level of financial depressed Agriculture, over-dependence on the nations railroad corporations, overproduction, and a withdrawal of foreign investments, collapsing the stock market, credit, and the entire economic system. Furthermore, it precipitated a political crisis, where the political stability and Laissez-faire of the 1870-1890 period was drawing to a conclusion, as government took sides: towards conservative protectionists, and Populism.

Thus to many extents, the industrial elite class not only overindulged, and oppressed the consumer, but created great social, political, and economic upheavals throughout the process—they are frequently denoted as ‘Robber Barons.’ Their disastrous system did have it merits however, in a revolutionary industrial growth, crucial to future world affairs. The monopoly of enterprises, corruption, cheating, and extortion of the public did not justify the “industrial power they built...(enabling) the United States to win two world wars.” (Doc-L)—there is inherent error in justifying the unethical means by unintended ends. Furthermore, the industrials cannot be judged
unilaterally: some were ideal captains, and some were ideal fiends—hence “the industrial machine was built and...the social and human cost was high” (Doc-L). The industrial tycoon did remain, though, a figure similar to the “Gilded Age;” they retained merit like the artificial domestic peace, prosperity, and progress they created, with a turbulent undercurrent of crisis and corruption.

I, **Jeremy Jacox**, give and grant to John Braithwaite the right to publish and distribute this essay I wrote in my junior year in high school

Signed: Jeremy Jacox.
ESSAY: Discuss the “interwar period” between 1920 and the outbreak of WW II as it relates to the successes and failures of the US policy in the diplomatic arena and prevention of war.

Introductory Summary:

The primary element motivating American isolationist strategy was a recoil from intervention—in essence, the aversion to war. The overriding criterion for successful isolationist policy therefore is whether the United States ultimately avoided war (and thus threats to its security). IT DID NOT. In practice, interwar foreign policy broadly reflected a non-committal approach to Europe. What critical strategic outcomes did these motives and methods imply?

The dominating future dilemma rested not in what the United did do, but in what it did not do: United States policies of inaction in Europe allowed a failing state (Weimar Germany) to persist, and allowed its exploitation by radicals—radicalist with visions of establishing a future European hegemony. The security dilemma of the 1940’s emerged out of the 1920’s and 1930’s German hotbed of instability—one that was not only ignored, but was also created by US policy. This arises because Isolationist strategy was flawed in two main assumptions: (1) conflict is inevitable, and (2) isolationism [non-intervention] avoids conflict. In Europe these fatal American assumptions met with equally fatal results: (1) sociopolitical and economic failure of the Weimar-
governed German state, (2) disorder and extremism, and (3) the absence of collective security framework to deter or contain the Third Reich’s aggressions. Ultimately these seeds of war, sown by the United States (and its allies), germinated into the greatest human conflict—World War II—and isolationist strategy failed to attain its most explicit objective: the avoidance of modern war.

Successful invention (as long-term state-building, restructuring, and European stabilization) might have prevented the sociopolitical conditions for radicalism, and minimized security threats leading to war. Future grand strategy must involve intervention to rebuild failing states, and thereby prevent future security threats, to succeed in a sweeping war against terror.

Fatal Assumptions:

Isolationism was born in the age of the Founding Fathers: “honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none” (Thomas Jefferson First Inaugural Address). The modern isolationist policies were founded on subtle, traditional assumptions that in the 20th century were flawed. Their implications helped to determine why isolation lacked the ability to truly avoid conflict:

1. **Conflict Is Inevitable**

Isolationism failed to anticipate the potential for conflict prevention. Beyond its idealism for peace, isolationist logic actually assumed foreign conflict itself was inevitable (as was true for the war-torn European empires of the 18th and 19th centuries), this central assumption founded the argument that the United States would inevitably be drawn into conflict through foreign
entanglements, unless it sought to establish a perfectly isolationist sphere. Isolationist thought overlooked the premise that modern conflicts could be triggered by instability (i.e. the Balkans) in the weak or failing states, and thus that intervention (reconstruction, state-building) to re-establish a region could minimize conflict; war would not then be inevitable.

(2) **Isolationsim (Non-Intervention) Avoids Conflict**

Pure isolationism meant complete withdrawal, meaning severance of ALL entangling relations with any foreign state, albeit social, political, or economic. In 18th and 19th century America, geographical insularity was a sufficient degree of isolation to avoid conflict. However, neo-isolationism overlooked the modern economic interdependence and cultural ties of states: even beyond diplomatic alliances (power politics), the world was already entangled, and as such the US could not practice isolationist policy successfully and still maintain security, without cutting free of the web of business, financial, and cultural interests (economic politics) they would not sacrifice.

Thus neo-isolationist philosophy was flawed by projecting outdated assumptions onto a new modern century. The United States could minimize conflict, but not by isolationism.

[3] **Fatal Isolationist Policy Mechanism for Peace:**

Having explored the conceptual emptiness and inapplicability of America’s isolationist strategy, an analysis of the main policies actually enacted by elites, in order to prevent conflict, mirrors their theoretical misinterpretations and reveals new flaws. The implementation of neo-isolationist strategy produced a body of policies strictly limited to ‘formal’ internationalism, with few political commitments, through which the United
States attempted to achieve peace. These primary policy mechanisms are embodied by the following:


The forces of isolationism completely rejected a system of collective security framed as a “general association of nations” [Wilson’s Fourteen Points Speech, 1918], in favor of a unilateralist security strategy. Isolation doctrine specifically forbids alliances on principle that it engenders unwilling conflict not in a state’s own interests. In pursuit of peace, the United States recoiled from a collective security network, fearful to commit military forces and thus empower the global initiative. This reactionary attitude to the League of Nations reveals the perception that a general worldwide alliance to preserve peace (as its emphatic objective!) was synonymous with the selective balance-of-power alliance that the founding fathers had cautioned against. This comparison stretched 19th Century isolationist rhetoric far beyond its original domain of localized alliances to an internationalist arena, to where it applicability would reach a breaking point.

The unilateralist policy of the 1920’s and 1930’s required intervention to preserve security interests only when directly threatened by neighboring aggressors, and as America was dominant on the continent, and protected by the oceans, isolationism asserted that a peaceful United States was inevitable. Built entirely on the flawed assumption that modern isolationism can avoid war, this justification for unilateral action fails to take into account the vulnerability of American interests in Europe (economic investments, foreign markets, trade), which would allow overseas security threats to have a direct domestic impact.
The Treaty of Versailles (sans League of Nations.

Although it was not formally passed in the Senate (due to rejection of Article X—the League), isolationist America made no effort to challenge the basic tenets of the Treaty; US objections to its vindictiveness (Wilson attempts to compromise in a “peace without victors”) ultimately bowed to the great powers—France, Britain, and Italy—in the spirit of refusing to dictate European affairs. The Treaty demanded the economic stripping and demoralization Germany in the full cause of justice: distribution of all German colonial assets, territorial and resource (coal, iron) acquisitions. The brutal conditions culminated in a staggering reparations bill for $33 billion in gold, and in the forced acceptance of War Guilt 231—holding Germany responsible “for all...loss and damage” as the ultimate aggressor. The natural effect of Germany’s reaction to sweeping European antagonism is well explained by Robert McNamara:

“In humiliating Germany, in pressing for every conceivable momentary advantage from her, and in giving rise to her feelings of betrayal and the need for vengeance, the Allies at Versailles [sought] their own devastation at Germany’s hands in the Second World War.”(1)

Conversely, strong American pressures [from a united Congress and Presidency] for conciliation, the erasure of all debts and reparations, and a commitment to rebuilding Europe would have marginalized the depth of humiliation Germany faced (and partially appeased vengeful Allies), and thus eliminate German sentiments of betrayal and vengeance.

Financial and Economic ‘Reconstruction”
The series of loans (notably 1924 Dawes Plan) injected billions into German economy for reconstruction, stimulating economic output in an unprecedented boom. Yet the effect of injected loans was neutralized by the drowning debts of Versailles. Reparations were scaled to a fraction, but too late for stabilization (1929 Young Plan, near precipice of Great Depression), US investment also spawned hopeless German economic dependence on the US economy, threatening complete destabilization in the event of a cyclical recession. Neo-isolationism overlooked economic internationalism (justifying limited reconstruction), and succeeded as a Keynesian priming of Germany’s industrial machine, yet failed to provide the long term stability of true reconstruction.

[d] Anti-War Treaties, Neutrality, & Arbitration:

The Five and Four Power Pacts (reduce naval tonnage), the 1922 Washington Conference (disarmament), the 1925 Treaty of Locarno (European border conflicts), the Neutrality Laws of the 1930’s, and the 1928 Kellogg-Briand Pact (abolish war) resonate a common theme; policy was driven by gusts of wary internationalism limited by the isolationist tornado, bearing the “conviction that the pressure of world opinion could keep the peace.” Isolationism bred paper treaties without the apparati to enforce their provisions, in the faith that good will alone would maintain order: in the realized, every state-for-itself depressionist world of the 1930’s these assertions proved fatal.

In essence, all isolationist policy was ultimately misguided (though well-intentioned), as the conditions necessary to successfully implement isolationism were non-existent in the modern world!
[4] Fatal Results:

Underestimating the security threat of exploited instability, and content with (powerless) legal attempts at the prevention of conflict, isolationist elites “did not realize the immediate need for American action to stabilize the world.” The progressive escalation of threat arose naturally from this hotbed of instability:

[a] Sociopolitical/Economic Failure of Weimar Germany:

The Weimar Republic—a provisional parliamentarian government—was born in impotency and popular illegitimacy! The Treaty of Versailles destine Weimar’s failure: its provisions were forcibly signed—unseen!—and German Weimar politicians were condemned for a “stab in the back” having abandoned imperial pride and assumed the war’s moral guilt. The financial burden of war and reparations drained economic vitality, precipitating a hyperinflation that liquidated muddle class assets. In supporting Versailles’ provisions, US isolationism (and the Allies) so created a destabilization of the regime it empowered, destroying all credibility in Germany’s first experiment with democracy.

Limited US policies of reconstruction and the failure to cancel war debts, culminated in results true to Hoover’s prediction that “continental stability cannot be secured unless there is a settlement of interlocked debts, reparations, and disarmament.” US economic policy strangled German economic autonomy, collapsing Germany’s industrial base in the Great Depression: truly “the golden chain of prosperity snapped at it weakest link—
the constant flow of American money abroad.” US reconstruction efforts—policies of inaction—left the Republic vulnerable to the socio-political and economic crises of instability, and allowed its decay into a weak and failing state.

[b] Disorder and Extremism:

Isolationism—strongest in the abyss of the Depression—failed to correct overseas instability, and protect the fragile Weimar state. Disorder erupted—the destabilization of the state cultivated a general anarchy echoing a model, modern failing state.” So claims Robert Rotberg:

“tension], [conflict], [danger]...criminal and political violence;...rising ethnic, linguistic, and cultural hostilities;... the use of terror against [its] own citizens;...escalating inflation;...basic food shortage,...[and] rising attacks on [its] fundamental legitimacy.”(7)

This collapse of order (and the de-legitimatization of an entire system of government) during the Depression revived political radicalism; although hidden during the gilded prosperity of Germany’s Gertmultlicheit—the “Good Times:”—there remained the “ugly Nazi sore festering under the skin-deep prosperity.”(5) The fragile German experiment with democracy was seceded by the German people to Hitler—an extremist and opportunist—and National Socialism through the electoral process, and manipulated into an extremist dictatorship. The accessions of National Socialism to control of the state was basically the response of a populace aching for a return to Germany’s former order and national glory (the Second Reich). Captured by Selig Adler:

“...The bitterness of national defeat, a ruinous inflation, and the ravages of mass depression invited mass consumption of Hitler’s warped gospel. This unreason included anti-Semitism, unquestioned obedience to a self-appointed leader, and an unbridled taste for predatory expansion.”(5)
Hitler’s intentions were masked by universal appeal (Mein Kamp was ignored; his vehicle was propaganda. Avoiding an analysis of Hitler’s unique power strategies, it was America’s inability and unwillingness to intervene that allowed the rise of National Socialism, by otherwise maintaining domestic conditions conducive to the propagation of disorder and radicalism. After allowing failure in a democratic state, the United States did not correct it (but a dictatorship did).

[c] Absence of an Effective Collective Security Deterrent

Having refused collective security (an ‘entangling alliance’) as a system for preservation of the peace, isolationist strategy permitted only limited unilateralist intervention strategies in response to direct, immediate threats (as discussed in theory). This philosophy of intervention (in practice) was unable to predict and react to the Third Reich’s expansionism, to counter its emergence as a European hegemony, and thus to prevent its rise as a future threat to American security. This inability occurred because long-term security risks were not accounted for, because extremism and instability were not perceived as risks, and because unilateral action in Europe was avoided.

In the clarity of hindsight, through the denial of commitment to action in collective security, interwar America was “unrealistic, peace-loving, and for all the unwilling to make genuine sacrifices to secure an ordered world.” The absence of an effective collective security system (the League of Nations’ was impotent as a deterrent and enforcer of order allowed an aggressive Germany to expand, and conquer:

“Once economic collapse led to a revival of nationalist thinking and policies, including a new enthusiasm for war, there was nothing in
place institutionally==neither an effective League of Nations nor a restored European balance of power—capable of stopping the slide into chaos.(2)

It was isolationism that directly defused the League’s power to operate militarily. The result was an intentional threat unilateralism (and appeasement) could not contain. Conversely, an interventionist American policy of diplomatic and military commitment to collective security might have empowered international efforts to control security threats (i.e. expansionism of Germany), through deterrence, and by establishing a European balance of power. Peace would be possible

All three fatal results of misapplied policy permitted (what I will call) ‘failure progression’, where instability begins a patterned socio-political process of (1) state failure, (2) radicalism culminating in a (3) security dilemma (i.e. hostile totalitarianism)—unless the process is interrupted. European conflict in World War II evolved directly from United States’ failure to correct instability in Weimar Germany. Thus isolationist policy allowed and encouraged this process, and provided no restoring policy mechanism to interpret it, culminating in war.

[5] Policy Prescriptions:

Security strategy undergoes dramatic tailoring under the premise that “state failures threatens global stability.” By rejecting isolationism in favor of a tempered Wilsonian internationalism, a new interwar policy which prevented failure progression might have greatly minimized European conflict. Specific policy for this reconstruction of failed states is prescribed in Rotbergs analysis:
“Sustainable nation building...requires a long-term commitment by outsiders to building capacities, strengthening security, and developing human resources...Focus on four primary and parallel objectives [is needed]: jump-starting the economy, restoring the rule of law, re-creating political institutions, and rejuvenating civil society.”(7)

Thus failure progression could have been avoided in Weimar Germany by an alternate strategy of: complete financial reconstruction—including debt erasure; establishment of German economic independence (eventual stability regardless of U.S. aid); a conciliatory Treaty of Versailles; postwar disarmament of the German military (maintain domestic order); benign occupation; establishment of a strong transitional government (a gradual shift from imperialism to democracy); and full commitment to the League of Nations. Peace could be preserved—regardless of the League’s power to actually deter security threats—as the very conditions wherein a security threat could germinate would be greatly minimized. Conflict might have been averted.

Considering nation-building in modern US foreign-policy, unilateralist action—and isolationism—largely dissolves in favor of multilateralism and collective security, to prevent security threats on an international level. While channeling its diplomatic, economic, and military power within an international framework—such as the United Nations—to foster international good will and lead to international security and humanitarian efforts. America could also protect its own security interests by rebuilding states, and maintaining primacy. Security policy must accommodate prevention, which "relies on outsiders’ recognizing early that a states’ internal turmoil has the potential to be fatally destructive.”(7) This analysis asserts successful intervention in Iraq by the Bush administration will require a costly “long term
commitment” to reconstruction. Conversely, nation-building in Afganastan—as the responsibility for 1980’s intervention against the Soviets—might have reaped drastic effects in preventing the greatest modern security threat—universal terrorism.

[6] Conclusion:

The isolationist strategy pursued by the United States during the interwar period could not avoid a greater modern war (World War II), failing it by its own standards. Unilateralist doctrine ignored the potent long-term security threat of state failure (in Weimar Germany), leading to a progression to Nazi totalitarianism. Ultimately, the cause of World War II was the United States failure to resolve and correct the effects of WW I.

In the Age of Terror, while the nature of warfare has changed, failed states as seeds of threat have not changed. Failed states are more abundant, and the fruits of instability shifted in the forces which exploit them; from secular totalitarianism controlling the state, to religious fundamentalism (and terrorism) working within the state. The United States MUST adopt a long-term preventative (rather than short-term corrective) security strategy, and learn to lead international efforts to rebuild states with potentially threatening instability. Otherwise, these wild seeds might germinate into conflict, and the United States security policy will fail by permitting failure.
THESIS:  
We can acquire insight as to what warfare was really like during the Great War [WWI] by looking at the physical, military, and tactical aspects of trench warfare as well as the effects it had on the soldiers both physically and psychologically.

PHYSICAL ASPECTS:  
- There were over 12,000 miles of trenches on the allied side and an astounding 25,000 miles accredited to the Central Powers.
- The British line contained nearly 800 battalions of 1,000 men each.
- Trenches began in nearby towns and gradually deepened.
- British trenches were wet, cold, and smelly while German trenches were very well constructed and comparably comfortable.
- There was an ever-present stench of rotting flesh caused by the casualties of the war that could not be properly disposed of.
- Some trenches had several feet of water because the table was very high and the annual rainfall was high as well.

TACTICAL ASPECTS:  
- The idea of trench warfare to gain ground and terrorize the opponent with as little damage to one own troops.
- There were three types of trenches: firing trenches, communications trenches, and saps [used for fighting]
- Two new and American inventions were used in trench warfare: barbed wire and the machine gun—later on, the hand grenade was also used.
- The British always had the hope that a general breakout in the fighting would occur and consequently their trenches were hastily built.
- As equipment improved so did the success in the battles by the allied forces. Soft cloth hats used at the beginning of the war were replaced by helmets. Respirators were also later used to protect from gas inhalation.

MILITARY EFFECTS ON THE SOLDIERS:  
- Seven thousand British men and officers were killed and wounded daily in the trenches.
- Soldiers had to learn excellent self control because of constant threat that hung over them from a non-stop bombardment of shelling.
- Scanty rations were brought to the men in sand bags and hastily prepared or eaten. Many advances were made in the way a soldier eats. Fresh meat and bread were in high demand.
Because of such death rates, a report of casualties was made each evening and form-letters of condolence became commonplace.

Health became a problem. Lice were rampant and there was little that professional “delouser” could do to control it. Rats ran rampant and spread disease and fed on the rotting corpses.

At the onset of the war the men were not equipped properly and there were many hurt and killed as a result. The felt hat thing for example.

The men in the trenches experienced an “unreal, unforgettable enclosure” Often times they spent the whole time disoriented and lost any how.

When Gen. Pershing saw this, he forbade American to get into the trenches which sparked a military conflict between himself and the French General, Marshall Foch.

CONCLUSION:
Trench warfare wasn’t just a part of the World War I. I believe it is safe to say that World War I was trench warfare. [At least until the Americans arrived in 1918] Technology has allowed warfare to escalate until the present time where modern warfare inventions have made trench warfare obsolete. Nevertheless, was is war and I believe it is helpful to study the facts and compare the details of this form a warfare to those that we are familiar with today such as tank combat, air to air battle, and jungle warfare. As in the thesis, more than anything we learn what the war really was like. I find it particularly interesting and useful to note the direct effects it had on the soldiers [and civilians] as well as the actual effectiveness of it in winning the war.

The essay was compelling and brilliant. It convinced me how futile modern warfare really is when it has to be fought hand to hand “in the trenches”. Fussell is a great writer. He was a product of Normandy all the way to Berlin from 1943-1945. With good reason he knows what he is talking about.
“The Personal Side of Developing People”

*By Jack Larkin*

*Taken From* Portraits of America, Vol. I

**THESIS OF THE ARTICLE:**

Larkin takes a look at this young American Republic and their ways of life, particularly their personal practices such as what they wore, their likes and dislikes, what they did to occupy their free time (amusements), and even their sexual preferences and practices.

**SALIENT POINTS OF READING INTEREST:**

- It was very common for the people to wear dull and inexpensive clothing; to have facial hair, and to make physical gesture which did not depict their feeling.
- Blacks in their celebrations used bodily expressions that were strange to whites.
- Farmers walked awkwardly, slouching from side to side—these different gestures and conduct characterized average American people.
- According to Larkin, each class and group of people were distinct in the way they carried themselves.
- The conditions in which the early American lived were quite repulsive, along with urine odors throughout the house and offices, the mixing of smells of dung, from horses and buffalo [in western areas] decorated the bars.
- Pigs cleaned the streets of food litter—and along with them came more infection and disease among those who took the swine for food. (poor classes)
- Privy habits differed in the areas of the country—the chamber pots [bed pans] were widely used.
- Bedding accommodations were dirty and infested with insects, lice, and mites, along with the same for children who were likewise infested.
- Means to improve sanitation and personal cleanliness were made through efforts such as washing once a day(almost), moving wash basins into bedchambers from the kitchen and later on, into personal water closets and bathtubs—the rich got cleaner—the poor got dirtier.
- Drinking [which was considered “healthy and fortifying”] was largely a part of society [generally among white males], thus, taverns played a
significant role in their drinking as a means for socials and such, not for a lady to become drunk—this was shameful and hence, one sees the gender differences.

- Violence and fighting always accompanied men and their drinks. Not just on the frontier but in towns and cities as well.
- Theives were publicly punished for their crimes which were looked upon as joyous and celebrated equality. These were almost holidays.
- Due to drunken accidents, campaigns began to promote temperance and respectability to civilize the “American man” and as a result, drinking along with its advocates declined in popularity in some areas.
- American Temperance Society was founded in 1826
- Religion had become a respectable exercise and many new American religions surfaced during the Age of Jackson
- Forms of public punishment changed—John Hancock wrote, “…mutilating or lacerating the body...” was an indignity to human nature, yet southerners continued the practice with custom.
- It was common action for men and women to become sexually acquainted before taking their vows of marriage, and in so doing, it was also common for the marriage to be accelerated due to early pregnancies. (Blacks were also involved with such customs), hence, this heightened sexuality aroused even the married to resort to prostitution and liaisons.
- Bundling (or the act of a single man and woman to lie together, fully clothed) was a widely accepted form in courtship.
- A greater emphasis on control (sexually) surfaced, and more focus was placed on personal establishment in the working world, before marriage or any possible altering or aspects (of sexual activity)—and consequently the common size of the family decreased. Apprehension of contraception and its use grew dramatically, thus after 1830, the birthrate declined. Alcott and Graham argued that these sexual relations be limited.
- Social customs such as smoking, snuffing, and chewing began to lose favor amongst the honorable and respectable when at one time they were shared by all alike.
- To top off these changes with the young republic, the old English customs of bowing the head, tipping the hat, and other similar quirks, slowly diminished to the all too recognizable American “hand-shake” so simple yet so equal.

MY ASSESSMENT & CONCLUSION:
It’s very interesting to actually read of the characteristics and customs of the early Americans. I believe that as we are taught through out schooling, those who determine the curriculums choose not to portray our early parents as they really were. I had always thought of those before me as clean and chaste examples. I have even found myself repeating the words, “why couldn’t the people of today be more like those before us,” but in actuality we are not much different. Although in reading this essay, it is very comforting in noting how this young American Republic was willing to do better and change. They were eager to build their own morals from a foundation of lesser values and they were successful in do it. Not only did they change morally, but ethically too! Emphasis on prestige and position soon diminished under the idea that people
really were created equally. The evident class distinctions grew unfamiliar even to their foreign associates. Yes, our forefathers and parents participated in many things that generally would cause some to frown upon their past, and yet, it is quite possible that the strong ethics and morals that so many identify with in this day and age were planted by the very same young republic that so indulged in those practices.

“Cowboys don’t bath, they just dust off!”
THESIS: Years passed in turmoil. Thousands of Americans died. Major changes resulted in the country, industrial, political, emotional, socially and culturally. All of these issues from the war that would change history forever. The war went on and only one side could overcome the other and come out victorious. The Union Army emerged the winner. There are many assumptions why the Union Army overcame the Confederates; therefore leaves us the question, “Why did the Union win?”

I. The weeks after the assassination of Lincoln
   A. Confederate armies were surrendering.
   B. Confederate President flees toward: convicted falsely with connection to Lincoln’s assassination
   C. Steamboat Sultana sinks in the Mississippi
   D. Gangs, guerillas, and outlaws ravaged the region for years afterwards.
   E. 620,000 soldiers died. This does not included civilian deaths.

II. Why did the Confederate Army lose?
   A. God was on the side heaviest battalions
      1. North had superior man power of at least 3 to 1, the Union Army at least 2 to 1.
      2. North had greater advantage economically and logistically.
      3. However, if was possible for the South to overcome the disadvantages
   B. Internal division which weakened the Confederacy.
      1. Conflicts between governors, disaffection of non-slave holders from a rich man’s war and a poor man’s fight, opposition habeus corpus, disloyalty from slaves, and growing doubts from slave holders.
      2. “Weakness in morale” a “loss of the will to fight.”
      3. However, the North experienced the same types of internal struggles
         a. Opposition to conscription, taxation, suspension of habeas corpus, etc.
         b. Whit as well as blacks grew disaffected with war to preserve slavery.
      4. North had the institutionalization of obstruction in the Democratic Party in the North which compelled the Republicans to close the ranks in support of war policies and overcome opposition.
   C. Quality of leadership. (Military and Civilian)
1. Northern leadership
   a. Gradual development of superior northern leadership
   b. Better strategic leadership in the West.
   c. Remarkable war leadership by Lincoln
   d. Ulysses S. Grant, William Tecumseh Sherman and others

2. Southern Leadership
   a. Early was the South enjoyed better leadership
   c. South neglected the war in the West.
   d. Bumbling leaders who performed miracles of organization and improvisation.

III. Four major turning points which sculpture the eventual outcome.
   A. Great counter-offensives by the Southern leaders in summer of 1862
      1. Assured a prolongation in the conflict.
      2. Created potential Confederate success.
   B. Defeat of Confederate invasions in Maryland and Kentucky and stalled European mediation. Fall of 1862.
      1. Perhaps prevented Democratic victory in the northern elections
      2. Set the stage for the Emancipation Proclamation.
   C. Union victories at Gettysburg, Vicksburg, and Chattanooga. Fall of 1863.
   D. Sherman’s capture of Atlanta, Philip Sheridan’s destruction of rebel army in the Shenandoah Valley. Summer of 1864.
   E. Defeat cause demoralization and loss of will.
   F. Victory pumps up morale and the will to win.

IV. Consequences of the war:
   A. Secession and slavery were killed.
   B. Results brought on transfiguration of American society.
   C. War marked a transition of the United States to a singular noun.
   D. Speeches given by Lincoln on importance of the Union. “This last best hope…etc
   E. Change in the federal government:
      1. Creation of internal revenue to collect taxes, the draft to the army, expansion of federal courts, national currency and banking system, first agency for social welfare.
      2. Powerful shift of political power from South to the North
      3. Traditional ideals kept by the South.
      4. Government of limited powers that protected the rights of property and protected. the yeoman farmer from “industrialization.”
      5. Saw Black Republican party as “essentially a revolutionary party.”
   F. Destroyed the Southern vision of America and ensured the Northern vision would become the American vision.

SUMMARY VIEW:
Why did the Union army win? There are many reasons for the reason they won, just as there theories for the extinction of dinosaurs. Perhaps the better leadership of the North had the advantage over the Confederate army. But let’s look at the statistics: 360,000 Yankees dean compared to 260,000 rebels killed. Better leadership? Perhaps not until the end. Yet the argument of a weary South losing its “will to fight” is a convincing one after important victories won by the North. Perhaps the reason for the South losing is conglomerate of many reasons, which may be the greatest argument. There’s just not a single reason but the positive affects the war had on the country may outweigh any derogative resulted from the war. Were 620,000+ lives a small price to pay for a Union victory? “The war marked a transition of the United States to a singular noun. The ‘Union” became a nation…”This was a challenging and informative piece of reading. I now care about what I learn.
From its creation in the late 18th century, the United States has been plagued by a conflict of two forces: nationalism and sectionalism. Nationalism is a loyalty to the abstract concept of the political union to the federal government formed by the Constitution, demonstrated by supporting forces such as political parties, separation of powers, and federalism and officeholders that serve the nation in its entirety. Sectionalism, on the other hand, is a division of territory, peoples, and cultures which may, and often does, undermine nationalism; it is loyalty to other causes above the Union, specifically local interests that are detrimental to the welfare of the other parts of the nation or to the Union itself. In the early years of the nation, despite emerging from a critical period under the Articles of Confederation during which States were sovereign, and nationalism was suppressed or non-existent, sectional feelings were repressed as the new government under the Constitution asserted itself and successfully lead the country through the election and administration of Andrew Jackson. However, as the nation grew in the following decades, tensions created by differences in geography, economics, and cultural cleavages there were increased sectionalist influences in politics, diplomacy, and interpretation of the Constitution. While nationalist ideals were eventually tossed aside when the good of the Union did not coincide with the interests of the section(s), over issues such as states rights, slavery, tariffs, economic conflicts resulting from industrialism vs agrarianism. The two giant forces grew and became powerful elements of change in the United States.

One cause of sectionalism is geographic differences. In early 19th century, the entirety of the United States was located in the same area. (North America) There were no distant territories, such as the empires of Europe. The Monroe Doctrine, written in 1823, presented the opinion that due to geographic separation, the European and American continents should refrain from interfering with each others governments. That interplay of forces was understood as diplomatic nationalism and the Monroe Doctrine became the cornerstone of American foreign policy thereafter. This belief was reinforced by the fact that nearly all of the colonies formed in the Americas had broken free from European control, to govern themselves; however, the United States was a
collage of separate self-governing colonies, which constituted one nation “indivisible” under the Constitution of 1789 in a political federal union. The

Northern colonies were industrial and commercial, while the Southern colonies were agrarian; and the West was yet undetermined, but would become agrarian and commercial. These divisions were clearly geographic, economic, and cultural distinct entities. The origins for these divisions lay in the nature of how land was used which promoted vastly different interests and goals. As the US acquired and settled more territory—over a broader and wider area—it proved that sections were inevitable and there by the geographic nature of the features of topography would result. The South was an area of abundant rich farmland with a warm climate, and a broad fan of land uninterrupted by mountains or rivers. The South came to rely on slavery from 1619 onward. The North was a colder climate, good harbors, and smaller area with ports that drew immigrants to work in cottage factories, commercial enterprises, and commerce. These fundamental differences in geography and topography predetermined the later outcome of their economics, politics, and cultures. The West took on attributes of both regions. The West, vast and unknown in size, would become the battleground for political power, economic advantages, and commercial development. For the West, it awaited population and development to transform it resources into consumable goods to send east and abroad. Up until the election of 1820’s the sections were nearly balanced but it would be economic forces of the west that would bring the change. The Northeast was primarily federalists, while the South was primarily republicans, and in the West the evolutionary changes resulted in the triumph of the democrats and the process of popular democracy under republican and federal forces. North of the Missouri Compromise line, would be New England and the Ohio Valley who would become Federalist or Whigs. South of Mason Dixon line (South boundary of Pennsylvania) the agrarian South would be predominantly states right oriented and Democrats. The West lay beyond both sections was up for grabs!

Economic and geographic differences were more the direct cause of sectionalism; while, political and cultural issues were more unifying and the formula for nationalistic developments. The varied geographies and economies produced vastly different areas that were sectional. The South relied upon plantations, slavery, and rigid class structure. Due to the lack of industry, the South had to export its raw materials to Europe or the North in exchange for manufactured goods. On the other hand, the North, was a melting pot immigration from Europe, a commercial and laboring class that eschewed slavery and relied on individualism. And because of ports and commercial centers the rise of the city with urbanization, cosmopolitan blending and cultural fusion taking place created a very different northern section that was evident in the South. The North had a much more versatile economy. Most its wealth lay in manufacturing and factories (rather than plantations), wage earners rather than slaves. But the Ohio Valley, still part of the North, was a vital agrarian center known as the “bread basket” featuring many products
from the farms rather than just a single crop (cotton) had done in the South. Northern manufacturers relied heavily upon immigrant labor and did not have to compete with slave labor, forming a self-perpetuating economic cycle and helped to give the North an urban character and population advantage which in turn dramatically affected the political influences due to the fact the Constitution based representation on population. The western states joined the ranks of the North because they were not founded on slavery and in the north farmers made use of newly developed machinery such as the steel plow. To protect its industry from competition—both foreign and domestic—challenges by pushing for tariffs through Congress until the late 1820’s. These tariffs helped solely northern manufacturers and raised the prices for consumers in the South and West; this brought about the nullification crisis, the Southern outcry against Northern sectionalism. Through the Fugitive Slave Act in 1850, the South also sought to protect its economic system against the will of abolitionists and communitarians who fought slavery on moral grounds.

