

SELECTED THEMES IN THE HISTORY OF USA

Author

Dr. S. NATARAJAN

Assistant Professor (T)

Department of History

Manonmaniam Sundaranar University

Tirunelveli – Tamil Nadu



**DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
MANONMANIAM SUNDARANAR UNIVERSITY
DIRECTORATE OF DISTANCE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION
TIRUNELVELI – TAMIL NADU -627 012.**

December - 2025

Sl.No	Unit	Content	Page No
1	I	Sectional Conflict - Civil War- Abraham Lincoln – Reconstruction – The Civil Rights Act- 14 th Amendment - Carpet Baggers – Scalawags – Black Codes.	1-36
2	II	Westward Movements -Industrialization and the Rise of Big Business – Growing Pains of Urbanization - Politics in the Gilded Age.	37-100
3	III	The Progressive Era – McKinley- Spanish American War – Theodore - Roosevelt - Square Deal- William Howard Taft - Dollar Diplomacy - Woodrow Wilson – New Freedom – First World War	101-190
4	IV	Inter - War Years - Great Depression – Franklin D. Roosevelt – New Deal – Second World War - Cold war – Truman Doctrine - Eisenhower– John F. Kennedy – Lyndon B. Johnson - Civil Rights Movement – Martin Luther King - Richard Nixon – Vietnam War	191-292
5	V	Contemporary USA - Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan – George Herbert Walker Bush . – Bill Clinton – George Walker Bush – War on terrorism - Barrack Obama – Multiculturalism - Popular Culture - The Afro- Americans Experience - Hispanics and Asians.	293-373
		References	374

Unit- I

Sectional Conflict - Civil War- Abraham Lincoln – Reconstruction (1865-1877) – The Civil Rights Act- 14th Amendment - Carpet Baggers – Scalawags – Black Codes General Causes:

Objectives

- To understand the roots of **sectional conflict** the North and the South.
- To the **Civil War** and **Abraham Lincoln** in preserving the Union.
- To examine **Reconstruction (1865–1877)**.
- To the impact of Reconstruction policies on **freed slaves** Southern society.

Causes of the Civil War were centred on sectionalism – conflict between the national and sectional interests. Nature divided the United States into separate geographical areas, where climate, soil and produce differed from each other. These different territories were inhabited severally by aggressive, independent and adventurous populations, belonging to various national groups of Europe. This brought into extended a situation in which the national and sectional interests worked against each other. In an attempt to effect reconciliation between the two interests the federal principles in the Constitution were evolved- yet the situation of rivalry was not removed. When the national legislations did not agree with local aspirations the states advocated the theory of stat rights. The Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions against the Alien and Sedition Acts and South Carolina Exposition against the tariff laws of President Jackson – which raised the nullification controversy – represented the attempts of the states to assert their independent views. This trend gained strength on the issue of slavery. In fact the civil war represented the culmination of the divisive forces were at work.

More basic than the independent attitude of people was the economic conflict between the North and the South. Industrial Revolution transformed the north into an industrial and commercial society. It created a capitalist class of merchants, trade, insurance banking and foreign exchange. In a bid to protect and promote their interests they demanded protective tariff, a national bank, liberal interpretation of the Constitution, a strong central government and internal improvements like railways to link the East with the West. The southerners, on the other hand, were agriculturists and landlords. They raised cotton, tobacco and other basic raw materials and marketed them to northern states

and foreign countries. They bought most of the imported goods, paying unnecessarily high prices because of the tariff. In consequence the aristocrats of the South felt that they produced the basic wealth of the nation but were exploited by the northern financiers. In an attempt to safeguard their interests they opposed protective tariff, national bank, liberal interpretation of the Constitution and internal improvements that were aimed all inking the East and the West. The issues were old, for in this conflict between the respective principles, upheld by Hamilton and Jefferson. As years passed by, this contradiction became institution-aliased, as that between the Whigs and the Democrats and as that between the North and the South.

The issue of slavery as the label of the conflict between the industrial system of the North and the agricultural system of the South. Many an American attributed the conflict of moral and sentimental opposition to slavery. No doubt there were a few whites, particularly certain Quakers, who opposed slavery on moral grounds, but the version that the war broke out because of slavery is not true to reality. The slave was the victim of the sectional conflict in the United States and not the cause of it. It was evident that the Americans treated the native Indian population with the utmost ferocity. It is wrong to assume that they suddenly turned into humanitarians and developed love for the blacks. Secondly, if the blacks were looked down with hatred and subjected to ill-treatment in the South, it was equally so in the North. Thirdly, President Lincoln never made slavery an issue, when he decided to preserve the Union at the cost of war. In his inaugural address he declared that it was not his purpose, directly, to interfere with the institution of slavery, where it had existed. Therefore it is clear that if he abolished it, it was because he wanted to remove a source of conflict between the two economic systems and to gain the sympathy of the liberals of Europe. Fourthly, even the South seemed prepared to do away with slavery. Jefferson Davis, President of the rebel states of the South, offered to abolish slavery, if the English extended their aid in the Civil War. Had he fought for preservation of Slavery, he never would have agreed to it. Despite these, slavery was made a national issue and was attacked on political, economic and moral grounds. This was because the slave symbolised the source of southern influence and wealth. Destruction of slavery appeared essential for the destruction of the political and economic influence of the slave-holders and the establishment of the political and

economic ascendancy of the North. Filthly, it is an American way to attribute a moral objective to their endeavours aimed at the promotion of selfish interests. Abolition of slavery, a projected on a moral plain, not only won for the North the sympathy of liberal Europe but drove the south on the defensive.

In fact it was the question of balance of power that served as the fundamental cause of war. The bitter conflict between the two systems of economy rendered the control of the national government of paramount importance. The progress of the North or the South much depended upon its ability to command a majority in Congress and to wrest control of the federal set up. The rival sides used at different times political parties, slaves, conquests and settlement of new states as instruments of their gigantic struggle for self advancement. SO long as one or the other side entertained a hope of preserving the balance of power in its favour, there came from its side no violent rift. But when the North gained a clear cut majority inn Congress and installed its own sectional party at the political helm of the entire Union, the South no more had any flicker of hope of regaining the balance of power inn its favour. Between the two desperate alternatives of secession and humiliation, it decided in favour of the more honourable.

Immediate Causes: A series of major developments that occurred during the decade after 1850 hastened the drift of the country to the arena of war. Among them the important were:

Implementation of rail road projects on sectional lines worked against the interests of the South. Since 1850, the rail roads entered into a stage of rapid expansion. While the South was neglected practically, the North received most of the new lines. The network of roads in the North –east and the North – West had been linked directly. But in the case of the northern system and the southern system such a link was not provided. Traditionally the West was dependent upon the South for marketing the products, for they were transported to the Southern ports through rivers. But with the completion of rail roads, it could sell the goods in the eastern markets and ship them through the northern ports. Incidentally, this broke the alliance of the West with the South and promoted the alliance of West with the North in Congress. This alignment placed the South at a disadvantage.

Secondly, the decade after 1850 witnessed keen competition between industry and agriculture. The industrial as well as agricultural products were in increasing demand. To cope with the situation the rival sections sought to promote production and supply. This created a demand for more workers. The steady migration from Europe assured for the North the needed supply of labour. The South on the other hand was not only deprived of supply of more slaves from Africa but was required to liberate the slaves under its yoke.

Thirdly, the Kansas – Nebraska Act of 1854 not only destroyed the peace, though shaky it was, that had so long existed between the North and the South but also added new dimensions to sectional rivalry. As the elder leaders like Henry Clay, who had no great for it, shot into prominence. Among them the most influential was Senator of Illinois, Stephen A. Douglas. He was guided by an ambition to add to the importance of his home state and make Chicago a railway centre. By this time there was a proposal to construct a railroad to the Pacific. The survey indicated that there were three possible routes- a northern route, a central route from Chicago and a southern route. Douglas was particular to push through the central route but as Kansas – Nebraska through which this line was to be constructed was not yet settled by the whites, there came opposition. Therefore he wanted this area to be organised into territories, so that a government could be provided and people could be moved into this land. It was also found essential to win the support of the South for this central route project. With these ends in view he proposed that 1) Upper Louisiana, which was a free soil area under the Missouri Compromise, Should be divided into the territories of Kansas and Nebraska, one of which would presumably become slave white the other free. 2) Missouri Compromise should be repealed; Settlers in each territory were to decide whether their land was to be free or slave. It was expected that popular sovereignty or squatter sovereignty as this process was called, would reduce slavery into a local issue. Also it was anticipated that the North would get the free state of Nebraska and the Pacific Rail Road, while the South would receive Kansas as a slave state and repeal of the Missouri Compromise, which prevented the extension of slavery to the North. President Pierce, who was much influenced by Jefferson Davis, his Secretary of War and southern leader, supported the bill. It was passed into act in 1854.

James Ford Rhodes called this Act “The most momentous measure that passed Congress from the day that the senators and representatives first met to the outbreak of the civil war”. This statement is true to a limited extent, for it opened Pandora “s Box. The Missouri Compromise had been regarded as the final remedy to the problem created by the extension of slavery. The South never imagined that it would gain any part of upper Louisiana to its fold. But the Act declared this Compromise as no more valued and reopened the entire issue of the extension of slavery and expansion of the South. With Kansas as a slave state, the South saw the possibility of regaining an equal number of seats in the Senate. However, these possible advantages secured by the south threatened the status of the North and excited bitterness. Secondly, the Act led to a struggle between the North and the South for the control of Kansas. The settlers from low moved into Nebraska, made it a free soil area and won it for the North. The South found it impossible to contest it, but made a determined attempt to secure possession of the southern territory of Kansas. The northerners as well as the southerners now formed aid societies for promoting colonisation. The efforts of the North proved more successful than that of the South, for the slave holders appeared reluctant to take their slaves to a region, where the situation seemed flexible. However in 1855 when the election to the territorial legislature was held, the slave holders of Missouri invaded the polling booths and captured a majority. The principle of popular sovereignty proved unworkable. The two factions met separately in conventions and drafted two constitutions, one pro –slavery and the other anti-slavery. Now the two sides armed against each other and came into clash. In a civil war that lasted for four months, about 200 people were killed. Bleeding Kansas” as this situation was referred to, inflamed sectional animosity. It was only after the South withdrew from the Union that Kansas was admitted as a free state. Thirdly, the Act created a revolution in the party system and contributed to its reorganisation on a sectional basis. The Whigs were divided into the northern and the southern groups. The Democrats were divided into the Nebraska Democrats, who supported the Act and the Anti-Nebraska Democrats, who opposed it. In 1854 a few anti-slavery men, belonging to free soil party, the northern Whigs and the Anti-Nebraska Democrats met at Jackson in Michigan, and formed the Republican Party. While the Democratic Party drew its inspiration from the ideals of Jefferson’s Republican Party, the new Republican Party.

found its necessity in the Principles of Hamilton's Federalist Party. The Republicans condemned slavery as a moral, social and political evil, denounced the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, demanded repeal of the Kansas – Nebraska Act and the fugitive slave law and opposed further extension of slavery. The new alignment of parties made them so sectional that no more did they serve as links between the North and the South.

Fourthly, the Dred Scott decision shook the confidence of the anti-slavery sections in the impartiality of the judiciary. Dred Scott, a slave of Missouri, lived with his master in the free states of Illinois and Minnesota. On his master's death he with the support of that abolitionists, filed a suit for his freedom on the ground that he lived in Free states. But Missouri court and the federal circuit court rejected his case. When it went to the Supreme Court on appeal, Chief Justice Roger B. Taney, who succeeded Marshall, ruled that Dred Scott was not a citizen, as the Negroes within the meaning of the Constitution were not persons but things. He was still a slave as his residence in other areas did not affect his status. Missouri Compromise itself was unconstitutional, as it violated the Fifth Amendment, which prohibited Congress from depriving any person of his property. This implied that Congress had no right to bar slavery from any territory and agreed with Calhoun's contention that slave was only property. The leaders of the North condemned this decision as a southern conspiracy and made it a political issue.

Finally, the victory of the Republican Party in the Presidential election of 1860 rendered the status of the South in the Union unequal. The Republicans grew popular and turned into a party, exclusively of the North. In the election of 1860 their candidate, Abraham Lincoln, captured the presidency. The South took it as the victory of the North over it and the loss of its status in the national government. In 1861 the southern states seceded from the Union to organise a rival government. This decisive step came as the last straw on the camel's back. War broke out, when the forces of the South attacked and subdued the federal garrison at Fort Sumter.

The Secession of the southern states from the Union to form the Confederate States of America represented an immediate reaction to the victory of the Republican Party in the presidential election. This gave the signal to the outbreak of Civil War. The North and the South fought a bitter war for four years. In the end the southern states were

defeated and brought back to the Union. This victory gave a violent remedy to the issue of sectionalism and slavery.

Lincoln and Secession

Early Career of Lincoln: One of the greatest presidents of the United States, Abraham Lincoln was born in 1809 in a family of settlers in a log cabin in Kentucky. Not far from the settlement of the Lincolns was born Jefferson Davis, who was destined to become President of the Confederate States of America. While the Davis family moved to the south, the Lincoln family went to the West. A man with exceptional strength, he could split, build cabins, pilot boats and argue with reason. Like then other settlers of the times, he too fought against the native tribes, yet he was kind to animals and birds. A practical joker, homely wit and inventor of stories, he endeared himself to his fellow whites. Noted for his common sense, he displayed a keen interest in acquiring knowledge. He studied law and politics and read classics, Shakespeare's dramas and Aesop's Fables. At Springfield in Illinois he established a reputation as a lawyer and a local politician. A member of the Whig Party he was elected to the Illinois State Legislature and subsequently to the House of Representatives at Washington. Yet he was only a local politician with no recognition.

However, the revival of controversy over slavery drew him into politics. In 1858 the Republicans nominated him as their candidate for election to the Senate. Stephen A. Douglas, as candidate of the Democratic Party, contested against Lincoln. While Lincoln was a local leader, slow but persistent speaker, Douglas was a national figure, an eloquent orator and matchless debater. With nothing to lose but much to gain, Lincoln challenged Douglas to a series of seven debates. The sound reasoning and common sense, displayed during these debates, made him a national leader and won for him the admiration of many. In the course of the debate at Freeport, Lincoln asked Douglas whether popular sovereignty was possible under the Dred Scott decision. The two principles came into clash with each other, for the people could exclude slavery under popular sovereignty but they could not do so under Dred Scott decision. If Douglas favoured popular sovereignty, he stood to lose support of the South and if he supported Dred Scott decision he stood to lose the sympathy of the North. In his Freeport Doctrine Douglas favoured popular sovereignty and stated that the states could keep slavery away

by refusing to enact the laws, needed for its survival. Because of this stand, Douglas could win the election by defeating Lincoln but he alienated the South and lost chance to become president. In the process Lincoln became a popular hero.

The presidential election of 1860 was of crucial importance. The Republicans nominated Lincoln as their candidate; the northern Democrats, Douglas and the southern Democrats, Breckinridge. The Republicans demanded restriction of slavery to the states where it existed, the northern Democrats favoured preservation of the Union through conciliation and the southern rights even the southern Democrats wanted protection of southern rights even at the cost of secession. Lincoln carried all northern states except New Jersey to win the election. In his bid to save the Union Douglas rallied to the support of Lincoln after the election was over. In his inaugural address the President promised to enforce the fugitive slave law and not to interfere with slavery in the states where it existed. But the sectional victory of the North was too much for the South to bear.

Six weeks after the election, South Carolina adopted an Ordinance of Secession and seceded from the Union. By February, 1861 six other states – Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida and Georgia too announced withdrawal from the Union. The seceded states met in a convention at Montgomery, Alabama, adopted a constitution and formed themselves into the Confederate States of America. Jefferson Davis, who had served as Secretary of War under President Pierce, was appointed President. Subsequently Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee and Arkansas also joined the Confederate States. However, Western Virginia set up a separate government, declared its loyalty to the federal government and became a separate state in the Union. The capital of the Confederacy was shifted from Montgomery in Alabama to Richmond in Virginia. The rebel states raised an army, captured federal properties and defied the authority of the Union.

Several factors guided the south in deciding on secession. It appeared that victory of the Republican Party marked a permanent victory for the North and loss of control of the federal administration for the South. Many people in the South felt that the Republicans would free the slaves and would establish Negro rule in the South for promoting the interests of the North. Secondly, the slave holders believed that slavery was essential for their welfare and its extension to more territories was indispensable for

their prosperity. While they could secure no new areas for extension, the North proceeded to occupy vast areas for itself. Thirdly, the South wanted to be free from the control of the North so that it could acquire more areas for slavery. Mexico and Cuba appeared vulnerable and the slave holders wanted to annex them, but this was not possible if it remained in the Union. Fourthly, the South counted on a divided North and European aid. France was sympathetic, while Great Britain was dependent upon the South for the supply of cotton. Supported by the European powers, it was expected, that the southern states could gain a definite victory in the event of war.

Buchanan, the retiring President, took no effective steps to prevent secession. Congress felt that the South could be pacified through concession. Senator John J. Crittenden of Kentucky suggested what was called Crittenden Compromise, which Compromise line of 35° 30", protection of slavery south of that line, continuation of slavery in the District of Columbia and compensation for owners of run-away slaves. But the Republicans rejected this proposal. Now a peace convention was called at Washington, yet no solution could be found. When Lincoln was inaugurated on 4th March 1861, he found the war unavoidable. Possibly with the hope of goading the Confederacy into striking the first blow, he sent supplies to the besieged garrison at Fort Sumter. Before supply ships could reach Fort Sumter, the Confederate forces occupied it. This started the war.

Course of the War

Rival Camps: At the beginning of the war most of the people on either side under – estimated the strength of their opponents and expected a quick victory. The North felt that most of the South remained loyal to the Union and only a few extremes were bent upon war. The South anticipated no formidable opposition as it felt that the people of the northern states were divided against each other and less warlike. Yet the war lasted for four years and cost the lives of more than six lakhs of people.

The population and army of the North were much larger than those of the South. Twenty three states with twenty two million people remained in the Union. Against them were eleven seceded states, with nine million people, of whom five million were whites. The North enlisted into its service twenty lakhs of soldiers, while the south could raise eight lakhs. The Union had a navy of its own, but the Confederate State had none.

Despite this comparative weakness, the South had certain advantages. Its population was more united than that of the North and had cultivated considerable experience as killers of Indians and hunters of animals. It had the best generals of the Union- Jackson and the two Johnston's.

The North commanded possession of vast resources. It controlled more than two thirds of the banking capital. The manufacture was more than ten times those of the South. The railway expansion in the northern region gave it more than double the mileage of the South. This made it possible for the quick movement of troops and equipments to the theatres of war. Thus the North combed the farm with the factory and linked both by rails. The South on the other hand was one large farm, which depended upon imports of manufactured goods.

More than these, the North had the advantage of having diplomatic relations with foreign powers. Not only did it maintain cordial relations but did gain sympathy abroad by projecting an impression that it was fighting in defence of a noble cause. The South expected that Great Britain and France either for continued supply of cotton or because of sympathy would support it but was disappointed. Most of the cotton harvest of the year had already been exported. Besides, Britain found it possible to import cotton from Egypt and India. France had will to interfere, but found helpless without support of the British navy. Had any of the great European powers recognised the South, the northern blockade could have been broken, supplies could have been rushed to the South and the union forces could have been defeated, but these did not happen.

North and South at War:

The determination of the North to preserve the Union required an offensive against the South. The South wanted to preserve its independence, which necessitated a defensive rather than an offensive war. The strategy of the Union army consisted of disrupting supplies to the South through the sea and making powerful thrusts through the land.

Immediately after the fall of Fort Sumter to the Confederate forces, Lincoln ordered blockade of the southern ports. This was so effective that the communication of the South with Europe was practically cut off. In 1861 the Union army, taking the offensive, advanced to Richmond but was defeated by the Confederate forces in the battle

of Bull Run. This reverse convinced the North of the uphill task ahead. The two sides now devoted themselves to the equipment of large forces for a grim struggle.

In 1862 war was resumed in the West. Determined to gain control of the Mississippi, U.S. Grant at the command of the northern army, occupied Fort Henry and Shiloh. Another Union army captured New Orleans. In 1863 Grant, as the result of his victory over the Confederate forces, wrested possession of their strongholds, Vicksburg and Chattanooga. These remarkable gains won for the North control of the Mississippi and cut off communications of the South with the West. Early in 1864 Grant assumed supreme command. Sherman in the course of a brilliant expedition reached Georgia and captured Atlanta.

The war in the East was marked by changing fortunes. In 1862 the Union army made its second thrust towards Richmond, but was defeated in the second battle of Bull Run. Now the Confederate forces led by General Lee invaded Pennsylvania, but were compelled to retreat after a hard fought battle at Antietam. In the same year Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation, which announced that slaves in rebel states were free from the 1st of January, 1863. The federal army made a third attempt to reach Richmond, but was defeated at Fredericksburg. In the mean time Lee gained another victory at Chancellorsville in 1863 and advanced to Pennsylvania. But the Union forces under General Meade checked the advance of the southern Army in a decisive battle at Gettysburg. The year 1863 marked a turning point in the war. The victories of the northern army at Gettysburg and Vicksburg and the emancipation of the slaves forced Great Britain and France to abandon all their designs of extending assistance to the Confederacy.

In 1864 Grant began his operations against Lee and his army in Virginia. Sherman, advancing from Atlanta, took possession of Savannah. For fear of being encircled and in his bid to join the Confederate forces in North Carolina, Lee withdrew from Richmond. In 1865 Grant and Sherman surrounded Lee and his army at Appomattox and forced them to surrender. This marked the end of the war and collapse of the Confederacy.

Behind the Lines:

The Union as well as the Confederacy mobilised all their resources to stand up to the challenges. The war efforts, victories and reverses had their impact upon the working of the administrative system, diplomatic relations and the life of the people. Despite the stresses and strains of war, Lincoln maintained his usual balance, avoided extreme measures and proved himself as one of the best war time presidents of the country. Though he committed serious mistakes in strategy of war and choice of generals, he knew the pulse of the nation and with his usual sense of humour, inspired confidence into his people in an hour of peril. The Republicans and the northern Democrats rallied to this support. However, when the moderates called Copperheads and the radicals attacked his war time policies, the President faced the opposition with vigour. Civil liberties were suspended, martial law was enforced, and many were arrested imprisoned or banished. He justified these rigorous measures as essential for saving the Constitution and the Union. In 1864 Lincoln was re-elected to the presidency. Jefferson Davis was President of the Confederacy. Though able and bold, he lacked the qualities needed to gain the loyalty of his people. He had his cabinet but it consisted of obscure leaders. In 1861 the southern states in a convention at Montgomery adopted a constitution. According to its provisions the president could hold office for a six year term but was not eligible to seek re-election. Congress had two houses as in the United States. The judiciary consisted of a supreme court and district courts. Though the district courts functioned, the Supreme Court was not organised because of war. The constitution laid emphasis on the rights of states, protected slavery and prohibited foreign slave trade, protective tariff and internal improvement with confederate funds. The war required the concentration of powers with the central government. The jealousy with which the states sought to preserve their rights rendered it difficult for the confederate government to assume broad powers, needed for the mobilisation of resources for the conduct of war.

The federal and the confederate governments saw the importance of diplomacy in the conduct of war. They drew Indian tribes into the conflict but most of them fought on the side of the Confederacy. The tribes entertained their animosity against the federal government, as it destroyed many of the tribes and took away their lands. Among the European powers Great Britain and France evinced a keen interest in the Civil War. Great

Britain was eager to see the nation divided and weak, so that it would not challenge her maritime interests. France too was equally anxious to see the country divided so that she could establish her authority in Mexico. These European countries were heavily dependent on cotton, produced by the South. Added to these, the powers entertained an impression that the North was a land of semi barbarian savages, who were rough in their dealings with other peoples and were exploiting the peasants of the South. They believed that white society in southern states was a class of cultured farmers and land holders like the English aristocracy. Despite these, Great Britain found no compelling necessity of going to the aid of the south. France was helpless without British co-operation. In 1862 when Lee gained victories over the federal army in Maryland, the British cabinet seriously considered the question of recognising the Confederate States, but abandoned the plan, when the battle at Antietam changed the tide of war in favour of the Union. Seward, Secretary of State, contemplated upon a war against Great Britain so as to force the seceded states to return to the Union, but Lincoln did not agree. In fact a war with the European powers would have been disastrous to the North, for the South would have been enabled to receive foreign support. However certain incidents caused irritations in the relations of the United States with England and France. In 1861 an American ship San Jacinto stopped the British steamer Trent and seized two confederate commissioners, Mason and Slidell. The British condemned it as violation of freedom of the seas and demanded release of the commissioners. Threatened with war, the Union complied with. Another source of trouble came, when the confederate agents placed orders for building warships in England and France. A few of these vessels particularly the Alabama wrought havoc to American shipping. Because of American protests the two powers took steps against more war ships joining the confederate side.

The Union relied upon volunteer enlistment for raising armies but after two years of war it found the response inadequate. In March 1863 it made it compulsory for all men between the ages of 20 and 45 to render military service. The country was divided into districts and each district was made responsible for the supply of a fixed quota. The law exempted the sole supporters of aged parents and fathers of young children. It also permitted a man to gain exemption by paying 300 dollars or furnishing a substitute. In consequence the poor men and immigrants were the worst affected. The unequal working

of conscription laws and emancipation of blacks made the people angry with the administration. This led to riots in New York, causing the death of more than 500 blacks and whites. In the Confederacy because of popular enthusiasm for war, the recruitment was heavy. Yet this spectacle changed after one year. In 1862 conscription was enforced. It required all men between the age groups of 18 and 35 and subsequently between 17 and 50 to render military service. Exemptions were allowed in certain cases and substitutes were permitted. The rigours in the working of the law excited much opposition in the South too.

To Lincoln preservation of the Union was of paramount interest and abolition of slavery a subsidiary issue. He appeared reluctant to emancipate the slaves partly because a large section of people of the North were opposed to it and partly because he was afraid of losing support of the slave states, which decided to remain in the Union. Yet in 1863 he issued the Proclamation of Emancipation, making use of his war time powers. Lincoln declared all the slaves in the rebel states as free. In effect this meant nothing, for the slaves remained slaves in the states which were loyal to the Union and in the states which were under confederate authority. In issuing this order what the President expected was to gain the support of the radicals, to win sympathy of European powers and to weaken the Confederacy.

The financial resources of the rival governments were markedly unequal. The Union had a monetary system and a treasury department, while the Confederacy had to create them, which it did. The North possessed enormous amount of gold and silver, while the South had little of these. Both sides sought to find more funds to finance the war by increased taxes, issue of paper currency and sale of bonds. In 1863 Congress created a national banking system with a view to establishing uniform currency and creating a market for the sale of federal bonds. The Confederacy used the printing press more freely than the Union did for the issue of paper notes. It imposed taxes on agricultural products and livestock, increased the existing taxes and raised loans in France and Great Britain. As the money so raised was inadequate, the army was permitted to live off the country by seizing commodities from the people and to employ the blacks for construction of roads and forts, As the war moved from year to year and as the prospect of victory vanished, the credit fell. The war bonds found no purchasers.

Paper money lost all its value and prices increased abnormally. These developments together with the ravages of war ruined the economy of the South.

The North experienced a severe economic depression during the war. As there was no adequate supply of cotton and other raw materials, many of the factories were closed. Several of the banks ceased to function, prices increased and the labouring classes suffered considerably. But the economy began to recover after the initial shock. Because of the heavy demand for war materials, food and clothing, the administration placed orders for their supply with the private agencies, profits increased. Large areas were brought under crops, adding to the production of grain. The transportation of troops and supplies required better communications. This stimulated railroad building. Though the war continued for four years, life in the country was not much affected. With increased prosperity, theatres, bar rooms and dancing halls became crowded. On the other hand the people of the South suffered badly because of war. As the white population of the South was smaller than that of the North, almost every family was required to furnish one person or other for military service. Of the total recruits, at least one third never returned home, while an equal proportion was crippled. As cotton, tobacco and other raw materials could not be exported, many of the farms were abandoned. Production fell and prices reached unprecedented levels. Because of inadequate facilities for repairing rails and frequent invasions, movement of goods suffered greatly. These developments added to the ordeals of the people.

Results of the Civil War

The Civil War ended in 1865, causing havoc on an extensive scale. About six lakhs of people were killed, farms were laid waste, factories were destroyed, railroads were dismantled and ships were captured. The invading forces, marching and fighting, devastated vast areas. Humbled in war the traditional leadership, that was furnished by the aristocracy of the South, lost its ground. The slaves were freed by law, but they were neither rehabilitated nor enabled to live as independent inhabitants. These issues presented powerful challenges to the victorious North. Yet, apart from the tragedy of destruction, the Civil War was attended with consequences, which in general proved beneficial to political unity and economic prosperity of the United States.

Strains in Foreign Relations:

The Civil War badly affected the relations of the United States with Great Britain, France and the Indian tribes. Constructed in England, the confederate warships, Alabama, Shenandoah and Florida, caused damage to the shipping interests of the Union. Washington demanded compensation and the issue strained the relation between the powers, until it was settled through arbitration. The French utilised the situation, caused by the war, to send forces to Mexico and to elevate prince Maximilian of Austria to the Mexican throne. Juarez, the talented leader of Mexican Indians, fought a heroic struggle against the occupation army. After the Civil War was over, the United States threatened to intervene in defence of the Monroe Doctrine and forced the French to withdraw. A more tragic consequence of the war was the fate of the Indian tribes. Many of the natives, who survived the wars of destruction, eager to extricate themselves from the tentacles of American expansionism, threw their lot with the confederacy. But they allied themselves with a wrong side, as it so happened on many an occasion, with a power that was defeated. Not only did they suffer heavy losses during the campaigns but fell victims to American revenge.

Political Results:

The victory of the federal army strengthened the Union and established the supremacy of national government over the state governments. What was conspicuous in the working of federal system was the prolonged conflict between nationalism and sectionalism. While many of the people believed in the supremacy of the national government and the indestructibility of the Union, many others in the rights of the states and the inevitable disintegration of the Union. The issues that came one after the other precipitated controversies and created crises. From time to time the making of the Constitution, enactment of tariff laws, and admission of new states to the Union and restriction of slavery had served as trouble spots. They excited the issues of nullification, secession and civil war. But the victory of the Union over the southern states gave a permanent though violent remedy to sectionalism. The states were denied of the rights but they were convinced of the futility of attempting to go out of the Union. It was established beyond doubt that the United States was a not only a federation of states but also an indestructible national entity consisting of indestructible state units.

The Civil War affected the working of party system. For generations the white aristocracy of the South had furnished leadership to political parties and governments. But now they were humbled in war, their slaves were freed and their influence was crippled. This enabled the northern leaders to maintain their undisputed supremacy for years to come. The radicals of the North made an attempt to elevate the poor whites and the freed blacks to leadership in competition with the planters and aristocrats of the South. In the process of promoting this idea they alienated the white citizens of the South. While the North remained under the banner of the Republican Party, the South extended its loyalty to the Democratic Party. In consequence sectionalism found its expression in the changed alignment of parties.

The emancipation of slaves represented an incidental result of the war. Victorious on the Field of battle, the North decided to cut at the root of the power and pride of southern aristocracy. If Lincoln Proclamation of 1863 abolished slavery in the rebel states, the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution provided for the abolition of slavery in all the states while the fourteenth Amendment made the freed Negroes citizens. It also provided that no state should deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law. This measure made the states accountable to the federal judiciary in all matters concerning life, liberty and property of citizens. These amendments represented a revolution in the constitutional history of U.S.A.

Economic Results:

The economic changes that came as the result of the Civil War were of vast importance. Before 1860 the agrarian order, led by the southern planters, dominated federal system and checked the rise of the industrial order under the Northern capitalists. But with the Civil War the trend changed leading to the ascendancy of industrialism one agrarian system.

The war time demands for commodities greatly accelerated the growth of industry and commerce. With increased demand, prices increased to 117 percent above pre-war levels, yielding large profits to trade. The federal government placed orders with industrialists for supply of huge quantities of war materials, food stuff and clothing. The railways rendered the quick movement of goods possible. To cope with the unprecedented demand for labour, there came no adequate supply of workers. Therefore

the industrialist sought mass production through technological improvements. More lands were brought under cultivation, new mines were opened and large factories were established. As a result, the country experienced industrial boom of great magnitude.

In the mean time Congress enacted laws for encouraging the growth of industries. This could be done without much opposition, as the representatives of southern states withdrew from the national legislature. In 1863 Congress passed the national Bank Act. Though its immediate purpose was to promote the sale of war bonds, it contributed to the creation of a sound and uniform currency. The newly enacted tariff laws increased the taxes on imported goods had gave protection to internal manufactures against foreign competition. Lands were given free not only to factories but also to the immigrants in a bid to attract labour. Laws were enacted for the construction of railroads. The Civil War legislations prepared the ground for the industrial greatness of the country. The leadership so ling furnished by the planters and slave holders gave way to that of the industrialists and merchants. These developments consolidated the industrial order and led to its expansion while the agrarian order went down fighting. In fact the Civil War represented a turning point in the history of the United States, for it ended the age of conflict between industry and agricultures and contributed to the victory of Hamiltonian concepts over Jefferson an ideal.

Reconstruction

After the Civil War, two major problems confronted the country, one political and other economic. The political issue related to restoration of the rebel states to their former status and reestablishment of legally constituted governments. The economic problem related to rehabilitation of freed blacks and reconstruction of southern economy. Attempts at reconstruction began under President Lincoln. But in 1865 he was assassinated and was succeeded by Vice President Johnson. From 1868m Grant the Republican candidate, held the presidency for two terms, after which another Republican, B. Hayes became President. The reconstruction continued under them and was considered as ended in 1877.

Problems of Reconstruction

The war left the home land of the planters and slave holders in ruins. Cities were destroyed, fields were desolated, houses were burned, and communications were

disrupted. In consequence vast sections of people lived in distress. The liberated blacks ran to the cities to earn a living. The state governments collapsed with the surrender of the confederate army. Many of the administrators fled the capitals or remained in prisons. In the absence of regular governments, the federal troops roamed about the country to maintain a kind of order, yet the problem of reconstruction appeared formidable.

Political as well as economic issues combined together in creating the reconstruction problem. Conditions were to be created so as to enable the southern states to return to the Union. The political reconstruction related to this question. Though this appeared simple, difficulties came because of differences among the Republicans. The radical Republicans decided to treat the seceded states as conquered territories and to show them no mercy. They were led in the House of Representatives by Thaddeus Stevens of Penn-Sylvania and in the Senate by Charles Sumner of Massachusetts. Great orators, both of them were determined to destroy the influence of southern aristocrats. The conservative Republicans, on the other hand, wanted to ignore secession so as to get the southern states back into their „proper practical relation.” They were led by President Lincoln and Vice President Johnson. Moderates as they were, the two leaders were eager to restore normalcy and not to punish the humbled South. The second issue, that was of economic nature, required the settlement of former slaves and war-torn economy. The federal government assumed responsibility for promoting rehabilitation of the blacks but left the task of repairing the shattered economy mostly to the defeated people of the South. The federal administration constituted the Freedmen’s Bureau with offices in all southern states to look after freed blacks. The whites, on the otherhand, were required to find their own ways of living through self labour or free labour.

In the formulation of reconstruction programme several considerations came into play. Before the end of war, leaders of the North asserted that rebellious states always remained in the Union, as they never had the right to secede. On the other hand leaders of the South maintained that they left the Union and that secession was legal. But after the end of war, southern states anxious to return to the Union, accepted the northern view, while the North, determined to punish the seceded states accepted the southern view. Secondly, the North decided to exact from the South compensation for the losses suffered during the war. The industrialists demanded enactment of favourable legislations on

tariff, banking, credit and railways. This required exclusion of the southerners from authority. Thirdly, several leaders were determined to destroy the influence of planters and aristocrats. This could be done only if the poor whites and blacks were given the status of equality. Incidentally, it was expected that these oppressed sections would extend their support to the Republican Party.

There were two stages of reconstruction. In the first stage it was the Presidential Reconstruction, for Lincoln and subsequently Johnson gave the lead to the programme. In the second stage it was Congressional Reconstruction, for during this period Congress exercised direct control over reconstruction programme.

Presidential Reconstruction

The Lincoln Plan:

In Lincoln's scheme of reconstruction reconciliation of the South and preservation of the Union served as the guiding factors. Hatred and revenge found no place. A moderate as he was, he entertained the view that southern states had not seceded from the Union, but were in a state of rebellion. Therefore he decided to use his constitutional power to pardon the rebels. In his proclamation of amnesty issued in December 1864, he outlined a plan of political reconstruction, known as Ten Per Cent Plan.

There were two proposals in the plan: 1) That all southerners, taking an oath of loyalty to the Union were to be granted pardon and restoration of property except in slaves. However, high ranking civil and military leaders of the Confederacy were exempted from this concession. 2) That as soon as one tenth of the voters in the 1860 election in any state took an oath of loyalty and elected their state conventions to organise new state governments, the rebel state was to be restored to its former status in the Union. Under the operation of this scheme four states, Louisiana, Arkansas Tennessee and Virginia reconstituted their governments. However, as these states made no attempt to grant voting rights to blacks. Congress, led by radical Republicans, considered Lincoln's plan as too moderate to be approved and refused to admit the representatives of these states. On 14th April 1865, Lincoln was assassinated by a secessionist, John Wilks Booth. This created more complications.

Lincoln's Service to the Nation:

Born in obscurity, Lincoln fought through difficulties to emerge as a national hero. Self educated, he became a lawyer and leader, noted for his ability for clear analysis and forcible presentation of facts. He entered politics during a period of crisis, when the country was threatened with sectionalism. The Republicans accepted him as their candidate and the country elected him to the presidency. As President, the greatest service that Lincoln rendered to his people was preservation of the Union. For long southern states believed in their right to defy national laws and to secede from the Union. The situation that assumed a serious turn since the Mexican War culminated in secession, posing a powerful challenge to the new President. In this critical hour Lincoln displayed his great qualities of leadership. He isolated the South by keeping the border slave states with the Union and preventing the European powers from going to its aid. Though he erred often in military strategy, he mobilised the resources of the country on an unprecedented scale and preserved national unity. Secondly, Lincoln granted freedom to the slaves by making use of his war-time powers. However, it cannot be denied that he did it much because of political considerations and that he made no attempt to grant vote to freedmen. Thirdly, Lincoln displayed a spirit of conciliation in dealing with the humbled rebel states. Despite the havoc wrought by the war, he called upon the nation to forget the past, to discard the concept of revenge and to consider the southerners as members of the same national home. In his last cabinet meeting, he exhorted: "We must extinguish our resentment if we expect harmony and union."

The Johnson Plan:

In 1865 on the death of Lincoln, Johnsons became President, but in this capacity he was not destined to be great. The times appeared difficult and his intellectual attainments proved unequal to the unexpected elevation. In May 1865 Johnson announced his plan of reconstruction which was based upon Lincoln's. It granted general amnesty to the whites of the South, except those who served as leaders of rebel states and possessed wealth exceeding 20,000 dollars. They were to be given general pardon and their property except in slaves when they took the required oath of loyalty. Secondly, he recognised the governments of Virginia, Tennessee, Arkansas and Louisiana, as constituted under Lincoln's scheme of reconstruction. Thirdly, he made it clear that the

other rebel states could rejoin the Union, when they repudiated their ordinances of secession, war debt and slavery. By December, 1865 all southern states except Texas fulfilled the terms and were ready for re-admission to the Union. However neither did Johnsons nor did any state government appear ready to grant vote to the blacks.

Annoyed at the attitude of these states, Congress rejected the Presidential Plan of Lincoln and Johnson. It refused to admit members from the reconstructed states and announced its determination to administer reconstruction programme by itself. As a result the Presidential Plan fell through and reconstruction passed under control of Congress. In fact the Presidential Plan was so lenient to the rebel states that Congress, dominated by the radicals, was not prepared to accept it. The right to admit states to the Union rightly belonged to Congress and not to President.

Congressional Reconstruction

Guided by Stevens and Sumner, Congress appointed a Committee of Fifteen, consisting of representatives from both the houses to formulate terms of reconstruction. Before any definite policy was formulated, Congress passed two Acts over the veto of President Johnson for safeguarding the interests of the blacks. One of them extended the tenure of the Freedmen's Bureau, which was founded during the Civil War to take care of the freedmen and the other, the Civil Rights Act of 1866, forbade states from discriminating against the blacks and guaranteed to them equal protection with the whites before law. In 1866 Congress accepted the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution. It provided for citizenship and civil rights including equal protection before law for the blacks. It also repudiated the confederate war-debt and disqualified the former confederates from holding offices unless Congress pardoned them. Of the southern states Tennessee voted for this amendment and was therefore admitted into the Union.

Congressional plan:

By 1867 the Committee of Fifteen completed investigations and formulated its proposals for reconstruction. Accordingly Congress adopted a plan of reconstruction for the remaining ten states. It provided: 1) The South was to be divided into five military districts under commanders of army, who were empowered to protect life and property. 2) The black and white citizens whose names were registered as voters, were to elect delegates to state conventions, which were to draft new state constitutions, guaranteeing

to the blacks right to vote. These constitutions were to be submitted to the voters for ratification and to Congress for approval. 3) The newly elected legislatures were to ratify the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution. When these conditions were fulfilled, the rebel states were to join the Union. Accordingly six of the ten states satisfied these conditions and returned the Union by 1868.