To serve their own interests while still trying to preserve nationalism as unity turned to politics. Through political maneuvers each of the sections could get out of the national government something that it wanted that was unique to that section. For decades, that seemed to be enough to pacify the sections. Compromise was the watch-word since the Constitution, and it was again used in the Missouri Compromise, compromises over the tariff problems of 1833, and still later in the Compromise of 1850, which like effective glue, held the union together. However, as time went on, politics became influenced much more by sectionalism. Again, in the case of the Missouri Compromise each side came away with the addition of state added to their ranks to keep the political balance of power in the Senate at bay and equal. The ugly head of nullification forced both sides to relent in their demands as sections and “hang together”. The North allowed the tariff to be lowered, while the South allowed it to exist to preserve the Union. The Compromise of 1850 passed through Congress only as several separate bills, including the Fugitive Slave Act and the admission of California as a free state, (which only benefited one section), the balance of power and the resolution of conflict, postponed the coming of civil war in 1850 to preserve the nation and its political authority of nationalism. The Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854 seemed the ultimate Compromise allowing the people of the territories to decide whether to free or slave, but the pressure placed on this decision at the forefront of sectionalism unrestrained in the “Bleeding Kansas” affair of 1856. The caning of Sumner brought the violence of Kansas to Congress, thus, showing sectionalism to become more powerful than political union and could not prevent the coming of a civil war. Senator Stephan A. Douglas’ declaration of the Freeport Doctrine showed even those who worked hardest at compromise served the sectional interest.

Through the Era of Good Feelings in the aftermath of the War of 1812, nationalism was primary influence and goal of the diplomatic and judicial
functions of the nation. Even the famous American System was an economic attempt to bring nationalism to north & south, east & west! The Rush-Bagot Agreement of 1817 and a convention in 1818, the United States resolved conflict with Great Britain; the Adams-Onis or Transcontinental Treaty in 1819 similarly dealt with Spain and set the stage for what come to be known as Manifest Destiny by opening up the way to the Pacific Ocean. The Monroe Doctrine, announced in 1823, again presented a unified diplomatic front to the European nations politely condemning their attempts to further colonize in the western hemisphere. However, with two decades, the Mexican-American War was sectional stain on the dream of unified Manifest Destiny. The Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, following the war seemed to reaffirm the nationalist dream of Manifest Destiny. In addition to the above considerations, The Gadsden Purchase of 1853 contained the possibility for a transcontinental railroad, while tying the nation together; it was also a huge potential boon for the Southern economy, and a threat to commercial centers in the Midwest and East. The Ostend Manifesto of 1854 was a deliberate attempt by Southerners to annex Cuba, which most certainly would have become a slave state, and adding to Southern interests in Congress. Therefore, the national-sectional waffling continued at least until 1850.

The Constitution of the United States was not worded any differently in the North than in the South, nor did it change occur in its text to favor sectionalism over nationalism during the period. In *McCulloch v Maryland*, the Supreme Court under John Marshall define the “necessary and proper” clause based upon loose interpretation of the Constitution; thereby granting significantly greater powers to the Congress. In 1828, *The South Carolina Exposition and Protest*, John Calhoun advanced the doctrine of states rights and nullification which was aimed at the tariff. President Andrew Jackson responded to the direct threat posed by nullification to nationalism by stating “Nullification is forbidden by the Constitution...it is destructive of the great object for which the Constitution was written.” Jackson also opposed sectionalism in opposing the 2nd Bank of the US to be re-chartered.

Despite these nationalist interpretations of the Constitution, the Dred Scott ruling in 1857, by Chief Justice Roger Taney diminished the powers of Congress and destroyed the constitutionality of popular sovereignty. This was a ruling that demonstrated that sectionalism had become sufficiently powerful to change the Constitution, distorting the framework of the Union. The Freeport Doctrine provided a way for the northerners to defy the federal government and the Supreme Court, nearly as controversial as nullification had been.

By the mid-19th century, the United States was overrun with sectional conflict. The North though it did not secede, contributed to the tension that lead to the Civil War, while the South did not have a President in office to bind it to the Union. Through the early 1800’s, as each side attempted to manipulate politics, diplomacy, and the Constitution in favor of their own economic system and geographic area, nationalist ideas became increasingly unpopular. Even aft the Civil War, sectionalism remained a significant force
and specific determining factor which led to the reconstruction of the Union on permanently challenged American government and policy.

I, Tyrie Vella, give and grant permission to John Braithwaite to publish this essay which I wrote as a weekend homework assignment for Mr. David Carpenter my US AP history teacher. Date November 2003.

Signed: Tyrie Vella
The Treaty of Versailles

THE QUESTION:
To what extent, if any, was the Treaty of Versailles both a triumph and a tragedy in American and world diplomatic history?

At the end of World War I, President Woodrow Wilson, preplanned for the post war world by announcing to Congress, in January of 1918, his famous Fourteen Points. In actuality, according my teacher the list was one of 23 points which was trimmed down to fourteen. The most important one of all was the fourteenth point that called for "a general association of nations" to oversee a new world order "guaranteeing political independence and territorial integrity to all nations equally."

After reading and discussing this issue in class, it is my clear opinion that the Versailles Peace Treaty was a noble attempt to end the war, bring about the peace, and make the world a constitutional democracy. However noble its intent, the treaty became a document of vengeance, violence, and mutual world distrust!

The Good Things That Came Out of Versailles Treaty:

It did finalize the end to World War I, which was one of its intended purposes. It was an idealized statement by President Wilson seeking to make the
world safe for democracy. It was to set a precedent of constitutional government for the whole world. These were noble goals and lofty objectives.

It sought to bring about disarmament among nations, especially those nations who had constituted the Triple Alliance—Germany, (Italy), Austria, & Turkey. Italy, under Orlando, was cagey about the issue of which side to support. When it was obvious the Entente Powers would win, the Italians changed sides! The Fourteen Points had been given to the Germans “as the basis of a negotiated peace” by President Wilson, without getting concurrence from Lloyd-George, Clemanceau, and Orlando. For the Germans this was a good proposal. The peace they signed was not the Fourteen Points, but rather a document we now refer to as the Treaty of Versailles.

The end of the war stopped the killing of soldiers and civilians. Because of the Fourteen Points, the German General Staff signed the famous Amiens document in a railroad car thinking the Fourteen Points were the basis of the peace, and thus, the end of the war.

**The Bad Things to Come from the Versailles Agreement:**

During the peace negotiations from April until September of 1919, Wilson bargained one point after another away to the vengeful European leaders. He did this so that he could extract the *League of Nations* from them. Hopefully, the League of Nations would become a one world government of democratic ideals and constitutionalism. But in the bargaining, Wilson allowed the Clemenceau “the tiger” of France to insist on War reparations payments into the billions of dollars. Also, David Lloyd George, Clemenceau, and Orlando, insisted that the Germany accept “the sole and complete responsibility for the causation of the war.”*(Article 231).* This was an absolute absurdity! Both sides were guilty of war guilt, but making the
Germans admit it as their complete national responsibility as the cause of war only exacerbated the problems of Versailles. The causes of war were: nationalism, militarism, alliance systems, propaganda, imperialism, and fanaticism. Surely, the other European nations were surely affected by these issues as well as the Germans! The fact that Germany was “stabbed in the back” laid the foundation later for a muddy little corporal by the name of Adolph Hitler to lead a drunken brawl in Munich. It is now known as the famous “Beer hall putsch!” The Munich incident led directly to the rise of Nazism and the perpetration of World War II in 1939. One issue was directly linked to the other. Consequently, war guilt, reparations, and non-enforcement of the covenants of the League of Nations allowed Germany to rearm and retaliate because of the failures of the Versailles. Wilson’s notion of peace without victory was complete idealistic nonsense!

The approximate 42 billion dollars of war costs, were expected to be amortized as reparations by Germany alone was idiotic! Nevertheless, that was what Prince Max of Baden tried to do. Germany was expected to shoulder the reparations payments to all Entente powers. (The actual debt for Germany was 56 billion as the vanquished nation). These severe reparations helped to bring chaos, depression, and inflation to Germany and the rest of Europe until it created a financial collapse. This even endured for a whole decade and then caught the United States in the gut wrenching throes of the worst depression in the history of the modern world in 1929. Finally, in 1928 President Herbert Hoover stopped the reparations payments but the damage was done.

Vengeance was the desire of the European leaders of the Entente! Because they insisted that Germany pay the whole thing, they set the conditions of the European continent on such a course so as to allow the rise of fascism in Europe. The worst example was the rise of Hitler in Germany. Even when that happened,
none of the Entente powers tried to stop it until it was everlastingly too late. My teacher argued that World War II was only phase two of World War I.

It appears to me that Hitler and Mussolini were direct results of the failures at Versailles. Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia University estimates that 33,000,000 people lost their lives to say nothing of those wounded and scarred in battle.

The questions asks who were the major players? In terms of nations it included: Russia, Poland, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Holland, Britain, France, Italy, Spain, Turkey, Canada, the Balkan countries, Greece, and the United States to name just the obvious combatant nations. In terms of individuals, the list is long, but a few of the more important leaders were Lloyd-George, Clemenceau, Orlando, Kerensky, Kaiser Wilhelm II, and among the generals were: Ludendorf, von Hindenburg, Foch, Jaffre, Pershing, MacArthur and a young cadre of colonels from America by the names of Eisenhower, Patton, Bradley, and Marshall. It would be fun to face them and ask the question if Versailles solved the issues of World War I.

My Conclusions are:

First, that Versailles Treaty was a colossal collapse on the scale of a Wagnerian grand Opera such as “Gotterdammerung” or Shakespeare’s “King Lear” where everyone is guilty, everyone dies, and everyone is a murderer! Second, the outcomes of WWI failed miserably and completely to solve the problems—both long range, and immediate—that caused the war. The failure of the Versailles conference to deal fairly and honestly with the issues, gave rise to the very conflicts that provoked WW II. The Versailles Treaty is an example of idealism gone astray and diplomacy giving way to vengeance and vice. Lastly, one can
contend that the failures of Versailles were the vortex of the militarism the world would face from 1933 to 1993. Constitutional government gave way to dictators, democracy gave way to terror, and the innocent people of the world still live in fear, frustration, and foolishness thinking that dictators can accomplish justice, peace, and harmony in this world.
Thesis statement: The Versailles Peace Treaty was a declaration of victory in World War I, and at the same time, a contract of vengeance that propelled the whole world in another more violent and divisive war than the one it purported to make “the world safe for democracy.”

Point #1: The Good Things That Came Out of Versailles
- It formally ended World War I
- It attempted to “make the world safe for democracy”
- It was an attempt to make world constitutionalism a reality.

Point #2: Bad Things That Came from Versailles Treaty:
- It was politicized in the U.S. and failed to win support of America
- It was pure vengeance the Europeans insisting on war reparations
- Article 231 was a positively wrong declaration that propelled another war
- It caused the European Depression of 1920’s
- It gave rise to the dictators: Hitler, Mussolini, and Franco

Point #3: The Major Players Included:
- From France—Georges Clemenceau “the tiger”
- From Britain—David Lloyd George “the money monger”
- From Italy—Victorio Orlando “The wishy-washy” weasel
- From U.S—Woodrow Wilson, the idealistic college professor in world politics
- From Germany—The Great Prussian General Staff of militarism

Point #4: Future Consequences of Versailles:
- It was world diplomacy on the scale of Wagnerian Grand Opera (Gotterdammerung)
- It failed to solve the problems that caused the war
- It caused the rise of fascism and militarism in Europe and Asia 1920-30’s
- It was a complete collapse of idealism in world diplomacy
- It was the vortex of warfare 1935-1945 in the World

Conclusions:
First, the Versailles Treaty was a tragedy of unparalleled comparison.
Second, the Treaty served as the basis for WW II
Third, the colossal tragedy of Hitler became a reality because of it
Fourth, the American rejection of the treaty insured the failure of world government by constitutional processes.

NOTE: This essay came from a 10th grader, in a regular World Studies class (NOT AP COURSE) The young man was an “at risk boy from a ‘gang’ environment.” I sensed there was more between his ears than just a gang mentality and so I challenged him to write and produce a college level essay. This is the final draft after a rough draft was made, a 2nd draft was submitted, and then he cleaned up the errors and produced this essay. The original rough draft was written “In-Class” in front of my eyes. It was NOT a product of “go home and return with the assignment.” And the greatest thrill it that it was not plagiarized!
Growing up in a period of salutary neglect, the 13 British colonies in North America had an unprecedented opportunity to establish their own identity apart from the English, and indeed they did. They had different ways of speaking, acting, eating, governing, fighting, of living from the life of their ancestors generations ago in England. By 1750, colonists in America had stopped thinking of themselves as British, and instead embraced and flaunted their own identity as Americans; however, until a year or two preceding the Declaration of Independence, the colonists lacked unity until 1774-1775, and even then was it incomplete.

An ocean separating them from their mother country allowed colonists to establish their own identity from the get go. The greatest realization of this fact occurred after the series of four wars, the last of which was the costly French and Indian War (1754-63). In that war, Americans realized that they could protect themselves without the aid of the British. This led to resentment of the haughty British officers, as the colonists were no longer impressed by their ineffective methods of warfare. The brutality of the British troops against both British and American soldiers also brought the Americans to believe more in their “greater worthiness” to be God’s chosen people. This realization in the immense difference
between British and American cultures and customs proves how the colonists viewed themselves as an entirely different “race” of people than the British. Had their idea of unique identity not existed, the colonists would have never frowned upon the harsh practices of British military officers, as their practices would be the same because of their shared English identity. Document H, the *Letters from an American Farmer*, exemplifies this feeling of separate identity especially well. It shows how Americans are neither European nor the descendant of a European, rather a strange mix of cultures which results in the formation of something new, something with its own unique culture and lifestyle: an American. Edmund Burke also recognizes the Americans’ separate identity in Doc. B, in which he urges Parliament not to attempt to govern the colonies as any British town. Burke recognizes the geographical complications of attempting to govern America as part of England, and he also notes that, because of the separation of the two nations, a separate identity is to be expected and all that could be done was to “let them carry across the ocean into…America the images of the British constitution.” (D.B.) The use of the word “images” suggests that Burke wants to communicate to Parliament the fact that Americans are not British anymore, and only faint images of British culture exists within the newly formed American identities. Through the examples of the Americans’ feeling of separation from their British counterparts after the French and Indian War as well as the obvious statements in the *Letters from an American Farmer*, in which the author clearly states the Americans’ feelings of a
new identity, along with the plea to Parliament to recognize the differences that have arisen in American culture, it is plain to see how strongly the colonists felt about their differing identity from their descendents in the time period leading up to the Revolutionary War.

Though the colonists now shared a unique identity, unity amongst the colonies was scarce until two years before the Declaration, and even then was in incomplete. Ben Franklin illustrates the disunity of the colonies in Doc. A, a political cartoon (the first drawn in America), which urged the colonies to “Join, or Die.” The fact that such a cartoon even had to be drawn illustrates the state of disunity the colonies were experiencing at that time (1754). As time progressed, the colonies did move more toward being united. In Doc. C, Lee boats that “all North America is most firmly united” (DC). Doc. E, issued by the Continental Congress also speaks of the “united colonies”. However, even on the eve of the Revolution, a majority of the colonists were not united. It would be easily believed that independence was the common goal of all the colonists, but indeed, it was not so. Only 40% of Americans were Patriots yearning for liberty, while 60% either remained loyal to the crown or took no side either way. In Doc. D, a view of an American Tory is presented, thus proving their existence and negative feelings toward the Revolution, which in turn contributed to the disunity of the colonies. Such disunity also presented itself in Doc. G, in which we see the aid for the relief of Boston in 1774 and 1775. Even so close to the Declaration’s issuing, only 5 of
the 13 colonies banded together to aid an American city. Through actions such as these and the known facts regarding the true disunited feelings of the colonists, it is clear to see that though the state of unity improved in the years leading up to the war, the truth of the matter was that the colonies and colonists were never truly all on the same page. America was never truly unified to the extent to which it was proposed to be in the years leading up to the Revolution.

A sense of American identity firmly established in the colonies did not prove to aid in establishing any true unity. The high sense of unique identity led to the Revolution, though disunity was common, even on the eve of the Revolution.
Andrew Jackson entered the presidency with the title “Victor of the Common Man”. He claimed to represent the people as a whole rather than just the privileged classes, and from this was Jacksonian Democracy born. To truly assess the validity of the statement “Reform movements in the United States sought to expand democratic ideals;” it is crucial to first address the issue of defining so called ideals. As developed under Jackson, though present before his time as well, democratic ideals are simply the notion of improving society for all and creating a world in which equality between all classes of men reign. Therefore, it is safe to say that the statement holds a high level of truth. The reform movements in the period of 1825-1850 embodied the spirit of democratic principles, starting with the Second Great Awakening, which essentially sparked the education reform as well as numerous women’s movements. Though all three sought to expand democratic ideals, it was only the Second Great Awakening and the education reform movement that had a lasting impression, as women’s movements were often overshadowed and therefore ineffective over a long period of time.

The Second Great Awakening came at a time in which faith amongst Americans was not high. The Enlightenment had sparked deist theories, and the religious faction of the country was slowly fading. In the early to mid 1800s, however, a new interest in religion and piety developed. Timothy Dwight, the president of Yale at the time, started a revolution of sorts by inspiring young educated men to resume the practice of religion. The revival filtered down to the lower
classes and the uneducated. Charles G. Finney ignited upstate New York, the “burned over district”, with his incendiary fire-and-brimstone speeches. In his sermons he promised salvation to “harlots, and drunkards, and…all sorts of abandoned characters,” (D.B.). These fiery sermons reached thousands, and all offered the promise of salvation to everyone willing to convert and reform, not only the upper classes. The Second Great Awakening led to a widespread reformation in the South and West through camp meetings and circuit riders who spread the word to everyone who’d listen. The results were phenomenal, and in this was the Second Great Awakening a success, and because its ideas promised salvation to all people, it is the reform movement that is the epitome of democratic ideals.

The newfound religious enthusiasm fueled the education reform during this time period. Public schools, which had been scarce before, were receiving tax supported funding, offering the opportunity for all to be educated. Horace Mann, a lead advocate for public education, lobbied for improving schools, compulsory attendance and a longer school year. Within these newly improved schools, William H. McGuffey’s Reader was the most popular teaching tool. It offered religious and moral lessons, and was geared toward not only the children of the upper class, a previous standard in the school system, but rather to anyone willing to learn. In Doc. E, McGuffey’s reader outlines for the student the proper, moral way for a boy to behave, at the end bringing religion into the lesson (“it is God who makes…”). The public school system was a victory for the common man and personified democratic ideals in that education and the chance to better oneself was now more widely opened to all.

Also related to education in a way were the prison reforms. By 1825, juveniles were being detained in a facility separate from the adult offenders, and in these new juvenile dentition centers, adults attempted to prevent repeat crimes “by religious and moral instruction, by imparting to them useful knowledge” (D.A.) This new education of child offenders, which
sprouted from the Second Great Awakening’s religious ideas, embraced the democratic ideals of, again, equal opportunity to learn.

It was not only children with renewed chances to learn, but women as well benefited from the education reform. New colleges were established as a place where women could further their education, such as Mt. Holyoke in Massachusetts, and Oberlin in Ohio. The equal opportunity as idolized by democratic principles was found here as well.

Women were not satisfied, however, with only educational reforms. They yearned for a more equal status in society. At the Seneca Falls Convention in 1848, Elizabeth Cady Stanton argued for the women’s right to vote, though it may have seemed “strange to many” (D.I.). She and all the women at the convention petitioned for a more equal status in government, and in the Declaration of Sentiments, modeled after the Declaration of Independence, they enforced that “all men and women were created equal.” Stanton wanted women to have a chance to have an equal say in the government that their tax money supported and wanted a chance to speak out against the “disgraceful laws” that ultimately hurt women. Though this movement sought to expand democratic ideas, it was unsuccessful. The women’s movement was overshadowed in the 1850s by the issue of slavery, and was not able to procure the women’s right to vote until much later in the 1920s.

Another unsuccessful attempt by women was the temperance movement. As illustrated in Doc. H, women opposed their husbands’ drunken activities and sought to ban alcoholic beverages. Doc. H shows the detrimental effects of drinking from a woman’s point of view, left alone with her child as her husband progresses downward as his drinking increases. Women argued that abstinence was necessary, and that it was unfair to women to have their husbands constantly missing. In the end, only Maine banned the consumption and production of the drink, and the ban was only temporary at that. While again the women’s temperance movement sought
to create equality between men and women, it was ultimately another failure and not a victory in expanding democratic ideals.

The Second Great Awakening was the starting point for democratic victories. In its promise of salvation for all, it was the epitome of democratic ideals, which included an improved society for every citizen. Education was an offshoot of this movement, and it too was a victory in that education was available to everyone. Women’s movements as well were, in theory, seeking to expand upon democratic ideals. However, they failed, as none of their accomplishments stuck. It was a good try, but realistically only the Second Great Awakening and the education reform achieved their goal of expanding democratic ideals.
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The Age of Jackson DBQ

Prompt: To what extent was the Age of Jackson (1824-1836) an age of triumphant nationalism, and economic revolution, and age of social perfectionism, cultural romanticism, and at the same time, an era of divisive sectionalism?

The Age of Jackson was a significant transitional period in American politics in which new political party-systems were formed and the electorate expanded rapidly. In part, the growth of voter participation during the era stemmed from Jacksonian ideological rhetoric advocating freedoms for the common man and attacking the privileged, which was evident in attempts to improve the voting systems of states throughout the nation. As a result of the new ideology of freedom for the “common man,” Americans developed a new sense of nationalism and enthusiasm for the federal government, as evidenced by the throngs of people present during Jackson’s inauguration and his attempt to defend the union in the face of the nullification crisis by appealing to nationalism. In addition, Jacksonian rhetoric created a new concept of “social perfectionism” for the era, in which fundamental rights of the common man, such as universal suffrage and protection from aristocratic hegemony, were highly esteemed. The idealistic and romantic political picture created by Jackson and his supporters led to a surge in cultural romanticism in the United States strikingly evident in paintings from the era. The new sense of national unity that emerged during the Age of Jackson also resulted in the growth of transportation systems and greater economic unity, although crises soon emerged over...
fundamental issues such as the Second Bank of the United States and the “Tariff of Abominations.” In fact, this tariff would become the source of much sectionalism in the country during the nullification crisis involving South Carolina.

Although forces of sectionalism persisted throughout much of Jackson’s administration, they were overpowered by stronger nationalistic forces that prevented the breakup of the Union during the era. These atonalistic forces were clearly evident in Jackson’s Farewell Address to the Nation, in which he indirectly attacked the doctrine of nullification and warned of the dire consequences of a breakup of the Union in order to encourage the enforcement of federal laws (doc R). Although Jackson clearly attempts to exploit fears of the dissolution of the union and political chaos to turn the public away from sectionalism, his speech accurately depicts many key components of nationalism during the age, such as policies “in the affections of the people.” Similar rhetorical techniques were employed by Jackson in his Nullification Proclamation, in which he labels nullification as contrary to the existence of the Union and alludes to religion to express his belief that the doctrine violates God’s will (doc S). Jackson’s Throughout his speech, Jackson consistently appeals to his audience’s emotion and desire for a secure future in order to win support for his policies regarding nullification. The historian Robert Remini supports the view of Jackson as a promoter of nationalism with his argument regarding Jackson’s commitment to democracy and popular government (doc J). Remini reveals that the democratization of the federal government under Jackson may have played a major role in the growth of nationalism during the period. Clearly, Jackson’s new policies and rhetoric succeeded in spurring nationalism among the American people.

One of the major contributing factors to the surge in nationalism during the Age of Jackson was the new ideology of social perfectionism that surfaced from Jacksonian ideology. According to the historian James Parton, universal suffrage, an aspect of social perfectionism, surfaced as a major issue during the Age of Jackson and heavily divided Americans by class (doc
C). In addition, Jackson’s handling of the Second Bank of the United States clearly demonstrated his commitment to social perfectionist ideals. In his veto of a proposed bill to re-charter the bank, Jackson cited the duty of government to protect commoners from monopolies and the privileged, recurring themes of his ideological rhetoric (doc F). Jackson’s commitment to protecting “the humble members of society” from the exclusive privileges enjoyed by the elite and his belief that the government should provide equal opportunities to all citizens is evident in a statement from 1832 (doc H). Clearly, social perfectionism and the realization of ideals that had existed since the American Revolution were crucial components of Jackson’s political ideology.

A new outgrowth of American culture in the form of romanticism characterized the arts during the Age of Jackson. For example, a painting with an elaborate color scheme intended to emphasize the emotional aspects of Jackson’s inauguration was created in 1829 toward the end of his first term (doc M). In general, Romantic art and literature was a reaction to the rationalist ideas of the Enlightenment, which had declined by this time and had been replaced by an approach based on emotion and intuition. [Can you give some examples of this in this paragraph to show the reader and prove the point you are making!]

The class tensions in American society that had arisen after the spread of Jacksonian rhetoric, in addition to economic growth as a result of Clay’s American System, produced a major transformation in the economy known as the Market Revolution as well as controversy over the federal banking system. According to Sellers, the Market Revolution marked a major transformation of the United States from a region isolated from world trade and lacking efficient domestic trade to a nation with an efficient and mobilized trading infrastructure in the early nineteenth century (doc P). This transformation resulted from improved transportation and finances created by Clay’s American System. However, since the Age of Jackson was an important transitional period in the American economy, many conflicts arose over economic matters, including over the re-chartering of the Second Bank of the United States. While the
Boston Daily Advertiser praised the Bank’s role in establishing a safe currency and facilitating trade (doc E). Jackson dismissed the Bank as an institution of the privileged that compromised the welfare of the majority of Americans (doc F). Eventually, Jackson prevailed over the bank and succeeded in his original goals in an economic revolution that heavily affected American banking for the next century. In addition to the bank, the tariff of abominations (1828) caused much economic debate but proved to threaten the union. In the Ordinance of Nullification, South Carolina denounced the tariff as unconstitutional and unbefitting the state, thereby claiming the right of states to nullify federal laws (doc G). Eventually, the leaders of these economic objections to Jackson’s policies would become known as the “Great Triumvirate” and would lead the Whig party in opposition to Jackson (doc U). Evidently, economic upheavals and conflicts characterized the age.

The economic conflicts between Jackson and the Whig leaders occurred in the background of larger sectional conflicts that firmly divided the United States during the Age of Jackson. In the 1828 election, the National Republican candidate John Adams received support mostly in New England and more well-settled areas of the west, while Jackson received his support almost entirely from the south and west (doc A). The regional political divisions that this election demonstrated pointed to growing sectionalism between the north and the south. In addition, political divisions in the nation were evident in Jackson’s use of the spoils system to replace officials from different parties, which was advocated as a democratic system by historians and supporters of Jackson (doc B). Finally, the ringing denouncement of Jackson’s policies as unconstitutional by Henry Clay demonstrates the growing divisions between the Whigs and the Democrats by the end of Jackson’s presidency. Since frontiersmen and the poor were generally democrats while the rich and well-established in the north were generally Whigs, the divisions between the two parties during Jackson’s administration reflected sectional divisions in the nation.
As evidenced by economic and sectional conflicts, the growth of the arts, the popularity of Jacksonian ideology, the Age of Jackson was characterized by triumphant nationalist, economic revolutions, social perfectionism, cultural romanticism, and divisive sectionalism.

(This is a very nice conclusion and appropriate ending to the essay!)

- This is a superlative essay! It would have to score a “9” on the AP Exam.
- There are a couple of omissions that are serious however. You need to point out when discussing social perfectionism examples of the organizations such as the founding of Mormonism, Shakers, Oneida Community, and Brook Farm. You need to insert these into the essay and discussion. In reference to the sectional controversy you must deal in some significant way, with the abolitionist movement that grew out of Jacksonian Democracy and developed and grew after Jackson.
Jacksonian Democracy

On March 4, 1829, thousands of Americans from all regions of the country, including farmers, laborers, and others of modest social rank, crowded in Washington, D.C., to witness the inauguration of Andrew Jackson. “The whole of the preceding day, immense crowds were coming into the city from all parts, lodgings could not be obtained, and the newcomers had to go to Georgetown, which soon overflowed, and others had to go to Alexandria.” (Document V) The pictures of Andrew Jackson’s Inaugural of 1828 show an immense crowd around the White House celebrating President Jackson’s inauguration. (Document M) However, to other onlookers, the New England aristocrats, the sight was less alluring. Justice of the Supreme Court Joseph Story viewed the inauguration with disgust and remarked: “The reign of King ‘Mob’ seems triumphant.” Andrew Jackson believed that America’s goal should be to eliminate the favored status of powerful elites and make opportunity more widely available to the “common man.” Jackson shared this view when he said, “every man is equally entitled to protection by laws; but when the laws undertake to add to those natural and just advantages artificial distinctions...and exclusive privileges...the humble members of society—the farmers, mechanics, and laborers...have a right to complain of the injustice of their government”. (Document H) For this reason, during the presidential election of 1828 many New England aristocrats voted for the Republican candidate John Quincy Adams in hopes to stop Jackson from winning the election. (Document A) “Jackson himself was fiercely committed to democracy. And by democracy he meant majoritarian rule. A Hero for the Age.” (Document J) The Age of Jackson, an era of triumphant nationalism for America’s “common man,” triggered the beginning of an age of social perfection which led to the removal of virtually all Native Americans east of the Mississippi River; the Bank of the United States failed to renew its charter, triggering an
economic evolution that would ultimately lead to the sectionalism between wealthy New England aristocrats and the rising entrepreneurs of the South and the West, who were also known as the “common man.”

During Andrew Jackson’s presidency, Jackson worked to increase the rights of the “common man” while eliminating the favored status of powerful elites, causing a rising nationalism amongst the working class. Until the 1820’s relatively few Americans had been permitted to vote. Most states restricted the right to vote to white males who were property owners or taxpayers. When Jackson became president in 1828, there was a huge conflict on “whether `universal suffrage,’ so called was to have any practice effect in the United States.” (Document C) By 1828, electors were chosen by popular vote in every state but South Carolina. In the presidential election of 1824, fewer than 27 percent of adult white males had votes. In the election of 1828, the figure rose to 58 percent and in 1840 to 80 percent. In Jackson’s First Inaugural Address, on March 4, 1829, Jackson assured a period of nationalism by pledging to “undertake the arduous duties” that have been appointed to him by the choice of the free people. Jackson also told the people of the United States that the task to reform the government would “require particularly the correction of those abuses that have brought the patronage of the Federal Government into conflict with the freedom of election,” and also mentioned that the unjust “appointment of continued power in unfaithful or incompetent hands” must be reversed. (Document Q) Jackson kept this promise when he attacked the entrenched officeholders in the federal government. Jackson believed that official duty offices belonged to the people, not to the entrenched officeholders. “In a country where offices are created solely for the benefit of the people, no one man has any more intrinsic right to official station than another.” (Document B) In the end, Jackson removed a total of one-fifth of the federal officeholders during his eight years in office.

“The Age of Jackson was a turbulent era—a period of boom and bust...of institutionalized violence, racial antagonisms, utopian communities, reform movements, and abolitionist crusade...” (Document J) In the first decades of the nineteenth century, the whites in the western states and territories whom Jackson came to represent began to view Native Americans simply as “savages.”
For this reason, the commitment to Indian removal became very favorable among white westerns who favored removal because they feared that continued contact between the expanding white settlements and the Indians would produce endless conflict and violence. This was the beginning of the age of social perfectionism. Andrew Jackson wanted to move the Indians west, beyond the Mississippi, out of the way of expanding white settlement. Andrew Jackson had long advocated their removal west and favored Indian removal for several reasons: “to protect the American people and provide greater security of the United States; and to prevent the certain annihilation of Indian life and culture that would occur if the tribes were to remain with eastern states.” (Document K) In the Map of Cherokee “Trail of Tears,” it shows the path that the “Five Civilized Tribes,” the Cherokee, Creek, Seminole, Chickasaw, and Choctaw, had to take due to the Removal Act that was signed by Jackson. (Document L) Between 1830 and 1838 virtually all the “Five Civilized Tribes” were expelled from the southern states and forced to relocate in the new Indian Territory, which Congress had officially created by the Indian Intercourse Act of 1834. Despite resistance from several tribes including the Cherokee and the Seminole, by the end of the 1830s, virtually all the important Indian societies of the Mississippi had been removed to the West. In the Cherokee letter protesting the Treaty of New Etocha, 1836, the Cherokee tribe expresses their sadness by saying, “We are overwhelmed! Our hearts are sickened, our utterance is paralyzed, when we reflect on the condition in which we are placed...” (Document Z) By removing Native Americans in wanted western lands, Jackson believed that he had saved the Indians from conflicts with the whites while allowing white expansion westward that had been penetrating the West for nearly two centuries.