There still remained four states-Virginia, Texas, Mississippi and Georgia. They were required to accept the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution as a further condition for admission. This Amendment, adopted in 1870, forbade the United States as well as the member states from denying vote to a citizen on ground of race, colour or previous condition of servitude. The four states accepted this condition and rejoined the Union in 1870. Though the Congressional Plan appeared harsh, it did a service to the nation, for it gave vote to poor whites and to some extent blacks too, introducing thereby greater democracy in the country.

Impeachment of Johnson:

The differences between the President and Congress on the issue of reconstruction led to open rift. Johnson freely exercised his veto on Congressional reconstruct Reconstruction measures, while Congress overrode the presidential veto. In his public speeches he severely attacked members of Congress. In consequence the radicals decided to curtail powers of the President. The Tenure of Office Act, enacted in 1867, prohibited him from removing civil officers without consent of the Senate and made its violation a punishable misconduct; This was particularly intended to protect t Secretary of War. Edwin M Stanton, a critic of Johnson, but the President promptly removed him from office. Thereupon the House of Representatives voted to impeach Johnson. The trial lasted for ten weeks, after which the Senate acquitted him by a margin of one vote. The President completed his term, without attempting to do much and retired from office.

Black Rule and White Reaction:

Though the blacks and the poor whites gained political rights, the running of government proved a difficult task. Brought up under the baneful influence of continuous slavery, the blacks received neither education nor experience. With their talents crippled, they found it impossible to administer the states. Now many whites, generally poor but mostly radicals, rushed to the aid of the blacks. These adventurous and opportunistic

northerners often took with them only their carpet bags and were called Carpet Baggers. More detested were the Scalawags or the whites of the South, who had deserted to the Republican camp to join the blacks. The Negro-Carpetbag-Scalawag rule of the South received support from the radicals in Congress. Conventions, called and controlled by their leaders, drew up new constitutions for the states, granting vote to the blacks and denying vote to the leaders of the Confederacy.

The reconstructed governments did many things, good as well as bad. In a serious attempt to rebuild the war torn economy roads, bridges and public buildings which were destroyed or damaged during the Civil War, were rebuilt. Much money was invested for the improvement of railroad communication. Social and political reform received due attention. Thus compulsory free public education was introduced, for the first time the blacks in large number attended schools. The right of the blacks to control their own churches received recognition. The election system and judicial procedure were greatly improved. The taxation system was reorganised. The poor people were assisted in gaining ownership of small farms. In general the black rule was moderate and beneficial. Neither did it attempt to confiscate lands from the white aristocracy nor did it destroy the white supremacy in social and economic fields. The constitutions that were during this period often continued to be in operation for long.

However, it cannot be denied that this period witnessed increased corruption in administration. Though many of the black legislators endeavoured to provide an efficient and clean administration many of the white adventurers exploited the situation for promoting their private ends. Persons who could not read or write were appointed to hold public expense. The legislatures voted away large amounts but only to be squandered away. As a result public debt increased and so did bribery, fraud and favouritism.

Before long there came a reaction of the whites of the South, causing defeat of the Congressional programme. Under the shadow of defeat in Civil War the white leaders to begin with compromised with the new situation. But as years passed by, the northerners lost much of their zeal, while the southerners reacted energetically. The white opposition manifested itself in different forms. 1) In the states like North Carolina and Tennessee, where the whites commanded a clear majority, they regained control of the state governments through election. The Democratic Party returned to power in these states. 2)

In other states where the federal troops enforced racial equality, the whites relied upon terrorism. Secret societies were founded, of which the most powerful were the Ku Klux Klan and the Knights of the White Camelia. Members of these societies dressed in masks and long robes, rode about at night, tarred and feathered the blacks, attacked Negro settlements and committed murders. In an attempt to check their activities Congress passed in 1870 the Force Act, which empowered federal authorities to suspend the writ of habeas corpus, to supervise elections and employ troops. The activities of the secret societies were curbed, yet the frightened blacks did not venture to go near polling booths, when elections came. In subsequent elections the whites recaptured the state governments. 3) After returning to power, the whites passed laws to deprive the blacks of their political rights. The Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution forbade the states from denying vote to any citizen because of "race, colour or previous condition of servitude". But the new state laws imposed other restrictions, based upon property or education. Many of the blacks had no property also lost their vote. Therefore it was provided that they should possess ability to read a portion of the Bible or Constitution or to understand, when it was read out to them. The white examining boards readily said yes in the case of whites, even if they did not know what was read out to them and said no in the case of the blacks even if they knew. Thus the whites kept most of blacks out of political authority.

Having regained control, southern whites promoted the growth of agriculture and industry and competed with the northerners in all walks of life. The Amnesty Act of 1872 restored political rights to most of the Southern leaders. In 1877 Rutherford B. Hayes, Republican President, who succeeded President Grant, withdrew the federal troops from the South. The reconstruction now ended-it ended in defeat of the policy of Congress, for the whites of the South again kept the blacks away from power. The causes of the failure of Congressional reconstruction were; continued white supremacy in economic and social life of the South, unpopularity of carpetbag rule because of high taxation and corruption and a softening of radicalism in the North and consequent indifference to the developments in the South.

Reconstruction produced bad as well as good results. 1) For a short period the blacks, supported by deprived the whites of the South of their positions in government

and kept them out of power. This turned the white's vindictive and sharpened racial bitterness. 2) Humbled in war and humiliated through reconstruction programmes, the whites of the South turned solidly against the Republican Party and rallied under the Democratic Party. The North on the other hand remained under the Republican Party. As a result, the period that followed was marked by one party rule in the South by the Democrats and in the North by the Republicans. 3) The reconstruction precipitated a crisis in the relation of Congress with Presidency. In the process of the impeachment of Johnson the two branches of government exposed themselves to public criticism. Ultimately this affected popularity of the radicals. 4) However there were good results too. The heavy taxes imposed by reconstruction governments forced the land lords to sell away their lands. This promoted an equitable distribution of landed property. The educational policy formulated by black governments contributed to social awareness of the blacks and poor whites. Finally, as slave labour was not available and free labour was inadequate the South turned to mechanisation. There followed a period of rapid industrialization. As a result, the interests of industrial North and of the industrialised South became identical, obliterating sectional differences.

The Civil Rights Act- 14th Amendment

Following the Civil War, Congress submitted to the states three amendments as part of its Reconstruction program to guarantee equal civil and legal rights to Black citizens. A major provision of the 14th Amendment was to grant citizenship to "All persons born or naturalized in the United States," thereby granting citizenship to formerly enslaved people.

Another equally important provision was the statement that "nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." The right to due process of law and equal protection of the law now applied to both the federal and state governments.

On June 16, 1866, the House Joint Resolution proposing the 14th Amendment to the Constitution was submitted to the states. On July 28, 1868, the 14th amendment was declared, in a certificate of the Secretary of State, ratified by the necessary 28 of the 37 States, and became part of the supreme law of the land.

Congressman John A. Bingham of Ohio, the primary author of the first section of the 14th Amendment, intended that the amendment also nationalize the Bill of Rights by making it binding upon the states. When introducing the amendment, Senator Jacob Howard of Michigan specifically stated that the privileges and immunities clause would extend to the states “the personal rights guaranteed and secured by the first eight amendments.” Historians disagree on how widely Bingham's and Howard's views were shared at the time in the Congress, or across the country in general. No one in Congress explicitly contradicted their view of the amendment, but only a few members said anything at all about its meaning on this issue. For many years, the Supreme Court ruled that the amendment did not extend the Bill of Rights to the states.

Not only did the 14th Amendment fail to extend the Bill of Rights to the states; it also failed to protect the rights of Black citizens. A legacy of Reconstruction was the determined struggle of Black and White citizens to make the promise of the 14th Amendment a reality. Citizens petitioned and initiated court cases, Congress enacted legislation, and the executive branch attempted to enforce measures that would guard all citizens' rights. While these citizens did not succeed in empowering the 14th Amendment during Reconstruction, they effectively articulated arguments and offered dissenting opinions that would be the basis for change in the 20th century.

Amendment XIV

Section 1

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section 2

Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the

Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

Section 3

No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice-President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

Section 4

The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.

Section 5

The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

Carpet Baggers

The term carpetbagger refers to Northern Republicans who traveled to the South in the years immediately following the Civil War to pursue economic and political opportunities. The name was intended to be derogatory. It was applied mainly by white Southern Democrats who resented carpetbaggers' involvement in the effort to enfranchise Southern blacks and blamed them for many of the economic hardships confronting the

South during Reconstruction. A “carpetbag” was a cheap suitcase made of soft, carpet-like material; the implication was that poor white Northerners relocated to the South in the hopes of earning their fortunes at the expense of white Southerners. Carpetbaggers became a symbol to Southerners of Northern interference in Southern affairs during Reconstruction, and of the failure of the Republican Party's efforts to build a permanent Southern constituency while bringing about an economic and social revolution in Southern society.

For many years, the history of Reconstruction depended heavily on the accounts of white Southern Democrats who regained political control of the South in the 1870s by ousting Republican governments. This “Redemption” of the South was said to be necessary for the restoration of good government after a decade of corruption and incompetence at the hands of “ignorant” black voters, treacherous scalawags (Southern whites allied to the Republican Party), and unscrupulous carpetbaggers. The carpetbaggers, as outsiders, were viewed with a particular hatred and disdain, and white Southerners described the defeat of the carpetbagger governments during Redemption as a return to Southern home rule.

According to this Southern tradition, the carpetbaggers were representative of the lowest class of Northern society. They came to the South to exploit the suffering of white Southerners and to get rich, and they quickly enlisted the aid of the former slaves in doing both. Along the way, the tradition goes, they poisoned the otherwise harmonious relationship between Southern blacks and their former masters by encouraging the freedpeople to seek rights and responsibilities for which they were either unfit or unprepared. They did so not out of genuine concern for the former slaves and their rights, but rather out of a selfish need to build a political power base for the Republican Party in the South in order to secure high political offices for themselves.

Again, according to the tradition, the carpetbaggers teamed with scalawags and newly enfranchised freedmen to take control of the South after the war. They levied high taxes on plantation owners and other well-to-do white Southerners and funneled public money into their own pockets while overseeing ballooning state debts. White Southern Democrats, tired of this dishonesty and mismanagement of public affairs, supposedly had no choice but to regain political control by attacking the carpetbaggers’ political base, the

black voter. First through violence and intimidation, and later through measures such as the literacy test, grandfather clause, and poll tax, white Southern Democrats systematically disfranchised African Americans during the 1870s.

The Rehabilitation of the Carpet Baggers

In recent decades, historians have finally begun to look closely at this traditional account of Reconstruction and found it inaccurate and heavily distorted by racism. While it is true that many carpetbaggers came to the South after the war to seek their economic and political fortunes, many others were former Union army officers who remained in the South after the war and felt a genuine responsibility to secure the rights of the freedpeople and protect them from further exploitation by the planter elite. Many carpetbaggers shared the Radical Republican vision of a South that would be dramatically transformed by the war, based on the Northern principle of free labor. This transformed South would include an enfranchised and politically mobilized black population, loyal to the Republican Party and economically independent of the former slave masters. Most carpetbaggers became heavily involved in politics only when the economic prospects they had envisioned turned out to be less rich than expected. In particular, the quick return to political power of influential Confederate leaders, and the implications this would have for the rights of the newly freed slaves, drove many carpetbaggers to seek political office.

During and immediately after the Civil War, many northerners headed to the southern states, driven by hopes of economic gain, a desire to work on behalf of the newly emancipated enslaved people or a combination of both. These “carpetbaggers”—whom many in the South viewed as opportunists looking to exploit and profit from the region’s misfortunes—supported the Republican Party, and would play a central role in shaping new southern governments during Reconstruction. In addition to carpetbaggers and freed African Americans, the majority of Republican support in the South came from white southerners who for various reasons saw more of an advantage in backing the policies of Reconstruction than in opposing them. Critics referred derisively to these southerners as “scalawags.”

Republican Rule in the South

In the two years following the assassination of President Abraham Lincoln and the end of the Civil War in April 1865, Lincoln's successor Andrew Johnson angered many northerners and Republican members of Congress with his conciliatory policies towards the defeated South. Freed African Americans had no role in politics, and the new southern legislatures even passed "black codes" restricting their freedom and forcing them into repressive labor situations, a development they strongly resisted. In the congressional elections of 1866, northern voters rejected Johnson's view of Reconstruction and handed a major victory to the so-called Radical Republicans, who now took control of Reconstruction.

Congress' passage of the Reconstruction Acts of 1867 marked the beginning of the Radical Reconstruction period, which would last for the next decade. That legislation divided the South into five military districts and outlined how new state governments based on universal (male) suffrage—for both whites and Blacks—were to be organized. The new state legislatures formed in 1867-69 reflected the revolutionary changes brought about by the Civil War and emancipation: For the first time, Blacks and whites stood together in political life. In general, the southern state governments formed during this period of Reconstruction represented a coalition of African Americans, recently arrived northern whites ("carpetbaggers") and southern white Republicans ("scalawags").

Carpetbaggers

In general, the term "carpetbagger" refers to a traveler who arrives in a new region with only a satchel (or carpetbag) of possessions, and who attempts to profit from or gain control over his new surroundings, often against the will or consent of the original inhabitants.

After 1865, a number of northerners moved to the South to purchase land, lease plantations or partner with down-and-out planters in the hopes of making money from cotton. At first they were welcomed, as southerners saw the need for northern capital and investment to get the devastated region back on its feet. They later became an object of much scorn, as many southerners saw them as low-class and opportunistic newcomers seeking to get rich on their misfortune.

In reality, most Reconstruction-era carpetbaggers were well-educated members of the middle class; they worked as teachers, merchants, journalists or other types of businessmen, or at the Freedman's Bureau, an organization created by Congress to provide aid for newly liberated Black Americans. Many were former Union soldiers.

In addition to economic motives, a good number of carpetbaggers saw themselves as reformers and wanted to shape the postwar South in the image of the North, which they considered to be a more advanced society. Though some carpetbaggers undoubtedly lived up to their reputation as corrupt opportunists, many were motivated by a genuine desire for reform and concern for the civil and political rights of freed Blacks.

Scalawags

White southern Republicans, known to their enemies as "scalawags," made up the biggest group of delegates to the Radical Reconstruction-era legislatures. Some scalawags were established planters (mostly in the Deep South) who thought that whites should recognize Blacks' civil and political rights while still retaining control of political and economic life. Many were former Whigs (conservatives) who saw the Republicans as the successors to their old party.

The majority of the scalawags were non-slaveholding small farmers as well as merchants, artisans and other professionals who had remained loyal to the Union during the Civil War. Many lived in the northern states of the region, and a number had either served in the Union Army or been imprisoned for Union sympathies. Though they differed in their views on race many had strong anti-Black attitudes these men wanted to keep the hated "rebels" from regaining power in the postwar South; they also sought to develop the region's economy and ensure the survival of its debt-ridden small farms.

The term scalawag was originally used as far back as the 1840s to describe a farm animal of little value; it later came to refer to a worthless person. For opponents of Reconstruction, scalawags were even lower on the scale of humanity than carpetbaggers, as they were viewed as traitors to the South.

Scalawags had diverse backgrounds and motives, but all of them shared the belief that they could achieve greater advancement in a Republican South than they could by opposing Reconstruction. Taken together, scalawags made up roughly 20 percent of the

white electorate and wielded a considerable influence. Many also had political experience from before the war, either as members of Congress or as judges or local officials.

Black Codes

Black codes were restrictive laws designed to limit the freedom of African Americans and ensure their availability as a cheap labor force after slavery was abolished during the Civil War. Though the Union victory had given some 4 million enslaved people their freedom, the question of freed Black people's status in the postwar South was still very much unresolved. Under black codes, many states required Black people to sign yearly labor contracts; if they refused, they risked being arrested, fined and forced into unpaid labor. Outrage over black codes helped undermine support for President Andrew Johnson and the Republican Party.

Reconstruction Begins

When President Abraham Lincoln announced the impending passage of the Emancipation Proclamation in early 1863, the stakes of the Civil War shifted dramatically. A Union victory would mean no less than revolution in the South, where the “peculiar institution” of slavery had dominated economic, political and social life in the antebellum years.

In April 1865, as the war drew to a close, Lincoln shocked many by proposing limited suffrage for African Americans in the South. He was assassinated days later, however, and his successor Andrew Johnson would be the one to preside over the beginning of Reconstruction.

Johnson, a former senator from Tennessee who had remained loyal to the Union during the war, was a firm supporter of states' rights and believed the federal government had no say in issues such as voting requirements at the state level.

Under his Reconstruction policies, which began in May 1865, the former Confederate states were required to uphold the abolition of slavery (made official by the 13th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution), swear loyalty to the Union and pay off their war debt. Beyond those limitations, the states and their ruling class—traditionally dominated by white planters—were given a relatively free hand in rebuilding their own governments.

Passage of the Black Codes

Even as former enslaved people fought to assert their independence and gain economic autonomy during the earliest years of Reconstruction, white landowners acted to control the labor force through a system similar to the one that had existed during slavery.

To that end, in late 1865, Mississippi and South Carolina enacted the first black codes. Mississippi's law required Black people to have written evidence of employment for the coming year each January; if they left before the end of the contract, they would be forced to forfeit earlier wages and were subject to arrest.

In South Carolina, a law prohibited Black people from holding any occupation other than farmer or servant unless they paid an annual tax of \$10 to \$100. This provision hit free Black people already living in Charleston and former slave artisans especially hard. In both states, Black people were given heavy penalties for vagrancy, including forced plantation labor in some cases.

Limits on Black Freedom

Under Johnson's Reconstruction policies, nearly all the southern states would enact their own black codes in 1865 and 1866. While the codes granted certain freedoms to African Americans including the right to buy and own property, marry, make contracts and testify in court (only in cases involving people of their own race) their primary purpose was to restrict Black peoples' labor and activity.

Some states limited the type of property that Black people could own, while virtually all the former Confederate states passed strict vagrancy and labor contract laws, as well as so-called "anti-enticement" measures designed to punish anyone who offered higher wages to a Black laborer already under contract.

Black people who broke labor contracts were subject to arrest, beating and forced labor, and apprenticeship laws forced many minors (either orphans or those whose parents were deemed unable to support them by a judge) into unpaid labor for white planters. Passed by a political system in which Black people effectively had no voice, the black codes were enforced by all-white police and state militia forces often made up of Confederate veterans of the Civil War across the South.

Impact of the Black Codes

The restrictive nature of the codes and widespread Black resistance to their enforcement enraged many in the North, who argued that the codes violated the fundamental principles of free labor ideology.

After passing the Civil Rights Act (over Johnson's veto), Republicans in Congress effectively took control of Reconstruction. The Reconstruction Act of 1867 required southern states to ratify the 14th Amendment which granted "equal protection" of the Constitution to former enslaved people and enact universal male suffrage before they could rejoin the Union.

The 15th Amendment, adopted in 1870, guaranteed that a citizen's right to vote would not be denied "on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." During this period of Radical Reconstruction (1867-1877), Black men won election to southern state governments and even to the U.S. Congress.

As indicated by the passage of the black codes, however, white southerners showed a steadfast commitment to ensuring their supremacy and the survival of plantation agriculture in the postwar years. Support for Reconstruction policies waned after the early 1870s, undermined by the violence of white supremacist organizations such as the Ku Klux Klan.

By 1877, when the last federal soldiers left the South and Reconstruction drew to a close, Black people had seen little improvement in their economic and social status, and the vigorous efforts of white supremacist forces throughout the region had undone the political gains they had made. Discrimination would continue in America with the rise of Jim Crow laws, but would inspire the civil rights movement to come.

Self-Assessment Questions

1. Explain the meaning and causes of sectional conflict in the United States.
2. Discuss slavery as the main cause of the American Civil War.
3. Write an essay on the role of Abraham Lincoln in the American Civil War.
4. Examine the chief aim of Abraham Lincoln during the Civil War.
5. Describe the Reconstruction period in the United States (1865–1877).
6. Analyze the objectives and significance of the Civil Rights Act.
7. Explain the provisions and importance of the 14th Amendment.
8. Write an account of the role of Carpetbaggers during Reconstruction.
9. Examine who the Scalawags were and their role in Southern politics.
10. Describe the Black Codes and their impact on African Americans.

Unit- II

Westward Expansion (1860-1900) -Industrialization and the Rise of Big Business –
Growing Pains of Urbanization (1870-1900) -Politics in the Gilded Age.

Objectives

- To understand Westward Expansion (1860–1900) in the USA.
- To analyze industrialization and big business.
- To examine urban problems (1870–1900).
- To study Gilded Age politics and its impact.

Westward Expansion (1860-1900)

Widely held rhetoric of the nineteenth century suggested to Americans that it was their divine right and responsibility to settle the West with Protestant democratic values. Newspaper editor Horace Greely, who coined the phrase “Go west, young man,” encouraged Americans to fulfill this dream. Artists of the day depicted this western expansion in idealized landscapes that bore little resemblance to the difficulties of life on the trail.

Introduction

In the middle of the nineteenth century, farmers in the “Old West”—the land across the Allegheny Mountains in Pennsylvania—began to hear about the opportunities to be found in the “New West.” They had long believed that the land west of the Mississippi was a great desert, unfit for human habitation. But now, the federal government was encouraging them to join the migratory stream westward to this unknown land. For a variety of reasons, Americans increasingly felt compelled to fulfill their “Manifest Destiny,” a phrase that came to mean that they were expected to spread across the land given to them by God and, most importantly, spread predominantly American values to the frontier.

With great trepidation, hundreds, and then hundreds of thousands, of settlers packed their lives into wagons and set out, following the Oregon, California, and Santa Fe Trails, to seek a new life in the West. Some sought open lands and greater freedom to fulfill the democratic vision originally promoted by Thomas Jefferson and experienced by their ancestors. Others saw economic opportunity. Still others believed it was their job

to spread the word of God to the “heathens” on the frontier. Whatever their motivation, the great migration was underway. The American pioneer spirit was born.

The Westward Spirit

While a small number of settlers had pushed westward before the mid-nineteenth century, the land west of the Mississippi was largely unexplored. Most Americans, if they thought of it at all, viewed this territory as an arid wasteland suitable only for Indians whom the federal government had displaced from eastern lands in previous generations. The reflections of early explorers who conducted scientific treks throughout the West tended to confirm this belief. Major Stephen Harriman Long, who commanded an expedition through Missouri and into the Yellowstone region in 1819–1820, frequently described the Great Plains as a arid and useless region, suitable as nothing more than a “great American desert.” But, beginning in the 1840s, a combination of economic opportunity and ideological encouragement changed the way Americans thought of the West. The federal government offered a number of incentives, making it viable for Americans to take on the challenge of seizing these rough lands from others and subsequently taming them. Still, most Americans who went west needed some financial security at the outset of their journey; even with government aid, the truly poor could not make the trip. The cost of moving an entire family westward, combined with the risks as well as the questionable chances of success, made the move prohibitive for most. While the economic Panic of 1837 led many to question the promise of urban America, and thus turn their focus to the promise of commercial farming in the West, the Panic also resulted in many lacking the financial resources to make such a commitment. For most, the dream to “Go west, young man” remained unfulfilled.

While much of the basis for westward expansion was economic, there was also a more philosophical reason, which was bound up in the American belief that the country—and the “heathens” who populated it—was destined to come under the civilizing rule of Euro-American settlers and their superior technology, most notably railroads and the telegraph. While the extent to which that belief was a heartfelt motivation held by most Americans, or simply a rationalization of the conquests that followed, remains debatable, the clashes—both physical and cultural—that followed this western migration left scars on the country that are still felt today.

Manifest Destiny

The concept of Manifest Destiny found its roots in the long-standing traditions of territorial expansion upon which the nation itself was founded. This phrase, which implies divine encouragement for territorial expansion, was coined by magazine editor John O’Sullivan in 1845, when he wrote in the *United States Magazine and Democratic Review* that “it was our manifest destiny to overspread the continent allotted by Providence for the free development of our multiplying millions.” Although the context of Sullivan’s original article was to encourage expansion into the newly acquired Texas territory, the spirit it invoked would subsequently be used to encourage westward settlement throughout the rest of the nineteenth century. Land developers, railroad magnates, and other investors capitalized on the notion to encourage westward settlement for their own financial benefit. Soon thereafter, the federal government encouraged this inclination as a means to further develop the West during the Civil War, especially at its outset, when concerns over the possible expansion of slavery deeper into western territories was a legitimate fear.

The idea was simple: Americans were destined—and indeed divinely ordained—to expand democratic institutions throughout the continent. As they spread their culture, thoughts, and customs, they would, in the process, “improve” the lives of the native inhabitants who might otherwise resist Protestant institutions and, more importantly, economic development of the land. O’Sullivan may have coined the phrase, but the concept had preceded him: Throughout the 1800s, politicians and writers had stated the belief that the United States was destined to rule the continent. O’Sullivan’s words, which resonated in the popular press, matched the economic and political goals of a federal government increasingly committed to expansion.

Manifest Destiny justified in Americans’ minds their right and duty to govern any other groups they encountered during their expansion, as well as absolved them of any questionable tactics they employed in the process. While the commonly held view of the day was of a relatively empty frontier, waiting for the arrival of the settlers who could properly exploit the vast resources for economic gain, the reality was quite different. Hispanic communities in the Southwest, diverse Indian tribes throughout the western states, as well as other settlers from Asia and Western Europe already lived in many parts

of the country. American expansion would necessitate a far more complex and involved exchange than simply filling empty space.

Still, in part as a result of the spark lit by O'Sullivan and others, waves of Americans and recently arrived immigrants began to move west in wagon trains. They travelled along several identifiable trails: first the Oregon Trail, then later the Santa Fe and California Trails, among others. The Oregon Trail is the most famous of these western routes. Two thousand miles long and barely passable on foot in the early nineteenth century, by the 1840s, wagon trains were a common sight. Between 1845 and 1870, considered to be the height of migration along the trail, over 400,000 settlers followed this path west from Missouri.

Federal Government Assistance

To assist the settlers in their move westward and transform the migration from a trickle into a steady flow, Congress passed two significant pieces of legislation in 1862: the Homestead Act and the Pacific Railway Act. Born largely out of President Abraham Lincoln's growing concern that a potential Union defeat in the early stages of the Civil War might result in the expansion of slavery westward, Lincoln hoped that such laws would encourage the expansion of a "free soil" mentality across the West.

The Homestead Act allowed any head of household, or individual over the age of twenty-one—including unmarried women—to receive a parcel of 160 acres for only a nominal filing fee. All that recipients were required to do in exchange was to "improve the land" within a period of five years of taking possession. The standards for improvement were minimal: Owners could clear a few acres, build small houses or barns, or maintain livestock. Under this act, the government transferred over 270 million acres of public domain land to private citizens.

The Pacific Railway Act was pivotal in helping settlers move west more quickly, as well as move their farm products and later cattle and mining deposits, back east. The first of many railway initiatives, this act commissioned the Union Pacific Railroad to build new track west from Omaha, Nebraska, while the Central Pacific Railroad moved east from Sacramento, California. The law provided each company with ownership of all public lands within two hundred feet on either side of the track laid, as well as additional land grants and payment through load bonds, prorated on the difficulty of the terrain it

crossed. Because of these provisions, both companies made a significant profit, whether they were crossing hundreds of miles of open plains, or working their way through the Sierra Nevada Mountains of California. As a result, the nation's first transcontinental railroad was completed when the two companies connected their tracks at Promontory Point, Utah, in the spring of 1869. Other tracks, including lines radiating from this original one, subsequently created a network that linked all corners of the nation.

In addition to legislation designed to facilitate western settlement, the U.S. government assumed an active role on the ground, building numerous forts throughout the West to protect and assist settlers during their migration. Forts such as Fort Laramie in Wyoming (built in 1834) and Fort Apache in Arizona (1870) served as protection from nearby Indians as well as maintained peace between potential warring tribes. Others located throughout Colorado and Wyoming became important trading posts for miners and fur trappers. Those built in Kansas, Nebraska, and the Dakotas served primarily to provide relief for farmers during times of drought or related hardships. Forts constructed along the California coastline provided protection in the wake of the Mexican-American War as well as during the American Civil War. These locations subsequently serviced the U.S. Navy and provided important support for growing Pacific trade routes. Whether as army posts constructed for the protection of white settlers and to maintain peace among Indian tribes, or as trading posts to further facilitate the development of the region, such forts proved to be vital contributions to westward migration.

Who were the Settlers?

In the nineteenth century, as today, it took money to relocate and start a new life. Due to the initial cost of relocation, land, and supplies, as well as months of preparing the soil, planting, and subsequent harvesting before any produce was ready for market, the original wave of western settlers along the Oregon Trail in the 1840s and 1850s consisted of moderately prosperous, white, native-born farming families of the East. But the passage of the Homestead Act and completion of the first transcontinental railroad meant that, by 1870, the possibility of western migration was opened to Americans of more modest means. What started as a trickle became a steady flow of migration that would last until the end of the century.

Nearly 400,000 settlers had made the trek westward by the height of the movement in 1870. The vast majority were men, although families also migrated, despite incredible hardships for women with young children. More recent immigrants also migrated west, with the largest numbers coming from Northern Europe and Canada. Germans, Scandinavians, and Irish were among the most common. These ethnic groups tended to settle close together, creating strong rural communities that mirrored the way of life they had left behind. According to U.S. Census Bureau records, the number of Scandinavians living in the United States during the second half of the nineteenth century exploded, from barely 18,000 in 1850 to over 1.1 million in 1900. During that same time period, the German-born population in the United States grew from 584,000 to nearly 2.7 million and the Irish-born population grew from 961,000 to 1.6 million. As they moved westward, several thousand immigrants established homesteads in the Midwest, primarily in Minnesota and Wisconsin, where, as of 1900, over one-third of the population was foreign-born, and in North Dakota, whose immigrant population stood at 45 percent at the turn of the century. Compared to European immigrants, those from China were much less numerous, but still significant. More than 200,000 Chinese arrived in California between 1876 and 1890, albeit for entirely different reasons related to the Gold Rush.

In addition to a significant European migration westward, several thousand African Americans migrated west following the Civil War, as much to escape the racism and violence of the Old South as to find new economic opportunities. They were known as exoduses, referencing the biblical flight from Egypt, because they fled the racism of the South, with most of them headed to Kansas from Kentucky, Tennessee, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas. Over twenty-five thousand exoduses arrived in Kansas in 1879–1880 alone. By 1890, over 500,000 blacks lived west of the Mississippi River. Although the majority of black migrants became farmers, approximately twelve thousand worked as cowboys during the Texas cattle drives. Some also became “Buffalo Soldiers” in the wars against Indians. “Buffalo Soldiers” were African Americans allegedly so-named by various Indian tribes who equated their black, curly hair with that of the buffalo. Many had served in the Union army in the Civil War and were now organized into six, allblack cavalry and infantry units whose primary duties were to protect settlers from Indian

attacks during the westward migration, as well as to assist in building the infrastructure required to support western settlement.

While white easterners, immigrants, and African Americans were moving west, several hundred thousand Hispanics had already settled in the American Southwest prior to the U.S. government seizing the land during its war with Mexico (1846–1848). The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which ended the war in 1848, granted American citizenship to those who chose to stay in the United States, as the land switched from Mexican to U.S. ownership. Under the conditions of the treaty, Mexicans retained the right to their language, religion, and culture, as well as the property they held. As for citizenship, they could choose one of three options: 1) declare their intent to live in the United States but retain Mexican citizenship; 2) become U.S. citizens with all rights under the constitution; or 3) leave for Mexico. Despite such guarantees, within one generation, these new Hispanic American citizens found their culture under attack, and legal protection of their property all but non-existent.

Homesteading: Dreams and Realities

As settlers and homesteaders moved westward to improve the land given to them through the Homestead Act, they faced a difficult and often insurmountable challenge. The land was difficult to farm, there were few building materials, and harsh weather, insects, and inexperience led to frequent setbacks. The prohibitive prices charged by the first railroad lines made it expensive to ship crops to market or have goods sent out. Although many farms failed, some survived and grew into large “bonanza” farms that hired additional labor and were able to benefit enough from economies of scale to grow profitable. Still, small family farms, and the settlers who worked them, were hard-pressed to do more than scrape out a living in an unforgiving environment that comprised arid land, violent weather shifts, and other challenges.

The Difficult Life of the Pioneer Farmer

Of the hundreds of thousands of settlers who moved west, the vast majority were homesteaders. These pioneers, like the Ingalls family of *Little House on the Prairie* book and television fame (see inset below), were seeking land and opportunity. Popularly known as “sodbusters,” these men and women in the Midwest faced a difficult life on the frontier. They settled throughout the land that now makes up the Midwestern states of

Wisconsin, Minnesota, Kansas, Nebraska, and the Dakotas. The weather and environment were bleak, and settlers struggled to eke out a living. A few unseasonably rainy years had led would-be settlers to believe that the “great desert” was no more, but the region’s typically low rainfall and harsh temperatures made crop cultivation hard. Irrigation was a requirement, but finding water and building adequate systems proved too difficult and expensive for many farmers. It was not until 1902 and the passage of the Newlands Reclamation Act that a system finally existed to set aside funds from the sale of public lands to build dams for subsequent irrigation efforts. Prior to that, farmers across the Great Plains relied primarily on dry-farming techniques to grow corn, wheat, and sorghum, a practice that many continued in later years. A few also began to employ windmill technology to draw water, although both the drilling and construction of windmills became an added expense that few farmers could afford.

The first houses built by western settlers were typically made of mud and sod with thatch roofs, as there was little timber for building. Rain, when it arrived, presented constant problems for these sod houses, with mud falling into food, and vermin, most notably lice, scampering across bedding. Weather patterns not only left the fields dry, they also brought tornadoes, droughts, blizzards, and insect swarms. Tales of swarms of locusts were commonplace, and the crop-eating insects would at times cover the ground six to twelve inches deep. One frequently quoted Kansas newspaper reported a locust swarm in 1878 during which the insects devoured “everything green, stripping the foliage off the bark and from the tender twigs of the fruit trees, destroying every plant that is good for food or pleasant to the eye, that man has planted.”

Farmers also faced the ever-present threat of debt and farm foreclosure by the banks. While land was essentially free under the Homestead Act, all other farm necessities cost money and were initially difficult to obtain in the newly settled parts of the country where market economies did not yet fully reach. Horses, livestock, wagons, wells, fencing, seed, and fertilizer were all critical to survival, but often hard to come by as the population initially remained sparsely settled across vast tracts of land. Railroads charged notoriously high rates for farm equipment and livestock, making it difficult to procure goods or make a profit on anything sent back east. Banks also charged high interest rates, and, in a cycle that replayed itself year after year, farmers would borrow

from the bank with the intention of repaying their debt after the harvest. As the number of farmers moving westward increased, the market price of their produce steadily declined, even as the value of the actual land increased. Each year, hard-working farmers produced everlarger crops, flooding the markets and subsequently driving prices down even further. Although some understood the economics of supply and demand, none could overtly control such forces.

Eventually, the arrival of a more extensive railroad network aided farmers, mostly by bringing much needed supplies such as lumber for construction and new farm machinery. While John Deere sold a steel-faced plow as early as 1838, it was James Oliver's improvements to the device in the late 1860s that transformed life for homesteaders. His new, less expensive "chilled plow" was better equipped to cut through the shallow grass roots of the Midwestern terrain, as well as withstand damage from rocks just below the surface. Similar advancements in hay mowers, manure spreaders, and threshing machines greatly improved farm production for those who could afford them. Where capital expense became a significant factor, larger commercial farms known as "bonanza farms" began to develop. Farmers in Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota hired migrant farmers to grow wheat on farms in excess of twenty thousand acres each. These large farms were succeeding by the end of the century, but small family farms continued to suffer. Although the land was nearly free, it cost close to \$1000 for the necessary supplies to start up a farm, and many would-be landowners lured westward by the promise of cheap land became migrant farmers instead, working other peoples' land for a wage. The frustration of small farmers grew, ultimately leading to a revolt of sorts, discussed in a later chapter.

An Even More Challenging Life: A Pioneer Wife

Although the West was numerically a male-dominated society, homesteading in particular encouraged the presence of women, families, and a domestic lifestyle, even if such a life was not an easy one. Women faced all the physical hardships that men encountered in terms of weather, illness, and danger, with the added complication of childbirth. Often, there was no doctor or midwife providing assistance, and many women died from treatable complications, as did their newborns. While some women could find employment in the newly settled towns as teachers, cooks, or seamstresses, they

originally did not enjoy many rights. They could not sell property, sue for divorce, serve on juries, or vote. And for the vast majority of women, their work was not in towns for money, but on the farm. As late as 1900, a typical farm wife could expect to devote nine hours per day to chores such as cleaning, sewing, laundering, and preparing food. Two additional hours per day were spent cleaning the barn and chicken coop, milking the cows, caring for the chickens, and tending the family garden. One wife commented in 1879, “[We are] not much better than slaves. It is a weary, monotonous round of cooking and washing and mending and as a result the insane asylum is a third filled with wives of farmers.”

Despite this grim image, the challenges of farm life eventually empowered women to break through some legal and social barriers. Many lived more equitably as partners with their husbands than did their eastern counterparts, helping each other through both hard times and good. If widowed, a wife typically took over responsibility for the farm, a level of management that was very rare back east, where the farm would fall to a son or other male relation. Pioneer women made important decisions and were considered by their husbands to be more equal partners in the success of the homestead, due to the necessity that all members had to work hard and contribute to the farming enterprise for it to succeed. Therefore, it is not surprising that the first states to grant women’s rights, including the right to vote, were those in the Pacific Northwest and Upper Midwest, where women pioneers worked the land side by side with men. Some women seemed to be well suited to the challenges that frontier life presented them. Writing to her Aunt Martha from their homestead in Minnesota in 1873, Mary Carpenter refused to complain about the hardships of farm life: “I try to trust in God’s promises, but we can’t expect him to work miracles nowadays. Nevertheless, all that is expected of us is to do the best we can, and that we shall certainly endeavor to do. Even if we do freeze and starve in the way of duty, it will not be a dishonorable death.”

Making a Living in Gold and Cattle

Although homestead farming was the primary goal of most western settlers in the latter half of the nineteenth century, a small minority sought to make their fortunes quickly through other means. Specifically, gold (and, subsequently, silver and copper) prospecting attracted thousands of miners looking to “get rich quick” before returning

east. In addition, ranchers capitalized on newly available railroad lines to move longhorn steers that populated southern and western Texas. This meat was highly sought after in eastern markets, and the demand created not only wealthy ranchers but an era of cowboys and cattle drives that in many ways defines how we think of the West today. Although neither miners nor ranchers intended to remain permanently in the West, many individuals from both groups ultimately stayed and settled there, sometimes due to the success of their gamble, and other times due to their abject failure.

The California Gold Rush and Beyond

The allure of gold has long sent people on wild chases; in the American West, the possibility of quick riches was no different. The search for gold represented an opportunity far different from the slow plod that homesteading farmers faced. The discovery of gold at Sutter's Mill in Coloma, California, set a pattern for such strikes that was repeated again and again for the next decade, in what collectively became known as the California Gold Rush. In what became typical, a sudden disorderly rush of prospectors descended upon a new discovery site, followed by the arrival of those who hoped to benefit from the strike by preying off the newly rich. This latter group of camp followers included saloonkeepers, prostitutes, store owners, and criminals, who all arrived in droves. If the strike was significant in size, a town of some magnitude might establish itself, and some semblance of law and order might replace the vigilante justice that typically grew in the small and short-lived mining outposts.

The original Forty-Niners were individual prospectors who sifted gold out of the dirt and gravel through "panning" or by diverting a stream through a sluice box. To varying degrees, the original California Gold Rush repeated itself throughout Colorado and Nevada for the next two decades. In 1859, Henry T. P. Comstock, a Canadian-born fur trapper, began gold mining in Nevada with other prospectors but then quickly found a blue-colored vein that proved to be the first significant silver discovery in the United States. Within twenty years, the Comstock Lode, as it was called, yielded more than \$300 million in shafts that reached hundreds of feet into the mountain. Subsequent mining in Arizona and Montana yielded copper, and, while it lacked the glamour of gold, these deposits created huge wealth for those who exploited them, particularly with the advent of copper wiring for the delivery of electricity and telegraph communication.

By the 1860s and 1870s, however, individual efforts to locate precious metals were less successful. The lowest-hanging fruit had been picked, and now it required investment capital and machinery to dig mine shafts that could reach remaining ore. With a much larger investment, miners needed a larger strike to be successful. This shift led to larger businesses underwriting mining operations, which eventually led to the development of greater urban stability and infrastructure. Denver, Colorado, was one of several cities that became permanent settlements, as businesses sought a stable environment to use as a base for their mining ventures.

For miners who had not yet struck it rich, this development was not a good one. They were now paid a daily or weekly wage to work underground in very dangerous conditions. They worked in shafts where the temperature could rise to above one hundred degrees Fahrenheit, and where poor ventilation might lead to long-term lung disease. They coped with shaft fires, dynamite explosions, and frequent cave-ins. By some historical accounts, close to eight thousand miners died on the frontier during this period, with over three times that number suffering crippling injuries. Some miners organized into unions and led strikes for better conditions, but these efforts were usually crushed by state militias.

Eventually, as the ore dried up, most mining towns turned into ghost towns. Even today, a visit through the American West shows old saloons and storefronts, abandoned as the residents moved on to their next shot at riches. The true lasting impact of the early mining efforts was the resulting desire of the U.S. government to bring law and order to the “Wild West” in order to more efficiently extract natural resources and encourage stable growth in the region. As more Americans moved to the region to seek permanent settlement, as opposed to brief speculative ventures, they also sought the safety and support that government order could bring. Nevada was admitted to the Union as a state in 1864, with Colorado following in 1876, then North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington in 1889; and Idaho and Wyoming in 1890.