Throughout the Jacksonian Era, Jackson believed that society’s goal should be to eliminate the favored status of powerful elites and make opportunity more widely available. For this reason, New England aristocrats often felt attacked by the Jackson presidency which led to forming of the Whig Party and a growing national sectionalism. In Document V, pictures of the “Great Triumvirate,” the leaders of the Whig Party, Daniel Webster, Henry Clay, and John Calhoun, are shown next to Martin Van Buren, Jackson’s personal choice for president. Andrew Jackson emphasizes his goal to eliminate the favored status of aristocrats when he says, “But when the laws
undertake to add to those natural and just advantages artificial distinctions...and exclusive privileges...the humble members of society-the farmers, mechanics, and laborers...have a right to complain of the injustice of their government.” (Document H) Jackson consistently opposed concentrating power either in federal government or in powerful and aristocratic institutions associated with it. Due to this view, Jackson made it clear that he would not favor renewing the charter of the Bank of the United States, which was due to expire in 1836. In the Boston Daily Advertiser of September 1832, it defends the national bank by saying that the bank “is one of the most important and valuable instruments that is used in the practical administration of the government...As the fiscal agent of the executive, it has exhibited a remarkable intelligence, efficient, energy, and above all, independence.” (Document E) Regardless of attempts by many aristocrats to save the national bank Andrew Jackson predictably vetoed the Bank Bill of 1832 and said “All the objectionable principle of the existing corporation, and most if it odious features, are retained without alleviation.” (Document F) When Jackson decided to remove the government’s deposits from the National Bank it damages the “monster” Bank severely. After several attempts to restore the National Bank it finally died in 1836, and the country lost a valuable financial institution and was left with a fragmented and chronically unstable banking system that would plague the economy for more than a century.

Another issue that led to an increased tension for sectionalism was the battle for power between the states and the Federal government. In 1832, the controversy over nullification produced a crisis when South Carolinians responded angrily to a congressional tariff bill that offered them no relief from the 1828 "tariff of abominations." Almost immediately, the legislature summoned a state convention, which voted to nullify the tariffs of 1828 and 1832 and to forbid the collection of duties within the state. The people of the State of South Carolina believed that the acts of the Congress that imposed duties and imposts on the importation of foreign commodities were unauthorized by the Constitution. For this reason South Carolinians believed that the duties and imposts were null and void. (Document G) Despite the claim by South Carolina, Jackson insisted that nullification was treason and proposed a force bill authorizing the president to use the military
to see that acts of Congress were obeyed. In Jackson’s Nullification Proclamation, Jackson stated that a law of the United States that was constitutional could not be “repealed by the authority of a small majority of the voters of a single state.” (Document S) Luckily on March 1, 1833, a compromise was reached by which the tariff would be lowered gradually so that by 1842, it would reach approximately the same level as in 1816. Throughout Jackson’s presidency he faced much opposition from sectionalists who were distraught from the policies against aristocrats that Jackson enforced.

The election of Andrew Jackson to the presidency in 1828 marked the beginning of the “era of the common man.” Thousands of Americans from all regions of the country, including farmers, laborers, and others of modest social rank, crowded in Washington, D.C., to witness the inauguration of Andrew Jackson. However, to other onlookers, the New England aristocrats, the sight was less alluring. Andrew Jackson believed that America’s goal should be to eliminate the favored status of powerful elites and make opportunity more widely available to the “common man.” For these reasons, Jackson’s presidency triggered the nationalism of the working class while causing the aristocrats to start an opposing party known as the Whigs to oppose Jackson’s policies. The Age of Jackson, an era of triumphant nationalism for America’s “common man,” triggered the beginning of an age of social perfection which led to the removal of virtually all Native Americans east of the Mississippi River; the Bank of the United States failed to renew its charter, triggering an economic evolution that would ultimately lead to the sectionalism between wealthy New England aristocrats and the rising entrepreneurs of the South and the West, who were also known as the “common man.”
World War I: 20th Century Militarism

By the mid-nineteenth century, European powers attempted to create colonies by sending large number of migrants to settle and populate new lands in order to create a military, political and business structure that allowed them to dominate and profit from the existing populations of their colonies. As the colonizing of new lands by European powers increased the construction of empires took on a new and different form from those of earlier eras and the period became known as the age of imperialism. Due to the increasing fervor the age of imperialism created, nationalism spread rapidly throughout the European continent during the nineteenth century creating competition and conflict throughout the European continent. In Harry Elmer Barnes, The Genesis of World War, Barnes reveals the blunders and conflict that existed prior to the ending of the nineteenth-century, due to the age of imperialism, which acted as a precursor to the Great War. “The general European system after 1870, based as it was upon nationalism, militarism, secret alliances, and imperialist aims, naturally inclined Europe toward war…” (Document A) Between the years of 1871 and 1914 tensions in the European continent skyrocketed due to the Austria annexation of Bosnia Herzegovina, the Moroccan Crisis, and the First and Second Balkan Wars. (Document C) By 1914 the major powers of Europe became organized into two great competing alliances; The Triple Entente linking Britain, France, and Russia and the Triple Alliance which united Germany, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and Italy. This great division of Europe into the two great coalitions and the “excesses of nationalism, militarism, liberalism, socialism, and economic imperialism” once again threatened the peace of the world. (Document B) During World War I many issues and conflicts were left unresolved after the signing of the Treaty of Versailles, which made the Great War a contributor to another hundred years of warfare rather than achieving the world peace that Wilson and many others envisioned.
When the Archduke Franc Ferdinand was assassinated in Sarajevo on June 28, 1914, controversy quickly escalated in Europe which set into motion a series of fast-moving events that escalated into a full-scale war. In Karl Kautsky's Outbreak of the World War: German Documents Collected, Kautsky reveals Austria-Hungary's reaction to the assassination of Ferdinand through a letter from the Austro-Hungarian Ambassador. In the ambassador's letter Austria-Hungary's hostility toward Russia is shown when the ambassador writes, "should a war between Austria-Hungary and Russia be unavoidable, we might be convinced that Germany our old faithful ally, would stand at our side." (Document D) With support from Germany, Austria Hungary launched a punitive assault on Serbia. The Serbians quickly called on Russia to help with their defense which led to Germany declaring war on both Russia and France after invading Belgium in preparation for a thrust across the French border. On August 4, Great Britain declared war on Germany in response to the invading of Belgium and in order to honor its alliance with France and Russia. Within less than a year, virtually the entire European continent and parts of Asia were embroiled in the Great War.

As Europe hastily entered into a state of total war, Wilson called on his fellow citizens to remain neutral. However, due to the lurid reports of German atrocities skillfully exaggerated by propagandists, the hostility of many Americans toward Germany rapidly amplified. Along with the rising hostility toward Germany, many Americans including President Wilson fervently admired England which led to the Americans attributing to the cause of the Allies. When war orders from Britain and France soared after the spark of the war, American began ignoring the blockade of Germany and continued to trade with Britain. By 1915, the United States had gradually transformed itself from a neutral power into the arsenal of the Allies. "By abandoning his neutral financial and industrial policy in favor of the Allies, President Wilson made it possible for the Entente Powers to enjoy an enormous advantage over the Central Powers in getting supplies." (Document I) As tensions between Germany and the United States escalated, Germany began to resort to barbaric tactics in the form of submarine warfare. Beginning on February 18, 1915, Germany began to use the newly improved submarine to "destroy every enemy merchant ship that is found in the area of war without its always being possible to avert the peril that thus threatens persons and cargo." (Document M) Enemy vessels, the Germans announced would be sunk on
In Theobald von Bethmann-Hollweg’s speech he reveals Germany’s reason for using unrestricted submarine warfare when he tells the Reichstag that due to the unexpected brutality of the war, Germany is forced “to help our people out of the distress and disgrace which our enemies contemplate for them.” (Document Z) On May 7, 1015, a German submarine sank the British passenger liner Lusitania without warning, causing the deaths of 1,198 people, 129 of them Americans. While the government of the United States declared that the Lusitania was an ordinary unarmed merchant vessel, reports found that the Lusitania “undoubtedly had guns on board which were mounted under the decks and masked” which led to the German commanders being put into a position where they no longer had to observe the rules of capture. (Document G)

Despite the Lusitania tragedy, President Wilson was still far from ready to commit the United States to war. However when Germany decided to once again begin unrestricted submarine warfare against America to cut off Britain from vital supplies, tension between the United States and Germany flared. On February 25, 1917 the British gave Wilson a telegram they had intercepted from the German foreign minister, Arthur Zimmermann, to the government of Mexico. The Zimmerman telegram revealed Germany’s plans to begin unrestricted submarine warfare and offered Mexico “the lost territory in Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona” if the Mexican government agreed to wage war against the Americans in the event of war between Germany and the United States. (Document F) On April 2, 1917, two weeks after German submarines had torpedomed three American ships, Wilson appeared before Congress and asked for a declaration of war. In Wilson’s Formal Declaration of War Wilson “authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Imperial German Government.” (Document E)

Prior to the intervention of the United States, Europe became the scene of an imposing stalemate due to trench warfare where “both the Allies and the Central Powers found themselves virtual prisoners of their trenches for months on end.” (Document Q) In the map of the Western Front of World War I, the long line of Allied Forces and Central Powers fighting in France shows the stalemate that existed in France during Germany’s offensive attack due to trench warfare. (Document X) However, within the first months of joining the war, the United States had begun to alter the balance. American warships began escorting merchant vessels across the Atlantic and
also helped sow antisubmarine mines in the Atlantic. By October 1918 sinking of Allied ships had decreased from nearly 900,000 in the month of April 1917 to 112,000. Many Americans had hoped that providing naval assistance alone would be enough to turn the tide in the war, but it quickly became clear that a major commitment of American ground forces would also be necessary to shore up the tottering Allies. Due to the low number of soldiers in the United States army President Wilson decided that only a national draft could provide the needed men. Despite the protest of many politicians, Wilson won passage of the Selective Service act. The draft brought nearly 3 million men into the army, and due to the great support the army received from American citizens due to propaganda posters and lurid stories that inflated the malice of the Central Powers, another 2 million joined the armed services voluntarily. (Document T) Under the command of General John J. Pershing, and the new American Expeditionary Force joined the existing Allied forces in the spring of 1918. By the time Americans arrived, morale on both sides was declining, and many soldiers had come to believe that the war would be virtually endless. Despite the low morale of the Allied forces, American forces at Chateau-Thierry assisted the French in repelling a bitter German offensive that had brought within fifty miles of Paris. By July 18, the Allies had halted the German advance and began a successful offensive of their own. On September 26, the American fighting force advanced against the Germans in the Argonne Forest that lasted nearly seven weeks. Faced with an invasion of their own country, Germany leaders now began to seek an armistice and on November 11, 1918, the Great War shuddered to a close. Despite the quick resolution of the Great War after the intervention of the United States, the First World War was the most destructive war up to that time. “Of the 65,000,000 men directly involved in the war, 9,000,000 were killed outright. 22,000,000 more were wounded with permanent debilitating injuries. 5,000,000 are missing [therefore, it safe to assume that they too are dead].” (Document O)

As World War I came to a close, President Wilson began to make preparations to create a stable peace which he had promised the nation before leading the United States to war. On January 8, 1918 Wilson appeared before Congress to present the principles for which he claimed the nations was fighting. Wilson called these fourteen distinct provisions, the Fourteen Points. Wilson’s proposals contained eight specific recommendations for adjusting post war boundaries, for establishing new nations to replace the defunct Austro Hungarian and Ottoman Empires, and made
five general principles to govern international conduct in the future. Also, there was a proposal for a league of nations that would help implement these new principles and territorial adjustment and resolve future controversies. (Document S) When President Wilson arrived in Paris on December 13, 1918 for the Paris Peace Conference he shared his ideas with the leaders of the victorious Allied nations: Lloyd George representing Great Britain; Clemenceau representing France; and Vittorio Orlando, the prime minister of Italy. From the beginning of the conference, the idealism that Wilson had sought to create was competing with a spirit of national aggrandizement. Due to the competing concerns produced in Paris, Wilson was unable to win approval of many of the broad principles he supported. In the picture titled The Fate of the League of Nations, Wilson is picture blowing bubbles that are labeled the League of Nations from a bowl labeled idealism. Like bubbles that vanish into the air, Wilson’s idealistic views were for the most part ignored despite the creation of the weak League of Nations. (Document N) At the end of the Paris Peace Conference, the Treaty of Versailles was created which required Germany and her allies to accept full responsibility for causing the war and make reparations to certain countries that had formed the Allies. (Document J)

When the Treaty of Versailles was signed on June 28, 1919, Allied leaders believed that the Germans would never again be allowed to become powerful enough to threaten the peace of Europe. Despite the treaty’s success in ending World War I, it failed to solve the problems that caused the war. In the years following the signing of the treaty, Europe went through a devastating depression, it gave rise to the dictators: Hitler, Mussolini, and Franco, and caused the rise of fascism and militarism in Europe and Asia. Beginning from the failure to force the German General Staff to admit defeat, the German General Staff supported the false idea that the army had not been defeated on the battlefield, but could have fought on to victory, except for being betrayed at home. During the war, Adolph Hitler became obsessed with this idea, laying blame on Jews and Marxists in Germany for undermining the war effort and kept this mentality until he rose to power in World War II. (Document U) The Treaty of Versailles was far from what Wilson had hoped and although it did contain a provision for a League of Nations, the League quickly became controversial in the United States. In addition, Woodrow Wilson’s bold and idealist dream of a peace based on the principles of democracy and justice failed. During World War I many issues
and conflicts were left unresolved after the signing of the Treaty of Versailles, which made the
Great War a contributor to another hundred years of warfare rather than achieving the world peace
that Wilson and many others envisioned.
The Age of Jackson brought in many changes to American life that altered it permanently. Because, from the beginning of Jackson’s Presidency, so many changes came about in multiple areas of American society, many have come to the conclusion that this period in American history was an age in which the different facets of American life were experiencing a new beginning, with new cultural and social movements as well as political and economic ways of thinking. The Age of Jackson, due to the incredible political and territorial changes it underwent along with other factors can be thought of as an age in which nationalism, economic evolution, social perfectionism and cultural romanticism, prevailed to varying degrees. However, alongside this era of transformation, there ran a strong and growing sentiment of division and sectionalism that had its effects both during the Jacksonian presidency and after it.

The Age of Jackson can be primarily thought of as an age in which nationalism predominated. Although there certainly emerged a loyalty to one’s region, for the most part, the country was united by the ideals that Jackson represented. Jackson’s election to the presidency was seen as the emergence of a new era, in which the common man, the typical worker, had an active voice in the government. Andrew Jackson, was not only a war hero, but also a man most Americans could identify and relate to, and so, supported him and willingly allowed him to lead them, a fact many people including congressmen noticed and commented on, as seen by Henry Clay’s comments, (Doc. D.) who expresses that the vast majority of people “follow him
wherever he leads.” Furthermore, Jackson represented an important and significant military victory to the minds of the American people, the Battle of New Orleans, in which they (the Americans) defeated the best army in the world, a fact that added to the already ardent nationalism. Beyond that, the fact that voting requirements were lowered to include in the electorate most white males, greatly raised the feelings of patriotic duty in the country as a whole, as people, from all stations of life, (as long as they were white males), now had the power to choose their leader, and they chose Andrew Jackson, a man they knew would voice their opinions and give them their rightful place as the true source of power in the government, a fact corroborated many times, by Jackson himself(Doc. H).

The nationalistic spirit of the age did not restrict itself to the personal lives of people, but came to influence the economic policies of the nation. One of the most controversial topics of the time was the removal of the Indian tribes, to secure land for white expansionism. Many scholars, among them Robert V. Remini, author of The Jacksonian Era (Doc. K.), believed that Jackson passed this law as a measure to protect Indian culture; although Jackson’s motives for passing the law may not be explicitly clear, one factor that definitely affected his decision, was the increasing lust for land that was gripping the nation. As with many other economic policies, Jackson’s primary concern was to allow the common, working class man to have the same economic opportunities as those belonging to the upper classes. Jackson, who authorized this systematic removal of the Indians, may have foreseen the violence that would have erupted over this fight for Indian land, something that was already starting to be seen in such Supreme Court cases as Worcester vs. Georgia, (1832), (Doc. O.), where although the affected tribe, the Cherokees, won the case, both the state and federal governments, in other words the people of Georgia, proceeded to remove them, regardless of the validation of their rights in the case. This case, as well as the removal of the Indian tribes to lands in the far west (Doc. L.) demonstrates a continuation of the economic trend that had started in past decades, the expansion of territory,
made both by wealthy and poor citizens of America, a trend that would increase and eventually evolutionize enough to force the government to take some measures to protect the rights of the white settlers, and to ensure that the expansion process would take place smoothly.

Another key issue that helped make the Jacksonian Era, one with economic evolution was the bank controversy that emerged. Andrew Jackson, through personal experience, never trusted the national bank, and from the very beginning of his term, he sought to eliminate its stronghold over the nation. A crucial reason why Jackson refused to help the bank in any way was that he believed it to be a useless institution that benefited a small percentage of the population, while rendering the rest to lie in poverty, a sentiment clearly expressed in his veto message to Congress regarding the bank, (Doc. F.). Although many did not share his opinion about the national bank, as seen in a Boston newspaper (Doc. E.), and although there were many legislative battles, eventually through appeals to the public, and thanks in part to the financial chaos that was ensuing from the bank at that time, (in an effort to pressure the influential shareholder’s to ask Jackson to recharter the bank), Jackson managed his goal, and the national bank was no longer a government institution. As a result of the lack of a national bank, the economy becomes a much more complex issue, and for the most part, its consequences were disastrous for the nation. However, the lack of a national bank did permit state banks to grow, which in turn, allowed for more and more working class people to get loans, and become property owners. Furthermore, the state banks, much more flexible than the national one, enabled more economic opportunities to be granted, something that Jackson, had always wanted. Jackson’s vision of a more democratic America also infiltrated in Supreme Court cases, such as Charles River Bridge vs. Warren Bridge Court (Doc. W.), where the Supreme Court protected and allowed for competition among industries, competition that would undoubtedly benefit the “common man.” In this way, the Age of Jackson represented an economic revolution; through policies and laws,
the U.S. economy became more egalitarian, and allowed for more options to those who were not part of the privileged classes.

As conditions regarding the economic state of the country were undergoing changes, so was the social aspects of American life. The Age of Jackson, it can be argued was an age in which class distinctions, although perhaps not as obvious as in past times, were still very flagrant in society; it was a continuation of the patterns manifested in past administrations. As the nation’s economic policies became more democratic, and more people had the opportunity to advance in social status, conditions improved slightly, but not significantly. Just as classes in society remained different from each other in regards to their respective monetary issues, they also differed in how they perceived their president, as evidenced by how the nation voted in 1828, with most of the affluent and commercial New England states voting for John Adams, while the western and southern states favored Jackson, (Doc. A). While the lower classes idolized him and thought of him as “their” president, many in the affluent classes of society, thought his policies were aimed against them, (many times they were ), and so believed him to be an instigator of revolts. Although social relationships between the different types of people living in the U.S. did alter because of the highly nationalistic spirit of the age, it did not manage to change many prejudices against the minority groups in America, a fact supported by the overall increasingly hostile reactions towards the African slaves, and also towards the Indian tribes.

The Age of Jackson, besides being an era that introduced the nation to new political and economic changes, also brought cultural changes, as the literary movement of Romanticism made its way through the nation (Doc. N.). Romanticism, a movement that came to America during the early 1800’s was a movement in complete opposition to the rationalism that preceded it, as it valued intuition and feeling over reason and logic. American literature quickly produced works of importance through such renowned authors as Washington Irving, and Edgar Allen
Poe. This cultural era quickly enveloped the nation as it called for a return to the purity and wholesomeness of nature, something many in the crowded cities of the U.S. also longed for. In short, many Americans felt that the Romanticism movement expressed the sentiments of the time, as the increasing industrialism of the age gave rise to people unhappy with their situation in the city, and longing for the comforts of the country.

All through the Age of Jackson, there were issues underlying the nationalistic sentiment of the era, that served to divide the country into factions, and that would eventually lead to the formation of rival political parties such as the Whigs. One issue that managed this had to do with Jackson’s interpretation no of the power the executive branch had; the spoils system, a system in which the victor of the election would replace the officeholders in the government for those of his same political party. The spoils system antagonized all those who had held long-term posts in the government; as well as all those who believed that not all people were equal (all white males, that is), and so, some people were naturally incapable of holding a government position. Jackson, who steadily maintained that all white males are equal, continued his spoils system, and justified it by claiming that they were democratic, a fact Richardson, writer of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents (Doc. B.), agrees with. This issue divided the government because it was a direct blow to the established order, as well as intimidated all those who were against Jackson, since it meant, that he (Jackson) was not looking to make money, but rather, had a clear vision for the country, and wanted to fulfill, and was capable of doing anything to fulfill that vision.

Another issue that divided the government even more deeply, because it concerned the whole nation, as well as the concept of the Union, was the nullification crises. This issue pitted the state of South Carolina against the federal government, over the nullification of tariffs. For a long time, the southern states, particularly South Carolina had been vocal about the hindrance of a tariff that benefited the northern manufacturers, but according to the southerners, was useless
for them. Led by John Calhoun, the state of South Carolina maintained that the states, since they made up the union, had the final say, in whether or not they would apply a federal law, the state became so adamant about the issue, that it actually produced an Ordinance of Nullification that expressed the southerner’s thoughts on the tariffs they were charged (Doc. G.). The federal government, headed by President Jackson, maintained that it was the people, not the states that made up and were represented by the executive branch, a sentiment seen in his Nullification Proclamation (Doc. S.), and so the states, made up by people, who willingly submitted themselves to be ruled by their chosen federal government, in denying the power of the federal government, were in essence denying the power of the people, and so South Carolina’s nullification actions were considered treasonous. Although the matter was quickly resolved, through Jackson’s strong armed tactics, the precedent had been set, and for the rest of Jackson’s presidency, he resolved to put, above all other matters, the preservation of the union. The issue was so important he included it in his farewell speech (Doc. R.), where he warned against the possible divisions that could endanger the preservation of the Union. This issue was a complex one, that had its roots in the writing of the constitution, and the debate of states vs. federal rights had always been a controversial topic, as opinions varied widely, and managed to divide the country, regardless of how united in might be due to the ongoing nationalism. This issue not only plagued Jackson’s presidency, but also future ones.

The expanded electorate issue, that caused a great amount of nationalist and patriotic fervor during this age, also led to many conflicts among the politicians themselves, as they viewed the increasing electorate as a possible source of endangerment to some politician’s personal views. Many, including James Parton, author of the Life of Andrew Jackson (Doc. C), thought that this upsurge in eligible voters may not have been for the best, as many of those that supported Jackson, were those with little or limited means, and so, may not have been educated. Many politicians upheld this belief, that Jackson was a representative of an uneducated mob, a
belief that was shared by those of the more affluent social classes, and that was seen even in the very beginnings of the Jacksonian Age, such as during Jackson’s inauguration, as described by Mrs. Samuel Harrison Smith who attended this event (Doc. V.), and that caused division, even among the strong nationalistic sentiment that was prevalent during the Age of Jackson.

The Jackson Age, was one in which much unity was achieved, as people were unified through their common nationalistic sentiment, as well as their participation in the economic, social and cultural movements that were sweeping the nation. However, in the midst of all these unifying factors, divisions started to emerge, that not only threatened to livelihood of the nation then, but
Lincoln DBQ

The circumstances in which President Abraham Lincoln found himself in at the very beginning of his term were exceedingly daunting. The country he had been chosen to lead, was on the brink of a civil war, and the country was divided in more ways than one, and had been portioned for quite some time now. However, despite the difficulties that lay ahead of him, the 16th President managed to preserve the Union, and along the way, laid the foundation for the myth he was to become in American history. Nowadays, Lincoln is recognized as an American hero, whose presidency changed many aspects of American life. Although there are some who question whether the legend that he, Lincoln, has become is a truthful illustration of him, it can be asserted that this legend about him, is roughly accurate, as it is based on his actions during the course of a very difficult period in America. Furthermore, it can be argued that not only is Abraham Lincoln deserving of the legend that has grown around him, but also that he was the originator of the modern American presidency and the creator of the war powers, as seen through the course of action he practiced during the civil war.

The importance that Lincoln had and continuous to have on American thought and culture is apparent in many different areas. The myth of who Lincoln was, and what he achieved has infiltrated all aspects of American life, as evidenced in Walt Whitman’s emotional poem, “Oh Captain! My Captain!” (Doc. Y), in which the poet laments the death of Lincoln. The crucial aspect of the myth that surrounds Lincoln, is that in it Lincoln is perceived in many different ways; he is attributed with a wide arrange of facets that when seen altogether, establish him as the embodiment of the ideal American hero. Lincoln, most specifically in posterity,
and is seen as “a kind of Christ figure” (Doc. C). In his legend, Lincoln is seen as a virtuous “honest, upright, God-fearing, generous, and patriotic” (Doc. D) man who sacrifices himself for the benefit of his country and people. The recurrence of the thought of him as representative of all the traditional Christian values that helped found America was further extolled by the fact that his speeches spoke of values that were fundamentally Christian in aspect, an example being his Second Inaugural Address (Doc. S), in which he expresses his desire to proceed with the consequences of war “with malice towards none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God.” This perception of Lincoln as a tragic hero who died for his people is recognized by historians such as Richard Hofstadter (Doc. E), who understand the grip this myth has on the American people, and how this legend has nurtured the American hopes and dreams of someday reaching its ideal. Although this myth is undeniably biased in the way in which it interprets Lincoln as a sort of demigod, it is nonetheless rooted in real events and situations from which Lincoln emerged displaying admirable leadership qualities that gave hope to the American people in a time of need, and that would, in subsequent years fuel the legend that would replace him in the history books, and in the minds of the American people.

At the time that Lincoln took office, the country was hopelessly divided on many issues, and the irreconcilability of differences between regions that would erupt in a Civil War from 1861 to 1865. The fact that all through the course of the war, Lincoln managed to firmly impose his authority despite such difficulties as the draft riots, the disunity of the Republican party, and the difficulty that financing the war entailed, and that he was able to remain in constant contact with the thoughts of the American people, all contribute to the image that the American public has forged of him as one of the greatest presidents of all time. Lincoln demonstrated his political genius, and by so, encouraging the myth that would soon envelop him, by looking past previous rivalries, and filling his cabinet with intelligent, able men that were able to provide him with valuable insight into the war (Doc. F). Another illustration, of Lincoln’s far reaching intellect is
his clear perception of the situation, as expressed in his Annual Message to Congress, in which he admits the magnitude of the Civil War in American history (Doc. P). Furthermore, Lincoln managed to establish an open, communicative relationship between the President and the people, as seen in his First Inaugural Address (Doc. M), in which he openly tells the public about the distinct possibility of a civil war. This closer relationship between the President and the American people can also be seen in his world famous Gettysburg Address (Doc. R) in which he attempts to raise the public’s morale by validating what the soldiers had fought for, and in doing so, inspired hope in the community that the war would be won. Lincoln also achieves this by recognizing the sacrifices his supporters were making, something he did in his letter to Mrs. Bixby (Doc. V) concerning her son who died in combat. Although, there were many instances during his term, in which Lincoln betrayed a flaw in character, such as his remaining prejudice against African-Americans, as evidenced in his belief that colonization was the best solution to the problem of discrimination (Doc. W), or his reluctance to end slavery in places where it was already firmly entrenched (Doc. J), the fact that Lincoln nevertheless managed to overcome his own prejudices for the sake of his country, and follow through with his promise of the liberation of slaves everywhere by legalizing and enforcing the Emancipation Proclamation, demonstrates that although the myth of Lincoln is in fact a myth, it is one firmly ingrained in the truth of Lincoln’s actions (Doc. Q).

The assertion that Lincoln was the first of the modern presidents can be sustained by recognizing the fact that Lincoln’s presidency marked a change in the way that the President was connected to the people. Through Lincoln’s addresses to the people, it can be perceived that the connection between people and President increased and became more open. Additionally, there was a change in how President’s came to see their role, as Abraham Lincoln now saw the importance of preserving the Union for the good of the nation as a whole, and did not favor specific regions. The belief that Lincoln was the first of the modern Presidents is corroborated
by several historians, such as Richard E. Neustadt (Doc. H.), and the authors of “What were the
Consequences of the Civil War?” (Doc. X), in which these authors also imply the dramatic
changes that took place in the whole country as a result of the change to a more modern
presidency.

The idea that Lincoln was the first of the modern presidents goes hand in hand with the
idea that he was the creator of the war powers. All previous domestic wars, had been much
smaller in comparison to this one, and so all preceding presidents didn’t have the need to fully
exploit the rights given to them, or to create them. In Lincoln’s case, many measures had to be
taken in order to insure the preservation of the Union. For example, Lincoln suspended the right
to habeus corpus in order to better detain the insurrectionary (Doc. N), something which many
historians, including James McPherson, don’t necessarily see as a bad thing, considering what
this measure helped achieve (Doc. O.). Also, Lincoln saw the need to take more direct control
during the war, a claim that would later be repudiated by the Supreme Court Case, Ex Parte
Milligan (Doc. U.). In short, Lincoln, because of the urgency of the matter, did not bother to
abide by the constitutional niceties, and proceeded to take the measures, and invent some, he
thought were necessary to preserve the Union, and in doing so, he managed to indirectly create
the war powers. However, even when Lincoln took it upon himself to create certain rights, he did
so, while including the people of the United States; He never isolated them from the affair,
perhaps because he knew he could not afford to do so.

That Lincoln was an important figure in American history is an undisputable fact. And
that he led the nation and its aims to victory is also irrefutable. The controversy surrounding
Lincoln involves the role he would play in posterity; in how he affected the future proceedings of
the country, and how he, Lincoln, would be thought of in history. Although these last questions
may never have a solid, concrete answer, it is certain that every American, through their own perspective and knowledge, will formulate their own opinion on the matter.
Lincoln—lawyer, father, politician, President, God? Abraham Lincoln, a man whose actions and achievements have inspired men and women alike to read his speeches, research his history and defend his almost mythological righteousness, was the quintessential man and the quintessential President. Although some are skeptical as to whether or not he was as selfless and moral as many scholars claim, modern day historians like Oates, Dallek and Hofstadter claim that Lincoln was that and more. Documents A-H support this claim, while Document C goes as far as to say that Lincoln was a demi-god who resembled Christ. Lincoln rose above his rustic, illiterate background from Illinois, his chronic depression and the common prejudices of the time and tackled slavery, while transforming a chaotic, dissolving country into a strong Union. This is why “Honest Abe” is considered the creator of the Modern Presidency and of the war powers, as well as the greatest President to ever grace the White House. (This is down right brilliant!!) It is right on the money and is a perfect introductory paragraph.

Selflessness is a key characteristic used to describe President Lincoln. The ultimate act of selflessness is sacrificing your life, the most highly-valued commodity on Earth. And Lincoln, in the words of Document C, “Abraham Lincoln died for his country.” This man pledged his life to the resurrection of the Union and the country that he brilliantly governed.(Yea verily!) He declared that he was anti-slavery during a time when slavery was strongly accepted (Document J). He actually questioned many of the common believes and practices of the time (Document I, J, L) revealing his ideas concerning slavery, equality and the attitude of Americans dealing with
the success of the Union. Lincoln, in his first inaugural address, clearly stated his determination and dedication to “…preserve, protect, defend…” the Union (Document M). He rose against all odds, the advice of his cabinet, the Republican Party that supported him, to issue the Emancipation Proclamation (Document Q). Lincoln sacrificed not only his life in the end, but his respect and his integrity in the beginning.