The Cattle Kingdom

While the cattle industry lacked the romance of the Gold Rush, the role it played in western expansion should not be underestimated. For centuries, wild cattle roamed the Spanish borderlands. At the end of the Civil War, as many as five million longhorn steers

could be found along the Texas frontier, yet few settlers had capitalized on the opportunity to claim them, due to the difficulty of transporting them to eastern markets. The completion of the first transcontinental railroad and subsequent railroad lines changed the game dramatically. Cattle ranchers and eastern businessmen realized that it was profitable to round up the wild steers and transport them by rail to be sold in the East for as much as thirty to fifty dollars per head. These ranchers and businessmen began the rampant speculation in the cattle industry that made, and lost, many fortunes.

So began the impressive cattle drives of the 1860s and 1870s. The famous Chisholm Trail provided a quick path from Texas to railroad terminals in Abilene, Wichita, and Dodge City, Kansas, where cowboys would receive their pay. These “cow towns,” as they became known, quickly grew to accommodate the needs of cowboys and the cattle industry. Cattlemen like Joseph G. McCoy, born in Illinois, quickly realized that the railroad offered a perfect way to get highly sought beef from Texas to the East. McCoy chose Abilene as a locale that would offer cowboys a convenient place to drive the cattle, and went about building stockyards, hotels, banks, and more to support the business. He promoted his services and encouraged cowboys to bring their cattle through Abilene for good money; soon, the city had grown into a bustling western city, complete with ways for the cowboys to spend their hard-earned pay.

Between 1865 and 1885, as many as forty thousand cowboys roamed the Great Plains, hoping to work for local ranchers. They were all men, typically in their twenties, and close to one-third of them were Hispanic or African American. It is worth noting that the stereotype of the American cowboy and indeed the cowboys themselves—borrowed much from the Mexicans who had long ago settled those lands. The saddles, lassos, chaps, and lariats that define cowboy culture all arose from the Mexican ranchers who had used them to great effect before the cowboys arrived.

Life as a cowboy was dirty and decidedly unglamorous. The terrain was difficult; conflicts with Native Americans, especially in Indian Territory (now Oklahoma), were notoriously deadly. But the longhorn cattle were hardy stock, and could survive and thrive while grazing along the long trail, so cowboys braved the trip for the promise of steady employment and satisfying wages. Eventually, however, the era of the free range ended. Ranchers developed the land, limiting grazing opportunities along the trail, and in

1873, the new technology of barbed wire allowed ranchers to fence off their lands and cattle claims. With the end of the free range, the cattle industry, like the mining industry before it, grew increasingly dominated by eastern businessmen. Capital investors from the East expanded rail lines and invested in ranches, ending the reign of the cattle drives.

Violence in the Wild West: Myth and Reality

The popular image of the Wild West portrayed in books, television, and film has been one of violence and mayhem. The lure of quick riches through mining or driving cattle meant that much of the West did indeed consist of rough men living a rough life, although the violence was exaggerated and even glorified in the dime store novels of the day. The exploits of Wyatt Earp, Doc Holiday, and others made for good stories, but the reality was that western violence was more isolated than the stories might suggest. These clashes often occurred as people struggled for the scarce resources that could make or break their chance at riches, or as they dealt with the sudden wealth or poverty that prospecting provided.

Where sporadic violence did erupt, it was concentrated largely in mining towns or during range wars among large and small cattle ranchers. Some mining towns were indeed as rough as the popular stereotype. Men, money, liquor, and disappointment were a recipe for violence. Fights were frequent, deaths were commonplace, and frontier justice reigned. The notorious mining town of Bodie, California, had twenty-nine murders between 1877 and 1883, which translated to a murder rate higher than any other city at that time, and only one person was ever convicted of a crime. The most prolific gunman of the day was John Wesley Hardin, who allegedly killed over twenty men in Texas in various gunfights, including one victim he killed in a hotel for snoring too loudly.

Ranching brought with it its own dangers and violence. In the Texas cattle lands, owners of large ranches took advantage of their wealth and the new invention of barbed wire to claim the prime grazing lands and few significant watering holes for their herds. Those seeking only to move their few head of cattle to market grew increasingly frustrated at their inability to find even a blade of grass for their meager herds. Eventually, frustration turned to violence, as several ranchers resorted to vandalizing the barbed wire fences to gain access to grass and water for their steers. Such vandalism

quickly led to cattle rustling, as these cowboys were not averse to leading a few of the rancher's steers into their own herds as they left.

One example of the violence that bubbled up was the infamous Fence Cutting War in Clay County, Texas (1883–1884). There, cowboys began destroying fences that several ranchers erected along public lands: land they had no right to enclose. Confrontations between the cowboys and armed guards hired by the ranchers resulted in three deaths—hardly a “war,” but enough of a problem to get the governor's attention. Eventually, a special session of the Texas legislature addressed the problem by passing laws to outlaw fence cutting, but also forced ranchers to remove fences illegally erected along public lands, as well as to place gates for passage where public areas adjoined private lands.

An even more violent confrontation occurred between large ranchers and small farmers in Johnson County, Wyoming, where cattle ranchers organized a “lynching bee” in 1891–1892 to make examples of cattle rustlers. Hiring twenty-two “invaders” from Texas to serve as hired guns, the ranch owners and their foremen hunted and subsequently killed the two rustlers best known for organizing the owners of the smaller Wyoming farms. Only the intervention of federal troops, who arrested and then later released the invaders, allowing them to return to Texas, prevented a greater massacre.

While there is much talk—both real and mythical—of the rough men who lived this life, relatively few women experienced it. While homesteaders were often families, gold speculators and cowboys tended to be single men in pursuit of fortune. The few women who went to these wild outposts were typically prostitutes, and even their numbers were limited. In 1860, in the Comstock Lode region of Nevada, for example, there were reportedly only thirty women total in a town of twenty-five hundred men. Some of the “painted ladies” who began as prostitutes eventually owned brothels and emerged as businesswomen in their own right; however, life for these young women remained a challenging one as western settlement progressed. A handful of women, numbering no more than six hundred, braved both the elements and male-dominated culture to become teachers in several of the more established cities in the West. Even fewer arrived to support husbands or operate stores in these mining towns.

As wealthy men brought their families west, the lawless landscape began to change slowly. Abilene, Kansas, is one example of a lawless town, replete with prostitutes, gambling, and other vices, transformed when middle-class women arrived in the 1880s with their cattle baron husbands. These women began to organize churches, school, civic clubs, and other community programs to promote family values. They fought to remove opportunities for prostitution and all the other vices that they felt threatened the values that they held dear. Protestant missionaries eventually joined the women in their efforts, and, while they were not widely successful, they did bring greater attention to the problems. As a response, the U.S. Congress passed both the Comstock Law (named after its chief proponent, anti-obscenity crusader Anthony Comstock) in 1873 to ban the spread of “lewd and lascivious literature” through the mail and the subsequent Page Act of 1875 to prohibit the transportation of women into the United States for employment as prostitutes. However, the “houses of ill repute” continued to operate and remained popular throughout the West despite the efforts of reformers.

The Loss of American Indian Life and Culture

As American settlers pushed westward, they inevitably came into conflict with Indian tribes that had long been living on the land. Although the threat of Indian attacks was quite slim and nowhere proportionate to the number of U.S. Army actions directed against them, the occasional attack—often one of retaliation—was enough to fuel the popular fear of the “savage” Indians. The clashes, when they happened, were indeed brutal, although most of the brutality occurred at the hands of the settlers. Ultimately, the settlers, with the support of local militias and, later, with the federal government behind them, sought to eliminate the tribes from the lands they desired. The result was devastating for the Indian tribes, which lacked the weapons and group cohesion to fight back against such well-armed forces. The Manifest Destiny of the settlers spelled the end of the Indian way of life.

Claiming Land, Relocating Landowners

Back east, the popular vision of the West was of a vast and empty land. But of course this was an exaggerated depiction. On the eve of westward expansion, as many as 250,000 Indians, representing a variety of tribes, populated the Great Plains. Previous wars against these tribes in the early nineteenth century, as well as the failure of earlier

treaties, had led to a general policy of the forcible removal of many tribes in the eastern United States. The Indian Removal Act of 1830 resulted in the infamous “Trail of Tears,” which saw nearly fifty thousand Seminole, Choctaw, Chickasaw, and Creek Indians relocated west of the Mississippi River to what is now Oklahoma between 1831 and 1838. Building upon such a history, the U.S. government was prepared, during the era of western settlement, to deal with tribes that settlers viewed as obstacles to expansion.

As settlers sought more land for farming, mining, and cattle ranching, the first strategy employed to deal with the perceived Indian threat was to negotiate settlements to move tribes out of the path of white settlers. In 1851, the chiefs of most of the Great Plains tribes agreed to the First Treaty of Fort Laramie. This agreement established distinct tribal borders, essentially codifying the reservation system. In return for annual payments of \$50,000 to the tribes (originally guaranteed for fifty years, but later revised to last for only ten) as well as the hollow promise of noninterference from westward settlers, Indians agreed to stay clear of the path of settlement. Due to government corruption, many annuity payments never reached the tribes, and some reservations were left destitute and near starving. In addition, within a decade, as the pace and number of western settlers increased, even designated reservations became prime locations for farms and mining. Rather than negotiating new treaties, settlers oftentimes backed by local or state militia units simply attacked the tribes out of fear or to force them from the land. Some Indians resisted, only to then face massacres.

In 1862, frustrated and angered by the lack of annuity payments and the continuous encroachment on their reservation lands, Dakota Sioux Indians in Minnesota rebelled in what became known as the Dakota War, killing the white settlers who moved onto their tribal lands. Over one thousand white settlers were captured or killed in the attack, before an armed militia regained control. Of the four hundred Sioux captured by U.S. troops, 303 were sentenced to death, but President Lincoln intervened, releasing all but thirty-eight of the men. The thirty-eight who were found guilty were hanged in the largest mass execution in the country’s history, and the rest of the tribe was banished. Settlers in other regions responded to news of this raid with fear and aggression. In Colorado, Arapahoe and Cheyenne tribes fought back against land encroachment; white militias then formed, decimating even some of the tribes that were willing to cooperate.

One of the more vicious examples was near Sand Creek, Colorado, where Colonel John Chivington led a militia raid upon a camp in which the leader had already negotiated a peaceful settlement. The camp was flying both the American flag and the white flag of surrender when Chivington's troops murdered close to one hundred people, the majority of them women and children, in what became known as the Sand Creek Massacre. For the rest of his life, Chivington would proudly display his collection of nearly one hundred Indian scalps from that day. Subsequent investigations by the U.S. Army condemned Chivington's tactics and their results; however, the raid served as a model for some settlers who sought any means by which to eradicate the perceived Indian threat.

Hoping to forestall similar uprisings and all-out Indian wars, the U.S. Congress commissioned a committee to investigate the causes of such incidents. The subsequent report of their findings led to the passage of two additional treaties: the Second Treaty of Fort Laramie and the Treaty of Medicine Lodge Creek, both designed to move the remaining tribes to even more remote reservations. The Second Treaty of Fort Laramie moved the remaining Sioux to the Black Hills in the Dakota Territory and the Treaty of Medicine Lodge Creek moved the Cheyenne, Arapaho, Kiowa, and Comanche to "Indian Territory," later to become the State of Oklahoma.

The agreements were short-lived, however. With the subsequent discovery of gold in the Black Hills, settlers seeking their fortune began to move upon the newly granted Sioux lands with support from U.S. cavalry troops. By the middle of 1875, thousands of white prospectors were illegally digging and panning in the area. The Sioux protested the invasion of their territory and the violation of sacred ground. The government offered to lease the Black Hills or to pay \$6 million if the Indians were willing to sell the land. When the tribes refused, the government imposed what it considered a fair price for the land, ordered the Indians to move, and in the spring of 1876, made ready to force them onto the reservation.

In the Battle of Little Bighorn, perhaps the most famous battle of the American West, a Sioux chieftain, Sitting Bull, urged Indians from all neighboring tribes to join his men in defense of their lands. At the Little Bighorn River, the U.S. Army's Seventh Cavalry, led by Colonel George Custer, sought a showdown. Driven by his own personal ambition, on June 25, 1876, Custer foolishly attacked what he thought was a minor

Indian encampment. Instead, it turned out to be the main Sioux force. The Sioux warriors—nearly three thousand in strength—surrounded and killed Custer and 262 of his men and support units, in the single greatest loss of U.S. troops to an Indian attack in the era of westward expansion. Eyewitness reports of the attack indicated that the victorious Sioux bathed and wrapped Custer's body in the tradition of a chieftain burial; however, they dismembered many other soldiers' corpses in order for a few distant observers from Major Marcus Reno's wounded troops and Captain Frederick Benteen's company to report back to government officials about the ferocity of the Sioux enemy.

American Indian Submission

Despite their success at Little Bighorn, neither the Sioux nor any other Plains tribe followed this battle with any other armed encounter. Rather, they either returned to tribal life or fled out of fear of remaining troops, until the U.S. Army arrived in greater numbers and began to exterminate Indian encampments and force others to accept payment for forcible removal from their lands. Sitting Bull himself fled to Canada, although he later returned in 1881 and subsequently worked in Buffalo Bill's Wild West show. In Montana, the Blackfoot and Crow were forced to leave their tribal lands. In Colorado, the Utes gave up their lands after a brief period of resistance. In Idaho, most of the Nez Perce gave up their lands peacefully, although in an incredible episode, a band of some eight hundred Indians sought to evade U.S. troops and escape into Canada.

The final episode in the so-called Indian Wars occurred in 1890, at the Battle of Wounded Knee in South Dakota. On their reservation, the Sioux had begun to perform the "Ghost Dance," which told of an Indian Messiah who would deliver the tribe from its hardship, with such frequency that white settlers began to worry that another uprising would occur. The militia prepared to round up the Sioux. The tribe, after the death of Sitting Bull, who had been arrested, shot, and killed in 1890, prepared to surrender at Wounded Knee, South Dakota, on December 29, 1890. Although the accounts are unclear, an apparent accidental rifle discharge by a young male Indian preparing to lay down his weapon led the U.S. soldiers to begin firing indiscriminately upon the Indians. What little resistance the Indians mounted with a handful of concealed rifles at the outset of the fight diminished quickly, with the troops eventually massacring between 150 and 300 men, women, and children. The U.S. troops suffered twenty-five fatalities, some of

which were the result of their own crossfire. Captain Edward Godfrey of the Seventh Cavalry later commented, “I know the men did not aim deliberately and they were greatly excited. I don’t believe they saw their sights. They fired rapidly but it seemed to me only a few seconds till there was not a living thing before us; warriors, squaws, children, ponies, and dogs went down before that unaimed fire.” With this last show of brutality, the Indian Wars came to a close. U.S. government officials had already begun the process of seeking an alternative to the meaningless treaties and costly battles. A more effective means with which to address the public perception of the “Indian threat” was needed. Americanization provided the answer.

Americanization

Through the years of the Indian Wars of the 1870s and early 1880s, opinion back east was mixed. There were many who felt, as General Philip Sheridan (appointed in 1867 to pacify the Plains Indians) allegedly said, that the only good Indian was a dead Indian. But increasingly, several American reformers who would later form the backbone of the Progressive Era had begun to criticize the violence, arguing that the Indians should be helped through “Americanization” to become assimilated into American society. Individual land ownership, Christian worship, and education for children became the cornerstones of this new, and final, assault on Indian life and culture.

Beginning in the 1880s, clergymen, government officials, and social workers all worked to assimilate Indians into American life. The government permitted reformers to remove Indian children from their homes and place them in boarding schools, such as the Carlisle Indian School or the Hampton Institute, where they were taught to abandon their tribal traditions and embrace the tools of American productivity, modesty, and sanctity through total immersion. Such schools not only acculturated Indian boys and girls, but also provided vocational training for males and domestic science classes for females. Adults were also targeted by religious reformers, specifically evangelical Protestants as well as a number of Catholics, who sought to convince Indians to abandon their language, clothing, and social customs for a more Euro American lifestyle.

A vital part of the assimilation effort was land reform. During earlier negotiations, the government had respected that the Indian tribes used their land communally. Most Indian belief structures did not allow for the concept of individual land ownership; rather,

land was available for all to use, and required responsibility from all to protect it. As a part of their plan to Americanize the tribes, reformers sought legislation to replace this concept with the popular Euro-American notion of real estate ownership and self-reliance. One such law was the Dawes Severalty Act of 1887, named after a reformer and senator from Massachusetts, which struck a deadly blow to the Indian way of life. In what was essentially an Indian version of the original Homestead Act, the Dawes Act permitted the federal government to divide the lands of any tribe and grant 160 acres of farmland or 320 acres of grazing land to each head of family, with lesser amounts to others. In a nod towards the paternal relationship with which whites viewed Indians—similar to the justification of the previous treatment of African American slaves—the Dawes Act permitted the federal government to hold an individual Indian's newly acquired land in trust for twenty five years. Only then would he obtain full title and be granted the citizenship rights that land ownership entailed. It would not be until 1924 that formal citizenship was granted to all Native Americans. Under the Dawes Act, Indians were given the most arid, useless land. Further, inefficiencies and corruption in the government meant that much of the land due to be allotted to Indians was simply deemed “surplus” and claimed by settlers. Once all allotments were determined, the remaining tribal lands—as much as eighty million acres—were sold to white American settlers.

The final element of “Americanization” was the symbolic “last arrow” pageant, which often coincided with the formal redistribution of tribal lands under the Dawes Act. At these events, Indians were forced to assemble in their tribal garb, carrying a bow and arrow. They would then symbolically fire their “last arrow” into the air, enter a tent where they would strip away their Indian clothing, dress in a white farmer's coveralls, and emerge to take a plow and an American flag to show that they had converted to a new way of life. It was a seismic shift for the Indians, and one that left them bereft of their culture and history.

The Impact of Expansion on Chinese Immigrants and Hispanic Citizens

As white Americans pushed west, they not only collided with Indian tribes but also with Hispanic Americans and Chinese immigrants. Hispanics in the Southwest had the opportunity to become American citizens at the end of the Mexican-American war, but their status was markedly second-class. Chinese immigrants arrived en masse during

the California Gold Rush and numbered in the hundreds of thousands by the late 1800s, with the majority living in California, working menial jobs. These distinct cultural and ethnic groups strove to maintain their rights and way of life in the face of persistent racism and entitlement. But the large number of white settlers and government-sanctioned land acquisitions left them at a profound disadvantage. Ultimately, both groups withdrew into homogenous communities in which their language and culture could survive.

Chinese Immigrants in the American West

The initial arrival of Chinese immigrants to the United States began as a slow trickle in the 1820s, with barely 650 living in the U.S. by the end of 1849. However, as gold rush fever swept the country, Chinese immigrants, too, were attracted to the notion of quick fortunes. By 1852, over 25,000 Chinese immigrants had arrived, and by 1880, over 300,000 Chinese lived in the United States, most in California. While they had dreams of finding gold, many instead found employment building the first transcontinental railroad. Some even traveled as far east as the former cotton plantations of the Old South, which they helped to farm after the Civil War. Several thousand of these immigrants booked their passage to the United States using a “credit-ticket,” in which their passage was paid in advance by American businessmen to whom the immigrants were then indebted for a period of work. Most arrivals were men: Few wives or children ever traveled to the United States. As late as 1890, less than 5 percent of the Chinese population in the U.S. was female. Regardless of gender, few Chinese immigrants intended to stay permanently in the United States, although many were reluctantly forced to do so, as they lacked the financial resources to return home.

Prohibited by law since 1790 from obtaining U.S. citizenship through naturalization, Chinese immigrants faced harsh discrimination and violence from American settlers in the West. Despite hardships like the special tax that Chinese miners had to pay to take part in the Gold Rush, or their subsequent forced relocation into Chinese districts, these immigrants continued to arrive in the United States seeking a better life for the families they left behind. Only when the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 forbade further immigration from China for a ten-year period did the flow stop.

The Chinese community banded together in an effort to create social and cultural centers in cities such as San Francisco. In a haphazard fashion, they sought to provide services ranging from social aid to education, places of worship, health facilities, and more to their fellow Chinese immigrants. But only American Indians suffered greater discrimination and racial violence, legally sanctioned by the federal government, than did Chinese immigrants at this juncture in American history. As Chinese workers began competing with white Americans for jobs in California cities, the latter began a system of built-in discrimination. In the 1870s, white Americans formed “anti-coolie clubs” (“coolie” being a racial slur directed towards people of any Asian descent), through which they organized boycotts of Chinese produced products and lobbied for anti-Chinese laws. Some protests turned violent, as in 1885 in Rock Springs, Wyoming, where tensions between white and Chinese immigrant miners erupted in a riot, resulting in over two dozen Chinese immigrants being murdered and many more injured.

Slowly, racism and discrimination became law. The new California constitution of 1879 denied naturalized Chinese citizens the right to vote or hold state employment. Additionally, in 1882, the U.S. Congress passed the Chinese Exclusion Act, which forbade further Chinese immigration into the United States for ten years. The ban was later extended on multiple occasions until its repeal in 1943. Eventually, some Chinese immigrants returned to China. Those who remained were stuck in the lowest-paying, most menial jobs. Several found assistance through the creation of benevolent associations designed to both support Chinese communities and defend them against political and legal discrimination; however, the history of Chinese immigrants to the United States remained largely one of deprivation and hardship well into the twentieth century.

Hispanic Americans in the American West

The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which ended the Mexican-American War in 1848, promised U.S. citizenship to the nearly seventy-five thousand Hispanics now living in the American Southwest; approximately 90 percent accepted the offer and chose to stay in the United States despite their immediate relegation to second-class citizenship status. Relative to the rest of Mexico, these lands were sparsely populated and had been so ever since the country achieved its freedom from Spain in 1821. In fact, New

Mexico—not Texas or California—was the center of settlement in the region in the years immediately preceding the war with the United States, containing nearly fifty thousand Mexicans. However, those who did settle the area were proud of their heritage and ability to develop rancheros of great size and success. Despite promises made in the treaty, these Californios as they came to be known—quickly lost their land to white settlers who simply displaced the rightful landowners, by force if necessary. Repeated efforts at legal redress mostly fell upon deaf ears. In some instances, judges and lawyers would permit the legal cases to proceed through an expensive legal process only to the point where Hispanic landowners who insisted on holding their ground were rendered penniless for their efforts.

Much like Chinese immigrants, Hispanic citizens were relegated to the worst-paying jobs under the most terrible working conditions. They worked as peóns (manual laborers similar to slaves), vaqueros (cattle herders), and cartmen (transporting food and supplies) on the cattle ranches that white landowners possessed, or undertook the most hazardous mining tasks.

In a few instances, frustrated Hispanic citizens fought back against the white settlers who dispossessed them of their belongings. In 1889–1890 in New Mexico, several hundred Mexican Americans formed las Gorras Blancas (the White Caps) to try and reclaim their land and intimidate white Americans, preventing further land seizures. White Caps conducted raids of white farms, burning homes, barns, and crops to express their growing anger and frustration. However, their actions never resulted in any fundamental changes. Several White Caps were captured, beaten, and imprisoned, whereas others eventually gave up, fearing harsh reprisals against their families. Some White Caps adopted a more political strategy, gaining election to local offices throughout New Mexico in the early 1890s, but growing concerns over the potential impact upon the territory's quest for statehood led several citizens to heighten their repression of the movement. Other laws passed in the United States intended to deprive Mexican Americans of their heritage as much as their lands. "Sunday Laws" prohibited "noisy amusements" such as bullfights, cockfights, and other cultural gatherings common to Hispanic communities at the time. "Greaser Laws" permitted the imprisonment of any unemployed Mexican American on charges of vagrancy. Although Hispanic Americans

held tightly to their cultural heritage as their remaining form of self-identity, such laws did take a toll.

In California and throughout the Southwest, the massive influx of Anglo-American settlers simply overran the Hispanic populations that had been living and thriving there, sometimes for generations. Despite being U.S. citizens with full rights, Hispanics quickly found themselves outnumbered, outvoted, and, ultimately, outcast. Corrupt state and local governments favored whites in land disputes, and mining companies and cattle barons discriminated against them, as with the Chinese workers, in terms of pay and working conditions. In growing urban areas such as Los Angeles, barrios, or clusters of working-class homes, grew more isolated from the white American centers. Hispanic Americans, like the Native Americans and Chinese, suffered the fallout of the white settlers' relentless push west.

Summary

The Westward Spirit

While a few bold settlers had moved westward before the middle of the nineteenth century, they were the exception, not the rule. The "great American desert," as it was called, was considered a vast and empty place, unfit for civilized people. In the 1840s, however, this idea started to change, as potential settlers began to learn more from promoters and land developers of the economic opportunities that awaited them in the West, and Americans extolled the belief that it was their Manifest Destiny—their divine right—to explore and settle the western territories in the name of the United States.

Most settlers in this first wave were white Americans of means. European immigrants, particularly those from Northern Europe, also made the trip, settling in close-knit ethnic enclaves out of comfort, necessity, and familiarity. African Americans escaping the racism of the South also went west. In all, the newly settled areas were neither a fast track to riches nor a simple expansion into an empty land, but rather a clash of cultures, races, and traditions that defined the emerging new America.

Homesteading: Dreams and Realities

The rigors of this new way of life presented many challenges and difficulties to homesteaders. The land was dry and barren, and homesteaders lost crops to hail, droughts, insect swarms, and more. There were few materials with which to build, and

early homes were made of mud, which did not stand up to the elements. Money was a constant concern, as the cost of railroad freight was exorbitant, and banks were unforgiving of bad harvests. For women, life was difficult in the extreme. Farm wives worked at least eleven hours per day on chores and had limited access to doctors or midwives. Still, they were more independent than their eastern counterparts and worked in partnership with their husbands. As the railroad expanded and better farm equipment became available, by the 1870s, large farms began to succeed through economies of scale. Small farms still struggled to stay afloat, however, leading to a rising discontent among the farmers, who worked so hard for so little success.

Making a Living in Gold and Cattle

While homesteading was the backbone of western expansion, mining and cattle also played significant roles in shaping the West. Much rougher in character and riskier in outcomes than farming, these two opportunities brought forward a different breed of settler than the homesteaders. Many of the long-trail cattle riders were Mexican American or African American, and most of the men involved in both pursuits were individuals willing to risk what little they had in order to strike it rich.

In both the mining and cattle industries, however, individual opportunities slowly died out, as resources—both land for grazing and easily accessed precious metals—disappeared. In their place came big business, with the infrastructure and investments to make a profit. These businesses built up small towns into thriving cities, and the influx of middle-class families sought to drive out some of the violence and vice that characterized the western towns. Slowly but inexorably, the “American” way of life, as envisioned by the eastern establishment who initiated and promoted the concept of Manifest Destiny, was spreading west.

The Loss of American Indian Life and Culture

The interaction of the American Indians with white settlers during the western expansion movement was a painful and difficult one. For settlers raised on the notion of Manifest Destiny and empty lands, the Indians added a terrifying element to what was already a difficult and dangerous new world. For the Indians, the arrival of the settlers meant nothing less than the end of their way of life. Rather than cultural exchange, contact led to the virtual destruction of Indian life and culture. While violent acts broke

out on both sides, the greatest atrocities were perpetrated by whites, who had superior weapons and often superior numbers, as well as the support of the U.S. government.

The death of the Indian way of life happened as much at the hands of well-intentioned reformers as those who wished to see the Indians exterminated. Individual land ownership, boarding schools, and pleas to renounce Indian gods and culture were all elements of the reformers' efforts. With so much of their life stripped away, it was ever more difficult for the Indians to maintain their tribal integrity.

The Impact of Expansion on Chinese Immigrants and Hispanic Citizens

In the nineteenth century, the Hispanic, Chinese, and white populations of the country collided. Whites moved further west in search of land and riches, bolstered by government subsidies and an inherent and unshakable belief that the land and its benefits existed for their use. In some ways, it was a race to the prize: White Americans believed that they deserved the best lands and economic opportunities the country afforded, and did not consider prior claims to be valid.

Neither Chinese immigrants nor Hispanic Americans could withstand the assault on their rights by the tide of white settlers. Sheer numbers, matched with political backing, gave the whites the power they needed to overcome any resistance. Ultimately, both ethnic groups retreated into urban enclaves, where their language and traditions could survive.

Industrialization and the Rise of Big Business

Introduction

"The electric age was ushered into being in this last decade of the nineteenth century today when President Cleveland, by pressing a button, started the mighty machinery, rushing waters and revolving wheels in the World's Columbian exhibition." With this announcement about the official start of the Chicago World's Fair in 1893, the *Salt Lake City Herald* captured the excitement and optimism of the machine age. "In the previous expositions," the editorial continued, "the possibilities of electricity had been limited to the mere starting of the engines in the machinery hall, but in this it made thousands of servants do its bidding the magic of electricity did the duty of the hour."

The fair, which commemorated the four hundredth anniversary of Columbus's journey to America, was a potent symbol of the myriad inventions that changed

American life and contributed to the significant economic growth of the era, as well as the new wave of industrialization that swept the country. While businessmen capitalized upon such technological innovations, the new industrial working class faced enormous challenges. Ironically, as the World's Fair welcomed its first visitors, the nation was spiraling downward into the worst depression of the century.

Millions of people came to the United States from Europe in the late 19th century seeking a better future than the one they had at home. The future they found, however, was often grim. While many believed in the land of opportunity, the reality of urban life in the United States was more chaotic and difficult than people expected. In addition to the challenges of language, class, race, and ethnicity, these new arrivals dealt with low wages, overcrowded buildings, poor sanitation, and widespread disease. The land of opportunity, it seemed, did not always deliver on its promises. Subsequent frustrations among working-class Americans laid the groundwork for the country's first significant labor movement.

Inventors of the Age

The late nineteenth century was an energetic era of inventions and entrepreneurial spirit. Building upon the mid-century Industrial Revolution in Great Britain, as well as answering the increasing call from Americans for efficiency and comfort, the country found itself in the grip of invention fever, with more people working on their big ideas than ever before. In retrospect, harnessing the power of steam and then electricity in the nineteenth century vastly increased the power of man and machine, thus making other advances possible as the century progressed.

Facing an increasingly complex everyday life, Americans sought the means by which to cope with it. Inventions often provided the answers, even as the inventors themselves remained largely unaware of the life-changing nature of their ideas. To understand the scope of this zeal for creation, consider the U.S. Patent Office, which, in 1790—its first decade of existence—recorded only 276 inventions. By 1860, the office had issued a total of 60,000 patents. But between 1860 and 1890, that number exploded to nearly 450,000, with another 235,000 in the last decade of the century. While many of these patents came to naught, some inventions became lynchpins in the rise of big business and the country's move towards an industrial-based economy, in which the

desire for efficiency, comfort, and abundance could be more fully realized by most Americans.

An Explosion of Inventive Energy

From corrugated rollers that could crack hard, homestead-grown wheat into flour to refrigerated train cars and garment-sewing machines, new inventions fueled industrial growth around the country. As late as 1880, fully one-half of all Americans still lived and worked on farms, whereas fewer than one in seven—mostly men, except for long-established textile factories in which female employees tended to dominate—were employed in factories. However, the development of commercial electricity by the close of the century, to complement the steam engines that already existed in many larger factories, permitted more industries to concentrate in cities, away from the previously essential waterpower. In turn, newly arrived immigrants sought employment in new urban factories. Immigration, urbanization, and industrialization coincided to transform the face of American society from primarily rural to significantly urban. From 1880 to 1920, the number of industrial workers in the nation quadrupled from 2.5 million to over 10 million, while over the same period urban populations doubled, to reach one-half of the country's total population.

In offices, worker productivity benefited from the typewriter, invented in 1867, the cash register, invented in 1879, and the adding machine, invented in 1885. These tools made it easier than ever to keep up with the rapid pace of business growth. Inventions also slowly transformed home life. The vacuum cleaner arrived during this era, as well as the flush toilet. These indoor “water closets” improved public health through the reduction in contamination associated with outhouses and their proximity to water supplies and homes. Tin cans and, later, Clarence Birdseye's experiments with frozen food, eventually changed how women shopped for, and prepared, food for their families, despite initial health concerns over preserved foods.

With the advent of more easily prepared food, women gained valuable time in their daily schedules, a step that partially laid the groundwork for the modern women's movement. Women who had the means to purchase such items could use their time to seek other employment outside of the home, as well as broaden their knowledge through education and reading. Such a transformation did not occur overnight, as these inventions

also increased expectations for women to remain tied to the home and their domestic chores; slowly, the culture of domesticity changed.

Perhaps the most important industrial advancement of the era came in the production of steel. Manufacturers and builders preferred steel to iron, due to its increased strength and durability. After the Civil War, two new processes allowed for the creation of furnaces large enough and hot enough to melt the wrought iron needed to produce large quantities of steel at increasingly cheaper prices. The Bessemer process, named for English inventor Henry Bessemer, and the open-hearth process, changed the way the United States produced steel and, in doing so, led the country into a new industrialized age. As the new material became more available, builders eagerly sought it out, a demand that steel mill owners were happy to supply.

In 1860, the country produced thirteen thousand tons of steel. By 1879, American furnaces were producing over one million tons per year; by 1900, this figure had risen to ten million. Just ten years later, the United States was the top steel producer in the world, at over twenty-four million tons annually. When quality steel became cheaper and more readily available, other industries relied upon it more heavily as a key to their growth and development, including construction and, later, the automotive industry. As a result, the steel industry rapidly became the cornerstone of the American economy, remaining the primary indicator of industrial growth and stability through the end of World War II.

Alexander Graham Bell and the Telephone

Advancements in communications matched the pace of growth seen in industry and home life. Communication technologies were changing quickly, and they brought with them new ways for information to travel. In 1858, British and American crews laid the first transatlantic cable lines, enabling messages to pass between the United States and Europe in a matter of hours, rather than waiting the few weeks it could take for a letter to arrive by steamship. Within twenty years, over 100,000 miles of cable crisscrossed the ocean floors, connecting all the continents. Domestically, Western Union, which controlled 80 percent of the country's telegraph lines, operated nearly 200,000 miles of telegraph routes from coast to coast. In short, people were connected like never before, able to relay messages in minutes and hours rather than days and weeks.

One of the greatest advancements was the telephone, which Alexander Graham Bell patented in 1876. While he was not the first to invent the concept, Bell was the first one to capitalize on it; after securing the patent, he worked with financiers and businessmen to create the National Bell Telephone Company. By 1880, fifty thousand telephones were in use in the United States, including one at the White House. By 1900, that number had increased to 1.35 million, and hundreds of American cities had obtained local service for their citizens. Quickly and inexorably, technology was bringing the country into closer contact, changing forever the rural isolation that had defined America since its beginnings.

Thomas Edison and Electric Lighting

Although Thomas Alva Edison is best known for his contributions to the electrical industry, his experimentation went far beyond the light bulb. Edison was quite possibly the greatest inventor of the turn of the century. He registered 1,093 patents over his lifetime and ran a world-famous laboratory, Menlo Park, which housed a rotating group of up to twenty-five scientists from around the globe.

Edison became interested in the telegraph industry as a boy, when he worked aboard trains selling candy and newspapers. He soon began tinkering with telegraph technology and, by 1876, had devoted himself full time to lab work as an inventor. He then proceeded to invent a string of items that are still used today: the phonograph, the mimeograph machine, the motion picture projector, the dictaphone, and the storage battery, all using a factory-oriented assembly line process that made the rapid production of inventions possible.

In 1879, Edison invented the item that has led to his greatest fame: the incandescent light bulb. He allegedly explored over six thousand different materials for the filament, before stumbling upon tungsten as the ideal substance. By 1882, with financial backing largely from financier J. P. Morgan, he had created the Edison Electric Illuminating Company, which began supplying electrical current to a small number of customers in New York City. Morgan guided subsequent mergers of Edison's other enterprises, including a machine works firm and a lamp company, resulting in the creation of the Edison General Electric Company in 1889.

From Invention to Industrial Growth

New processes in steel refining, along with inventions in the fields of communications and electricity, transformed the business landscape of the nineteenth century. The exploitation of these new technologies provided opportunities for tremendous growth, and business entrepreneurs with financial backing and the right mix of business acumen and ambition could make their fortunes. Some of these new millionaires were known in their day as **robber barons**, a negative term that connoted the belief that they exploited workers and bent laws to succeed. Regardless of how they were perceived, these businessmen and the companies they created revolutionized American industry.

Railroads and Robber Barons

Earlier in the nineteenth century, the first transcontinental railroad and subsequent spur lines paved the way for rapid and explosive railway growth, as well as stimulated growth in the iron, wood, coal, and other related industries. The railroad industry quickly became the nation's first "big business." A powerful, inexpensive, and consistent form of transportation, railroads accelerated the development of virtually every other industry in the country. By 1890, railroad lines covered nearly every corner of the United States, bringing raw materials to industrial factories and finished goods to consumer markets. The amount of track grew from 35,000 miles at the end of the Civil War to over 200,000 miles by the close of the century. Inventions such as car couplers, air brakes, and Pullman passenger cars allowed the volume of both freight and people to increase steadily. From 1877 to 1890, both the amount of goods and the number of passengers traveling the rails tripled.

Financing for all of this growth came through a combination of private capital and government loans and grants. Federal and state loans of cash and land grants totaled \$150 million and 185 million acres of public land, respectively. Railroads also listed their stocks and bonds on the New York Stock Exchange to attract investors from both within the United States and Europe. Individual investors consolidated their power as railroads merged and companies grew in size and power. These individuals became some of the wealthiest Americans the country had ever known.

Jay Gould was perhaps the first prominent railroad magnate to be tarred with the “robber baron” brush. He bought older, smaller, rundown railroads, offered minimal improvements, and then capitalized on factory owners’ desires to ship their goods on this increasingly popular and more cost-efficient form of transportation. In addition to owning the Union Pacific Railroad that helped to construct the original transcontinental railroad line, Gould came to control over ten thousand miles of track across the United States, accounting for 15 percent of all railroad transportation. When he died in 1892, Gould had a personal worth of over \$100 million.

In contrast to Gould’s exploitative business model, which focused on financial profit more than on tangible industrial contributions, Commodore Cornelius Vanderbilt was a “robber baron” who truly cared about the success of his railroad enterprise and its positive impact on the American economy. Vanderbilt consolidated several smaller railroad lines, called trunk lines, to create the powerful New York Central Railroad Company, one of the largest corporations in the United States at the time. He later purchased stock in the major rail lines that would connect his company to Chicago, thus expanding his reach and power while simultaneously creating a railroad network to connect Chicago to New York City. This consolidation provided more efficient connections from Midwestern suppliers to eastern markets. Vanderbilt’s personal wealth at his death (over \$100 million in 1877), placed him among the top three wealthiest individuals in American history.

Giants of Wealth: Carnegie, Rockefeller, and Morgan

The post-Civil War inventors generated ideas that transformed the economy, but they were not big businessmen. The evolution from technical innovation to massive industry took place at the hands of the entrepreneurs whose business gambles paid off, making them some of the richest Americans of their day. Steel magnate Andrew Carnegie, oil tycoon John D. Rockefeller, and business financier J. P. Morgan were all businessmen who grew their respective businesses to a scale and scope that were unprecedented. Their companies changed how Americans lived and worked, and they themselves greatly influenced the growth of the country.

Andrew Carnegie and *the Gospel of Wealth*

Andrew Carnegie, steel magnate, has the prototypical rags-to-riches story. Although such stories resembled more myth than reality, they served to encourage many Americans to seek similar paths to fame and fortune. In Carnegie, the story was one of few derived from fact. Carnegie, more than any other businessman of the era, championed the idea that America's leading tycoons owed a debt to society. He believed that, given the circumstances of their successes, they should serve as benefactors to the less fortunate public. For Carnegie, poverty was not an abstract concept, as his family had been a part of the struggling masses. He desired to set an example of philanthropy for all other prominent industrialists of the era to follow. Carnegie's famous essay, *The Gospel of Wealth*, featured below, expounded on his beliefs.

John D. Rockefeller and Business Integration Models

Like Carnegie, John D. Rockefeller was born in 1839 of modest means. Rockefeller worked initially with family and friends in the refining business located in the Cleveland area, but by 1870, Rockefeller ventured out on his own, consolidating his resources and creating the Standard Oil Company of Ohio, initially valued at \$1 million. Rockefeller was ruthless in his pursuit of total control of the oil refining business. As other entrepreneurs flooded the area seeking a quick fortune, Rockefeller developed a plan to crush his competitors and create a true **monopoly** in the refining industry. Beginning in 1872, he forged agreements with several large railroad companies to obtain discounted freight rates for shipping his product. He also used the railroad companies to gather information on his competitors. As he could now deliver his kerosene at lower prices, he drove his competition out of business, often offering to buy them out for pennies on the dollar. He hounded those who refused to sell out to him, until they were driven out of business. Through his method of growth via mergers and acquisitions of similar companies—known as **horizontal integration**—Standard Oil grew to include almost all refineries in the area. By 1879, the Standard Oil Company controlled nearly 95 percent of all oil refining businesses in the country, as well as 90 percent of all the refining businesses in the world.