Lincoln was a man plagued by mental and emotional problems that nearly destroyed Lincoln’s confidence and his sanity. Document D goes as far as to say that Lincoln suffered from chronic depression. This depression most likely sprung from his horrible childhood, and an illiterate father which he was terribly embarrassed about. And despite all of these problems, which many fail to deal with today, even with advanced medical care and expensive drugs, Lincoln was able to achieve greatness. (What powerful insight and understanding!) Document F and Document E outline this struggle against his inner self, the anxiety, fear, depression that he felt during his Presidency and most probably over the course of his life. Document E (Mike—sometimes to eliminate the triteness of repeated words or phrases, you can use the document author’s name) describes the source of these feelings, stating that it came from observing the bad in people and in society. Having to constantly fight a battle for the lives of over 5 million malnourished, illiterate people weighed heavily on Lincoln. Although there is substantial evidence supporting the claim that Lincoln was a racist and the emancipation of slaves was a necessary step towards the solidification of the Union (Document W, I, J), Lincoln witnessed the cruelty and inhumanity of slavery firsthand. This experience led him to abhor the bondage of any human being. Carrying these feelings of suffering and of sin, Lincoln symbolized or resembled Christ (Documents E and C), standing firm in his beliefs although it would mean criticism, hate and death. Because he was determined to see slavery abolished, because he was determined to solidify and secure the Union (Document P, Q, D, C) he was willing to be like the
Atlas of Greek mythology, and carry the burden of a troubled world on his shoulders. (Wow! This is fantastic!)

War powers are the exclusive right of the Congress to declare war against an enemy of the U.S. Before Lincoln, the War of 1812 and the Mexican-American War were both declared by Congress but Lincoln had a different interpretation of Commander in Chief. Lincoln, without the consent of Congress, declared war against the South. Congress was occupied by both Southern and Northern politicians, making it impossible for a declaration of war against the South. Since this bold step taken by Lincoln, Presidents such as Harry Truman have declared war and deemed it a police action. But Lincoln’s move to strengthen the power of the executive branch was a shift towards the Modern Presidency, which modern scholars believe that Lincoln invented (Document H). This Modern Presidency was characterized by Lincoln breaking and deviating from the laws of the Constitution. Document U gives evidence of Lincoln and his northern generals charging confederates with war crimes in a military court. Lincoln, forfeiting a grand jury and an impartial jury, violated the laws of the Constitution. Although the Supreme Court decided to overturn the military court decision unanimously, it was a landmark case. It was the first time in history that the President violated the Constitution intentionally, marking the beginning of the Modern Presidency. This coincides with the war powers that Lincoln utilized, justifying the declaration of war against the South as a police action.

Oates, Dallek, Hofstadter and Goodwin are modern historians who studied Lincoln’s life and presidency, finding that Lincoln was the great man that common myth portrayed him as. Intelligent, selfless and determined Lincoln rose above his lowly, illiterate background, fighting depression and changed the country and the office of the President forever. Lincoln bent the laws of Constitution, challenged a racist white society and began a civil war. But these things were not done in selfishness but in duty, in principle, because the first Modern President believed in himself and the ultimate success of the Union.
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American Containment Policy

In 1947, amid the fear of aggressive expansionism on the part of the Soviet Union, State Department official George Kennan devised a strategy known as containment, one that would guide U.S. foreign policy for the next 40 years. By containing Communist doctrine and maintaining the status quo in terms of Soviet influence, the U.S. hoped to protect its own vital economic and political interests in Europe, Asia, and Latin America. On par with the Truman Doctrine, containment in Europe and Latin America was a success, whereby U.S. financial aid and friendly diplomatic relationships promulgated pro-American governments to rise. On the other hand, containment in Asia proved ineffective, as the U.S. frequently took the wrong side in limited, regional conflicts.

Strategic containment proved awfully effective in Western Europe and Scandinavia, where friendly governments subdued socialist factions. In 1949, the allied-occupied territories in Germany were unified to form the Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany). The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, a pact between the U.S., Canada, and various Western European countries was organized in 1949, with the sole purpose of containing the Soviet sphere of influence in the region. Communists were quickly ousted from the governments of Italy and France under constant pressure from the Americans. Communist insurgents, supported with financial and military assistance from the Soviet Union, were defeated in Greece and Turkey, both of which later became members of the anti-Soviet bloc. The Marshall Plan, administered by the United States following World War II, distributed economic aid to the war-torn nations of
Europe. This badly needed assistance showed America’s resolve to keep Western Europe out of the Soviets’ sphere of influence. When the Soviets tried to force westerners out of West Berlin by blockading all land-routes, the U.S. responded with the Berlin Airlift. Keeping with its policy of containment, the U.S. dropped foodstuffs and medical supplies to Berliners who were desperately trying to avoid Soviet domination. The rather strict enforcement of containment in Europe showed to be a tremendous success.

Economic assistance in Latin America paved the way for autocratic governments that proved hostile to Soviet Communism. The Pact of Rio, signed by most Latin American countries as well as the U.S. in 1947, was extremely anti-Communist in nature. Fulgencio Batista rose to power in Cuba in 1952 as a staunch ally of U.S. economic interests. General Samoza of Nicaragua publicly declared himself a “friend of the U.S.A.”, and put down several socialist revolutions in his nation. Other dictators, such as Rafael Trujillo of the Dominican Republic, rose to power with military assistance from the United States. Containment in Latin America was most effective in keeping Communism out of the Western Hemisphere.

While containment proved a success in Europe and Latin America, in Asia the U.S. was unable to prevent Communism from spreading like wildfire. After many years of American support for the Nationalist government of China, led by General Chiang Kai-Shek, Communists eventually seized control of the region in 1949. Although Chinese Communism was very different from Soviet Communism, the U.S. found itself in a poor relationship with the new People’s Republic. The U.S. wrongly supported the French in colonial Indochina, forcing local leaders such as Ho Chi Minh to seek help from the Soviet Union, eventually turning Communist. Finally, the Korean War resulted in a stalemate between Communist North and a friendlier South, demonstrating the U.S.’s inability to keep Communism under control on the continent. A flawed policy of containment in Asia did not protect against the spread of Communism there.
In the period immediately following World War II, it became necessary for the U.S. to protect its credibility throughout the globe by keeping Communism, the inherent enemy of capitalism, where it was. In Europe, bloc nations such as Poland, Hungary, and Bulgaria were already under Soviet domination and the U.S. has a vital interest in stopping this form of government from spreading. While containing it didn’t prove successful in Asia, Latin American and Western Europe were built-up as pro-American regions, with thoroughly friendly governments. Kennan’s strategy was a major contributor to the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991.
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During the nineteenth century there were several distinct events that instigated debate over the issue of slavery in America. These events exacerbated the already intense sectionalism and generally uneasy relations that existed between North and South. Two of these events, The Mexican-American War and the Compromise of 1850 that followed in its wake, served as catalysts for Anti Slavery Northerners to voice their objections. The nucleus of the Antislavery position in the context of the aforementioned events was that slavery was an archaic and immoral institution that, if not abolished in the South, should be confined there. In both cases the antislavery factions partook in political action in an attempt to achieve their previously mentioned agenda. Consisting of proposed laws, acts and compromises, those opposed to slavery attempted to contain slavery legally through various pieces of legislation. In this way, those opposed to slavery had their moral objections to human bondage manifested in various political proposals. While the political actions were relatively ineffective during the Mexican-American War, they forged one of the last great American compromises during the crisis that followed it.

The Mexican War of 1846-1848 was more than an act of American aggression or a nationalistic war fueled by sentiments of manifest destiny. The President during the war was James K Polk, a champion of the South hailing from North Carolina. Many Northerner’s saw Polk’s perusal of the war as nothing more than an attempt to acquire land from Mexico that could be divided into slave states. The foremost issue
which Northerners objected to was the expansion of slavery into the national territories. The Missouri Compromise banned slavery in national territories north of 36 degrees, 30 minutes (roughly the southern border of Missouri). Also, the Senate was balanced to give equal representation to slave and Free states. The Missouri Compromise, however, left room for more free states then slave states, and if continued would upset the balance of power within the Senate. Thus, many southerners supported the war to provide more room for slavery to expand (believing that if slavery were contained, then it would die out). Northerners objected to the situation, seeing it as attacking a neutral nation to protect the interests of slave holders. Northerners began to voice their objection to this immoral war. Pennsylvanian Congressman David Wilmot sought to curtail the expansion of slavery which would result from it with his bill that came to be known as “Wilmot’s Proviso.” The bill would prohibit slavery in the land acquired from Mexico. Therefore, Texas would be the last slave state to enter the union and slavery would be isolated to the Southeast. The bill managed to pass in the House, due to the population advantage the North had, but failed to pass in the Senate. The Free-Soil party formed in support of the bill. The moral stance against the expansion of slavery is exemplified in the Free-Soil party’s slogan “Free Soil, Free Speech, Free Labor and Free Man”. A year later Democrats proposed a new solution, the doctrine of popular sovereignty which Congressman Stephen A Douglas helped push forward. Congressman Abraham Lincoln’s spot resolution of 1848 voiced the moral objections that many Northerners had about the war. In it he accused Polk of fabricating the accusation that Mexico started the war, and further reinforced the idea that the war was simply an instrument used by Southerners to expand slavery. Throughout the war, Northerners had many moral objections to the conduct and attempted to embody their objections in political action, which was relatively ineffective and precipitated the next crisis, surrounding the compromise of 1850.
Another pivotal event that sparked debate over slavery was the Compromise of 1850 and the events leading up to it. Much of the compromise consisted of problems that had surfaced as a result of the Mexican War and the subsequent Mexican Cessation. The state of California, acquired from Mexico had attracted an influx of settlers looking for gold. In an attempt to stop slaveholders from dominating the extraction of distribution of gold, California applied as a free state. In the second place it was necessary to form a territorial government for the remainder of the territory acquired from Mexico, including that now occupied by Nevada and Utah, and parts of Wyoming, Colorado, Arizona and New Mexico. The fundamental issue was in regard to the admission of slavery into, or the exclusion of slavery from, this region. Antislavery supporters in the North saw slavery as an antiquated and embarrassing part of America that should be isolated to the Southeast. They saw it morally unacceptable to let slavery spread all the way to the Pacific Ocean. If slavery was contained, it would eventually collapse under its own weight. They pointed to the statements of Washington and Jefferson, and to the Ordinance of 1787, which forbade the extension of slavery into the Northwest. Furthermore, there was an often overlooked problem involving the Nation’s capital. Washington D.C. during this period was the largest slave market in North America. Morally conscious Northerners could not let the dark cloud of human bondage rest over the nation’s capital. Southerners retained their former position, believing that slavery can and should be expanded into the newly acquired territory. Southerners even accused Northerners of being slave holders themselves, the so called “wage slavery” of poor factory workers in the North was worse than slavery in their eyes. It was seventy-three year old Henry Clay that would orchestrate a masterful compromise that managed to mollify both sides as the situation had reached a boiling point. Clay himself shared many of the moral objections to slavery that many Northerners had, and helped represent their
objections politically in his compromise. In the compromise, the buying and selling of slaves prohibited in the District of Columbia. The Bear State of California would be admitted as a free soil state. And lastly, that the remainder of the new annexation be divided into the two territories of New Mexico and Utah and organized without mention of slavery and a fugitive slave law would be enacted to restrict the increasing numbers of runaway slaves. All parts of the compromise were signed by the President, Millard Fillmore, between September 9 and September 20, 1850. These last two provisions were a blow to the antislavery movement, but the country had, with the help of the dying Henry Clay, breathed a sigh of relief and averted Civil War. For three years, the compromise seemed to settle nearly all differences. Beneath the surface, however, tension grew. The new Fugitive Slave Law deeply offended many Northerners, who refused to have any part in catching slaves. Their moral qualms with slavery would resurface and they would again undertake political action to repress the spread of slavery.

The Mexican-American War and the Compromise of 1850 were political battlegrounds where pro and antislavery factions debated over the fate of slavery in America. Northerners had conscientious objections to the potential spread of slavery in the two events. They spoke out politically, creating new bills, acts and even political parties. While they had varying levels of success in their containment of slavery, the zealousness in which they combated its spread appalled and alarmed many Southerners, precipitating the climax of the slavery debate, The Civil War.

I, Rob Thurlow, give and grant to John Braithwaite, the right print and to publish my essay which wrote in high school during the school year 2004-2005.

Signed: Rob Thurlow
The Jacksonian Era

Although the election of Andrew Jackson to the presidency in 1828 marked the triumph of nationalism, the influence of the Market Revolution, and the rise of social and cultural achievements, in reality, it was the issue of sectionalism that became a dominate part of the Jacksonian era – an issue that would ultimately pull the country apart. During the Era of Good Feelings, Americans underwent a spirit of nationalism that characterized American politics. Jackson retook that nationalist sentiment through universal suffrage, increased western movement, and other political changes. His handling of administration matters, however, would only lead to factional debates. During the Market Revolution of the nineteenth century, America experienced dramatic changes in transportation (canals & railroads), communications, and economic activity of many types from agriculture to industry and commerce. There was fear that the emerging world of commerce, banking, and manufacturing would create a threat to a rigid agrarian society and to the vision of a nation of independent farmers. This thought would play a crucial part in the bank war of the 1830’s. The Age of Jackson was also part of the Romantic era in which cultural, religious, and social reform movements swept across the country. But the perception of unity and harmony would only be replaced by sectionalist tensions during the nullification crisis that would lead to the birth of the “second party system.”

After a long campaign filled with accusations hurled at both candidates in the presidential election of 1828, Jackson won with an electoral majority of 178 votes to Adams’s 83. Adams had gained virtually all of New England’s votes and showed great strength in the mid-Atlantic
region (Doc A). But Jackson’s victory was clear, and thus began a new era of democracy. In
March of 1829, thousands gathered before the Capitol in Washington, D.C. to witness the
inauguration of Andrew Jackson (Doc M). In his inaugural address, Jackson promised to be
“animated by a proper respect” for the rights of the separate states and noted that “as long as our
Government is administered for the good of the people, and is regulated by their will…it will be
worth defending” (Doc Q). He believed that the character and spirit of the people, or public
virtue, were fundamental to maintaining a free society. A virtuous citizenry was necessary to
liberty, and whatever corrupted the people thereby corrupted their institutions. As Arthur M.
Schlesinger Jr. wrote in *The Age of Jackson*, “The United States must remain a refuge from
tyrranny…America was the proving ground for democracy, and it was the mission of American
Democrats to exhibit to the world the glories of government by the people” (Doc. I). This
nationalistic ideology would be apparent in Jackson’s Presidency and would later become part of
the reason for his distaste of the Bank of the United States.

Jacksonian era marked a rise of democratic ideals and the beginning of factionalism. By
extending the right to vote among all adult white males and thereby expanding the electorate,
equality was becoming the governing principle in American society. It was questionable
whether this universal suffrage was “to have any practical effect in the United States” at all (Doc
C). The change eventually caused every state to be democratized to some degree; this unity, as
suspected, provoked resistance. Jackson next targeted the entrenched officeholders of the federal
government. Official duties, he argued, should belong to the people and be made “so plain and
simple that men of intelligence may readily qualify themselves for their performance” (Doc B).
During his years in office, Jackson removed no more than one-fifth of federal officeholders. By
following the spoils system, elected officials were able to appoint their own followers to public
office, a feature of American politics. In addition, to allow a maximum number of Democrats to
hold office, he set up a system of rotation in office by limiting tenure in office to one term. “No
man has any more intrinsic claim to office than another,” he noted (Doc Y). The spoils system and the rotation of officeholders affirmed the democratic ideal of the time. But Jackson’s performance received much criticism. His rotation in office had been viewed as a major culprit in the decline of administrative standards during the period, and as his presidency progressed, Jackson found further justification in having loyal friends in office. Those for the political change believed that “Jackson’s argument for the principle of ‘rotation in office’ was the argument for democracy. Offices exist to serve the people. His commitment to universal manhood suffrage was another manifestation of his belief in democracy and democratic rule” (Doc J). The nationalistic spirit would continue.

Andrew Jackson took steps in solving the Indian problem and further expanding white settlement. His favor of the Indian Removal Act, according to Robert V. Remini in The Jacksonian Era, was “to protect the American people and provide greater security of the United States” and that it was the only policy “to pursue if Indian tribes and their culture were to survive” (Doc K). The Act encountered resistance in Congress, where humanitarian and political objections nearly defeated it. Only by skillfully mobilizing their forces did Jackson’s followers succeed in passing the measure in 1830. The final vote made it the first important measure that distinguished the emerging Democratic Party from the opposition. By the end of the removal, Indian societies east of the Mississippi ceded their eastern lands and lived in the West where the environment was nothing they had experienced before. The harsh policies of the Jackson administration produced responses from the Indians themselves. Various debates, however, would persist throughout Jackson’s presidency.

Rooted in an agrarian, pre-modern society, traditional republican thought warned of the dangers of an expansive economy of the Market Revolution. Jackson feared that speculation, moneyed interests, and human greed would corrupt his country’s republican character and institutions, and was therefore ready to destroy the power of the National Bank of the United
States. In addition, Jackson’s commitment in his political changes such as the spoils system led him to view federal power and aristocratic institutions with opposition. When Congress passed a recharter bill, Jackson vetoed it. In his message to Congress in 1832, Jackson wanted to “take a stand against all new grants of monopolies and exclusive privileges, against any prostitution of [the] Government to the advancement of the few at the expense of the many…” (Doc F). The bank war created two conflicting positions: the soft money faction and the hard money faction. The attacks reflected concern for banking abuses as well as resistance to the onrushing Market Revolution; they were a step towards the development of party organization.

There were numerous social and cultural reforms during the Age of Jackson. The 1820’s Romanticism era marked a movement in literature, art, philosophy, religion, and politics. The rise of literature brought forth distinguished writers and poets such as Hawthorne, Melville, Poe, and Whitman. Religion was an important part of this movement and God was often connected with nature. The enduring religious organization to come out of the Age of Jackson was Mormonism which within a hundred and fifty years would become a world wide faith spawned by the revelations of Joseph Smith and the triumphant westward movement orchestrated and carried out by Brigham Young. In addition, “utopian and communitarian social movements and religious developments” were formed—such as the Shakers, the Oneida Community and Brook Farm among others. (Doc N). The era reflected, especially in literature, the age of westward expansion, transcendentalism, and all manner of poetry, short stories and the greatest novels of American cultural life such as *The Scarlet Letter* (by Hawthorne), *Walden* (Thoreau), *and the Leather-stocking Tales* of James Fennimore Cooper. Walt Whitman was the poet laureate!

Tensions occurred during the nullification crisis when advocates of sectionalism led by John C. Calhoun believed that state legislatures could deny enforcement of federal law if they felt it violated the United States Constitution. South Carolina’s bitterness at Jackson’s failure to urge a relief from the 1828 “tariff of abominations” sparked a debate over the theory of
nullification. Protective tariffs were considered unconstitutional and inequitable throughout the South, but resentment was most extreme in South Carolina. There, the tariff was a great symbol of southern oppression and stagnation of the economy; for a time it seemed that secession was possible. Jackson viewed the nullification with contempt. In his Nullification Proclamation, Jackson considered this power “incompatible with the existence of the Union, contradicted expressly by the letter of the Constitution, unauthorized by its spirit, inconsistent with every principle on which It was founded, and destructive of the great object for which it was formed” (Doc S). When Jackson proposed a force bill that would allow the military to stop any forces against dissidents and Henry Clay devised a compromise to lower the tariff, the state convention nullified the force act and in turn forced the revision of the tariff.

The two-party system created under Jackson reflected the changing conditions of the Jacksonian era. It was a response to the westward expansion, the emergence of an industrial economy, the controversy of the Bank of the United States, and the nullification crisis. The age of Jackson represented the emergence of a new political world and established countless achievements. The underlying issue of the period, however, was sectionalism. This issue would ultimately lead to the secession that would break into the Civil War of the 1860’s.
The Age of Progressivism

The reform movements that began in the last years of the nineteenth century to the first years of the twentieth were marked with great variety. There were efforts to wipe out political corruption, to end business monopolies, and to bridge the gap between social classes. As McGerr described, progressivism was an “explosion, a burst of energy that fired in many directions across America” (Doc. O). But while the Progressive Era may not have formed a cohesive, unified movement of reform, it did connect separate agendas in spirit. It bonded the nation together in a fight to solve the problems created by the rapid growth of industrialization and urbanization and to bring order and progress to a turbulent society. The movement would be effective in manifesting itself in national politics on the federal level of government, dramatically transforming American politics.

Industrialization had created great wealth for a number of people while others fell into poverty. Workers had to face long hours, dangerous conditions, and poor pay. Furthermore, with the rise of monopolies, the fear of concentrated power sparked reform impulses that aimed to limit and disperse authority and wealth. Grob and Billias noted the power of corporations in *Interpretations of American History* by stating questions that would lead Americans in support of reforms, “…what would happen as freedom and social mobility were more and more circumscribed by giant corporations with their impersonal machinelike qualities? Did not the emphasis of corporations on efficient production and material objectives distort the human qualities that had been responsible for America’s rise of greatness? Was not the growing disparity between rich corporations and poor workingmen creating a situation akin to that existing in many European countries where there was open class strife?” (Doc. E) The “antimonopoly” spirit thus sparked the beginning of the progressive movement.
Crusading journalists were among the first people to shape a climate favorable for reform. Known as muckrakers, these journalists revealed to middle class readers the evils of economic privilege, political corruption, and social injustice. Some muckrakers focused on corporate abuses. Ida Tarbell, for instance, exposed the activities of the Standard Oil Company. And in The Shame of the Cities, Lincoln Steffens aroused urban political reform. The work of the muckrakers aroused a sense of outrage against social and economic injustice and inspired challenges to Social Darwinism, the belief that people’s fortunes reflected the survival of the fittest. Progressives, on the other hand, viewed society’s failings as the result of an unhealthy environment in which people, particularly immigrants, lived. Therefore, settlement houses were established to offer social services to the poor. The muckrakers also inspired political reform by the creation of a city-manager plan in which elected officials hired trained managers or other outside experts to take charge of government. This helped to prevent corrupt influence in politics. The social settlement and the city-manager plan were just two of the many progressive reforms at the local level.

At the state level, progressives campaigned for electoral reforms to allow the people to play a more direct role in the political process and, at the same time, circumvent the often corrupted legislatures controlled by party bosses. Some Western states adopted practices that expanded voter rights, including the initiative, the referendum, and the recall. Under the initiative, reformers could submit new legislation directly to the voters in general elections. With the referendum, actions of the legislature could be returned to the electorate for approval. Using the recall, voters could petition to remove officials from office. Progressives also supported the 17th Amendment which provided for election of U.S. senators directly by vote of the people, rather than by state legislatures. The initiative, the referendum, and the direct election of senators were first proposed by the Populists in the Omaha Platform of 1892. This showed how much Progressivism was influenced by the ideas of Populism: “…like Populism, [it was] an
attempt to employ the tools of government to restore a balance to society that rapid
industrialization had knocked awry” (Doc. N).

Perhaps the most prominent state-level reformer was Robert La Follette of Wisconsin,
who turned his state to a “laboratory of progressivism.” He introduced changes such as
establishing a commission to supervise railroad practices and raising state taxes on corporations.
In addition, he greatly publicized the message of reform, arguing that it was the responsibility of
all people, not just politicians. As John Chamberlain described him, “La Follette was a man who
sought to make strict economic analysis the basis of his laws; he never talked without facts, the
best available facts…” (Doc. I). Progressives focused on labor reform as well. They sought to
eliminate or regulate child labor, to cut workers’ hours, and to establish a minimum wage.
Unions played an important role in pressuring numerous states to pass pro-labor legislations.
The Supreme Court also became tied to the labor movement, as seen in the case of Muller vs.
Oregon, which upheld a state law that limited women factory workers to a ten-hour day, causing
many states to regulate working hours for women. In New York’s Triangle Shirtwaist Fire of
1911, many women were trapped and died from a burning shirtwaist factory due to poor
management. The tragedy reminded people of the need for higher safety standards in factories
and the need to protect workers from future incidents. As stated in the National Party Platforms,
effective legislations was crucial for the “prevention of industrial accidents, occupational
diseases, overwork…and other injurious effects incident to modern industry” (Doc. H).

At the national level, progressives began work to regulate businesses and to break up
monopolies. This cause won wide support from particularly the middle class because of the
effects industrial development had on this class of citizens (Doc. B). These people favored
antitrust laws to eliminate monopolies, supported lower tariffs, a graduated income tax, and a
system to control currency. They found a spokesman, President Theodore Roosevelt, who would
begin to bring the federal level of government to national politics.
Roosevelt urged regulation to solve the problems caused by big business. His vision of the federal government was for it to become a sort of mediator to the public good, especially in solving solutions to corporate abuses. Known as the trustbuster, he ordered the Justice Department to revive the Sherman Antitrust Act against the railroad monopoly. In addition, Roosevelt used his “square deal” to increase the government’s power to oversee railroad rates, helping to push the Hepburn Railroad Regulation Act of 1906 that expanded the regulatory powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the agency that regulated commercial activity crossing state lines. Roosevelt explained, “I stand for the square deal…I mean not merely that I stand for fair play under the present rules of the game, but that I stand for having those rules changed so as to work for a more substantial opportunity and of reward for equally good service…” (Doc. J). Roosevelt was known for his various, at times, aggressive policies. He helped enact the Pure Food and Drug Act that restricted sale of dangerous medicines, proposed measures for workers such as the eight-hour work day, and regulated the stock market. He was also a nature conservationist who withdrew thousands of acres of forests and waterpower sites to protect them from exploitation by private interests.

Roosevelt’s successor, William Howard Taft, was more conservative, and domestic reforms slowed during his administration. When he planned to lower protective tariff rates, the Payne-Aldrich Tariff that resulted hardly reduced tariff rates; it was instead raised in some areas. This was one of the many problems that arose in Taft’s administration and ultimately led to his decline in popularity. Taft eventually lost support in 1912 and Roosevelt entered the presidential race as head of the new Progressive Party. Roosevelt’s program of “New Nationalism” sought a strong federal government and, more importantly, unity among the nation to work for the concerns of the people: “I do not ask for over centralization; but I do ask that we work in a spirit of broad and far-reaching nationalism…The New Nationalism puts the national need before sectional or personal advantage” (Doc. J). New Jersey’s progressive governor, Democrat
Woodrow Wilson, envisioned a wholly different approach. He supported an effort not to regulate monopoly, but to destroy it. He also favored banking reform and tightening of antitrust laws. His program was known as the “New Freedom.” Although both he and Roosevelt agreed that power was abused by the American government, Wilson believed that the government should retrain private power by dismantling corporations that had too much power in society. “It is necessary,” he said, “…to give society command of its own economic life again by denying to those who conduct the great modern operations of business the privacy that used to belong properly enough to men who used only their own capital and their individual energy in business” (Doc. K). In the end, Wilson won the election.

Wilson’s first goal in office was the lowering of the protective tariff. The Underwood-Simmons Tariff was signed to reduce taxes on imported goods and to break the power of trusts. The bill also included an income tax, permitted by the new 16th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. In reforming the banking system, Wilson supported the Federal Reserve Act of 1913, which created a centralized banking system that held assets of member banks in reserve and then used the reserves to support loans to private banks at an interest. It also permitted a more elastic currency (Federal Reserve notes) that would be easily suit the national need. To curb trusts, Wilson pushed through Congress the Federal Trade Commission Act of 1914, establishing a regulatory agency to prevent business practices that could lead to a monopoly. Finally, Wilson appointed Louis Brandeis, the first Jew and a leading critic of big business to serve the Supreme Court.

Progressive presidents were noted for their work in foreign affairs as well. A celebrated achievement in Roosevelt’s presidency was the Panama Canal that connected the Atlantic and the Pacific by a channel through South America. The United States negotiated a treaty with Colombia for rights to build a canal in Panama. When the Colombian Congress rejected, Roosevelt encouraged Panamanian desire for independence from Colombia. A revolution
occurred and the United States quickly recognized the new government of Panama and negotiated a treaty that enabled Americans to build the Panama Canal. William Howard Taft adopted a policy that became known to critics as “Dollar Diplomacy.” Taft encouraged bankers and industrialists to invest abroad, hoping to build American influence in the area. The policy, however, led the nation to become involved in a civil war in Nicaragua, where the United States supported the overthrow of the country’s leader and sustained a reactionary regime. Woodrow Wilson disliked dealing with international affairs but nevertheless faced great challenges particularly with Latin America. In 1913, the United States landed marines in Nicaragua to ensure that its choice for Nicaraguan president would remain in power. The Wilson administration then drew up a treaty with Nicaragua that reduced the country to virtual dependency. In addition, U.S. troops occupied Haiti and the Dominican Republic in 1916. American business interests continued to prevail in Latin America.

Despite the progressive reform movements, few addressed the social question of race. Most African Americans had faced poverty, discrimination, and limited employment opportunities. The passage of the Jim Crow laws separated blacks and whites in public places and the grandfather clause, poll taxes, and other laws deprived them of the right to vote. Thus, political participation was limited. Furthermore, many were not content with the ideas of Booker T. Washington, who had urged blacks to work their way up economically in order to win the respect of whites. Only then, Washington believed, could blacks and whites coexist in harmony. Northern intellectual W.E.B. Du Bois challenged this policy. In The Souls of Black Folk, Du Bois openly attacked Washington’s approach. He urged African Americans to instead gain a full education and fight for their rights. In 1909 Du Bois joined a group of progressives, black and white, to form the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) that strove to end the disfranchisement of black people, to abolish segregation, and to promote black civil and political rights.
Perhaps the most striking feature of the progressive era was the role of women in higher education, professions, and female organizations. The rise of women’s colleges and public universities in the late nineteenth century produced a large number of women with education above the high school level. With higher levels of education, women entered professional careers such as physicians, lawyers, scientists, teachers, and others. Women were also able to contribute to reform activities and join organizations such as the General Federation of Women’s Clubs (GFWC), a women’s volunteer service organization founded in 1890. The club movement was a direct challenge to the traditional male-dominated order and gave women the opportunity to express themselves freely in the public world. Clubwomen were able to support controversial issues such as child labor, conditions of workplaces, urban housing, and the manufacture or sale of alcohol. The largest single movement of the era, however, was the fight for woman suffrage. Many argued that with enfranchisement, women would be able to make contribution to politics and help the temperance movement or even curb the belligerence of men with their maternal influences. In 1910, Washington became the first state to extend suffrage to women. Other states soon followed. By 1920, the Nineteenth Amendment was ratified to guarantee political rights for women throughout the nation.

The reform movements of the Progressive Era from 1870 to 1920 expanded democracy, challenged the great monopolies, considered the public interest, and protected the vulnerable Americans. It changed American attitudes toward the power of government and turned attention from local and state issues to national politics and, furthermore, to international affairs. The era may not have formed a unified movement of reform but the nation was able to bond together with the common belief that progress was indeed possible against the rise of a modern industrial economy.
Abraham Lincoln

Abraham Lincoln, our nation’s Sixteenth President, is mostly known for having abolished slavery in the rebellious Confederate States of America through authoring the Emancipation Proclamation. However, Lincoln did much more for our nation than most people realize during his run as president from 1861 to 1865. Through his heroic image, his humanity and his literacy and political genius, Lincoln was able to face the difficulties of the nation and become a legend in American history. Lincoln was almost a god in his political image but was rendered a simple man in most other aspects of his personal life.

The portrait of Lincoln by Ken Corbett may have been painted about ten years ago, long after the president’s death, but solely by looking at it, one can see the passion and vigor behind the man (Document A). Lincoln has been described several times as almost being God-like to the people of his nation, even in the 20th century. “Jesus Christ died for the world, Abraham Lincoln died for his country” (Document C). His heroic and mystical attributes have been slowly added to his persona over the years. “[Lincoln was] a great man [who] shouldered the torment and moral burdens of a blundering and sinful people” (Document E). Walt Whitman even wrote a poem about Lincoln’s greatness and leadership in which an extended metaphor is used to exemplify Lincoln as the captain of a ship and the ship being America (Document Y). Today, people view him as a legendary man who carried the weight of the world and his country by himself. It makes one wonder what it must have been like to be in his mere presence during the
19th century if the historians of today can still paint such a powerful image of this man. But that was just it. He may have had characteristics of a god, yet he was human.

Lincoln’s humanity was another reason for which he was venerated in America. Lincoln himself subtly said he was human, “I claim not to have controlled events, but confess plainly that events have controlled me” (Document B). The people could see that amongst the superhuman qualities lied basic human flaws. “[Lincoln] was an intense, brooding person, plagued with chronic depression most of his life. ‘I am now the most miserable man living’” (Document D). Even in his own time, the people poked fun at the fact that Lincoln was human and he made mistakes, depicted in “Columbia Demands Her Children,” which shows the president as being disoriented, lost and confused amidst his political duties (Document T). In his humanity, several historians believe Lincoln’s accomplishments to have been a sort of dumb luck and stumbled upon. “Lincoln’s intentions at the start encompassed no commitment to emancipation. He had only one intention of that character, the preservation (somehow) of the union. All else evolved with events” (Document H). Nevertheless, his simplicity as a man was no match for his incredulous literacy brilliance. His speeches ring with the most noble of holy writ. There was at least one line in every speech that has become immortal, inspirational, and scriptorial for all men throughout the ages. For example, he said, in the Annual Message to Congress, “The World knows we know how to save it... We shall nobly save or meanly loose, the LAST BEST HOPE OF EARTH!” then later, in the Emancipation Proclamation he declared, And I hereby enjoin the people so declared to be free to abstain from all violence...and the gracious favor of Almighty God. And then from the Gettysburg Address, Lincoln takes flight with rhetoric as if it came from the gods of Valhalla to proclaim “Four score and seven years ago, etc. We are now engaged in great civil war testing whether that nation...can endure...that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom... And finally, the prophetic declaration from the Second Inaugural when he said, “With malice toward none, with charity for all...let us strive to finish the
work we are in, to bind up the nation’s wounds...and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.”

“[Lincoln] was almost entirely self-educated, with a talent for expression that in another time and place might have led him into a literary career” (Document D). The eloquence with which he spoke and wrote added to his image as being a man of intellect but of the people as well. “Wrong as we think slavery is, we can yet afford to let it alone where it is, because that much is due to the necessity arising from its actual presence in the nation” (Document J). Although he uses a relatively limited vocabulary in the penultimate paragraph of his Cooper Union Speech, Lincoln is able to philosophically and sophisticatedly condense the main issue of slavery into a simple sentence, to be understood by people of all classes and levels of literacy.

“The tribute to noble women for their angel-ministering to the suffering soldiers, surpasses, in its way, as do the subjects of it, whatever has gone before” (Document V). Even in his personal correspondence can show evidence of his simple yet complex diction. However, his political genius seemed, at his time, unbeatable; yet so unpretentious and always looking for the good of the general welfare of the people.

In his political career as President, aside from abolishing slavery with the Emancipation Proclamation and the formation of the Thirteenth Amendment, Lincoln committed several other acts of political genius never seen before. “Lincoln, after winning the presidency, made the unprecedented decision to incorporate his eminent rivals into his political family” (Document F). Of course with the aid of his eloquent mind and tongue, Lincoln was able to address the issue of slavery in facile terms that were comprehensible to all. “As a nation, we began by declaring that ‘all men are created equal.’ We now practically read it ‘all men are created equal, except negroes” (Document I). Through his suspension of habeas corpus, he committed another unprecedented action. “The Writ of Habeas Corpus is suspended in respect to all persons arrested, or who are now, or hereafter during the rebellion shall be, imprisoned in any fort, camp,
arsenal, military prison, or other place of confinement any military authority of by the sentence of any Court Martial or Military Commission” (Document N). His intelligence in politics was just the last piece of this remarkable puzzle that made up this unforgettable man.

By being both a legend and a man, and with his political and literary genius, Abraham Lincoln faced the problems of his America while gaining the respect and confidence of his people. Little did he know that the “legend” of Lincoln would leave him forever embedded in the minds of the people of his nation, both during and long after his presidency, which can be evidenced by this very essay.
Abraham Lincoln: Savior of the Union

Abraham Lincoln came to the world in the time of great [national] need. The sectional debates and the positions on slavery had caused bitter tensions between the North and the South. Furthermore, Lincoln’s victory in the 1860 election triggered the states of the South to secede from the Union. Lincoln, in turn, had to face the task of saving the Union. His passionate desire to preserve the Union demonstrated his genius in the face of difficulty. His heroic role in the Civil War would create the future of American Presidency and a model of modern power.

[Thesis statement!]

Lincoln was born on the Kentucky frontier in 1809 to the nearly illiterate Thomas Lincoln and Nancy Hanks Lincoln, who passed away when he was just nine years old. In 1816 his family moved to the state of Indiana. Working on a farm and splitting rails for fences, he found around him absolutely nothing to excite ambition for education. With little schooling, Lincoln dug deeply in his studies and was able to learn to read and write for himself. His first exposure to the world helped open new avenues for his life. In 1830 the Lincolns left Indiana for Illinois. He made a second flatboat trip to New Orleans, and in 1831 he left home for New Salem, in Sangamon County near Springfield. In New Salem, Lincoln served briefly in the Black Hawk War. Being elected captain of volunteers gave him his gift for leading men, a gift that would help him in leading the Civil War. (Very nice outside information)
After running unsuccessfully in 1832, Lincoln was elected two years later to the Illinois House of Representatives as a Whig. He supported the Second Bank of the United States, the Illinois State Bank, internal improvements, and protective tariffs. He also believed in the ideal that all men should receive full reward for their labors so that they have the opportunity to rise in life. Slavery was the opposite of opportunity and mobility, and Lincoln clearly stated his opposition to it early in his political career. In 1847 Lincoln, along with his wife Mary Todd, moved to Washington, D.C. where he served a single term in the United States House of Representatives. However, he failed to distinguish himself, became frustrated by tensions within the Whig party, and began to lose interest in politics. Law became ever more attractive to him since it provided a good living for his family. When slavery became a major issue, Lincoln reentered politics. He left the Whig party to help form the new Republican movement. Eventually he ran for the Senate as the endorsed nominee of the Illinois Republicans against the incumbent, Stephen A. Douglas. It was the Lincoln-Douglas debates during the senatorial campaign that made Lincoln a nationally known figure. His eloquent attacks on slavery attracted much attention: “There is no reason in the world why the Negro is not entitled to all the natural rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence…he is my equal and the equal of Judge Douglas, and the equal of every living man” (Doc. L). He did not want to directly challenge slavery where it already existed but wanted to prevent its expansion into the western territories. The nation, Lincoln argued, rested on the spread of free labor. Lincoln lost the election but gained a large following that would help him succeed in the election of 1860.

During the 1860 presidential election, the Democratic Party was split apart, with northern and southern wings each nominating different candidates. The divided Democrats together with Lincoln’s eloquence and appealing position on slavery made the result of the election clear. Within a few weeks of Lincoln’s victory, however, disunion began. First, South Carolina declared its secession from the Union. It was followed early in 1861 by all the states of the Deep
South: Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, and Texas. These states formed the Confederate States of America. They elected Jefferson Davis President, and Alexander H. Stephens Vice President. When Lincoln arrived in Washington for his first inaugural address, he directly dealt with the sectional crisis. “We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break, our bonds of affection” (Doc. M). The President pleaded not to have the states leave the Union. But he would soon find himself the leader of a nation at war with itself.

The Civil War came when Lincoln refused to give up Fort Sumter in Charleston Harbor and claimed that no troops or munitions would be sent unless supply ships met with resistance. When the Confederates decided to take the island by force, four more states (Virginia, Tennessee, Arkansas, and North Carolina) seceded quickly to join the Confederacy. Lincoln called for seventy-five thousand volunteers for three months. He moved boldly to use the war powers of the presidency by refusing to call Congress into session and proceeding to double the size of the army and navy; instituting an economic blockade of the South on land, as well as at sea; spending treasury funds without appropriations; and suspending the writ of habeas corpus. Lincoln was going to save the Union and, more importantly, the principles it stood for. His vigorous and seemingly arbitrary actions immediately called into question the character of his presidency, particularly regarding the writ of habeas corpus.

In Lincoln’s proclamation suspending the writ of habeas corpus, or the right of an arrested person to a speedy trial, the President was attempting to suppress opposition to the war. It was, according to Lincoln, “a necessary measure for suppressing the same, all Rebels and Insurgents, their aiders and abettors within the United States…resisting militia drafts, or guilty of any disloyal practice…shall be subject to martial law and liable to trial and punishment by the Courts Martial…” (Doc. N). In a written opinion, Chief Justice Roger B. Taney declared the presidential suspension of habeas corpus to be unconstitutional. Lincoln ignored Ex parte
Merryman, which required him to release an imprisoned Maryland secessionist leader. When the war was over, however, Lincoln’s good friend David Davis spoke for the Supreme Court in *Ex parte Milligan*, ruling that military trials in areas where the civil courts existed were unconstitutional. The courts decided that “the military trial of civilians…violated the constitutional guarantee of ‘grand jury and public trial by impartial jury’” (Doc. U). In political matters, President Lincoln made sharp distinctions between executive and legislative powers. In ordinary matters of government, he rarely interfered with the work of Congress. In addition, he gave much leeway to the members of his cabinet, who had been his major rivals for the Republican nomination: William H. Seward at the State Department, Salmon P. Chase at the Treasury Department, and Edwin M. Stanton in the War Department. In *A Team of Rivals: The Political Genius of Abraham Lincoln*, Lincoln’s political genius was well described. The fact that he was able to “form friendship with men who had previously opposed him” demonstrated his “acute understanding of the sources of power inherent in the presidency” (Doc. F).

The war started badly for the Union. In the first major battle at Bull Run on July 21, 1861, the Confederate army of P. G. T Beauregard led a counterattack against the inexperienced army of General Irvin McDowell. The battle was a severe blow to the Union morale. Disappointed, Lincoln put George B. McClellan in command. McClellan took command of the Union Army of the Potomac. With the urging of President Lincoln to begin offensive operations, McClellan attacked Virginia in the spring of 1862 by way of the peninsula between the York River and the James River. Although McClellan’s army reached the gates of Richmond in the Peninsula Campaign, Confederate General Joseph E. Johnston halted his advance at the Battle of Seven Pines, and then General Robert E. Lee defeated him in the Seven Days Battles and forced his retreat. McClellan was stripped of many of his troops to reinforce General John Pope’s Union Army of Virginia. Pope was beaten spectacularly by Lee in the Northern Virginia Campaign and the Second Battle of Bull Run in August. The Confederacy made its first
invasion of the North, when General Lee led 45,000 men of the Army of Northern Virginia across the Potomac River into Maryland on September 5. Lincoln restored Pope’s troops to McClellan. McClellan and Lee fought at the Battle of Antietam near Sharpsburg, Maryland on September 17, 1862 in the single bloodiest day of the war. Lee’s army returned to Virginia before McClellan could destroy it. Antietam was considered a Union victory as it halted Lee’s invasion of the North and provided an opportunity for Lincoln to announce his Emancipation Proclamation, that “all persons held as slaves within any state or designated part of a state, the people whereof shall then be in rebellion against the United States, shall then, thenceforward, and forever be free…” (Doc. Q).

In an annual message to Congress, Lincoln stated his purpose for freeing all slaves in the Confederacy: “We are for the Union…We know how to save the Union…In giving freedom to the slave, we assure freedom to the free – honorable alike in what we give, and what we preserve. We shall nobly save or meanly lose, the last best hope of earth” (Doc. P). Lincoln had no commitment to emancipation. His only intention was the preservation of the Union (Doc. H). Lincoln made the freeing of the slaves a war goal despite opposition from the northern “Copperheads” who tolerated secession and slavery. He knew that in giving freedom to the slaves, the slaves would still not be equal with the white race (Doc. W). But doing so, he believed, would help preserve the Union and ensure that Britain and France would not intervene to help the Confederacy.

Not until Lee ventured north again to Gettysburg did the tide turn. There, the Army of the Potomac under its newest commander, George G. Meade, defeated the Confederate army. The high point of the war came with the siege of Vicksburg, Mississippi and its surrender to Grant on July 4 1863, the day after the battle of Gettysburg. In the fall of 1863, Lincoln went to the small Pennsylvania town of Gettysburg to help dedicate the Soldiers’ National Cemetery. There, he gave the Gettysburg Address, honoring the brave men who fought in the war. “It is for
us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us – that from these honored dead we
take increased devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain;
that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the
people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth” (Doc. R).

Lincoln displayed his military genius through his role in the Civil War. Though his
military experience only consisted of his service in the Black Hawk War, he was a successful
commander in chief. He realized that the objective was to destroy the Confederate armies and
not the occupation of Southern territory. He saw that it was important to have adequate
commanders for the troops. As a result, he tried continuously to find a commander capable of
handling the war effort.

With the end of the Civil War, the South lay in ruins. Towns were destroyed, plantations
were burnt, and fields were neglected. Proposals for reconstructing the South emerged.
However, disagreements were present. Conservatives believed that the South should accept the
abolition of slavery and proposed conditions for the readmission of the seceded states. The
Radicals wanted the leaders of the Confederacy punished, Southern whites be disenfranchised,
legal rights of blacks protected, and the property of wealthy white Southerners who aided the
Confederacy be distributed among the freedmen. Moderates rejected the beliefs of the Radicals
and supported some concessions from the South on black rights. Lincoln sympathized with the
Moderates and Conservatives. He sought a policy that would encourage southern unionists and
Whigs to join the Republican Party and, at the same time, prevent the South from readmitting
and weakening the Republicans. He offered a 10 Percent Plan which called for the formation of
state governments when one-tenth of the voting population of 1860 took the oath of allegiance to
the United States. He also hoped to extend suffrage for blacks who were educated, owned
property, and served in the Union. The plan was well received in Congress. The Radicals set up
their Reconstruction plan through the Wade-Davis Bill. It would appoint a provisional governor
for each conquered state. When a majority of white males pledged their allegiance to the Union, the governor would summon a state constitutional convention. The bill left questions of the rights for blacks and departed from Lincoln’s plan. The president drew a pocket veto and began to move to a new approach to Reconstruction. But the plan was never produced.

In March 1865, at his second inaugural, Lincoln delivered another one of his finest speeches. He looked ahead to the nation’s future: “Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away...With malice toward none, with charity for all,...let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation’s wounds,...to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations” (Doc. S). One month later, Lincoln was assassinated while attending a play at Ford’s Theater in Washington.

Lincoln once said, “I claim not to have controlled events, but confess plainly that events have controlled me” (Doc. B). But it was his dedication to preserve the Union and his dealings with these events that altered the world. He had the ambition to use his war powers to take on political risks and overcome repeated defeats. He was a moral leader, strongly opposed to slavery and committed to a nation at war. Today, he is a great nationalist of modern historians, a man who is characterized as a kind of “mythological hero” and even seen as a figure of Christ.
Abraham Lincoln DBQ

“Four score ad seven years ago our forefathers brought forth upon this continent a new nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to proposition that all men are created equal”
(Document R) are arguably the finest and most stirring words ever uttered by a President of the United States. These simple words conjure images of the great stern man (Document A) known as Abraham Lincoln. Abraham Lincoln became the 16th President in a time of great need for our country. The nation was splitting in two and the two factions were on the verge of war. Over the next four years Lincoln not only managed to unite the North and South but began to shape his legacy which had become almost that of a mythical god. There is not enough that can be said about Lincoln’s greatness as a man and moreover as a president and in no way does his greatness cast a shadow to great for his accomplishments.

When Lincoln ran for President of the United States he was a largely unknown candidate outside of his home state of Illinois. Lincoln’s political career began in 1858 when he ran for the Illinois Senate. In 1858 a series of debates began between Lincoln and his opponent named Stephen A. Douglas. The two were very different and had largely different views on many issues. On the forefront of the debates to come was the issue of slavery. For several years there had been an ever increasing division among the southern slave states and the northern Free states. David Donald provides an excellent map of the political situation for the series of heated debates (Document K). The series of debates made Lincoln a very popular candidate by showing
his fiery passion for the slavery issue while Douglas seemed to show no interest at all. One of the debates occurred on August 27, 1858 and in this speech Lincoln in the most democratic fashion went on to say “...I am in favor of the race to which I belong having the superior position. I have never said anything to the contrary, but I hold that…there is no reason why the negro is not entitled to all the natural rights enumerated in the Declaration of independence.” (Document L). This appealed to many northern whites who firmly believed that the Black were not as superior as the whites but still deserved many rights. Later on in 1862 in Lincoln’s address to a Deputation of Negroes, Lincoln states that “not a single man of your race (African American) is made the equal of single man of ours.” (Document W.) Lincoln went on to lose the election but these run combined with the impassioned speeches made by Lincoln helped to promote him to national prominence as a positive influence on the abolitionist movement.

Although Lincoln did not succeed at running for Second his political career was not over. The presidential election of 1860 was only two years after his failure for Senate and the debate of slavery as well as the tension between the north and south was higher than it had ever been. Lincoln went on to win the presidency although he only received two fifths of the popular vote. This greatly upset the Southern States which believed in everything which Lincoln was against. Once Lincoln was elected several states promptly ceded from the Union. By the time of Lincoln’s inaugural address seven slave states had already ceded. In this first inaugural address Lincoln goes on to say “My countrymen one and all, think calmly and well upon this whole subject. Nothing valuable can be lost by taking time. If there be an object to hurry any of you in hot haste to a step which you would never take deliberately that object will be frustrated by taking time;” (Document M). Lincoln also goes on to attempt to bring the union together “We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained it must not break our bonds of affection,” (Document M). Although Lincoln had pleaded for the union to stay together, P.G.T Beauregard who was in charge of the confederate forces launched
an attack on Fort Sumter. This set off a series of events which would eventually lead to war between North and South. First Lincoln began to mobilize forces of the Union. Then four more states ceded from the Union. Lincoln promptly sent troops into war without asking for a declaration of war and in addition suspended the Writ of Habeas Corpus. “Now therefore be it ordered, first, that during that existing insurrection and as a necessary measure for surprising the same all Rebels and Insurgents, their aiders and abettors within the United States, and all persons discouraging volunteer enlistments, resisting militia drafts, or guilty of any disloyal practice affording aid and comfort to Rebels against the authority of the United States, shall be subject to martial law and liable to trial and punishment by the Courts Martial or Military Commission:” (Document N). During this turbulent period Lincoln even went as far as to ignore a writ, Ex Parte Merryman, which required the president to release Lamb din Milligan, a Maryland abolitionist. Later Ex Parte Milligan found that military trials held when civilian courts were present were unconstitutional. This set the stage for Lincoln’s passion which has become an important part of his image throughout the decades (Document U). These events would eventually to lead to the bloodiest conflict ever fought on American Soil and would in addition set the stage for the eventual freedom of the slaves by Lincoln.

One of the most important aspects of the Lincoln presidency aside from the actual physical conflict was the attempt to free the slaves. Contrary to his image today Lincoln did not believed that freeing the slaves was the best solution due to the fact that there was nothing that could be done to produce the same output the slaves did. Although Lincoln did not believe in emancipation many began to rally behind the idea. Furthermore Lincoln did not want to lose political power to the know nothings, whom he believed would only make the country more divided, “As a nation, we began by declaring that “all men are created equal.” We now practically read it “all men are created equal, except negroes.” When the know-nothings take control it will read “all men are created equal, except Negroes, foreigners and Catholics,”
The war went on and many died but the debate over slavery never ceased to exist. Finally on January 1, 1863 Lincoln signed one of the most important documents for African Americans in the United States. The emancipation proclamation gave freedom to all the slaves who were currently enslaved in states belonging to the confederacy. Unfortunately those who were either in states in the union or in states which were under control of Union forces were not included in the proclamation, (Document Q). Finally the war ended on April 9, 1865 when General Lee surrendered to General Grant. Although this was the formal end as well as a triumphant victory for Lincoln in war as well as with the slavery, the battle for equality for all had merely just begun and would continue for more than a century.

Although Lincoln’s life was tragically cut short by John Wilkes Booth, his legacy had already been created and would only grow to the status of a god in time. Over the years historians and fans of Lincoln have placed Lincoln on a pedestal unrivaled by any other politician in American History. Poems such as “Oh Captain! My Captain!” glorifies Lincoln by comparing him to the captain of a ship, the United States, and guiding the ship through turbulent water, or in translation by guiding the country through the civil war, (Document Y). Another Historian, Robert Dallek, compares Lincoln to such religious greats as Christ, “In his martyrdom Lincoln was even ascribed the characteristic if Christ. “It is not blasphemy against the Son of God…that we declare the fitness of the slaying of the second Father of our Republic on the anniversary of the day on which he was slain. Jesus Christ died for the world, Abraham Lincoln died for his country (Document C). A third famous novel A Team of Rivals; The Political Genius of Abraham Lincoln, written by Doris Kearns describes how Lincoln was smart enough and able to enough to not only come up from being a virtual nobody to becoming the President and as President creating the idea of using his enemies in his cabinet, (Document F). Even as he is compared to men such as Christ Lincoln maintained his greatness by staying humble, “I claim not to have controlled event, but confess plainly that events have controlled me,” (Document B).
The acknowledgements that Lincoln has received are well deserving of a man who came from a small humble background to becoming arguably the greatest president of the United States.

Abraham Lincoln was not only a homespun huckster but in addition was a giant of the people that became the leader of our nation at a time of greatest need. Even now in 2007 Lincoln is still admired and studied just as Christ and Cesar are. Although Lincolns achievements were on a much smaller scale than a majority of his god like counterparts, the manner and the efficiency in which he carried out his tasks has promoted Lincoln to a high status. Lincoln held the Union together against overwhelming odds and although his fellow politicians and leaders viewed him as a small town politician who was unable to control a country, he proved everyone wrong and not only held the nation together but proceeded to rid the nation of a horrible practice which had gone on for over a centuries. Abraham Lincoln’s shadow of greatness is by no means to large for his accomplishments and this image of a great heroic and influential man is well fitting for Lincoln.
The Legendary Lincoln

The result of the 1860 presidential election was a defining moment in the history of the United States. The emergence of the first Republican president foreshadowed the coming of change within the nation. President Abraham Lincoln fought to preserve the dividing Union and consequently brought the country to a new era. Thus, the everlasting adoration for Lincoln as the originator of the modern American Presidency and the creator of war powers is no great wonder. Lincoln’s heroic representation proves reasonable when considering his underprivileged upbringing, the situation placed upon him during his presidency, his steadfast ideals and resolutions, and the overall impact he’d made on the country.

Abraham Lincoln’s personal history illustrates a man who became an influential figure not by use of special privileges but with his own intellect and strength. Born in a modest log cabin in Kentucky, Lincoln was the son of a carpenter. Lincoln’s family later moved to Indiana due to his father’s troubles over property rights and his belief that the authorization of slavery in Kentucky was wrong. So, Lincoln grew up aiding his family with the usual chores and reading as many books as he could obtain during his spare time. Lincoln’s formal education totaled less than a year and “he was almost entirely self-educated (Doc-D)”. Despite this, Lincoln studied hard to become a lawyer and incorporated himself into politics. He had aims to run for state legislature, but lost in his first campaign. He entered two weeks before the election due to his volunteer service in the Black Hawk War. However, Lincoln’s time spent as a captain of the militia allowed him to discover his gift for leadership. His men admired his sincerity, his self-
expression, and his strength. Perhaps these qualities are what caused so many Americans to look
to Lincoln during such desperate times.

Preceding the Civil War, the events that transpired seemed like constant struggles for
dominance. Most of these debates revolved on the controversial issue of slavery. *Dred Scott vs. Sanford* was a significant case as Dred Scott, a Missouri slave, sued his master’s widow for freedom on the grounds that his residence in free territory had liberated him from slavery. However, the Supreme Court, under Chief Justice Roger Taney, ruled that Blacks had no claim on citizenship and no rights under the Constitution. Also, slaves were property and, by the Fifth Amendment, Congress could not take property without “due process of law”. Therefore, Taney concluded that the Missouri Compromise was unconstitutional because Congress had no right to take slave property from the citizens. While this debate did not immediately stop the prohibition of slavery, it did give the South the grounds to support their pro-slavery opinion. The federal government was losing power and conflict over new states becoming either slave or free, like the deadlock with Kansas, was clearly beginning to put a strain on the Union. But as soon as the Republican Lincoln won the Presidency, the South knew that the end of the Union was inevitable.

In the November election of 1860, the Republican leaders nominated Abraham Lincoln because of his reputation of eloquence, his moderate position on slavery, and his anonymity. “Lincoln seemed to have come from nowhere—a backwoods lawyer who had served one undistinguished term in the House of Representative (Doc-F).” But he was a natural public speaker “with a talent for expression that in another time and place might have led him into a literary career (Doc-D).” While in the legislature, he was firm on his opinions concerning such controversial topics as slavery, which he genuinely thought was founded on both injustice and bad policy. When engaged in a debate, Lincoln was sharp, witty, and a formidable opponent. Lincoln held debates with national figures like Stephen Douglas in Illinois (Doc-K). Lincoln did
not preach, but instead held an honest outlook. On the issue of slaves’ rights, Lincoln said “I agree with Judge Douglas he is not my equal in many respects…but in the right to eat bread without the leave of anybody else, which his own hand earns, he is my equal and the equal of Judge Douglas, and the equal of every living man (Doc-L).” Although these debates boosted his reputation, Lincoln only won about two-fifths of the popular vote during the presidential election. Still, his victory signaled the defeat of the South’s position in the Union.

The South knew of Lincoln’s general ideas to resolving the issues that plagued the country. In Lincoln’s First Inaugural Address, he states “My dissatisfied fellow countrymen…you have no oath registered in heaven to destroy the government, while I shall have the most solemn one to preserve, protect, and defend it (Doc-M).” His main priority was to preserve the Union. Lincoln was adamant that “We know how to save the Union…In giving freedom to the slave, we assure freedom to the free…this could not fail (Doc-P).” Lincoln insisted, “Our forefathers brought forth…a new nation…dedicated to proposition that all men are created equal (Doc-R).” With Lincoln’s firm attitude, the South realized that both parties would never reach an agreement, and the disunion began.

By the time Lincoln took office, seven slave states seceded from the Union. Although there was an attempt for compromise, the Union could no longer hold together and. With the attack on Fort Sumter, on April 14, 1861, the Civil War had begun.

During the Civil War, Lincoln used his presidential powers to his full advantage. In July 1861, Lincoln delivered a speech to Congress, asking them “Are all the laws but one to go unexecuted, and the government itself go to pieces lest that one be violated?” Lincoln did not really question the extent of his power from the Constitution, as other previous Presidents had done. He sent troops to battle without asking Congress, increased the size of the regular army, and proclaimed a naval blockade of the South. Because of the problems made by the Southern supporters in the North, Lincoln ordered, “That the Writ of Habeas Corpus is suspended in
respect to all persons arrested…by the sentence of any Court Martial or Military Commission (Doc-N).” Lincoln felt these commands were justified under the war powers given to him as president. But probably the most consequential decision of Lincoln’s presidency was the announcement of the Emancipation Proclamation. “That on the first day of January, A.D. 1863, all persons held as slaves within any state or designated part of a state…shall then, thenceforward, and forever be free (Doc-Q).” This act permanently affected the country. Lincoln continued to encourage the removal of slavery as the war waged. Finally, on April 9, 1865, General Lee of the south surrendered to General Grant of the North at Appomatocco Court House in Virginia. Under authority from Lincoln, Grant extended generous terms to Lee and his army. The North happily cheered and “with the end of the Civil War in 1865, the United States was permanently altered (Doc-X).”

Lincoln knew that when the war ended reconstruction was his next priority. Lincoln stated, “With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in…to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations (Doc-S).” Lincoln’s Reconstruction plan offered a general amnesty to white southerners who would pledge loyalty to the government and accept the elimination of slavery. When 10 percent of the voters took up the oath, they could set up a state government. Lincoln proposed this plan as a way to unite the nation as soon as possible and not isolate the Southerners. The Radical Republicans thought that the policy was too moderate and attempted to pass their own plan, the Wade-Davis Bill, which Lincoln promptly vetoed. In response, the Radicals refused to seat representative elected from Louisiana, Arkansas, and Tennessee. Whatever plan Lincoln may have had to accommodate the Radicals is unknown, because on April 14, 1865, he was assassinated in Washington. Some say that while “Jesus Christ died for the world, Abraham Lincoln died for his country (Doc-C).”
Abraham Lincoln’s legend continues to be revered as history goes on. Walt Whitman forever immortalized Lincoln in his poem—“Oh Captain! My Captain! /For you bouquets and ribbon wreaths…/ For you they call…/ But I, with mournful tread/ Walk the deck my Captain lies/ Fallen cold and dead (Doc-Y).” Idolatry and hero worship are words associated to Lincoln’s name as people realize the full impact of what this one man had done for his country. “The Lincoln legend has come to have a hold on the American imagination that defies comparison with anything else in political mythology (Doc-E).”

Lincoln was more than “a kind of homespun Socrates (Doc-D)”; he was a man ahead of his times. Some, like historian Richard Neustadt, say that Lincoln was the first 20th century president and the inventor of presidential war powers (Doc-H). During his presidency, Lincoln clearly showed great authority and leadership. Lincoln didn’t just learn law, but also understood it. He knew that he possessed power over the nation and neither abused nor took it for granted. He did all that was necessary to ensure that the Union of the United States was preserved.

Ultimately, the magnitude of Lincoln’s achievements is almost indescribable. For if these events were to have never happened, what would America be like today? Fortunately, the Republicans wisely turned to him as a presidential nominee. He unrelentingly fought for the preservation of his country. Abraham Lincoln’s image will forever be remembered as a child born as a nonentity who grew up to be a legend.

THIS IS A VERY GOOD PAPER. “9” It is very fluent and analytical as well as it covers the scope of his life and contributions.
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Question: Analyze the effectiveness of political compromise in reducing sectional tensions in the period 1820-1861.

In the four decades leading up to the Civil War, America was changing and developing. Slavery and a cash crop agriculture was flourishing in the South, while industrialization continued to shape the economy of the North. Not only did this difference create great rifts economically, but the increasing prevalence of slave labor to fuel the Southern economy caused by severe moral disagreement between the two regions. Fear Civil War, the US government passed a series of compromise bills which intended to relieve sectional tensions in the country, and to some extent they did. However, for the most part, these compromises only served to aggravate the deep moral and economic divisions of the two sections.

In the year 1820, the issue of slavery came to a climax when Missouri was to be admitted to the Union. The sectional balance in the Senate would be broken, thus giving more power to either the abolitionist North or the slaveholding South, neither option was beneficial for the preservation of the Union. For this reason, a compromise was agreed upon and a precedent was set; Missouri would be admitted as a slave state, Maine as a free, and a ‘line at 36’ 30’ was established, literally dividing the country on the basis of slavery vs freedom. Although this temporarily solved the problem by restoring sectional balance, animosity between the two regions of the country grew due to this dividing line. Immediately, the Compromise 1820 healed sectionalist wounds, but in the long run, it would only serve as further separation between the North and the South.

In 1828, Uncle Sam had another crisis in his hands. For years, the North had been benefiting from high tariffs. This economic strategy raised the prices of foreign goods, thus encouraging the purchase of US-made goods at higher prices. The industrial North profited immensely, while the South, forced to y expensive items with no extra profit, felt its rights were being denied by a favorist government. For this reason, the “nullies” of South Carolina, with John C. Calhoun as their figurehead, chose to nullify this unfair “Tariff of Abomination.” By 1832 Congress had lowered the tariff, but not by nearly enough, so SC[arolina] threatened to secede. The wound were healed the following year, however, when the Compromise Tariff of 1833 was passed, lowering the tariff to its 1816 rate. Although, at first appearing detrimental to the union, this conflict ended on a very pro-union not: crisis was averted by conciliation, and sectionalism was for the moment quieted.

The government’s acquiring of territories of territories from Mexico in the Mexican War in the mid-to-late 1840’s led to another big question faced thirty years before! Should this land be slave or free? The Wilmot Proviso, which answered simple “free” would obviously never pass the sectionally balanced Senate. But Clay came to the rescue as he had done in 1820, and created the Compromise 1850. To benefit the North, CA would be admitted as a free state, and DC would no longer [be] allowed the slave trade. For the South, the harsh Fugitive Slave Act was enacted. TX was awarded $10,000,000 and New Mexico and UT’s slavery question would
be answered by popular sovereignty, which pleased both sides equally. This compromise did away with sectionalism initially, and led to a second “era of good feeling”. There was one problem, however; no one could have guessed the violent reaction the North would have to the Fugitive Slave Act. Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and other abolitionist states passed “personal liberty laws” which stated that obeying this federal law was illegal within these states. Naturally, the South was furious: what started out as simple compromise, splitting the spoils of the war 50-50, ended up fueling the sectionalist war to such a degree that military action seemed unavoidable only a decade later.

As the United States would find out in 1861, compromise could never work to mend the nation over the slavery issue. The nation, as Lincoln insisted, could not and would not exist as half slave and half-free. War would have to be fought so that one system could prevail.