Seeking still more control, Rockefeller recognized the advantages of controlling the transportation of his product. He next began to grow his company through **vertical**

integration wherein a company handles all aspects of a product's lifecycle, from the creation of raw materials through the production process to the delivery of the final product. In Rockefeller's case, this model required investment and acquisition of companies involved in everything from barrel-making to pipelines, tanker cars to railroads. He came to own almost every type of business and used his vast power to drive competitors from the market through intense price wars. Other industrialists quickly followed suit, including Gustavus Swift, who used vertical integration to dominate the U.S. meatpacking industry in the late nineteenth century.

J. Pierpont Morgan

Unlike Carnegie and Rockefeller, J. P. Morgan was no rags-to-riches hero. He was born to wealth and became much wealthier as an investment banker, making wise financial decisions in support of the hardworking entrepreneurs building their fortunes. Ultimately, Morgan's most notable investment, and greatest consolidation, was in the steel industry, when he bought out Andrew Carnegie in 1901. Initially, Carnegie was reluctant to sell, but after repeated badgering by Morgan, Carnegie named his price: an outrageously inflated sum of \$500 million. Morgan agreed without hesitation, and then consolidated Carnegie's holdings with several smaller steel firms to create the U.S. Steel Corporation. U.S. Steel was subsequently capitalized at \$1.4 billion. It was the country's first billion-dollar firm.

Building Industrial America on the Backs of Labor

The growth of the American economy in the last half of the nineteenth century presented a paradox. The standard of living for many American workers increased. The decline in prices and the cost of living meant that the industrial era offered many Americans relatively better lives in 1900 than they had only decades before. For some Americans, there were also increased opportunities for upward mobility. For the multitudes in the working class, however, conditions in the factories and at home remained deplorable. The difficulties they faced led many workers to question an industrial order in which a handful of wealthy Americans built their fortunes on the backs of workers.

Working-Class Life

Between the end of the Civil War and the turn of the century, the American workforce underwent a transformative shift. In 1865, nearly 60 percent of Americans still lived and worked on farms; by the early 1900s, that number had reversed itself, and only 40 percent still lived in rural areas, with the remainder living and working in urban and early suburban areas. A significant number of these urban and suburban dwellers earned their wages in factories.

Factory wages were, for the most part, very low. In 1900, the average factory wage was approximately twenty cents per hour, for an annual salary of barely six hundred dollars. This wage left approximately 20 percent of the population in industrialized cities at, or below, the poverty level. An average factory work week was sixty hours, ten hours per day, six days per week, although in steel mills, the workers put in twelve hours per day, seven days a week. Factory owners had little concern for workers' safety. According to one of the few available accurate measures, as late as 1913, nearly 25,000 Americans lost their lives on the job, while another 700,000 workers suffered from injuries that resulted in at least one missed month of work. Another element of hardship for workers was the increasingly dehumanizing nature of their work. Factory workers executed repetitive tasks throughout the long hours of their shifts, seldom interacting with coworkers or supervisors. This solitary and repetitive work style was a difficult adjustment for those used to more collaborative and skill-based work, whether on farms or in crafts shops.

One result of the new breakdown of work processes was that factory owners were able to hire women and children to perform many of the tasks. From 1870 through 1900, the number of women working outside the home tripled. By the end of this period, five million American women were wage earners, with one-quarter of them working factory jobs. Most were young, under twenty-five, and either immigrants themselves or the daughters of immigrants. Their foray into the working world was not seen as a step towards empowerment or equality, but rather a hardship born of financial necessity. Women's factory work tended to be in clothing or textile factories, where their appearance was less offensive to men who felt that heavy industry was their purview. Other women in the workforce worked in clerical positions as bookkeepers and

secretaries, and as salesclerks. Not surprisingly, women were paid less than men, under the pretense that they should be under the care of a man and did not require a living wage.

Factory owners used the same rationale for the exceedingly low wages they paid to children. Children were small enough to fit easily among the machines and could be hired for simple work for a fraction of an adult man's pay. From 1870 through 1900, child labor in factories tripled. Growing concerns among progressive reformers over the safety of women and children in the workplace would eventually result in the development of political lobby groups. Several states passed legislative efforts to ensure a safe workplace, and the lobby groups pressured Congress to pass protective legislation. However, such legislation would not be forthcoming until well into the twentieth century. In the meantime, many working-class immigrants still desired the additional wages that child and women labor produced, regardless of the harsh working conditions.

Worker Protests and Violence

Workers were well aware of the vast discrepancy between their lives and the wealth of the factory owners. Lacking the assets and legal protection needed to organize, and deeply frustrated, some working communities erupted in spontaneous violence. The coal mines of eastern Pennsylvania and the railroad yards of western Pennsylvania, central to both respective industries and home to large, immigrant, working enclaves, saw the brunt of these outbursts. The combination of violence, along with several other factors, blunted any significant efforts to organize workers until well into the twentieth century.

Business owners viewed organization efforts with great mistrust, capitalizing upon widespread anti-union sentiment among the general public to crush unions through open shops, the use of strikebreakers, yellow dog contracts (in which the employee agrees to not join a union as a pre-condition of employment), and other means. Workers also faced obstacles to organization associated with race and ethnicity, as questions arose on how to address the increasing number of low-paid African American workers, in addition to the language and cultural barriers introduced by the large wave of southeastern European immigration to the United States. But in large part, the greatest obstacle to effective unionization was the general public's continued belief in a strong

work ethic and that an individual work ethic—not organizing into radical collectives—would reap its own rewards. As violence erupted, such events seemed only to confirm widespread popular sentiment that radical, un-American elements were behind all union efforts.

Worker Organization and the Struggles of Unions

Prior to the Civil War, there were limited efforts to create an organized labor movement on any large scale. With the majority of workers in the country working independently in rural settings, the idea of organized labor was not largely understood. But, as economic conditions changed, people became more aware of the inequities facing factory wage workers. By the early 1880s, even farmers began to fully recognize the strength of unity behind a common cause.

Models of Organizing: The Knights of Labor and American Federation of Labor

In 1866, seventy-seven delegates representing a variety of different occupations met in Baltimore to form the National Labor Union (NLU). The NLU had ambitious ideas about equal rights for African Americans and women, currency reform, and a legally mandated eight-hour workday. The organization was successful in convincing Congress to adopt the eight-hour workday for federal employees, but their reach did not progress much further. The Panic of 1873 and the economic recession that followed as a result of over speculation on railroads and the subsequent closing of several banks—during which workers actively sought any employment regardless of the conditions or wages—as well as the death of the NLU’s founder, led to a decline in their efforts.

Although the NLU proved to be the wrong effort at the wrong time, in the wake of the Panic of 1873, another, more significant, labor organization emerged. The Knights of Labor (KOL) was more able to attract a sympathetic following by widening its base and appealing to more members. Philadelphia tailor Uriah Stephens grew the KOL from a small presence during the Panic of 1873 to an organization of national importance by 1878. That was the year the KOL held their first general assembly, where they adopted a broad reform platform, including a renewed call for an eight-hour workday, equal pay regardless of gender, the elimination of convict labor, and the creation of greater cooperative enterprises with worker ownership of businesses. Much of the KOL’s strength came from its concept of “One Big Union”—the idea that it welcomed all wage

workers, regardless of occupation, with the exception of doctors, lawyers, and bankers. It welcomed women, African Americans, Native Americans, and immigrants, of all trades and skill levels.

In one night, however, the KOL's popularity—and indeed the momentum of the labor movement as a whole—plummeted due to an event known as the **Haymarket affair**, which occurred on May 4, 1886, in Chicago's Haymarket Square. There, an anarchist group had gathered in response to a death at an earlier nationwide demonstration for the eight-hour workday. Although the protest was quiet, the police arrived armed for conflict. Someone in the crowd threw a bomb at the police, killing one officer and injuring another.

The press immediately blamed the KOL for the Haymarket affair, despite the fact that the organization had anything to do with the demonstration. Combined with the American public's lukewarm reception to organized labor as a whole, the damage was done. The KOL saw its membership decline to barely 100,000 by the end of 1886. Nonetheless, during its brief success, the Knights illustrated the potential for success with their model of "industrial unionism," which welcomed workers from all trades.

Another important Union, the American Federation of Labor (AFL) was led by Samuel Gompers from its inception until his death in 1924. More so than any of its predecessors, the AFL focused almost all of its efforts on economic gains for its members, seldom straying into political issues other than those that had a direct impact upon working conditions. Gompers often settled disputes between unions, using the AFL to represent all unions of matters of federal legislation that could affect all workers, such as the eight-hour workday. By 1900, the AFL had 500,000 members; by 1914, its numbers had risen to one million, and by 1920 they claimed four million working members. Still, as a federation of craft unions, it excluded many factory workers and thus, even at its height, represented only 15 percent of the nonfarm workers in the country.

The Keys to Successful Urbanization

As the country grew, certain elements led some towns to morph into large urban centers, while others did not. The following four innovations proved critical in shaping urbanization at the turn of the century: electric lighting, communication improvements,

intracity transportation, and the rise of skyscrapers. As people migrated for the new jobs, they often struggled with the absence of basic urban infrastructures, such as better transportation, adequate housing, means of communication, and efficient sources of light and energy. Even the basic necessities, such as fresh water and proper sanitation—often taken for granted in the countryside—presented a greater challenge in urban life.

Electric Lighting

Thomas Edison patented the incandescent light bulb in 1879. This development quickly became common in homes as well as factories, transforming how even lower- and middle-class Americans lived. Although slow to arrive in rural areas of the country, electric power became readily available in cities when the first commercial power plants began to open in 1882. Gradually, cities began to illuminate the streets with electric lamps to allow the city to remain alight throughout the night. No longer did the pace of life and economic activity slow substantially at sunset, the way it had in smaller towns. The cities, following the factories that drew people there, stayed open all the time.

Communications Improvements

The telephone, patented in 1876, greatly transformed communication both regionally and nationally. The telephone rapidly supplanted the telegraph as the preferred form of communication; by 1900, over 1.5 million telephones were in use around the nation, whether as private lines in the homes of some middle and upper-class Americans, or as jointly used “party lines” in many rural areas. By allowing instant communication over larger distances at any given time, growing telephone networks made urban sprawl possible. In the same way that electric lights spurred greater factory production and economic growth, the telephone increased business through the more rapid pace of demand. Now, orders could come constantly via telephone, rather than via mail-order. More orders generated greater production, which in turn required still more workers. This demand for additional labor played a key role in urban growth, as expanding companies sought workers to handle the increasing consumer demand for their products.

Intercity Transportation

As cities grew and sprawled outward, a major challenge was efficient travel within the city—from home to factories or shops, and then back again. In 1887, Frank Sprague invented the electric trolley, which was powered by electricity rather than

horses. The electric trolley could run throughout the day and night, like the factories and the workers who fueled them. But it also modernized less important industrial centers, such as the southern city of Richmond, Virginia. As early as 1873, San Francisco engineers adopted pulley technology from the mining industry to introduce cable cars and turn the city's steep hills into elegant middle-class communities. However, as crowds continued to grow in the largest cities, such as Chicago and New York, trolleys were unable to move efficiently through the crowds of pedestrians. Finally, as skyscrapers began to dominate the air, transportation evolved one step further to move underground as subways. Boston's subway system began operating in 1897 and was quickly followed by New York and other cities.

The Rise of Skyscrapers

The last limitation that large cities had to overcome was the ever-increasing need for space. Eastern cities, unlike their mid western counterparts, could not continue to grow outward, as the land surrounding them was already settled. The increasing cost of real estate made upward growth attractive, and so did the prestige that towering buildings carried for the businesses that occupied them. Workers completed the first skyscraper in Chicago, the ten-story Home Insurance Building, in 1885. Although engineers had the capability to go higher, thanks to new steel construction techniques, they required another vital invention: the elevator. In 1889, the Otis Elevator Company installed the first electric elevator. This began the skyscraper craze, allowing developers in eastern cities to build and market prestigious real estate in the hearts of crowded eastern metropolises.

The Immediate Challenges of Urban Life

Congestion, pollution, crime, and disease were prevalent problems in all urban centers; city planners and inhabitants alike sought new solutions to the problems caused by rapid urban growth. Living conditions for most working-class urban dwellers were atrocious. They lived in crowded tenement houses and cramped apartments with terrible ventilation and substandard plumbing and sanitation. As a result, disease ran rampant, with typhoid and cholera common. Memphis, Tennessee, experienced waves of cholera (1873) followed by yellow fever (1878 and 1879) that resulted in the loss of over ten thousand lives. By the late 1880s, New York City, Baltimore, Chicago, and New Orleans

had all introduced sewage pumping systems to provide efficient waste management. Many cities were also serious fire hazards. An average working-class family of six, with two adults and four children, had at best a two-bedroom tenement. By one 1900 estimate, in the New York City borough of Manhattan alone, there were nearly fifty thousand tenement houses.

Churches and civic organizations provided some relief to the challenges of working-class city life. Churches were moved to intervene through their belief in the concept of the **social gospel**. This philosophy stated that all Christians, whether they were church leaders or social reformers, should be as concerned about the conditions of life in the secular world as the afterlife. Churches began to include gymnasiums and libraries as well as offer evening classes on hygiene and health care. Other religious organizations like the Salvation Army and the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) expanded their reach in American cities at this time as well. Beginning in the 1870s, these organizations began providing community services and other benefits to the urban poor. In the secular sphere, the **settlement house movement** of the 1890s provided additional relief. Pioneering women such as Jane Addams who found the Hull House in Chicago and Lillian Wald in New York led this early progressive reform movement in the United States, building upon ideas originally fashioned by social reformers in England. With no particular religious bent, they worked to create settlement houses in urban centers where they could help the working class, and in particular, working-class women, find aid. Their help included child daycare, evening classes, libraries, gym facilities, and free health care. The movement spread quickly to other cities, where they not only provided relief to working class women but also offered employment opportunities for women graduating college in the growing field of social work.

The success of the settlement house movement later became the basis of a political agenda that included pressure for housing laws, child labor laws, and worker's compensation laws, among others. Florence Kelley, who originally worked with Addams in Chicago, later joined Wald's efforts in New York; together, they created the National Child Labor Committee and advocated for the subsequent creation of the Children's Bureau in the U.S. Department of Labor in 1912. Julia Lathrop—herself a former resident of Hull House—became the first woman to head a federal government agency, when

President William Howard Taft appointed her to run the bureau. Settlement house workers also became influential leaders in the women's suffrage movement as well as the antiwar movement during World War I.

New cities were populated with diverse waves of new arrivals, who came to the cities to seek work in the businesses and factories there. While a small percentage of these newcomers were white Americans seeking jobs, most were made up of two groups that had not previously been factors in the urbanization movement: African Americans fleeing the racism of the farms and former plantations in the South, and southern and eastern European immigrants. These new immigrants supplanted the previous waves of northern and western European immigrants, who had tended to move west to purchase land. Unlike their predecessors, the newer immigrants lacked the funds to strike out to the western lands and instead remained in the urban centers where they arrived, seeking any work that would keep them alive.

The Changing Nature of European Immigration

Immigrants also shifted the demographics of the rapidly growing cities. Although immigration had always been a force of change in the United States, it took on a new character in the late nineteenth century. Beginning in the 1880s, the arrival of immigrants from mostly southern and eastern European countries rapidly increased while the flow from northern and western Europe remained relatively constant.

The previous waves of immigrants from northern and western Europe, particularly Germany, Great Britain, and the Nordic countries, were relatively well off, arriving in the country with some funds and often moving to the newly settled western territories. In contrast, the newer immigrants from southern and eastern European countries, including Italy, Greece, and several Slavic countries including Russia, came over due to "push" and "pull" factors similar to those that influenced the African Americans arriving from the South. Whatever the reason, these immigrants arrived without the education and finances of the earlier waves of immigrants and settled more readily in the port towns where they arrived, rather than setting out to seek their fortunes in the West. By 1890, over 80 percent of the population of New York would be either foreign-born or children of foreign-born parentage. Other cities saw huge spikes in foreign populations as well, though not to the same degree, due in large part to Ellis

Island in New York City being the primary port of entry for most European immigrants arriving in the United States.

The new immigrants who came at the end of the 19th century looked and acted differently from those who already lived in the United States. They had darker skin tone, spoke languages with which most Americans were unfamiliar, and practiced unfamiliar religions, specifically Judaism and Catholicism. Even the foods they sought out at butchers and grocery stores set immigrants apart. Because of these easily identifiable differences, new immigrants became easy targets for hatred and discrimination. If jobs were hard to find, or if housing was overcrowded, it became easy to blame the immigrants. Like African Americans, immigrants in cities were blamed for the problems of the day.

The number of immigrants peaked between 1900 and 1910, when over nine million people arrived in the United States. To assist in the processing and management of this massive wave of immigrants, the Bureau of Immigration in New York City, which had become the official port of entry, opened Ellis Island in 1892. Today, nearly half of all Americans have ancestors who, at some point in time, entered the country through the portal at Ellis Island. Doctors or nurses inspected the immigrants upon arrival, looking for any signs of infectious diseases. Most immigrants were admitted to the country with only a cursory glance at any other paperwork. Roughly 2 percent of the arriving immigrants were denied entry due to a medical condition or criminal history. The rest would enter the country by way of the streets of New York, many unable to speak English and totally reliant on finding those who spoke their native tongue.

Seeking comfort in a strange land, as well as a common language, many immigrants sought out relatives, friends, former neighbors, townspeople, and countrymen who had already settled in American cities. This led to a rise in ethnic enclaves within the larger city. Little Italy, Chinatown, and many other communities developed in which immigrant groups could find everything to remind them of home, from local language newspapers to ethnic food stores. While these enclaves provided a sense of community to their members, they added to the problems of urban congestion, particularly in the poorest slums where immigrants could afford housing.

Growing numbers of Americans resented the waves of new immigrants, resulting in a backlash. They successfully lobbied Congress to adopt both an English language literacy test for immigrants, which eventually passed in 1917, and the Chinese Exclusion Act (discussed in a previous chapter). The group's political lobbying also laid the groundwork for the subsequent Emergency Quota Act of 1921 and the Immigration Act of 1924, as well as the National Origins Act.

Settlement houses and religious and civic organizations attempted to provide some support to working class city dwellers through free health care, education, and leisure opportunities. Still, for urban citizens, life in the city was chaotic and challenging. But how that chaos manifested and how relief was sought differed greatly, depending on where people were in the social caste—the working class, the upper class, or the newly emerging professional middle class—in addition to the aforementioned issues of race and ethnicity. While many communities found life in the largest American cities disorganized and overwhelming, the ways they answered these challenges were as diverse as the people who lived there. Broad solutions emerged that were typically class specific: The rise of **machine politics** and popular culture provided relief to the working class, higher education opportunities and suburbanization benefited the professional middle class, and reminders of their elite status gave comfort to the upper class. And everyone, no matter where they fell in the class system, benefited from the efforts to improve the physical landscapes of the fast-growing urban environment.

The Life and Struggles of the Urban Working Class

For the working-class residents of America's cities, one practical way of coping with the challenges of urban life was to take advantage of the system of machine politics, while another was to seek relief in the variety of popular culture and entertainment found in and around cities. Although neither of these forms of relief was restricted to the working class, they were the ones who relied most heavily on them.

Machine Politics

The primary form of relief for working-class urban Americans, and particularly immigrants, came in the form of machine politics. This phrase referred to the process by which every citizen of the city, no matter their ethnicity or race, was a ward resident with an alderman who spoke on their behalf at city hall. When everyday challenges arose,

whether sanitation problems or the need for a sidewalk along a muddy road, citizens would approach their alderman to find a solution. The aldermen knew that, rather than work through the long bureaucratic process associated with city hall, they could work within the “machine” of local politics to find a speedy, mutually beneficial solution. In machine politics, favors were exchanged for votes, votes were given in exchange for fast solutions, and the price of the solutions included a kickback to the boss. In the short term, everyone got what they needed, but the process was neither transparent nor democratic, and it was an inefficient way of conducting the city’s business.

One example of a machine political system was the Democratic political machine **Tammany Hall** in New York, run by machine boss William Tweed with assistance from George Washington Plunkitt. There, citizens knew their immediate problems would be addressed in return for their promise of political support in future elections. Despite its corrupt nature, Tammany Hall essentially ran New York politics from the 1850s until the 1930s. Other large cities, including Boston, Philadelphia, Cleveland, St. Louis, and Kansas City, made use of political machines as well.

Popular Culture and Entertainment

Working-class residents also found relief in the diverse and omnipresent offerings of popular culture and entertainment in and around cities. These offerings provided an immediate escape from the squalor and difficulties of everyday life. For example, Coney Island on the Brooklyn shoreline consisted of several different amusement parks, the first of which opened in 1895. At these parks, New Yorkers enjoyed wild rides, animal attractions, and large stage productions designed to help them forget the struggles of their working-day lives. Freak “side” shows fed the public’s curiosity about physical deviance. Other cities quickly followed New York’s lead with similar, if smaller, versions of Coney Island’s attractions.