Politicians in the antebellum era, however, felt that compromise could smooth over the rifts between the North and the South, and to some extent, sectionalism was relieved. But the much bigger, grave consequence of compromise was the aggravation of already painful would of division. Compromise would never serve as answer; only violence would.
Evaluate the effectiveness of Progressive Era reformers and the federal government in bringing about reform at the national level. In your answer be sure to analyze the successes and limitations of these efforts in the period 1900-1920.

The first two decades of the 20th century brought about sweeping changes to every aspect of our nation. Much of this reform was due to a movement known as Progressivism, which grew out of the Greenback Labor and Populist Parties of the late 1800’s. The goal of the movement was to dedicate the government to social welfare programs. Although there was still much reform needed in many parts of the government, the persistence of dedicated individuals and groups made the Progressive Era one of astounding achievements in labor, business, health, and political reform.

In the early 1900’s, labor unions were still fighting for their rights. A victorious day came when, in 1914, the Clayton Anti-Trust Act was passed. (E) Hailed by the AFL leader Samuel Gompers as the “Magna Carta” of labor, this document finally secured workers the right to assemble and strike. Furthermore, the Workingmen’s Compensation Act guaranteed disabled workers assistance, and also did much in the way of child labor reforms. The Supreme Court also had a hand in bestowing benefits upon American laborers when, in the Muller vs Oregon case, women were guaranteed special rights in the workplace. Though dearly sexist, the ruling showed that the country was making great strides in the way of labor reform, even for women.

Trust-busting was also a major goal of the Progressive movement. President Roosevelt firmly believed that trusts that did not serve the public interests should be done away with. (A) They went so far as to attack big business directly by challenging one of J.P. Morgan’s own companies. Muckrakers helped Progressive business reform by publishing materials that exposed the wrong-doings of big business. Ida Tarbell’s expose of Standard Oil Company, for example, enraged the public and called on the masses to participate in reform efforts.

Change in federal health policies was also precipitated by a publication. Upton Sinclair’s The Jungle, in an attempt to expose the lives of the poor, actually emphasized the disgusting conditions of the meat packing industry and led TR to send two associates to confirm the books statements. (B) Following their Neill-Reynolds Report in 1906, the federal government passed the Pure Food and Drug Act, a major stride which vastly improved the quality and safety of American produced food and medicine. Not only Upton Sinclair influenced health reform, but Jacob A. Riis as well, in the form of the deathly conditions on the streets. In his photo expose How the Other Half Lives, he moved the nation with his portrayal of the poor in slums and tenements, and influenced the work of Hull House and other like-minded settlement houses. These progressive reforms moved the country forward in yet another way.
Drastic improvement in politics itself resulted from the Progressive movement. The Seventeenth Amendment, passed in 1913, guaranteed Americans the right to directly elect their own senators, a measure progressive Teddy Roosevelt strongly supported. This amendment was ushered on by yet another muckraker, DG Phillips, who wrote the *The Treason of the Senate*, which proclaimed that 75 of the US’s 90 senators represented the views of the railroads and big business, not the views of the people. Direct presidential primaries were also established in this period, which let the races of the States effect change with ever more momentum. Furthermore, influential state governors such as Robert LaFollette of Wisconsin and Hiram Johnson of California instituted the initiative, referendum, and recall. Which further developed true democracy? On an even more local level, in Galveston, TX, the city commission system were established by Progressivism, which increased the effectiveness of local governments.

Despite these immense strides in so many aspects of American life, much was left to be desired at the close of the Progressive Era. Racism ran rampant across the country, as black migration north led to race riots in the big cities such as Chicago. Additionally, the federal bureaucracy under Woodrow Wilson was segregated, though he tried to make up for it by appointing Lewis Brandeis to the Supreme Court. Teddy Roosevelt had made a similar gesture when he invited Frederick Douglass to dine at the White House for publicity’s sake. (the first president to invite a black man to dinner). Unsurprisingly, he never again invited a black man because he’d won his political points in the eyes of the country, much like Wilson’s appointment of Brandeis. Further, hampering the goals of the Progressives was public criticism that the movement was overly idealistic and failed to address the problem that legislation does not always equal change. Women also felt disenfranchised because, although their position was greatly improved, it took until the end of the (1920’s) until the 19th Amendment guaranteeing female suffrage was passed. They had taken such a great part in the movement, yet could not even vote. (H)

The Progressive Era brought about a significant number of critical reforms. Conditions were improved for many groups of people, but for others, such as blacks and the poor, nothing seemed to change. However, the movement led to a heightened level of informed masses, who were finally aware of many controversial happenings in the federal government. The Progressive movement, although un-influential in some areas, ultimately changed the fact of this great nation for the better.

*It ain’t perfect, but it is a beauty!’ “9”*

I, Ellie Gunderson, give and grant to JOHN A. BRAITHWAITE, the right to print and to publish my essays written during the 2004-2005 school year. This is for use in the Salt Lake City summer American History Institute.

Signed: Ellie Gunderson
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QUESTION:

*Does the analysis of a major world event [i.e. World War II] have an easy interpretation to explain why and how it happened? In the end, is there justification for what resulted as a consequence? Were Pearl Harbor and Hiroshima easy and specific events to historically interpret as to what was the cause, and what were the effects of the war?*

World War II helps define the history of the United States of America and the world as it impacted the lives of the majority of people around the world and caused many fatalities. The new wartime economy brought about jobs which caused unemployment rates to sink. Women filled the workplace and by 1945 women made up 36% of the workforce. The federal government encouraged Americans to recycle goods such as rubber, metal, paper, lipstick tubes and even kitchen fats to help with factory production. America, compelled to enter the war in 1941 after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, joined the Allies, Britain, France and the USSR, while the Axis powers consisted of Japan, Germany and Italy. The analysis of World War II proves the event to be a complex matter with numerous causes. In the end, the consequences of the War, the deaths and the unfair treatment towards many were justified. Despite the fact that Pearl Harbor and Hiroshima were key events in the war, they simply help to define the major event. Americans were forced to fight for peace throughout the world, while they needed to protect their own country.

In many ways, World War II can be considered a continuation of World War I. World War I left Germany in debt, as the Germans were forced to take complete responsibility for the war. This in turn led to the fall of the German economy and the fanaticism, specifically with
Hitler. Hitler and his German army invaded Poland, which marked the start of the World War II. In addition to taking over Poland (the “blitzkrieg” into Poland) Hitler advanced his army into France, precipitating the fall of France. The “Kristallnacht,” a night of German violence towards the Jews, marked an important cause of World War II. The militarism, aggression and imperialism that came along with World War I continued through to World War II. Countries felt like they needed to build up their military for protection.

America had an interest in World War II long before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. Hitler’s aggression posed a threat to various countries throughout the world including America. He was tearing through many European countries, destroying the lives of millions. As the Hitler epidemic was roaring through Europe, Americans began to fear what Hitler would do to America. In addition, Japan was beginning to imperialize countries such as China and the Philippines, which were both important to America. The Japanese were brutally treating the Chinese women during the Rape of Nanjing. Japanese men would rape the women and burn them afterwards. America felt they should protect their interest with China because of the lucrative trade. Japan had taken an interest in Southeast Asia, including the Philippine islands, which were earned by America during the Spanish American War. (Doc F) Although America had been maintaining a “hands-off” policy during the beginning of the war, Americans were concerned about their trade interest in Asia and Europe. Americans feared that Japan and Germany would become world leaders if the Allies lost the war. Since America advocated democracy, Americans wanted to prevent the fall of democracy in other countries. Countries in the Axis Powers, such as Japan and Germany, were being led by monarchs. As one way to prevent the overturn of democracy, America enacted the Lend Lease Act. This allowed the President to lend war materials to members of the Allies. This was another way of supporting the Allies.
The Japanese attack on America can be considered the “straw that broke the camel’s back.” The attack on Pearl Harbor forced America to retaliate and drew America into the war as a member of the Allies. After the attack, Americans led by Roosevelt, needed not only to protect their own country but to gain revenge. (Doc A) The Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor proved to be a surprise to America even though they had been preparing for war. In his speech to Congress, Roosevelt declares war between America and Japan. This war between Japan and America quickly merged into the already ongoing World War II. (Doc C) The casualties experienced by America were much greater than those faced by Japan. This in turn led to Americans craving vengeance. (Doc B) Although this disastrous attack marked the American entrance into the War, it does not simply explain the war. (Doc C) Americans had an interest in Okinawa because if they cut it off from Japan, Japan would be sealed off from China and Southeast Asia. At the same time, Japan was working hard to fortify this land, as they recognized that it would be of prime interest to America. Kamikaze warfare took place on this island. (Doc H) American forces invaded Mindoro and landed on Luzon in order to prevent the Japanese from gaining more defensible forces. America’s strategic method carried through the rest of the war. (Doc G) Both Japan’s fanaticism and America’s nationalism and determination were clearly evident in this war. Americans clearly wanted to defend their country, while Japan was fixated on Okinawa. Japan, realizing that this was an important island, fortified it with defense mechanisms. (Doc. H)

World War II ended with the bombing of Hiroshima and a great number of deaths. (Doc S) The Battle of Midway and Coral Sea defined a turning point in the war. Even though Japan had naval artillery superiority, America now had air superiority. This superiority foreshadowed America’s victory in the war. (Doc D) During the Battle of Midway and Coral Sea, a tactic known as “island hopping” was launched, in order to try to cut off Japanese access to other countries. This proved ineffective which forced America to turn to the bomb. (Doc E)
The end of the war came with a new technology: the atomic bomb, which was a product of the new nuclear age. (Doc P) Some may argue that the atomic bomb was a mistake, but according to Truman it was a necessity. Long after the dropping of the bomb, people still felt the effects. Disease spread among the survivors and was even passed on to their offspring as a result of the bombing. The effects were felt far beyond the initial impact. The nuclear age brought about a different type of violence, as not many knew what to expect. Even though the atomic bomb killed many, it immediately stopped the war. If the war was not stopped many more would have died as a result of the continued fighting. Albert Einstein’s letter to President Roosevelt advises him to find a supply of uranium ore and provide funds to support the production of bombs. Einstein’s knowledge and input helped to protect America. The irony behind this letter was that it was written prior to the Pearl Harbor Attack. (Doc K) There were recommendations to use the atomic bomb considering the American casualties to Japan’s casualties were at the ratio of 22:1. Many felt that the bomb was the only way for America to retaliate. (Doc M) America’s decision to drop the bomb was done in order to achieve peace throughout the nations. (Doc O) The Japanese appeared to plan on fighting until the last man, woman, and child was standing. Truman’s decision to use the atomic bomb reflected this belief since he felt the bomb was the only way possible to stop the war. This Japanese enemy was different than any enemy America had experienced before, which forced America to turn to the atomic bomb. (Doc N) President Truman used the atomic bomb as a weapon of war. According to Truman, this measure was taken in order to achieve peace throughout the world by ending the war. It did just that. Not once did Truman feel regret for dropping the atomic bomb; he knew it was necessary. (Doc Q) America’s “political, social, and military objective” was for Japan to surrender; after the first bombing they continued to fight, but the second bombing at Hiroshima left the Japanese with no other choice than to surrender. (Doc N) Knebel and Bailey’s “Hiroshima: The Victims” explores many different accounts in which various innocent Japanese were killed or wounded.
Although this bombing marked the end of the war it does not thoroughly explain all of the effects of the war. The bomb at Hiroshima not only ended the 6 years of fighting worldwide, but also the Holocaust, which killed over 11 million innocent people.

The numerous events that occurred during the time period known as World War II all help to define the reason and rationale behind fighting. America’s original neutrality theory did not last long considering all of the other countries that were already involved. This war not only made a great mark on our country’s history but on the history of the entire world.

I, Nora Hennessey, give and grant to John Braithwaite, the right to publish my essay on World War II, for the purposes of consultation and to use as a good writing model.

Signed Nora Hennessey
Date April 12, 2007
Does the analysis of a major world event [i.e. WW II] have an easy interpretation to explain why and how it happened? And in the end, is there a justification for what resulted as a consequence? Were Pearl Harbor and Hiroshima easy and specific events to historically interpret as to what was the cause and what were the effects of the war?

Prior to the Second World War, the world was unwitting to the devastation that would ensue on such a vast and tragic scale. War had been waging for two years when the Japanese struck Pearl Harbor, but in the eyes of Americans it was a sudden, unforeseen act of brutality by a presumptuous and arrogant group of people. In reality, World War II was merely a giant that had been asleep on the foot of America’s doorstep for far too long, a creature much larger and more complex than how the country wished to perceive it. The United States seemed to end the war in very much the same way that they believed it began. Hiroshima delivered a staggering blow to the Japanese population that left only an echo of death and silence. Decades later, it has become clear that both events in history were preceded and followed by complicated wartime occurrences that fully account for America’s response to Pearl Harbor and drastic course of action at Hiroshima.

On December 8, 1941, the day following Pearl Harbor, President Franklin D. Roosevelt addressed Congress with the statement that “since the unprovoked and dastardly attack by Japan,” the United States was to enter a complete state of war. (Doc. C) To support his proclamation, the President only had to remark upon the 3,000 plus military casualties that resulted from the attack; these numbers, along with the heavy loss of artillery were enough to send the American public into a frantic uproar. (Doc. B) Thinly veiled behind the ruin of Pearl Harbor however, were the actions of President Roosevelt, which contributed greatly to the country’s involvement. Immediately following Japan’s entrance into the Tripartite Pact, Roosevelt had imposed a fuel embargo with direct hopes of weakening
Japan’s air force. When the Japanese later invaded the Philippines, an American ally holding economic ties, Roosevelt froze Japanese assets in the United States. It is also important to note the effect the Lend-Lease program may have had in provoking the Japanese. Lend-lease provided American allied nations with vast amounts of war material, and began only nine months prior to Pearl Harbor. Other noncombatant actions being taken by the United States blatantly indicated that fear hung heavily over the heads of Americans. Roosevelt pushed for the passing of the Selective Service and Training Act of 1940, which became the first peacetime conscription in United States history. America also negotiated a deal with the British, exchanging old World War I destroyers for the allowance of the establishment of military bases on British possessions. During these final months leading up to Pearl Harbor, it appeared that the United States was fighting a war that only lacked direct conflict. All of these factors clearly were in some part responsible for the American entry in World War II.

Following Pearl Harbor and America’s declaration of war Roosevelt took military action in the Philippines; the blatant assault by Japan provided justification for reconquest and the opportunity to recapture economic interests. (Doc. G) Subsequently, the drastic measures taken by the Japanese in the Pacific, as they captured one island outpost after another, also held significance. (Doc. E) The United States was forced to respond harshly; Midway and Coral Sea resulted in heavy losses of Japanese aircraft carriers which ultimately put the enemy on the defensive until the war’s end in 1945. (Doc. D) These battles also provided the United States with an insight into how Japan was planning to fight the duration of the conflict; Americans had witnessed a new style of merciless warfare that had risen from the ruthless heart of the Japanese military.

The decision to drop the atomic bomb on Hiroshima in August of 1945 was exalted as a long awaited victory for America. Although some could not comprehend such a lack of morality, the adjudication behind the bombing was in fact much deeper than the fundamentals of
being right or wrong. The Battle on the Island of Okinawa seemed to embody the ruthless tactics of the Japanese. Okinawa was a densely populated island of farmers that was transformed overnight into an island of suicide bombers and victims that would fall prey to such extreme measures. (Doc. H) The United States witnessed how more and more the Japanese were willing to sacrifice human life at any cost, a factor that despite their ailing condition made their force even more dangerous. Prior to the bombing, America made several attempts at acquiring a resignation by the Japanese, but these efforts were in vain. The Japanese monarchy tenaciously urged starving citizens to take up arms in what appeared to be an incessant effort at vengeance.

It is also important to note that the atomic bomb was not merely a rash decision made under the strain of wartime casualties. As early as 1939, President Roosevelt began correspondence with Albert Einstein, in which Einstein recommended that America be alert to such bomb developments and cognizant of the fact that the German enemy may also have had an interest in this forthcoming weapon of mass destruction. (Doc. K) America’s first meeting of the Advisory Board regarding the Uranium that Einstein discussed was also in 1939, six years prior to the actual use of the bomb against Japan. (Doc. L) The final decision to drop the bomb ultimately was more cost effective in American lives and seemingly offered a much higher chance of surrender. (Doc. N) On the morning of August 6, 1945, Little Boy exploded approximately 1,800 feet above Hiroshima, Japan. (Doc. P) President Truman later stated that Hiroshima was chosen in accordance with its military significance, but it was a matter of great importance to the inexperienced President who more likely than not lost a great deal of sleep over the matter. (Doc. Q; Doc. R) It is imperative that the dropping of the atomic bomb be seen as more than just the consequence of half a decade of fighting, and rather be viewed as the inevitable result of total warfare which could only be matched with an equally aggressive defense. Although the atomic bomb later became a hotbed of controversy in America’s
conscience, the decision to measure up to such levels of hostility subsequently enabled the United States to emerge as a world superpower.

The American entrance and exit from the stage of World War II will always be highly debated and scrutinized aspects of world history. Despite countless attempts to over simplify the events of Pearl Harbor and Hiroshima, they can not truly be categorized into the traditional cause and effect patterns of war. In retrospect, it is easy to recognize that Hiroshima was just as complicated as Pearl Harbor, and that both were in fact only seminal events in the grand scheme of warfare.

I, Ellen Frankman, give and grant to John Braithwaite, the right to publish my essay on World War II, for the purposes of consultation and teaching of good writing.
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But We Had To!

Does the analysis of a major world event [i.e. WW II] have an easy interpretation to explain why and how it happened? And in the end, is there a justification for what resulted as a consequence? Were Pearl Harbor and Hiroshima easy and specific events to historically interpret as to what was the cause and what were the effects of the war?

Two days of sheer destruction started and ended the American war with Japan during World War II. The surprise attack by the Japanese at Pearl Harbor was a catalyst that prompted the United States to shun its neutral position and defend itself against a growing empire. However, one cannot pinpoint the cause of the war solely to the attack at Pearl Harbor. The causes of the war are numerous, and it is hard to understand which reason was the sole reason as to why the United States entered the war. Accordingly, the consequences of the war, most significantly the bombing of Hiroshima, are in some ways justified and in some ways are not. Problems existed in Europe and in Asia, and these problems all prompted the United States to enter the war, in addition to the immediate cause: the attack at Pearl Harbor. And after the war ended in 1945, the Americans used their only means of defense against the Japanese, an atomic bomb, that was properly used considering the context of the situation, but triggered decades of nuclear standoff that still plague the world today.

December 7, 1941 is a day that lives in the minds of Americans today, and is celebrated as the day that over 2,000 innocent men lost their lives. As evidenced by the first three documents, Pearl Harbor was a devastating blow to the US. 206 airplanes and ships were lost at the hands of the Japanese, and over 2,000 men were murdered, barring the extra 1,000 men
that were left injured (Doc A, B, C). Pearl Harbor was definitely an immediate reason as to why the United States initiated war with Japan, but a series of other events triggered the declaration of war as well. After the attack at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, the Japanese expanded at the expense of surrounding Southeast Asian nations. An expansion of Japanese influence not only violated the terms of the League of Nations, but also threatened American trade and property. Trade conducted between the United States and nations now under Japanese control was cut off, threatening the economy of the American nation and the lives of merchants at home. The US territory of the Philippines was under attack as well. In their hunger for more and more land, the Japanese conquered the island, and it wasn’t until January of 1945 that the United States was able to conquer parts of the land, for portions of the island still remained under the control of the Japanese (Doc E, G). In addition to Japanese aggression, the war between the Allied powers and the Axis powers was at its peak. The Allies had suffered severe blows, as evidenced by the Fall of France and the near-defeat of Britain in the air-led attack at the Battle of Britain. If the Americans didn’t step in, who’s to say Hitler wouldn’t travel across the Atlantic Ocean? The Americans were also indirectly involved with the war, with their supply of arms and money to the Allied powers in the Lend-Lease program, their cut-off of trade with the Japanese, their nuclear research in Germany and in Mexico, their secret deals with the Allied Powers, their signing of the Atlantic Charter, and the proposal for American troops by the Allied powers. This mixture led to a declaration of war on December 8, 1941, and contributed to the death of over 200,000 people within a matter of days. After the debacle at Pearl Harbor, there ensued a four year naval-air war to conquer the Japanese. It took Adm. Chester Nimitz, and Gen. Douglas MacArthur on a long deadly series of invasions of island after island hopping beginning at Midway, where with some American luck and Japanese tragedy, the American navy sunk four Japanese aircraft carriers. Another two went down in the Battle of the Coral Sea. Following these battles, came the climatic naval battle of Leyte Gulf and the aggressive American effort to reconquer the Philippines. From the blood baths there on the beaches, to Tinian, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa, the American paid the price in blood ten-fold over Pearl Harbor.
The “island hopping” cost Americans nearly as dearly as the atomic bombs would cost Japan. Consequently, there was no hesitation by the Americans using the Island of Tinian as the launching pad for the atomic strikes at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. President Truman took the responsibility for the decision, “not another American boy should die, if we can end this thing here and now.”

The war lasted for four years and ended on August 14, 1945, with a formal surrender by the Japanese after overwhelming shocks at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Towards the end of the war, in an effort to quell the war and save thousands of lives, President Truman agreed to drop atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, marking the first and only time a nation had ever used atomic weaponry as a method of defense (Doc N, Q, R). Although criticism has been drawn regarding the morality of the use of atomic weaponry, the only way to end the war and salvage people from their imminent deaths was the use of radioactive bombs. In 1941, the Japanese intentionally massacred over 2,000 men, and wounded over 1,000; over 200 planes and ships were destroyed, inflicting a shocking blow to the US navy, which was unprepared for the attack (Doc A, B, C). According to President Roosevelt, due to the distance between Japan and Pearl Harbor, it is logical that the Japanese deliberately attacked the United States (Doc C). The only way to remain steadfast to American beliefs, which were life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, was to retaliate, and so the Americans did. Japanese philosophy, at the time, centered on duty to the emperor and duty to one’s country; a sacrifice of life was considered honorable. This was clearly represented in the battles that occurred following the losses at the Battle of Midway and the Battle of the Coral Sea, such as the Battle of Leyte and the Battle of Okinawa (Doc F, H, N). In the Battle of Okinawa, kamikaze missions ran rampant, in which Japanese pilots intentionally flew into American vessels in order to further the cause of the war. Over 3,000 such missions were launched in total, and over 5,000 men died as a result, highlighting the vigor and the war ethic of the Japanese, who though it unfaithful and unholy to surrender (Doc H). And near the end of the war, the Japanese still had an army that numbered
5 million men (Doc N). The limited amount of land-space that the Japanese had regarding their numerous islands was reflected in the positioning of air bases. Air bases were located near civilian territory due to confined quarters. The only way to defeat the Japanese was to attack these military bases, and risk the lives of innocent civilians (Doc I, J). Before releasing the bomb onto the Japanese, President Truman fully informed himself of the situation while the American presidential administration had 4 years to determine whether or not the use of atomic weaponry was ethical. Truman was advised by his Secretary of War and by a group of scientists that the use of the newly-created atomic weaponry was necessary to end the war, save lives, and render the Japanese military forces powerless. If it weren’t deemed absolutely necessary, Truman would never have used the new machinery. He had known the devastating results that would have resulted (Doc N, M, Q). So on August 6, 1945, the Americans unleashed “Little Man” on the Japanese; the “Little Man”, ironically, killed between 70,000 and 130,000 people in a matter of seconds. The pilot who unleashed the bomb, General Tibbins, stated later that war was evil, and that an end to the war let soldiers return home to their families, families that would have died if the war had persisted (Doc P, R, S). In conclusion, the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima, although tragic, was justified because of the Japanese relentlessness, the attacks at Pearl Harbor, and the proximity of air bases to civilian territory. However, every coin has two sides. Radiation that resulted from the release of the bomb infected thousands of people and severely raised the death toll in Japan. More importantly, the use of the atomic bomb marked the beginning of the nuclear age. With the European nations weakened from the war, the United States and the Soviet Union were left in a power struggle. Threats of nuclear war kept each nation in check, but fear was disseminated throughout both countries. The nuclear standoff has continued to present day, with the fear of the release of biological and chemical weapons, and more importantly, the dissemination of weapons of mass destruction.
Even though World War II lasted for 6 years, its legacy continues today. Despite the combination of numerous causes to enter the war, the United States still declared war on the Japanese, and the Japanese lost more than 500,000 military personnel and civilians as a result. The use of the atomic bomb at Hiroshima can be justified in many ways, but the legacy of the bomb has threatened the lives of millions of people today. Innocent lives have been lost due to this legacy, and the threat of World War III has persisted since the beginning of the Cold War more than 50 years ago; a chain reaction has begun.
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World War II—A Reflection

Does the analysis of a major world event [i.e. WW II] have an easy interpretation to explain why and how it happened? And in the end, is there a justification for what resulted as a consequence? Were Pearl Harbor and Hiroshima easy and specific events to historically interpret as to what was the cause and what were the effects of the war?

The single inevitable consequence of war is death. To analyze war is to question whether or not those deaths are justifiable due to the causes which prompted the war in the first place. In the case of WWII (1941-1945) this process of analysis proves to be complex in that the causes of the war cannot be narrowed down to a single event such as Pearl Harbor and the inevitable deaths which came as a consequence, including those as a result of the use of atomic weapons, were justified. These reasons for war include not only Pearl Harbor but the growing threat of the fanatical governments Nazi Germany, Fascist Spain and Italy, as well as Imperial Japan. These causes were worthy of the titanic loss of human life because even though the revolutionary warfare used in these battles changed the way nations will fight for decades to come, the US eliminated the threat to democracy and emerged as a major world power by the push of a button.

Even though Pearl Harbor was the immediate cause of WWII in America there were many secondary reasons that spurred this world conflict. This time period of the 1930s was marred with an economic depression which drew people to a state of desperation in search of a leader, whether they be malevolent or benevolent. This led to the rise of military dictators such as Hitler and the Nazis in Germany, fascist Mussolini in Italy, as well as fanatical militarism and
imperialism in Japan. This was also a prime time for the emergence of leaders in these nations because WWI left people unhappy with unresolved conflicts with the negative outcomes of the Treaty of Versailles which practically completely limited their countries. However, America’s sole priority during this time period was to heal from the Great Depression and stay out of world conflict, so our nation practiced a policy of appeasement when Germany disregarded the WWI Treaty of Versailles and sent troops to the Rhineland and took over the Sudetenland, when Japan attacked China and brutally demolished Manchuria, and when Italy took Ethiopia. America continued to heal with Roosevelt’s New Deal policies as these three nations increased militarism, nationalism through propaganda, and imperialism; but Roosevelt ordered a build up of the military for protection. In September of 1939 Poland was invaded by Germany’s blitzkrieg so the Allies (US, UK, USSR, China, and France) declared war against the Axis powers, but by June of 1940 Britain was left fighting alone. The US aided Britain through policies like cash and carry to ensure trade, the selective service to provide soldiers, the Lend-Lease Program to provide war materials, the Atlantic Charter for post war, we provided escorts for British ships and we shot German subs on sight after the Greer was attacked. The United States also disrupted the economy of Japan by prohibiting the export of steel and scrap iron, froze all credits in the US, and cut off the oil supply because of the increasing Japanese power in the Pacific that resulted from imperialism into British Burma, Dutch East Indies, and French Indonesia as well as the fall of the Philippines (Doc G). The United States even began the Manhattan Project in order to compete with Germany’s research on atomic weapons (Docs K and L) in 1942. This shows that America was fighting a war that we were not even fighting prior to Pearl Harbor in 1941. After the Japanese massacred 24,003 and wounded 1,436 US Navy, USMC, Army and civilians while sinking 18 ships and destroying 188 planes in a surprise attack, the United States formally entered the war (Docs A, B, and C) not only for vengeance but to put an end to the threat to democracy posed by Germany, Italy and Japan.
In order to end this lagging war which seemed like it would continue on forever, the United States utilized atomic weapons and introduced a new kind of warfare which has many justifications despite the tremendous loss of human life. After the Battle of Midway the United States staged a counter offensive attack known as “Island hopping” or “Leap frogging”, where the military would capture an island in order to get closer to invading the main islands of Japan. This led to the Battle at Coral Sea which was the first naval battle in which ships never sighted each other and air craft was used only to attack forces (Doc D). This opened up a whole new type of psychological warfare where the soldier never had to see the enemy he was killing. This was a very costly tactic in that huge amounts of people were killed, but the United States didn’t grow any closer to their goal of Japanese surrender. Germany’s mass annihilation of the Jewish population during the Holocaust as well as Japan’s carnage in China created an urgency to end the war in order to put a halt to the massive loss of lives going on in Europe and Asia. Japan would fight to the last man before they would surrender (Doc H). The only way Japan would admit defeat would be complete destruction of her military power. If the US didn’t drop the Fat Man and Little Boy on August 6th and 9th of the year 1945, Japan would have continued fighting with her military force that was estimated around five million in July of 1945 (Doc N). Even though Hiroshima was bombed with a force equal to 13,000 tons of TNT and over 200,000 people were killed from the Fat Man and Little boy (Doc P), the dropping of these bombs saved many lives that would have been lost in conventional warfare had not the Japanese surrendered (Doc M). The dropping of the atomic bombs were justified.

World War II was a multifaceted conflict that had many causes that led to a justified outcome that took the lives of thousands of people, soldiers and civilians alike. The 1930s was a prime time for military dictators to take rise in desperate countries marred by the depression as well as unresolved conflicts from WWI. These military dictators that relished in their power in Germany, Italy and Japan created a threat to democracy that the United States could no longer
ignore. During the following 6 years of brutal combating, ships and airplanes created a new type of war in which soldiers no longer had to see the enemy they were killing. However, this led to massive amounts of casualties and Japan would fight to the last man. So as a result in August of 1945 the President of the United States Harry S. Truman made the justified decision to drop an atomic bomb over the Japanese islands of Hiroshima and Nagasaki (Docs O and N). This spurred the deaths of 200,000 Japanese civilians but saved the lives of potentially millions of people that would have been killed in conventional warfare that would continue for years until the Japanese surrendered. The single inevitable consequence of war is death.

I, __Brynn Lettieri__, give and grant to John Braithwaite, the right to publish my essay on World War II, for the purposes of consultation and to use as a writing model.

Signed __Brynn Lettieri__
Date __April 12, 2007__
World War II was born out of root causes of conflicts that World War I failed to resolve. Attempts to explain World War II as simply the product of an-eye-for-an-eye type retaliation by America on Japan for the kamikaze attacks on Pearl Harbor are unsophisticated, naïve, and inaccurate. The explanations of the causes and effects of World War II are remarkably complex; in other words, there are diverse fundamental and specific “why” and “how” answers. On a fundamental level, militaristic imperialism, fanatic nationalism, and propaganda were the problems that mushroomed into explosive acts of war. The bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the mass casualties that resulted were justified.

We were focused first and foremost on getting out of the Great Depression; FDR implemented the New Deal “alphabet soup” programs and the government lowered tariffs to encourage international trade. Many Americans believed that entering World War I was a mistake. Militarism sprung from the loss of morale of desperate people looking for strong leaders in times of economic hardship. Fascists like Mussolini and his brown shirts, in addition to Hitler and dictators in Spain and Japan, were able to exploit the failure of the Treaty of Versailles to resolve important issues. A policy of appeasement ensued: appeasement created a ticking time bomb. No one stopped aggressive action by Italy (in Ethiopia in 1935), Germany (in the Rhineland in 1936 and the Blitzkrieg in Poland in 1939), and Japan (in Manchuria in 1931
and China in 1937 in pursuit of natural resources for industrialization). FDR wished to act but the American public was not on board. No doubt Pearl Harbor was not the only cause; this is proven by aforementioned items and America’s advance planning for involvement in war via cash and carry (1939) and the Selective Service (1940), among other measures. The Arsenal of Democracy was set up in 1940 to defend the Four Freedoms: free want, fear, speech, and religion. However, the surprise terrorist attacks on Pearl Harbor, provoked by America’s no steel and scrap iron exports, US credit, or oil for Japan policy, can be fairly said to be the immediate cause of America’s entrance into the theater of Japan in World War II.

December 7, 1941, a “day that will live in infamy” in the words of FDR, was what forced America into World War II sooner than had been expected!. The attack produced shock waves from torpedoes, gushing oil, sinking ships, and instant death of almost 1,200 men and the demise of about 2,403 Americans altogether.\{A,B\} There was a parallel with the attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon and the crashing of a plane in Pennsylvania insofar as towering infernos and combusting jet fuel and the martyrdom of teams of young religious fanatics using airplanes as guided missiles and who would stop at nothing to destroy the West.\{A,B\} The attack was extremely efficient on the part of the Japanese, who sacrificed a little over 64 men, 29 planes, and 6 subs to destroy 2,403 Americans, 188 planes, and 18 large ships.\{B\} FDR declared that the terrorist attack which devastated the navy was committed by Japanese empire and its naval and air forces and that it was the result of advance planning (premeditation). He invoked God’s name in hope of American triumph in the war, and announced that American interests in the Pacific are threatened but America will do whatever it takes for however long it takes to win.\{C\} And so America sent forces to the Philippines, very near to Japan. We controlled the Philippines for a long time after ending Spanish rule there, and now the Japanese wanted to undermine that by creating a pan-Asian empire that included the Philippines, where
we were trying to reduce governing costs. The Japanese were also knowingly and willfully expanding into the Dutch East Indies, British Burma, and French Indochina.

The Japanese were more fanatical than ever now that the battle was moving to Okinawa, which held 500,000 people who were mostly farmers; they even more willing to die for their country. Kamikaze bombings increased exponentially to serve as a firewall to advancing Americans (indeed it was part of Japanese national policy). Okinawa was a strategic goldmine for America since troops could have a base from which to invade the mainland and could block Japan from entering China and Southeast Asia. Island hopping, involving hundreds of bloody Blitzkrieg-style battles, worked to a limited extent; power over the Philippines was mostly restored to America but island hopping on Iwo Jima and Tinian dealt with symptoms and not causes. The kamikazes were typically inexperienced teenagers and were strictly volunteers. 3,000 kamikazes shed the blood of over 5,000 souls – dozens of ships were gutted and sunk.

Einstein wrote a letter to FDR almost six years to the day before the use of fission bombs on Hiroshima. He discussed the possibility of a chain fission reaction of uranium in the immediate future, which could destroy a port and vicinity. There was a concern that they might not be transportable via air. To obtain the resources for the “extremely powerful” bombs Americans would have to go to Belgian Congo for the “most important” ores since the U.S.A. has a high quantity but low quality trove. Canada and former Czechoslovakia have acceptable ores. Einstein told FDR that must touch base with physicists regularly so as to speed up experiments and form the basis for government war plans. Germany working to take control of uranium resources to manufacture bombs so action should be even more urgent.

There is no such thing as “humane warfare”; only hypocritical humanitarians distinguish “acceptable” and “unacceptable” cruelty. Regrettably, “bloodshed” has always been permissible as means of ending conflict, but condemning nukes while praising Hellish
firebombing betrays a double standard. Terrorism must be condemned by all who seek peace. Truman was ultimately solely responsible and he went out of his way to make that clear so as to assuage subordinates. The power to destroy is frightening but the consequences were justified considering that use of nukes abruptly ended the war, bringing young lads home to family who would be dead if the radical Japanese had not been stopped. The superbly just principle of Double Effect demands that the action is intrinsically good or morally neutral, that the evil of the action must not cause the good effect and the evil effect must be merely permitted and not desired in itself, and permission of the evil must only be granted for sufficiently grave reasons. The bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki satisfy all four criteria; this is why it is unnecessary to justify President Harry S. Truman’s assertive response to a profound moral dilemma from a utilitarian perspective. Granted the death toll was very high, but saying that 200,000 “civilians” died in the colossal and phenomenally spooky mushroom clouds (an image engraved in the minds of billions) is inaccurate and betrays ignorance of Japan’s situation during the war and the difference between civilians proper and fanatic nationalists who would die for their country without a second thought. Japan was still building carriers, planes, and arms at the time of the bombing. They were also committing war crimes like the Rape of Nanking; Japanese soldiers were recorded on video burning women and children alive, raping women and then executing them, summarily executing civilians with gunshots to the back of the head, and spearing babies with bayonets and gleefully flinging them into the air. This was the equivalent of the Holocaust in Germany in which certain groups were systemically exterminated out of vitriolic racist hatred and lampshades were made from the skin of starved Jews murdered with poison gas. The war had been raging on for six years and the witness of the demonic crimes in concentration camps may have lent further support to drop the atomic bomb.

The causes of World War II, the second phase of World War I which involved a marked shift in war psychology and tactics (island hopping, fission bombing), are numerous and
complex. At the core were imperialism, nationalism, fanaticism, militarism, and propaganda. The Germans were expanding into Central Europe under strong leadership following the collapse of the economy, the Japanese were encroaching on Southeast Asia and China in pursuit of resources for industrialization, and the Italians invaded Ethiopia. Spain, too, was succumbing to radical fascism. Japan was threatening American and European interests in the Pacific and terrorizing its neighbors, and then kamikazes surprise attacked Pearl Harbor out of their resentment for American economic actions, killing thousands and devastating the navy, galvanizing American public support for entering World War II; America was already planning to become involved. The deaths of nearly 200,000 persons in the two atomic bombings on Japan are justified by the principle of Double Effect. This decisive and abrupt way to end the war marked the dawn of the atomic age and the beginning of America as a world superpower, which it still is today.

I, Will R. Huysman, give and grant to John A. Braithwaite, the right to publish my essay on World War II for the purpose of consultation and the teaching of good writing.
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World War I: 20th Century Militarism DBQ

The twentieth century saw an era of militarism, nationalism, imperialism, and a distinct alliance system in Europe that provided a basis for the world to unite in man’s most effective method of diplomacy and engaged in a war that would ultimately lead to another hundred years of global warfare. It is evident that there are various causes to World War I, both short and long term. The political and militaristic tensions in Europe were building since the Revolutions of 1848 and slowly reached a breaking point where the situation became so sensitive that a single action of any country sparked a war that would scar the history of the world. Thus, it can be safely stated that, “in estimating the order of guilt of the various countries…immediate responsibility for the World War falls upon Serbia, France, and Russia…Austria…Germany and England…” (Document A). This is for the fact that after such a long period of relative peace throughout the European continent, its inhabitants wished to glorify their respective countries through war. Such eagerness towards the ultimate method of established national supremacy by the people of Europe caused the major powers of the continent to begin a period of armament. Such militarism caused each European power to be under the impression that another country was arming itself to initiate a war. In addition to this long-range cause, nationalism provided another base for the initiation of the Great War. “Nationalism is an emotional state of mind of people in which they manifest the desire to maintain and foster their own government, ideals, aspirations, and frequently common religion, race, and language.” (Document B). This socio-political state of being in Europe, and later America, led each nation to propagandize their
superiority over another to their people and each other and became the pedestal for war in order
to confirm such a superiority. (Document T). Furthermore, the imperialistic claims of European
powers led the continent to war as well. The race for resources and supplies created a
competition that added to the already stressed political string between the imperialistic European
powers. Lastly, the structure of the alliance system in Europe became the defining factor in the
emergence of the Great War. This alliance system bound England, France, and Russia together to
form the Triple Entente and tied Germany, Austria, and Italy together to articulate the Triple
Alliance. With this system, if one country was to declare war on another, it’s allies were
expected to follow allowing the delicate situation in Europe to only need a small spark to ignite a
chain that would lead to a world war. By the end of the war through the Versailles Treaty in
1919, Europe was in ruins and the object of the treaty shifted from ceasing all hostilities to one
of revenge that would, in due course, cause the world to rise from the “war to end all wars” and
once again plunge into another age of warfare.

In addition to the prominent long-term causes to the emergence of World War I, there
existed various immediate grounds in which Europe entered a period of total war. One of the
most direct causes of World War I was caused by the assassination of Austrian Archduke Franz
Ferdinand of and his family by a member of the Serbian terrorist group known as the Black
Hand. This action led Austria to send an ultimatum of induction into their empire to Serbia,
prompting Serbia to reject the ultimatum and causing Austria to declare war on Serbia. Russia
and France, sensing a possible war, began mobilization of their army while Germany invaded
Luxembourg and declared war on France. With these events, it becomes evident how out- dated
the European alliance system was; Austria declared war on Russia, prompting England to declare
war on Austria and Italy to declare war on the Triple Entente. (Document C). Adding to the short
term causes of the Great War was the American financial assistance to both the Triple Alliance
and the Triple Entente. Nevertheless, the eventual policy of funding the Allies by the United
States ushered the Germans to engage in unrestricted submarine warfare which the Germans believed was necessary to weaken their enemies. (Document Z). Through these events in Europe ultimately led the United States into war. (Document I). This unrestricted aspect of war practiced by the Germans during the course of the war led to a significant event that would push Americans on the brink of declaring war: the sinking of Lusitania which was supposed to have been carrying guns and arms aboard according to the Germans. (Document M). With the false data, German submarines attacked the passenger cruise-liner under the assumption that it contained hidden arms and supplies for the English and “undoubtedly had guns on board which were mounted under the decks and masked…” (Document G). Lastly, the final act by the Germans that led America to enter the Great War with the Allied powers was the Zimmerman Note. During the war, Germany sensed the growing threat of America entering the war against them. Thus, to prevent this occurrence, the Germans sent a note to Mexico authored by Alfred Zimmerman that presented the option of the Mexican government declaring war on the Americans and distracting them from the war in Europe. In exchange, the Mexicans would have the German’s assistance in regaining the territories of Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona. (Document F). It may be noted that California was not included in the compromise for the fact that Germany wished to conquer the state for its own needs, as California was abundant in natural resources. Though, with this final act against the United States, President Woodrow Wilson was prompted to ask Congress to formally declare war on Germany and its allies. And on April 6, 1917, under the argument that the Imperial government of Germany had “committed repeated acts of war against the Government an the people of the United States of America…”, Americans prepared for the deadliest war in human history.

The course of the Great War in Europe was characterized by a state of total war and trench warfare that devastated the continent. With the mobilization of the great powers of Europe, the horrors of trench warfare persisted throughout every major battle in World War I.
Soldiers would be commanded to fight for months at a time and expected to fight even with the acknowledgement of death or victory being the only method of leaving the battlefield. English soldiers fought from July to November of 1916. On July 1 of the same year, the English lost 60,000 soldiers due to the advancements of trench warfare. By the end of this battle, known as the first Marne Battle, over a million British, French, and German soldiers were killed or wounded. In addition, the battles of Tannenberg, Verdun, and Gallipoli served as examples of the destructive nature of total war. Millions of people had been killed in these battles, both soldiers and civilians. These characteristics of trench warfare and total war served as the reason why World War I was the deadliest war the world has ever seen.

In addition to the European phase of the war, American intervention changed the war into a war of mechanization and was characterized by various offensives that shifted the tide of the war toward the Allies’ favor. One of the major turning points of World War I was the transitioning of alliances of Italy to the Allied powers and the admittance of the Ottoman Empire on the side of the Triple Alliance. The Battle of Piave was a major offensive by the allied powers fueled by the Americans that proved to shift the tide of the war dramatically. With these phases of the war, the world saw a shift from a two front war that resulted in a stalemate to a war of mechanization with the entrance of the United States into the war in 1916 and ultimately led to the victory of the Allies in 1917 through the Versailles Treaty.

Although there were both positive and negative outcomes from the Treaty of Versailles, it is widely presumed that negatives outweigh the constructive aspects of the war. Yet, this belief proves to be a fallacy from a historical perspective. The Versailles Treaty formally ended World War I, putting an end to the bloodiest conflict man has ever seen. The treaty attempted to see a course of actions that would make the world a place where democracy would flourish. In correlation to this, the treaty also attempted to make the world fit to be a ruled by constitutional governments to ensure peace and tranquility. President Woodrow Wilson’s Fourteen Points...
exemplified this attempt as he pushed European powers into accepting terms of victory and defeat that would not penalize any nation and construct a society that would mirror that of a human built utopia. (Document S). To further build upon this idea of peace, Wilson proposed in his Fourteen Points for the establishment of the League of Nations, a gathering of national leaders who would discuss and regulate international politics to ensure peace within the world. Yet, even with these seemingly constructive prospects towards post-war Europe, the Treaty of Versailles ultimately failed to create order and peace and eventually led Europe to the doorsteps of war once again.

The negative aspects of the Versailles Treaty are numerous. Firstly, the treaty itself was greatly used as a political tool in America, thus, it quickly lost the public’s support and diminished in popularity. This is shown by the political cartoons during the era that mocked many of the United States’ attempts in glorifying the treaty. Wilson’s prospects towards a League of Nations were attacked as a product of blind idealism that would eventually fail. (Document N). In addition, the concept of total war was introduced to militarism and followed by the acceptance of engaging in hostilities against civilians. Also, one of the major downfalls of the Versailles Treaty was the fact that the victorious European powers wished not to create peace in the continent, though intended to seek revenge upon Germany for being the cause of the war. This vengeance created the infamous Article 231 War Guilt Clause of the Versailles Treaty which blamed Germany for the initiation of the war and imposed Germany with the responsibility of reparations for the damages caused by the war. (Document J). It has been argued that the War Guilt Clause was an irrational product of the Versailles Treaty that set a sense of reprisal in the hearts of the German people. No country wanted war. The Great War was an inevitable event that needed only a small catalyst to ignite a world conflict. This event was then used to blame another by those in political power for the cause of this predicament. (Document K). Finally, with these aspects of the Treaty of Versailles, a basis was set for a period
of war for the next hundred years. Dictators rose to power because of the humiliating and vengeful accounts placed upon each dictator’s respective country. The era of Hitler, Mussolini, and Franco come to existence due to the harsh impositions of the Versailles Treaty.

Ultimately, the Treaty of Versailles failed to address the problems presented by World War I. It allowed the free growth of fascism and militarism in Europe and Asia that would cause the world to enter another world war. The faulty alliance system in Europe that caused the First World War would once again cause another world war. It remains evident that one individual can have a profound affect on the happenings of the world, as shown by the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand by a member of the Black Hand. And as the war came to a close, the Versailles Treaty attempted to fix the wrongs that cause the war initially. Though by the end of the war through the Versailles Treaty in 1919, Europe was in ruins and the object of the treaty shifted from ceasing all hostilities to one of revenge that would, in due course, cause the world to rise from the “war to end all wars” and once again plunge into another more terrible and bloody carnage of warfare.
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**WWII DBQ**

Does the analysis of a major world event [i.e. WW II] have an easy interpretation to explain why and how it happened? And in the end, is there a justification for what resulted as a consequence? Were Pearl Harbor and Hiroshima easy and specific events to historically interpret as to what was the cause and what were the effects of the war?

War is a complex issue that requires deep analysis with respect to its causes and effects. This statement is even more valid if the topic at hand is that of World War II, a war the girdled the entire globe. If the issue is taken at face value, then the bombing of Pearl Harbor was the definite cause of American entrance into WWII. But in reality, there were other underlying reasons that had pushed the US closer and closer to entering the conflict. The bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, one of the most obvious effects of the war, if also taken at face value, seem to be atrocious and unnecessary acts of aggression. The death of some 200,000 people is indeed an atrocity, but the act was necessary in order to end the war on favorable terms for the United States.

On December 7, 1941, Japan bombed the American naval base at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. The attack resulted in serious losses of American ships, aircraft, personnel, and civilians [A, B]. In the days after the bombing, war was declared and America entered the fray that had been raging for years [C]. Though we must not forget that since the mid-1800s, the United States had become an imperialistic nation. At the time of WWII, the US had a number of economic and political interests in the Pacific that were being infringed upon by Japan. Examples would be the naval bases at Guam and other Pacific islands, as well as the Philippines, which was still a
protectorate under American control [E, F, G]. Another point to make is that trade relations between the United States and Japan had become strained over the years. Before Pearl Harbor, the US had cut off the trading of essential resources, such as metals and oil. This crippled both the Japanese economy and the Japanese war machine even though the action wasn’t belligerent in nature. This trade cut-off was a clear sign of American disapproval, and the Japanese felt as if the American restrictions were strangling them. For the above reasons, it is apparent that Pearl Harbor couldn’t have been the only reason for American entrance into the war.

Beyond the Pacific theater, the United States was in a state of highly tense state of relations with Germany. Although neutrality had been proclaimed at the beginning of the war in Europe, it became obvious over the years that America favored the Allies over the Axis. This is because the US had been preferential towards the Allies with both their diplomatic and trade policies. Some examples of preferential treatment were the cash-only policy of buying American arms, the use American escorts to protect Allied merchant ships, and the lend-lease program for armaments. Also, when the United States finally did declare war, the Allies had been in serious trouble. France had already fallen, and the Germans were pushing up on Britain. If Britain had also fallen, then the way would have been clear for Hitler’s men to continue across the Atlantic. This shows why the United States had a very large interest in entering the war against the Axis before it made its way into the Western Hemisphere.

After years of fighting, Japan and Germany had been beaten back by the Allied forces. The Japanese has been battered in their clashes against the Americans, and they often had an exorbitantly higher rate of casualties than the US [M]. But there was a problem: although it was obvious that Japan would lose they were determined to literally fight until the last man. This was not a good omen for the US, because they had already suffered enormous casualties in their island-hopping strategy across the Pacific and certain battles in Europe, such as that of Normandy [E, M]. At this point, the Americans were standing at the gates of mainland Japan
itself. The land invasion of the Japanese homeland seemed imminent, but massive amounts of casualties on both sides had been predicted if such an invasion was undertaken [N]. Another issue at hand was that the US wanted to end the war as quickly as possible, especially before the USSR could get involved with Japanese peace negotiations and compromise American standing after the war [Q, R].

The atomic bomb, a radically new kind of weapon, was believed to be able to accomplish both the goals of saving American lives and ending the war quickly. Yet then the question arose as to whether it was moral or not to use such a weapon on the Japanese, especially since it seemed apparent that many civilians would be killed. The deaths of civilians were seen as inevitable, and this was not the US’s fault, because the Japanese had placed military, industrial, and civilian sectors all in the same areas [Q]. Another point to address is that morality doesn’t necessarily apply to warfare, because war always results in some sort of death and destruction, and to label some warfare moral and other types immoral seems hypocritical [R].

On August 6th and 9th of 1945, the US bombed Hiroshima and Nagasaki with one atomic bomb each [P, S]. The Japanese government had been warned to surrender before the bombings, but the military decided not to take the threat seriously. The attacks killed hundreds of thousands of people, most of them civilians, but it did manage to end the war [L]. The second bombing of Nagasaki must be considered just as necessary as the first, because again the Japanese refused to surrender, even after Hiroshima had been decimated.

The US had been skirting on the edges of war for years before the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor, and maybe if we had addressed these problems sooner, the attack wouldn’t have occurred. As for Japan, its attitude of all or nothing spelled annihilation for its people. If they had been more willing to see things clearly and surrender, then the atomic bombings wouldn’t have been necessary. The United States, to this day, has been the only nation to ever drop an atomic bomb on another country. This had endowed us with a perplexing legacy. The sheer
devastation created by atomic explosions can either be used as an example for future warfare, or as a warning to not let something like Hiroshima or Nagasaki ever happen again. The power of atomic warfare and the threat it poses would soon after WWII become essential in the Cold War conflict between the US and the USSR and in the ushering in of the nuclear age. As seen through the actions of such nations such as North Korea, India, Pakistan, and Iran, the issue of atomic weapons and power still plays enormously into global politics today.

I, Cihan Caglayan, give and grant to John Braithwaite, the right to publish my essay on World War II, for the purposes of consultation and good writing model.
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“A World At War”

Does the analysis of a major world event [i.e. WW II] have an easy interpretation to explain why and how it happened? And in the end, is there a justification for what resulted as a consequence? Were Pearl Harbor and Hiroshima easy and specific events to historically interpret as to what was the cause and what were the effects of the war?

In the 1940’s, a world-wide war raged between the Allied powers of the United Kingdom, the United States, and the Soviet Union, and the Axis powers of Germany, Italy and Japan. The war began in 1939; 21 years after the preceding World War I, whose results had greatly impacted this war. World War II was a very complex war. While the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor was the immediate cause of American involvement in the Second World War, there were several underlying causes as well, mostly concerning Japanese and German aggression and the American reaction. There is also a great deal of controversy regarding the results of the war, mainly pertaining to the United States dropping atomic bombs on two Japanese cities; an action which can be justified due to the new ways in which this war was being fought and the new type of enemies who the United States were fighting.

In 1937, the United States passed a Neutrality Act which exemplified American isolationism during World War II. The United States stated that they would not become involved in another world war unless they were attacked. Additionally, the United States wasn’t prepared to fight another large war as their weapons were less advanced than those of the Germans and they had a much smaller army than other countries. Despite its neutral position however, the United States was being indirectly affected by the war since it began. For the first
two years of the war, America stood by as their allies were being “bullied” by Germany. The German troops, which were growing in strength, swept through Europe, taking over Poland, France and most of Western Europe using their newly-developed blitzkrieg warfare. By June of 1940, Britain, our ally, was now fighting this war alone. Furthermore, there had been a great deal of Japanese aggression in Southeast Asia. In the terrible event known as, “The Rape of Nanjing,” the Japanese military tore through Nanjing, China, where they killed and raped thousands of innocent civilians. Could the United States, who had formally considered themselves a “world police” force, just sit idly by while their allies were engaged in this war?

Because the American public was against American involvement in the war, the United States reacted to this aggression passively. Firstly, they offered much aid to Britain through things such as the Atlantic-Charter agreement which offered England free trade with the United States and the Lend-Lease Act in which the United States supplied the Allied forces with war materials. The United States also knew that they couldn’t allow the Japanese to continue their expansion into territories such as Dutch East Indies, British Burma, and French Indochina. To help hinder Japanese power, the United States made Japan’s main exports, steel and scrap iron, illegal. They also cut off Japan’s supply to the resources that they needed, such as oil, and made Japanese credentials in the United States obsolete.

On December 7, 1941, the United States military base, Pearl Harbor, was attacked by the Japanese. (Doc A, C) This attack was devastating to the United States military, as it killed many men and damaged many American planes and ships. The results of this attack were much less destructive to the Japanese attackers, however. (Doc B) In response to the attack, President Franklin D. Roosevelt declared war on the Japanese. (Doc C) While this attack on Pearl Harbor seems to be the sole cause of American involvement in the war, the several other underlying causes of the war played a huge role in America entering this war. Roosevelt knew that America had to take action in this war, and the attack on Pearl Harbor was simply the admission ticket.
World War II was significant in world history because it changed the face of modern warfare. Weapons advanced, aircrafts became more complex, and submarines became increasingly capable. Perhaps the most important technology that this war brought however was the atomic bomb. In 1939, the potential to make such destructive bombs out of Uranium was discovered and reported to President Franklin D. Roosevelt. (Doc K) The bomb was finally completed six years later, in 1945, and the United States was the only country in the world with knowledge and possession of this extremely advanced weapon. (Doc L)

The United States was now faced the decision of whether or not to use the bomb as a weapon of war. If the United States chose to drop the bomb, new technologies would make this less personal. With the advancement of aircrafts came a new type of “war by air.” This type of warfare changed the psychological aspects of war, because it was now possible to kill people without actually seeing the results. The newly developed warfare known as “island hopping” was claiming the lives of many but was bringing few successes. (Doc E) In World War II, it was made clear that the United States was fighting a new kind of enemy. The Axis powers were very power-hungry, resilient, and persistent enemies. Germany had taken advantage of the appeasement policy, and it was apparent that they would stop at nothing to get power. The United States became aware of the true power of German destruction when the concentration camps were discovered by American troops. Japan fought by the belief that they should “fight until the last man is standing.” It seemed as if they would never surrender, and would continue to fight despite all of the destruction to their military. It became evident to the United States that they had to change the way they had been fighting this war and take extreme measures to end it.

If the United States chose to drop the bomb on a military base in Japan, the Japanese military would be left completely powerless and have no choice but to surrender. (Doc M) While the Japanese had been weakened by the constant military attacks by the Allied forces,
there was no signification that they would be surrendering, and the United States had to decide if the only way to end the war would be to drop the bomb. (Doc N)

When President Truman came into office, the decision over whether or not to drop the bomb was placed in his hands. (Doc Q) He eventually decided that the bombs would be used as the first nuclear weapons of war. The first bomb, named “Little Boy,” was dropped on the Japanese city of Hiroshima on August 6, 1945. It killed between 70,000-130,000 civilians. After this bomb was dropped, Japan still hadn’t surrendered, so the United States decided to drop yet another bomb, called Fat Man, on the city Nagasaki three days later. This bomb killed about 45,000 civilians and devastated more than two miles of the city. (Doc P) After the second bomb was dropped, Japan had surrendered and the United States had achieved their goal of ending the war through using the bombs. The Allied powers were victorious in World War II.

The atomic bombs were an extremely controversial issue, as they killed thousands of innocent people and destroyed entire Japanese cities. Japan had chosen to use heavily populated cities as military facilities, so the death of civilians was unavoidable on the American’s part. However, the dropping of these bombs can be justified. Although it was known that the bombs would cause a great deal of causalities, it was the only guarantee to end the war. (Doc Q) Additionally, it saved American lives that could’ve been spared had the war continued. (Doc R) Overall, the atomic bombs were an extremely important part of the chronology of World War II as they ended the war and everything that came with it. (Doc N)

World War II was a war that was both complex and controversial. Its causes and effects were multifaceted and far deeper than they appear to be from the outside. It is evident that Pearl Harbor was not the sole cause of American involvement in the war as the United States had been passively fighting the war in its own country since the beginning. Although American decisions during this war have been questioned throughout history, each of their actions can be justified through a thorough analysis of what else was happening in the war at that time.
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Does the analysis of a major world event [i.e. WW II] have an easy interpretation to explain why and how it happened? And in the end, is there a justification for what resulted as a consequence? Were Pearl Harbor and Hiroshima easy and specific events to historically interpret as to what was the cause and what were the effects of the war?

In the 1930s, the United States embraced isolationism as the ideology for their foreign policy. Following World War I, the United States developed a foreign policy which they hoped would help to isolate them from foreign conflicts. One of these foreign conflicts was the brutality that the Japanese were inflicting upon Chinese citizens. The Japanese hoped to become a colonial power, thus they began attacking Manchuria and China. Confident that the great European powers were too occupied with Hitler and Stalin and that the United States was unprepared for a full-scale war, the Japanese began to attack other Asian nations and territories in the Pacific. The United States did not want to support Japanese actions; therefore, they imposed an embargo on all oil supplies being sent to Japan, resulting in economic and military devastation and eventually Pearl Harbor. Many people may say that Pearl Harbor alone ensured the United States entrance into World War II and the only two uses of atomic weaponry in history, the bombings at Hiroshima and Nagasaki; however, through careful examination of the events preceding Pearl Harbor and those throughout the war, it is quite obvious that the United States involvement in World II is a very complex issue. The United States entering World War II cannot be solely attributed to Pearl Harbor nor can the causes and effects of the bombings of Hiroshima be easily interpreted.
On December 7, 1941, many United States battleships were sitting idly at Ford Island dock in Pearl Harbor, ill prepared for one of the most famous attacks in history in which three hundred sixty Japanese planes bombed the naval base, killing 1,177 men instantly. The total causalities for the United States would ultimately amount to almost four thousand men and the destruction of many of their battleships while the Japanese would sustain less than one hundred deaths (Docs. A and B). When addressing the nation regarding the attack, Franklin Delano Roosevelt informed the Americans that he authorized any means necessary that it would take to overcome the Japanese and stressed the extremities of the “premeditated” attack (Doc. C). However, could this have been the invasion that President Roosevelt had been waiting so patiently for?

Although it is commonly thought that Pearl Harbor was the one and only cause of the United States becoming involved in World War II, there seems that there may have existed other underlying causes. Many people believe that Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the president at the time, yearned for the United States to join the war even prior to Pearl Harbor; unfortunately, many Americans were fearful of becoming involved in another world war. Since the beginning of his presidency, Roosevelt had been watching German and Japanese aggression closely. He feared that the Germans and Japanese military intelligence would surpass that of the United States. He was well aware that the Germans were trying to produce nuclear fission and wanted to make sure that the United States created nuclear reactions before the Germans (Doc. K). By pressuring the Japanese with embargoes, Franklin Delano Roosevelt may have instigated the bombings at Pearl Harbor. The unnecessary embargoes on oil, steel, and scrap iron that the United States placed upon Japan infuriated the Japanese and made our horrible economic circumstances with them worse. Although he claimed that these embargoes were enacted as a result of Japan’s violations concerning the Kellogg-Briand Pact, Roosevelt was looking for a way to join his former allies in the war. He realized that Britain and France were struggling to
protect themselves and that if they lost to Germany, the United States would have very few allies. He was fearful that if this occurred, the United States would no longer remain the global power that it currently was. Another question commonly asked is why Roosevelt chose to place his most important battleships in a naval base that was halfway between the United States and Japan. Could Roosevelt have placed them there in order to create an easy target?

The United States had many naval, political, territorial, and economic interests in the Pacific, such as Guam, Wake Island, the Philippines, and Samoa. On the same day as Pearl Harbor, the Japanese began to bomb Wake Island, the Philippines, and Guam, all important military and naval bases. As the Japanese wreaked havoc on these islands, the United States felt the need to protect their precious territories. Although the Japanese were invading many islands in the Pacific that were not United States territories as well, their conquests did interrupt United States trade in the Pacific. Hadn’t they fought long and hard for these strategic points? The United States was not going to give up without a fight (Doc. E, G, and L).

In addition, many people may argue that the United States was indirectly involved in World War II even before it declared war on Japan. In 1940, Congress ratified the Lend-Lease Act in which the United States could “lend” nations war supplies in exchange for money. Roosevelt chose to allow the Allies to borrow supplies in order to fend off the German army, a completely biased act because everybody was well aware that the British Navy controlled the oceans; the weapons were even accompanied across the Atlantic Ocean by American ships (Doc. K). Another indication of United States involvement in the war, prior to 1941, was the nuclear research that they had been conducting. Since 1939, the United States had been experimenting with nuclear reactions with complete intention to use as protection in means of atomic weaponry (Docs. K and L).

Following Pearl Harbor, the United States entered one of the bloodiest wars in global history. As the war progressed, the United States began to understand the war mentality of the
Japanese. In the Battles of Iwo Jima and Okinawa the United States observed that the Japanese would do anything to win the war, even put civilians in danger (Docs. H and I). They practiced kamikaze warfare, in which young aviators would attack Allied ships and ultimately commit suicide (Doc. H). They placed their most important military bases in densely populated areas and believed that all of Japan should unite to conquer the Americans. It is difficult to fight a nation who is willing to kill their own people in order to win (Doc. J).

As it began to become more clear that the Japanese were not willing to surrender unconditionally and would fight until the last man, the United States decided to make a bold move. After the untimely death of President Roosevelt, Vice President Harry S. Truman was informed of the Manhattan Project and the research that had secretly been being conducted for the past few years. He was notified that Winston Churchill and Roosevelt had already met and agreed that dropping the atomic bombs were measures that needed to be taken in order to destroy Japan militarily and force them to surrender (Doc. L, N, Q, and R). Many generals, as well as President Truman, felt that in order to end the war with the least amount of casualties, Japanese as well as American, the bomb would need to be utilized as soon as possible (Doc. N). They ultimately decided to drop the bomb on four locations, Hiroshima, Nagasaki, Kokura, and Nigata, weather depending (Doc. O). These four locales were chosen because the United States wanted to demonstrate the destruction that their atomic weaponry could inflict and these cities happened to be the homes of millions of people, as well as military installments (Doc. Q). Although many Japanese civilians’ lives would have been saved if they had dropped the bombs on deserted islands, the Japanese probably would not have surrendered and the war may have continued for years, resulting in many more deaths. Had the United States chosen to invade Kyushu as an alternative, the United States as well as the Japanese may have suffered even more astronomical casualties (Doc. M).
When Paul Tibbets dropped the bomb on Hiroshima, it was easy to fly away without thinking about the actual people that were dying as a result; however, although “Little Boy” and “Fat Man” brought about the end of World War II, they would have lasting impacts on the world (Docs. L, P, and R). Currently, the radiation released from the bombs still effects Japan today. Following the bombings many people died from illnesses caused by radiation such as Leukemia and other cancers and many women gave birth to children suffering from abnormalities. Ultimately, Hiroshima and Nagasaki ushered in a nuclear age in which countries competed to create nuclear weapons. Eventually, the USSR and the United States would participate in a silent battle, the Cold War.

Although the United States’ entrance into World War II is a complex and multi-faceted issue, many people will agree that whereas the United States lost more than one million men, many more soldiers as well as civilians would have died had the bombs not been dropped and had the Americans invaded Kyushu; furthermore the war may have continued much longer than six years. No matter how a person chooses to interpret Pearl Harbor and Hiroshima, it is quite apparent that the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki terminated World War II, the bloodiest war known to man at the time.

I, Jaclyn Spiegel, give and grant to John Braithwaite, the right to publish my essay on World War II, for the purposes of consultation and good writing model.

Signed Jaclyn Spiegel
Date April 11, 2007
FDR and the New Deal

Franklin Delano Roosevelt had assumed the presidency in March 1933 during a time of great despair. But his willingness to experiment and to institute change offered hope to the millions of people trapped in the depression. His New Deal, which some believe went far beyond traditional reforms, included numerous legislations for financial recovery such as the Emergency Banking Act, relief for the unemployed such as the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), farm production control programs, and others. Eventually, forces from both the left and the right pushed Roosevelt to implement further legislations in his Second New Deal, such as the Works Progress Administration and, most importantly, the Social Security Act. Although historians continue to debate whether the New Deal should be characterized as a conservative, liberal, or socialist program, it is clear that this was merely a response to meet society’s needs and to provide for the “general welfare of the people.”

Roosevelt’s first inaugural address, with his famous quote, “the only thing we have to fear is fear itself” (Doc. B) brought a new style to the American presidency. His ebullient personality together with his promise to take immediate action assured Americans of a possibility for change, unlike Hoover, who was unable to produce policies to deal effectively with the crisis caused by the Great Depression. Using the radio to present his “fireside chats,” Roosevelt was able to communicate directly to the people regarding his programs. One was the “bank holiday,” which was created to alleviate the panic caused by the banking crisis in 1933 when banks failed as depositors flocked to withdraw their funds. Roosevelt explained that the banks would be reopened after allowing time for the government to organize banking-reform legislations. The result was the Emergency Banking Act which authorized inspection of banks prior to reopening and the Economy Act that cut the salaries of government employees and
reduced pensions of veterans in order to balance the federal budget. Though the bills may be seen as a conservative approach, this was just a first step toward relief from a financial crisis; Roosevelt wanted Americans to feel assured when putting their money in a reopened bank. In addition to the passage of these measures, further programs were enacted that corresponded to the three R’s of Roosevelt’s New Deal philosophy, as mentioned in his fireside chat of 1934: relief for the unemployed, recovery for agriculture, industry, and the economy as a whole, and reform for workers, farmers, or others in need of government help (Doc. Y).

Roosevelt’s first step was relief. Following the Great Depression, the number of those unemployed was at a percentage never before seen in history. According to The Coming of the New Deal, nearly “thirteen million Americans – about one quarter of the Labor force” were searching for jobs (Doc. H). To offer assistance, the president established projects such as the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), putting millions of young men to work in reforestation, road building, and flood control. Another celebrated accomplishment was the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) which was an experiment in regional development. People were to work at the Tennessee Valley building dams, operating electric plants, controlling flooding, and improving farm productivity. The TVA also helped sell electricity to residents at reasonable rates compared to those charged by private utility companies. Relief to the unemployed may not have been the most important task in the Roosevelt administration, but the programs were a source of thousands of jobs for those struggling to survive.

The second step was recovery. To stabilize prices within industries, the National Recovery Administration (NRA) was established under the leadership of Hugh Johnson. Antitrust laws were relaxed to helped industry set codes for wages, work hours, and production levels, also giving workers the “right of self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organization, to bargain collectively...” (Doc. D). The codes brought stability to the failing economy but did not bring instant recovery partly because administering such a vast program
was difficult especially with officials who had no experience. Industrial production also declined regardless of the rise in prices the codes had produced. This led to many critics who charged that the codes maintained prices at artificially high levels and promoted monopoly. In 1935 the United States Supreme Court declared the NRA unconstitutional in the case of Schechter vs. United States. Thurman W. Arnold stated his beliefs upon the NRA’s failure: “[Roosevelt] had tried regulation by businessmen in cooperation with the government under the NRA. [Its] failure, I think, convinced him that antitrust enforcement must be a vital part of the nation’s economic future…” (Doc. O). In agriculture, a similar policy was enacted. The Agricultural Adjustment Administration (AAA) aimed at raising prices by lowering production. It helped raise farm commodities, making the agricultural economy more stable compared to the years before. But it favored only the larger farmers over the smaller ones because of the control of powerful producers. In the end, the AAA was also declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. Despite the efforts of the NRA and the AAA, the economy had not undergone any significant changes. Seeing no end to the Depression, the public fiercely criticized the New Deal.

Most attacks came from the right – conservative critics who charged that the program gave the federal government too much power, interfering with free enterprise. As Norman Thomas wrote in The New Deal: No Program Security, “The old automatic control or adjustments of capitalism have completely gone. The Government interferes and must steadily interfere, to do something to re-divide the mild…” (Doc. S). Together they formed an anti-New Deal organization called the American Liberty League to arouse opposition to the almost dictatorial policies of the president. “…the office of President had been altered beyond recognition as Mr. Roosevelt exercised the powers of a dictator,” Edgar Robinson explained in The Roosevelt Leadership. “The constitution had been given deep wounds by his procedures” (Doc. K). Critics of the left believed that the New Deal accomplished too little for the unemployed or the impoverished, also failing to address the problems of people such as
minorities, women, or the elderly. Furthermore, demagogues such as Father Charles E. Coughlin, Dr. Townsend, and Huey Long together received national followings for their immediate solutions for ending what they believe to be the New Deal “conspiracies.” Coughlin, through his radio broadcasts, proposed monetary reforms like the issue of greenbacks and the nationalization of the banking system to ensure economic justice. His attacks were known to be anti-Semitic and Fascist, producing wide audiences in America. Dr. Townsend, after proposing a plan for federal pensions for the elderly, immediately rose to obscurity. Under the plan, those over the age of sixty would receive pensions of $200 a month if they retired and spent their money promptly. Townsend hoped that this would add needed funds into the economy. His idea eventually persuaded Roosevelt to create a similar plan of his own: the Social Security system, approved in 1935. Most shocking of all was Huey Long, the “Kingfish” from Louisiana. He proposed the Share-Our-Wealth program, a kind of wealth redistribution method which promised a minimum income of $5,000 per family to be paid for by taxing the wealthy. As a result of such forces, Roosevelt launched the Second New Deal. He was pushed into a more radical position, implementing new legislations with a new direction in mind.

The Second New Deal focused on new directions in relief and reform. Like the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) and other relief efforts earlier, the Works Progress Administration (WPA) provided jobs for the unemployed. A much larger agency than those of the first New Deal, the WPA, under the direction of Harry Hopkins, employed millions of men and women. Together, they helped with the construction of bridges, roads, airports, and other buildings. In addition, the National Youth Administration (NYA), which was part of the WPA, provided part-time jobs to the young in order for them to stay in school. For the reform legislation of the Second New Deal, Roosevelt focused on workers and farmers who needed more government assistance than those of the business classes. The Social Security Act, which would set an important precedent for the future, created several programs. It provided for unemployment
compensation financed by a federal tax on payrolls. It also created a federal insurance program funded by a tax shared equally between employers and employees. The elderly poor, disabled, and dependent children and their mothers were also benefited from the act. Because of his style of leadership and his popularity among workers and farmers, Roosevelt was elected a second term. However, controversies on the president’s programs still existed. Critics charged to the point that the Second New Deal programs such as the WPA were socialist or even communist. Schlesinger, in *The Coming of the New Deal*, wrote that the program “promoted personal government, capricious and vengeful, leading ultimately to the establishment of despotism if not of Communism” (Doc. L). Despite the attacks, in what was known as the greatest landslide in American history, the Union Party (which included the alliance of Coughlin and Townsend) and the Republican party nominee Alf Landon proved no match for a broad Democratic coalition of farmers, working classes, and especially African Americans who left the Republican party of Lincoln in favor of Roosevelt, who had avoided civil rights initiatives and provided them with unemployment relief and access to newly created agencies like the NYA.

Following the reelection of 1936, Roosevelt concentrated on the problem of the Supreme Court. Twice, the Supreme Court had declared legislations unconstitutional: the NRA and the AAA. To prevent the Court from being a future obstacle to his legislations, Roosevelt proposed a “court-packing” bill that would allow the president to appoint an additional justice for each current justice older than a certain age, claiming the courts were overworked and therefore needed an expanded membership to handle their load. Six new justices were added to the Court, allowing him to appoint liberal justices to change the balance of the court. This enraged conservatives who saw him as a dictator and his action as disturbing the system of checks and balances. Ironically, the justices backed away from their resistance to his program and upheld the constitutionality of laws that included the Social Security Act. The change in the Court’s position made the bill unnecessary, and it was eventually defeated. Roosevelt’s plan had sadly
amounted to a great blunder in his political career, as Democrats and conservatives gradually turned against his measures. Even more devastating was the “Roosevelt recession” of 1937-1938 caused by the Social Security tax and, at the same time, the reduction of government spending. This brought the economy to an immediate downturn. Once again, millions of workers lost their jobs. Although a tentative recovery was made after government funds began pouring into public works and relief programs once again, the New Deal had come to an end, as the nation faced another crisis: World War II.

Today, historians continue to debate whether the New Deal is a conservative, liberal, or even a socialist program. Some saw Roosevelt as a conservative man who, as Frank Freidel wrote, “…ardently endorsed states rights and small government in a truly Jeffersonian way” and believed that the government must intervene in order to protect the individual (Doc. A). The New Deal was also conservative in purpose, seen in the president’s initial aim at forming a program that was “as old as the earliest aspirations of humanity for liberty and justice and the good life” (Doc. I). Liberal historians such as Carl Degler argued Roosevelt was conservative at heart but his program was “a revolutionary response to a revolutionary situation” (Doc. I). This “Third American Revolution,” in responding to conditions of poverty and unemployment, went far beyond earlier reforms. In the programs of relief, recovery, and reform, the New Deal brought a kind of revolution in the role of government. It provided, among others, work for the unemployed, minimum wages and maximum hours for workers, rise in farm prices, electricity in rural America, public projects, regional planning, and old-age security. It put limits on free market and enhanced the power of the federal government. It also brought a revolution in politics, with a Democratic coalition that would last for decades. Others went further and argued that the New Deal adapted policies of the Socialist Party. They called the New Deal a “dangerous and tragic error” and believed the policies even followed “closely the Communist philosophy of Karl Marx” (Doc. G). But whatever the outlook is, the New Deal was merely a
response during a time of great need. Roosevelt did his best using his personal ideas while facing the realities of the time.

Roosevelt had taken great steps to relieve the public of the distress of the Great Depression, of unemployment and poverty. But the New Deal failed to end the depression. Unemployment rates remained high and the economy was essentially the same as it had been before. As summarized by Rosenman, the program consisted of “inconsistencies of methods, inconsistencies caused by ceaseless efforts to find ways to solve problems for the future as well as for the present...But...there also will be found a consistency and continuity of broad purpose” (Doc. E). This was the purpose of protecting the country during a time of economic crisis as well as providing for the “general welfare of the country and its citizens” (Doc F). As a result, only through experimentation and failures will the New Deal help guide the nation towards a more effective policy in the future.
**DBQ: FDR & the New Deal**

For the period of Franklin Roosevelt’s twelve years in office, he became more central to the life of the nation than any chief executive before him. By constructing a series of programs that permanently altered the federal government and its relationship to society, the New Deal created many of the broad outlines of the political world that exists today. The New Deal extended national regulation over new areas of the economy, presided over the birth of the modern labor movement, and became a major force in the agricultural economy. Roosevelt also projected an infectious optimism that helped alleviate the growing despair and through his “fireside chats” Roosevelt explained his programs and plans to the people which helped build public confidence in the administration. (Document Y) During the Great Depression of the 1930s, Roosevelt created the New Deal to provide relief for the unemployed, recovery of the economy, and reform of the economic system. Roosevelt’s desire to help change the lives of the nation is shown in *The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin Delano Roosevelt* when he expresses his hopes that through the New Deal program it will “help our people gain a larger social justice.” (Document E) In order to suppress the problems of depression and war that America was facing, Roosevelt became the strident supporter of his socialist program, the New Deal, which changed the nation and its policies forever.

During the term of President Herbert Hoover, the American public believed that the President had forgotten them because of his reluctance to provide relief for the unemployed. For this reason, when Roosevelt became President in 1932 many believed that Roosevelt would make a better president than Hoover, “chiefly because he is not afraid of a new idea.” (Document A) During his inaugural address he assured the American people that “the only thing we have to fear is fear
itself,” and guaranteed the nation that the primary task of his presidency was to put the people back to work while creating provisions for an adequate but sound currency. (Document B) On March 6, two days after taking office, Roosevelt issued a proclamation closing all American banks for four days until Congress could meet in special session to consider banking-reform legislation. During this “bank holiday” Roosevelt sent to Congress the Emergency Banking Act which was designed primarily to protect the larger banks from being dragged down by the weakness of smaller ones. The bill provided for the Treasury Department to inspect all banks before they would be allowed to reopen and gave federal assistance to some of the troubled institutions. In addition, Roosevelt sent to Congress the Economy Act which proposed to balance the federal budget by cutting the salaries of government employees and reducing pensions to veterans by as much as 15 percent. Within a month the immediate banking crisis was over due to the reopening of three quarters of the banks in the Federal Reserve System and the $1 billion in hoarded currency and gold that flowed back into them.

As the nation steadily became more confident in the economy, Roosevelt began to attack the increasing disparity between the prices of agricultural and other commodities that destroyed the purchasing power of farmers for industrial products. (Document C) In order to achieve this, Roosevelt created the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which Congress passed in May 1933. The most important feature of the AAA was its provision for reducing crop production to end agricultural surpluses and halt the downward spiral of farm prices. The government, through the AAA would tell individual farmers how much they should produce and would pay them subsidies for leaving some of their land idle. The goal of the AAA was to subsidize farm prices up to the point of parity. The AAA helped bring about a rise in prices for farm commodities in the years after 1933. Gross farm income increased by half in the first three years of the New Deal, and the agricultural economy as a whole emerged from the 1930s much more stable and prosperous that it hand been in many years. Also in response to the urging of the United States Chamber of Commerce to adopt an antideflation scheme that would permit trade associations to cooperate in stabilizing within their industries the Roosevelt administrations created the National Recovery Administration. The NRA called on every
business establishment in the nation to accept a temporary “blanket code” that would give workers a minimum wage of between 30 and 40 cents an hour, a maximum workweek of forty hours, and the abolition of child labor. At the same time, the NRA negotiated another, more specific set of codes with leaders of the nation’s major industries. These industrial codes set floors below which no company would lower prices or wages in its search for a competitive advantage, and the included provisions for maintaining employment and production. However when the NRA collapsed due to the failure of administrators to enforce the codes, Roosevelt was convinced that antitrust enforcement needed to be a vital part of the nation’s economic future which led to Roosevelt’s antimonopoly crusade in 1938. (Document O)

When Roosevelt took office in 1933, “the national income was less than half of what it had been four short years before” and nearly “thirteen million Americans were desperately seeking jobs.” (Document H) Although the Roosevelt administration did not consider relief to the unemployed its most important task, it recognized the necessity of doing something to help impoverished Americans survive. In response, Roosevelt created several relief programs which included the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, the Civil Works Administration, and the Civilian Conservation Corps. Through these acts the government began providing cash grants to states to prop up bankrupt relief agencies, put more than 4 million people to work on temporary projects, and pumped money into an economy badly in need of it while providing assistance to people with nowhere else to turn. Roosevelt’s favorite relief project, the CCC, was designed to provide employment to the millions of young men who could find no jobs in the cities. The CCC created camps in national parks and forests and in other rural and wilderness settings which gave millions of young men jobs in government programs that planted trees, built reservoirs, developed parks, and improved agricultural irrigation.

Despite many conservative views that attempted to “protect the system of private property and free enterprise by correcting such injustices and inequalities as arise from it,” Roosevelt believed that the “most serious threat to our institutions comes from those who refuse to face the need for change.” (Document M) In 1935, Roosevelt launched the Second New Deal in response to the
growing political pressures and the continuing economic crisis. Prior to the Second New Deal, many groups including the American Liberty League began to arouse public opposition to the New Deal’s “dictatorial” policies and its supposed attacks on free enterprise. (Document G) Despite these attacks the new proposals continued to attack corporations more aggressively due to the administration’s new attitude toward big business. The President was now willing to attack corporate interests openly. In “The New Deal in Review,” it states that during the Second New Deal, Roosevelt fought for the idea that “the individual must not bear the sole responsibility for his failure to cope with economic problems of unemployment or old age which are, quite obviously, beyond his powers, and that society as a whole must take over a substantial part of the burden.” (Document F)

When a group of progressives in Congress led by Robert E. Wagner introduced what became known as the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, it provided workers with a crucial enforcement mechanism missing from the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933. The NLRB had the power to compel employers to recognize and bargain with legitimate unions which led to the emergence of a powerful trade union movement in the 1930s. In the U.S. Statutes At Large, XLIX, it states that “employees shall have the right of self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organization, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing” and states that it is unfair for an employer, to restrain employees from joining unions, to dominate with the formation of labor organizations and to refuse to bargain collectively with the representatives of his employees. (Document D) Due to these new laws supporting unions, it resulted in an increased militancy of American workers and their leaders. Business leaders and industrialists lost the ability to control government policies which led to new and more militant labor organizations emerging to challenge the established, relatively conservative unions.

In 1935, Roosevelt gave public support to what became the Social Security Act, which Congress passed the same year. From the first moments of the New Deal, important members of the administration had been lobbying for a system of federally sponsored social insurance for the elderly and the unemployed. The Social Security System would give the elderly who were presently destitute up to $15 a month in federal system and would incorporate Americans presently working
into a pension system, to which they and their employers would contribute by paying a payroll tax. In addition, the Social Security Act created a system of unemployment insurance, which employers alone would finance and which made it possible for workers laid off from their jobs to receive temporary government assistance. The government also passed the GI Bill of Rights in 1944 which gave soldiers the right to a paid education after service which included cost of tuition, books, other living expenses, and “while enrolled in and pursuing a course under this part, such person shall be paid a subsistence allowance of $50 per month, if without a dependent, or $75 a per month, if he has a dependent.” (Document V) Also in the chart of Return on Investment in GI Bill of Right it shows that for every $1 invested into the program, the government would give $6.90 in order to send GIs to college which shows the government’s involvement in the plan. (Document X) The New Deal was also more sympathetic to African Americans than any previous government of the twentieth century. Through the urging of Eleanor Roosevelt, “black complaints against the New Deal programs received a hearing at the White House, and in 1935 the president agreed to sign an executive order barring discrimination in administration of WPA projects and from that point on, the Negro’s share in the New Deal expanded.” (Document T) The president himself appointed a number of blacks to significant second-level positions in his administration. These appointees became know as the ”Black Cabinet” which made efforts to ensure that New Deal relief programs did not exclude blacks; and by 1935, a quarter of all African Americans were receiving some form of government assistance.

“During the 1920’s and the 1930’s intellectuals in the United States were overwhelmingly persuaded that capitalism was a defective system inhibiting economic well-being and thereby freedom, and that the hope for the future lay in a greater measure of deliberate control by political authorities over economic affairs.” (Document N) For this reason when President Roosevelt took office he began to exercise his “powers of a dictator” in order to put an end to the depression that was harming the nation. For this reason, many Americans found themselves committed to attributes of a collectivist state that was influenced by a Socialist philosophy. (Document K) Many of the New Deal programs which included the AAA, CCC, NLRB, Social Security Act and the GI BILL
included many socialist ideas because it helped the poor while diminishing the power of the rich. However, despite criticism of the New Deal, “the New Deal, even in its second term has clearly done far more for the general welfare of the country and its citizens than any administration in the history of the nation.” (Document F) In order to suppress the problems of depression and war that America was facing, Roosevelt became the strident supporter of his socialist program, the New Deal, which changed the nation and its policies forever.
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- **Thesis**—Position is clear, argued well, and developed with outside information
  - Well developed and clearly focused (8-9)
  - Clear and adequate (5-7)
  - Confused, limited, or missing (2-4)
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- **Document Usage**—accurate, applicable, and interpreted correctly:
  - Sophisticated use of a substantial number of documents (8-9)
  - Several documents used, may be more descriptive than analytical (5-7)
  - Few documents used, significant errors in document interpretation (2-4)
  - No document used, obvious misunderstanding of documents (0-1)

- **Critical Thought**—deep, open, & clear for the readers
  - Strong interpretation and analysis (8-9)
  - Limited or superficial analysis, mostly descriptive (5-7)
  - Limited or no understanding of the question (2-4)
  - Shows a complete lack of understanding (0-1)

- **Evidence**—Facts, conclusions, & arguments are sound
  - Abundant, appropriate, dealing with all aspects of question (8-9)
  - Uses some factual information (5-7)
  - Superficial or missing supporting information (2-4)
  - Little or no evidence (0-1)

- **Writing Style**—Fluency, Form, & Correctness:
  - Well organized and well written (8-9)
  - Acceptable organization and writing (5-7)
  - Weak organization and/or poorly written (2-4)
  - May be incomprehensible (0-1)

- **Error Level**—Grammar, Mechanics, Content, & Logical
  - No errors or errors are insignificant (8-9)
  - May contain minor errors (5-7)
  - May contain major errors (2-4)
  - Has substantial factual errors (0-1)
Origins, Policies, & Procedures of the Populist Party

The Populist Party had its origins in the problems affecting farmers in the post-Reconstruction South and West of the late 1870’s. Southern farmers were subjugated by an economic system that not only governed their very lives, but it prevented them from advancing both economically and socially. This process was known as the crop lien system, was employed by merchants. Under the crop lien system, a farmer in need of supplies bought them on credit from his local merchant who consistently overcharged the farmer. The farmer used the proceeds from the sale of crops to repay the merchant, but invariably, the amount owed exceeded the amount made. The merchant would satisfy the farmer’s remain debt by taking ownership of the farmer’s future crops, which, since the farmer needed more supplies, perpetuated and compounded the debt. Ostensibly, the merchants provided ways for farmers to reduce their debt, but these means were unachievable or impractical. Because the farmers lacked any other means to sustain their business, the crop lien system can be viewed as legal for of economic slavery! The merchants designed the system so that the chances of a farmer ever paying off his debt were impossible. Although the Populist Party would fail as a political
institution, it proved that it could help to create the conditions of a more equal America.

Due to the impoverished living conditions of a majority of farmers—both South and West—it was difficult to pursue a stable livelihood and escape the debilitating economic condition of their livelihood. Finally, a group of farmers from Lampasas County, Texas formed “The Knights of Reliance” an obvious extension of labor movement’s Knight of Labor! The Knights of Reliance changed their name to “The Farmers Alliance” in 1876 and became the foundation for other Alliance groups in the South and West to grow in response to the anger of the merchant exploitation, the control of the federal government, and the corporations which they claimed, failed to protect their economic interests. There was a consensus among the members of the Alliance that in order to achieve reform they must work within the system. To do this, the farmers needed a powerful unifying leader who not only the interests of common man at heart, but could also serve as a successful politician. S.O. Daws was the early leader. He became one of many who would champion the cause of the Populist Movement.

Daws, was the first of the fathers of the Populist Party because he helped transform a group of uneducated farmers into a widespread political movement. He was able to appoint other organizers and lecturers who traveled in rural areas promoting the Alliance beliefs. Following the convention, the farmers became more determined to voice their opinions and reform the oppressive nature of the
crop lien system. To combat the crop lien system, Daws proposed the trade store system where all the farmers in a general location would deal with only one merchant. The merchants feared that the Alliance would grow and eventually accomplish its goals of reforming the corrupt practices of the merchants. The Alliance preached not only about the corruption of credit merchants, but also the general corruption of the federal government and the corporations.

Daws’ persuasive and intelligent argument drew in new leaders, one of whom was William Lamb. Lamb’s main economic proposal was to have the farmers in a general and combined their yearly harvests, sell them en masse, and distribute the profits evenly. The Populists’ success was a powerful recruiting tool: farmers who had been dubious about the Alliance’s legitimacy saw that if they unified, they could redress the injustices affecting the farming community.

Although, the Populist Party did not last beyond 1900, its reforms continue to influence constitutional government to this day. Most important of the suggestions by Populists were political and economic in nature. On the political front they proposed the Australian [secret] Ballot, the favored women to have the right to vote, the proposed three major and successful Amendment to the Constitution in—the Sixteentht, Seventeenth, Eighteenth Amendments. They believe in common man government and democracy. In addition to the constitutional reforms, they championed the direct democracy of recall elections,
referendums, and imitative petitions. Farmers felt this was fair and would help to eliminate corruption.

Populist believed that lobbyist had too much power! They wanted access to congressmen, mayors, governors and the like.

It was in the area of economic reforms that the Populists made their greatest impact. The single most important economic issue, according to the Populist Party, was the issue of free silver. The debate over the gold standard was in the forefront of all political debate. Deflation of currency was a major problem for the farmers. It has been argued that the Populist Platform of 1892 was the single most significant political document since the writing of the Constitution. The terrible depression of 1893 left millions unemployed and in need. Although, the Populist never achieved their goal of every person with a pension, the Social Security Board, of the New Deal Years, completed their advocacy of economic security and protection.

Much of the economic motives of the Populists were achieved after the Depression of 1929, when the New Deal provided jobs to stimulate the economy and protect the nations corps of workers. One of the leading New Deal agencies was the Agricultural Adjustment Act (AAA) which in essence paid farmers not to grow excess crops. This attempt by the New Deal was certainly a Populist idea in origin and content.
The Populist Party did more than propose reforms to economically benefit the lower class. It gave them a strong voice in political, constitutional, and governmental equality. When the movement became political and transformed from a group of farmers in a region, to a structured organized party, it was clear that the Populists Party could provide its members with representation, stability, and a policy of fairness in the eyes of the government and the people. Although, not all of the Populist programs were passed, the Populists transformed American politics by showing that the farmers when the united, could make a difference in helping all Americans to create fairness for its citizens.
The Transformation of Manifest Destiny

On the night of February 15, 1898 the U.S. battleship Maine exploded in Havana Harbor, killing 266 American seamen. For the American public, the loss of over two hundred servicemen by Spanish sabotage was an outrage to the American nation that could not be tolerated. For years the American people and press had been calling for intervention in the Caribbean as a humanitarian crusade against the Spanish. In the ensuing four months of fighting the context of the war would transform dramatically from its initial humanitarian grounds to one of American expansion. The Spanish-American War (1898) was a conflict that gave birth to a grand American vision. [A vision of national and international expansion and control]. The principles of the Monroe Doctrine of (1823) and the popular notion of Manifest Destiny, established in the 1840’s [by John L. O’Sullivan] were major underlying factors in the war. However, Manifest Destiny became intertwined with a new perception of American expansion. After the Spanish-American War, Manifest Destiny did not represent the singular notion of foreign annexation; rather, it glorified the expansion of American financial interests and American governmental practices and principles. The American perception of foreign policy no longer held the goal of pacifying territory for American population, but
supported the development of fledgling countries through American financial and political backing.

America’s war with Spain at the turn of the nineteenth century was a result of an American political stance rooted in foreign affairs since 1823 with the intellectual thinking of Benjamin Rush and John Quincy Adams, who in turn persuaded James Monroe, to adopt it as American national policy. In President Monroe’s seventh annual address to Congress on December 2, 1823, America’s position concerning the Western Hemisphere was presented to the world. During the Napoleonic war (1803-1815), Spain’s dominion over her South American colonies collapsed. The age of revolution came upon the Latin American countries under Simon Bolivar, San Martin, O’Higgins, and Rosas. The void of Spanish power in the new world gave birth to the republics of Columbia, Chile, Peru, Argentina, and Brazil. European powers were eager to exploit the economic opportunities of the new South American governments, while Spain, attempted to convince old allies to assist Spain in a war against here former colonies. Britain, eager to rule out European competitors, proposed that the United States and England discourage France and Spain from military intervention. President Monroe did not want monarchial government to return to South America. Monroe’s address to Congress, the President asserted that America would no longer tolerate European colonization or political intervention in the new world. The single sentence says it all: “the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered subjects for the future colonization by any European powers.”
In regards to American foreign policy, the Monroe Doctrine separated Europe from the Western Hemisphere.

Although the Monroe Doctrine constituted the foundation of American foreign policy at the turn of the nineteenth century, America’s descent into armed conflict with Spain was the result of popular perception as it was foreign policy. Since the conclusion of the Mexican-American War of 1848, the idea of Manifest Destiny became a staple of American culture. Manifest Destiny was not a clearly defined governmental policy of national initiative. Coined by journalist John L. O’Sullivan in 1845, Manifest Destiny presented America as a nation of limitless progress. The “infallibility” of this train of thought was derived from the idea that the Constitution’s founding principles of equality and freedom would drive the United States to succeed above all other powers.

The Spanish-American War (1898) served as catalyst, coming the principles of the Monroe Doctrine with expansionist ambition and missionary zeal embodied in the tradition notion of Manifest Destiny.

Ironically, following the Civil War, American intervention in Cuba became the solution for the cessation of humanitarian injustices. In 1896 Prime Minister Antonio Canovas del Castillo ordered that a concentration camp policy be put into place in the Cuban countryside. Despite the concentration initiative, the rebellion continued, and the camps were denounced as cruel and useless by an increasingly aware American public. Anti-Spanish public sentiment was intensified by slanted publications in American newspapers, notably the *New York World* and *New York Journal*, which published tales of atrocities while leaving tales of rebel brutality largely unnoticed.
The possibility of peace and Cuban independence arose in August, 1897. Prime Minister Canovas was assassinated, granting power to Mateo Sagasta. The liberal prime minister made it clear to the rebels and the United States that he was willing to negotiate. President McKinley remained faithful that negotiations with Sagasta would avoid war. Although prospects of peace remained probable, by early 1898, public outrage had transformed into an official declaration of war.

The de Lome letter crisis in February, 1898, dashed hopes of further negotiations with the Spanish government. Following the acquisition and publication of the de Lome letter, McKinley was forced into the difficult position of upholding his reputation as an active, decisive president while deliberating on America’s stance regarding Cuba. Whether McKinley supported America’s march to war in early 1898 is unclear. McKinley did not maintain any memoirs and rarely expressed his feeling or opinions in writing. The McKinley foreign policy was called “amateurish” the void of foreign political expertise was sought by Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Theodore Roosevelt, who would later drive American foreign policy into the age of American Imperialism.

American supremacy during the four months of fighting was largely due to a recently expanded and revitalized America navy. The conflict provided a proving ground for the one hundred and eleven American naval vessels sailing in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. The drastic difference between the American and Spanish fleets was demonstrated on May 1, 1898 at the Battle of Manila Bay. In a matter of hours, Admiral Dewey, with his seven warships, obliterated forty-seven Spanish vessels in and around Manila.
American naval victories in the Pacific and Atlantic oceans we the notion of Manifest Destiny to the importance of a powerful American naval presence. This would eloquently be proclaimed by Adm. Alfred Thayer Mahan. McKinley argued, that “We need Hawaii just as much and a good deal more than we did California. It is Manifest Destiny!

The Spanish-American was remarkably short, and overwhelmingly decisive. In just four months of combative conflict (April-August) controlled four new external territories—Cuba, Philippines, Guam, and Puerto Rico. The Congress passed the Teller Amendment which...would ensure the withdrawal of the American military once the occupying Spanish forces were defeated.

The disregard for Filipino involvement in the invasion of Manila in 1898, added insult to injury. Tension in and around the port city of Manila between the American occupying forces and Filipino revolutionaries became a guerilla war for Filipino Independence. From 1899 to 1902, Emilio Aguinaldo led the resistance in a deadly clash against the American forces. At the height of the conflict, 70,000 American soldiers were stationed in the Philippines. Whereas America’s crusade against the Spanish resulted in 379 deaths of American servicemen, stabling an American presence in the Philippines claimed the lives 4,234 American soldiers. Manifest Destiny, the founding ideal of limitless American expansion and progress, became intertwined with the nation’s expanding economic and political role in world affairs. The proposal of the restrictive Platt Amendment in the legislative and executive branches alike, show the imperialist principles and tastes. After the Spanish-American War, the United States began to walk the fine line between the priorities of western sovereignty, embodied in the Monroe Doctrine, and America’s inevitable
expansion in the Pacific and international arena in general through Manifest Destiny. Through America’s war with Spain, the nation became a self-entrusted world power, and the ideal of Manifest Destiny shifted with this perception. Not only was Manifest Destiny engrained in the popular perception of the American people, the perception of the nation’s destined progress would never be the same!