Another common form of popular entertainment was vaudeville—large stage variety shows that included everything from singing, dancing, and comedy acts to live animals and magic. The vaudeville circuit gave rise to several prominent performers, including magician Harry Houdini, who began his career in these variety shows before his fame propelled him to solo acts. In addition to live theater shows, it was primarily working-class citizens who enjoyed the advent of the nickelodeon, a forerunner to the

movie theater. The first nickelodeon opened in Pittsburgh in 1905, where nearly one hundred visitors packed into a storefront theater to see a traditional vaudeville show interspersed with one-minute film clips.

One other major form of entertainment for the working class was professional baseball. Club teams transformed into professional baseball teams with the Cincinnati Red Stockings, now the Cincinnati Reds, in 1869. Soon, professional teams sprang up in several major American cities. Baseball games provided an inexpensive form of entertainment, where for less than a dollar, a person could enjoy a double-header, two hot dogs, and a beer. But more importantly, the teams became a way for newly relocated Americans and immigrants of diverse backgrounds to develop a unified civic identity, all cheering for one team. By 1876, the National League had formed, and soon after, cathedral-style ballparks began to spring up in many cities. Fenway Park in Boston (1912), Forbes Field in Pittsburgh (1909), and the Polo Grounds in New York (1890) all became touch points where working-class Americans came together to support a common cause.

Other popular sports included prize-fighting, which attracted a predominantly male, working- and middle-class audience who lived vicariously through the triumphs of the boxers during a time where opportunities for individual success were rapidly shrinking, and college football, which paralleled a modern corporation in its team hierarchy, divisions of duties, and emphasis on time management.

The Upper Class in the Cities

The American financial elite did not need to crowd into cities to find work, like their working-class counterparts. But as urban centers were vital business cores, where multi-million-dollar financial deals were made daily, those who worked in that world wished to remain close to the action. The rich chose to be in the midst of the chaos of the cities, but they were also able to provide significant measures of comfort, convenience, and luxury for themselves.

Wealthy citizens seldom attended what they considered the crass entertainment of the working class. Instead of amusement parks and baseball games, urban elites sought out more refined pastimes that underscored their knowledge of art and culture, preferring classical music concerts, fine art collections, and social gatherings with their peers. In

New York, Andrew Carnegie built Carnegie Hall in 1891, which quickly became the center of classical music performances in the country. Nearby, the Metropolitan Museum of Art opened its doors in 1872 and still remains one of the largest collections of fine art in the world. Other cities followed suit, and these cultural pursuits became a way for the upper class to remind themselves of their elevated place amid urban squalor.

As new opportunities for the middle class threatened the austerity of upper-class citizens, including the newer forms of transportation that allowed middle-class Americans to travel with greater ease, wealthier Americans sought unique ways to further set themselves apart in society. These included more expensive excursions, such as vacations in Newport, Rhode Island, winter relocation to sunny Florida, and frequent trips aboard steamships to Europe. For those who were not of the highly respected “old money,” but only recently obtained their riches through business ventures, the relief they sought came in the form of one book—the annual *Social Register*.. First published in 1886 by Louis Keller in New York City, the register became a directory of the wealthy socialites who populated the city. Keller updated it annually, and people would watch with varying degrees of anxiety or complacency to see their names appear in print.

A New Middle Class

While the working class were confined to tenement houses in the cities by their need to be close to their work and the lack of funds to find anyplace better, and the wealthy class chose to remain in the cities to stay close to the action of big business transactions, the emerging middle class responded to urban challenges with their own solutions. This group included the managers, salesmen, engineers, doctors, accountants, and other salaried professionals who still worked for a living but were significantly better educated and compensated than the working-class poor. For this new middle class, relief from the trials of the cities came through education and suburbanization.

In large part, the middle class responded to the challenges of the city by physically escaping it. As transportation improved and outlying communities connected to urban centers, the middle class embraced a new type of community—the suburbs. It became possible for those with adequate means to work in the city and escape each evening, by way of a train or trolley, to a house in the suburbs. As the number of people moving to the suburbs grew, there also grew a perception among the middle class that the

farther one lived from the city and the more amenities one had, the more affluence one had achieved.

New Roles for Middle-Class Women

Social norms of the day encouraged middle-class women to take great pride in creating a positive home environment for their working husbands and school-age children, which reinforced the business and educational principles that they practiced on the job or in school. It was at this time that the magazines *Ladies' Home Journal* and *Good Housekeeping* began distribution, to tremendous popularity.

While the vast majority of middle-class women took on the expected role of housewife and homemaker, some women were finding paths to college. A small number of men's colleges began to open their doors to women in the mid-1800s, and co-education became an option. Some of the most elite universities created affiliated women's colleges, such as Radcliffe College with Harvard, and Pembroke College with Brown University. But more importantly, the first women's colleges opened at this time. Mount Holyoke, Vassar, Smith, and Wellesley Colleges, still some of the best known women's schools, opened their doors between 1865 and 1880, and, although enrollment was low (initial class sizes ranged from sixty-one students at Vassar to seventy at Wellesley, seventy-one at Smith, and up to eighty-eight at Mount Holyoke), the opportunity for a higher education, and even a career, began to emerge for young women. These schools offered a unique, all-women environment in which professors and a community of education-seeking young women came together. While most college-educated young women still married, their education offered them new opportunities to work outside the home, most frequently as teachers, professors, or in the aforementioned settlement house environments created by Jane Addams and others.

Education and the Middle Class

Since the children of the professional class did not have to leave school and find work to support their families, they had opportunities for education and advancement that would solidify their position in the middle class. They also benefited from the presence of stay-at-home mothers, unlike working-class children, whose mothers typically worked the same long hours as their fathers. Public school enrollment exploded at this time, with the number of students attending public school tripling from seven million in 1870 to

twenty-one million in 1920. Unlike the old-fashioned one-room schoolhouses, larger schools slowly began the practice of employing different teachers for each grade, and some even began hiring discipline specific instructors. High schools also grew at this time, from one hundred high schools nationally in 1860 to over six thousand by 1900.

The federal government supported the growth of higher education with the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890. These laws set aside public land and federal funds to create land-grant colleges that were affordable to middle-class families, offering courses and degrees useful in the professions, but also in trade, commerce, industry, and agriculture. The availability of an affordable college education encouraged a boost in enrollment, from 50,000 students nationwide in 1870 to over 600,000 students by 1920. Professional schools for the study of medicine, law, and business also developed. In short, education for the children of middle-class parents catered to class-specific interests and helped ensure that parents could establish their children comfortably in the middle class as well.

“City beautiful”

While the working poor lived in the worst of it and the wealthy elite sought to avoid it, all city dwellers at the time had to deal with the harsh realities of urban sprawl. Skyscrapers rose and filled the air, streets were crowded with pedestrians of all sorts, and, as developers worked to meet the always-increasing demand for space, the few remaining green spaces in the city quickly disappeared. As the U.S. population became increasingly centered in urban areas while the century drew to a close, questions about the quality of city life—particularly with regard to issues of aesthetics, crime, and poverty—quickly consumed many reformers’ minds. Those middle-class and wealthier urbanites who enjoyed the costlier amenities presented by city life—including theaters, restaurants, and shopping—were free to escape to the suburbs, leaving behind the poorer working classes living in squalor and unsanitary conditions. Through the City Beautiful movement, leaders such as Frederick Law Olmsted and Daniel Burnham sought to champion middle- and upper-class progressive reforms. They improved the quality of life for city dwellers, but also cultivated middle-class-dominated urban spaces in which Americans of different ethnicities, racial origins, and classes worked and lived.

Change Reflected in Thought and Writing

In the late nineteenth century, Americans were living in a world characterized by rapid change. Western expansion, dramatic new technologies, and the rise of big business drastically influenced society in a matter of a few decades. For those living in the fast-growing urban areas, the pace of change was even faster and harder to ignore. One result of this time of transformation was the emergence of a series of notable authors, who, whether writing fiction or nonfiction, offered a lens through which to better understand the shifts in American society.

UNDERSTANDING SOCIAL PROGRESS

One key idea of the nineteenth century that moved from the realm of science to the murkier ground of social and economic success was Charles Darwin's theory of evolution. Darwin was a British naturalist who, in his 1859 work *On the Origin of Species*, made the case that species develop and evolve through natural selection, not through divine intervention. Political philosopher Herbert Spencer took Darwin's theory of evolution further, coining the actual phrase "survival of the fittest," and later helping to popularize the phrase Social Darwinism to posit that society evolved much like a natural organism, wherein some individuals will succeed due to racially and ethnically inherent traits, and their ability to adapt. William Graham Sumner, a sociologist at Yale, became the most vocal proponent of social Darwinism. Not surprisingly, this ideology, which Darwin himself would have rejected as a gross misreading of his scientific discoveries, drew great praise from those who made their wealth at this time. They saw their success as proof of biological fitness, although critics of this theory were quick to point out that those who did not succeed often did not have the same opportunities or equal playing field that the ideology of social Darwinism purported. Eventually, the concept fell into disrepute in the 1930s and 1940s, as eugenicists began to utilize it in conjunction with their racial theories of genetic superiority.

Other thinkers of the day took Charles Darwin's theories in a more nuanced direction, focusing on different theories of realism that sought to understand the truth underlying the changes in the United States. These thinkers believed that ideas and social constructs must be proven to work before they could be accepted. Philosopher William James was one of the key proponents of the closely related concept of pragmatism, which

held that Americans needed to experiment with different ideas and perspectives to find the truth about American society, rather than assuming that there was truth in old, previously accepted models. His work strongly influenced the subsequent avant-garde and modernist movements in literature and art. John Dewey built on the idea of pragmatism to create a theory of instrumentalism, which advocated the use of education in the search for truth. Dewey strongly encouraged educational reforms designed to create an informed American citizenry that could then form the basis for other, much-needed progressive reforms in society.

In addition to the new medium of photography, popularized by Riis, novelists and other artists also embraced realism in their work. They sought to portray vignettes from real life in their stories, partly in response to the more sentimental works of their predecessors. Visual artists such as George Bellows, Edward Hopper, and Robert Henri, among others, formed the Ashcan School of Art, which was interested primarily in depicting the urban lifestyle that was quickly gripping the United States at the turn of the century. Their works typically focused on working-class city life, including the slums and tenement houses, as well as working-class forms of leisure and entertainment.

Novelists and journalists also popularized realism in literary works. Authors such as Stephen Crane, who wrote stark stories about life in the slums or during the Civil War, and Rebecca Harding Davis, who in 1861 published *Life in the Iron Mills*, embodied this popular style. Mark Twain also sought realism in his books, whether it was the reality of the pioneer spirit, seen in *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, published in 1884, or the issue of corruption in *The Gilded Age*, co-authored with Charles Dudley Warner in 1873. Some authors, such as Jack London, who wrote *The Call of the Wild*, embraced a school of thought called naturalism, which concluded that the laws of nature and the natural world were the only truly relevant laws governing humanity.

Critics of Modern America

While many Americans at this time, both everyday working people and theorists, felt the changes of the era would lead to improvements and opportunities, there were critics of the emerging social shifts as well. Authors such as Edward Bellamy, Henry George, and Thorstein Veblen were also influential in spreading critiques of the

industrial age. While their critiques were quite distinct from each other, all three believed that the industrial age was a step in the wrong direction for the country.

In the 1888 novel *Looking Backward, 2000-1887*, Edward Bellamy portrays a utopian America in the year 2000, with the country living in peace and harmony after abandoning the capitalist model and moving to a socialist state. In the book, Bellamy predicts the future advent of credit cards, cable entertainment, and “super-store” cooperatives that resemble a modern day Wal-Mart. *Looking Backward* proved to be a popular bestseller (third only to *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* and *Ben Hur* among late nineteenth-century publications) and appealed to those who felt the industrial age of big business was sending the country in the wrong direction.

Another author whose work illustrated the criticisms of the day was nonfiction writer Henry George, an economist best known for his 1879 work *Progress and Poverty*, which criticized the inequality found in an industrial economy. He suggested that, while people should own that which they create, all land and natural resources should belong to all equally and should be taxed through a “single land tax” in order to disincentivize private land ownership. His thoughts influenced many economic progressive reformers, as well as led directly to the creation of the now-popular board game, Monopoly.

Another critique of late nineteenth-century American capitalism was Thorstein Veblen, who lamented in *The Theory of the Leisure Class* (1899) that capitalism created a middle class more preoccupied with its own comfort and consumption than with maximizing production. In coining the phrase “conspicuous consumption,” Veblen identified the means by which one class of nonproducers exploited the working class that produced the goods for their consumption.

As the 19th century came to a close, a variety of factor led the United States to look beyond its borders. Countries in Europe were building their empires through global power and trade, and the business and political elite of the United States did not want to be left behind. As a new industrial United States began to emerge in the 1870s, economic interests began to lead the country toward a more expansionist foreign policy. By forging new and stronger ties overseas, the United States gained access to international markets for export, as well as better deals on the raw materials needed domestically.

As a result of these growing economic pressures, American exports to other nations skyrocketed in the years following the Civil War, from \$234 million in 1865 to \$605 million in 1875. By 1898, on the eve of the Spanish-American War, American exports had reached a height of \$1.3 billion annually. Imports over the same period also increased substantially, from \$238 million in 1865 to \$616 million in 1898. Such an increased investment in overseas markets in turn strengthened Americans' interest in foreign affairs.

Businesses were not the only ones seeking to expand. Religious leaders and social reformers joined businesses in their growing interest in American expansion, as both sought to increase the democratic and Christian influences of the United States abroad. Editors of such magazines as *Century*, *Outlook*, and *Harper's* supported an imperialistic stance as the democratic responsibility of the United States. Several Protestant faiths formed missionary societies in the years after the Civil War, seeking to expand their reach, particularly in Asia. Influenced by such works as Reverend Josiah Strong's *Our Country: Its Possible Future and Its Present Crisis* (1885), missionaries sought to spread the gospel throughout the country and abroad. Led by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, among several other organizations, missionaries conflated Christian ethics with American virtues, and began to spread both gospels with zeal. This was particularly true among women missionaries, who composed over 60 percent of the overall missionary force. By 1870, missionaries abroad spent as much time advocating for the American version of a modern civilization as they did teaching the Bible.

Social reformers also performed work abroad that mirrored the missionaries. Many were influenced by recent scholarship on race-based intelligence and embraced the implications of social Darwinist theory that alleged inferior races were destined to poverty on account of their lower evolutionary status. While certainly not all reformers espoused a racist view of intelligence and civilization, many of these reformers believed that the Anglo-Saxon race was mentally superior to others and owed the presumed less evolved populations their stewardship and social uplift—a service the British writer Rudyard Kipling termed “the white man's burden.”

By trying to help people in less industrialized countries achieve a higher standard of living and a better understanding of the principles of democracy, reformers hoped to contribute to a noble cause, but their approach suffered from the same paternalism that hampered social reforms at home. Whether reformers and missionaries worked with native communities in the borderlands such as New Mexico; in the inner cities, like the Salvation Army; or overseas, their approaches had much in common. Their good intentions and willingness to work in difficult conditions shone through in the letters and articles they wrote from the field. Often in their writing, it was clear that they felt divinely empowered to change the lives of other, less fortunate, and presumably, less enlightened, people. Whether overseas or in the urban slums, they benefited from the same passions but expressed the same paternalism.

America's Limited but Aggressive Push Outward

On the eve of the Civil War, the country had lacked the means to establish a strong position in international diplomacy. As of 1865, the U.S. State Department had barely sixty employees and no ambassadors representing American interests abroad. Instead, only two dozen American foreign ministers were located in key countries, and those often gained their positions not through diplomatic skills or expertise in foreign affairs but through bribes. Further limiting American potential for foreign impact was the fact that a strong international presence required a strong military—specifically a navy—which the United States, after the Civil War, was in no position to maintain.

Despite these limitations, the United States moved ahead sporadically with a modest foreign policy agenda in the three decades following the Civil War. Secretary of State William Seward, who held that position from 1861 through 1869, sought to extend American political and commercial influence in both Asia and Latin America. He pursued these goals through a variety of actions. A treaty with Nicaragua set the early course for the future construction of a canal across Central America. He also pushed through the annexation of the Midway Islands in the Pacific Ocean, which subsequently opened a more stable route to Asian markets. Most notably, in 1867, Seward obtained the Alaskan Territory from Russia for a purchase price of \$7.2 million. Fearing future loss of the territory through military conflict, as well as desiring to create challenges for Great Britain (which they had fought in the Crimean War), Russia happily accepted the

American purchase offer. Seward's purchase added an enormous territory to the country—nearly 600,000 square miles—and also gave the United States access to the rich mineral resources of the region, including the gold that triggered the Klondike Gold Rush at the close of the century. As was the case elsewhere in the American borderlands, Alaska's industrial development wreaked havoc on the region's indigenous and Russian cultures.

The United States also began to expand its influence to other Pacific Islands, most notably Samoa and Hawaii. With regard to the latter, American businessmen were most interested in the lucrative sugar industry that lay at the heart of the Hawaiian Islands' economy. By 1890, through a series of reciprocal trade agreements, Hawaiians exported nearly all of their sugar production to the United States, tariff-free. When Queen Liliuokalani tapped into a strong anti-American resentment among native Hawaiians over the economic and political power of exploitative American sugar companies between 1891 and 1893, worried businessmen worked with the American minister to Hawaii, John Stevens, to stage a quick, armed revolt to counter her efforts and seize the islands as an American protectorate. Following five more years of political wrangling, the United States annexed Hawaii in 1898, during the Spanish-American War.

The United States had similar strategic interests in the Samoan Islands of the South Pacific, most notably, access to the naval refueling station at Pago Pago where American merchant vessels as well as naval ships could take on food, fuel, and supplies. In 1899, in an effort to mitigate other foreign interests and still protect their own, the United States joined Great Britain and Germany in a three-party protectorate over the islands, which assured American access to the strategic ports located there.

The Spanish-American War and Overseas Empire

The Spanish-American War was the first significant international military conflict for the United States since its war against Mexico in 1846; it came to represent a critical milestone in the country's development as an empire. Ostensibly about the rights of Cuban rebels to fight for freedom from Spain, the war had, for the United States at least, a far greater importance in the country's desire to expand its global reach.

The Spanish-American War was notable not only because the United States succeeded in seizing territory from another empire, but also because it caused the global

community to recognize that the United States was a formidable military power. In what Secretary of State John Hay called “a splendid little war,” the United States significantly altered the balance of world power, just as the twentieth century began to unfold.

War: Brief and Decisive

The Spanish-American War lasted approximately ten weeks, and the outcome was clear: The United States triumphed in its goal of helping liberate Cuba from Spanish control. Despite the positive result, the conflict did present significant challenges to the United States military. Although the new navy was powerful, the ships were, as McKinley feared, largely untested. Similarly, untested were the American soldiers. The country had fewer than thirty thousand soldiers and sailors, many of whom were unprepared to do battle with a formidable opponent. But volunteers sought to make up the difference. Over one million American men—many lacking a uniform and coming equipped with their own guns—quickly answered McKinley’s call for able-bodied men. Nearly ten thousand African American men also volunteered for service, despite the segregated conditions and additional hardships they faced, including violent uprisings at a few American bases before they departed for Cuba. The government, although grateful for the volunteer effort, was still unprepared to feed and supply such a force, and many suffered malnutrition and malaria for their sacrifice.

To the surprise of the Spanish forces that saw the conflict as a clear war over Cuba, American military strategists prepared for it as a war for empire. More so than simply the liberation of Cuba and the protection of American interests in the Caribbean, military strategists sought to build additional naval bases in the Pacific Ocean, reaching as far as mainland Asia. Such a strategy would also benefit American industrialists who sought to expand their markets into China. Just before leaving his post for volunteer service as a lieutenant colonel in the U.S. cavalry, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Theodore Roosevelt ordered navy ships to attack the Spanish fleet in the Philippines, another island chain under Spanish control. As a result, the first significant military confrontation took place not in Cuba but halfway around the world in the Philippines. Commodore George Dewey led the U.S. Navy in a decisive victory, sinking all of the Spanish ships while taking almost no American losses. Within a month, the U.S. Army

landed a force to take the islands from Spain, which it succeeded in doing by mid-August 1899.

The victory in Cuba took a little longer. In June, seventeen thousand American troops landed in Cuba. Although they initially met with little Spanish resistance, by early July, fierce battles ensued near the Spanish stronghold in Santiago. Most famously, Theodore Roosevelt led his **Rough Riders**, an all-volunteer cavalry unit made up of adventure-seeking college graduates, and veterans and cowboys from the Southwest, in a charge up Kettle Hill, next to San Juan Hill, which resulted in American forces surrounding Santiago. The victories of the Rough Riders are the best-known part of the battles, but in fact, several African American regiments, made up of veteran soldiers, were instrumental to their success. The Spanish fleet made a last-ditch effort to escape to the sea but ran into an American naval blockade that resulted in total destruction, with every Spanish vessel sunk. Lacking any naval support, Spain quickly lost control of Puerto Rico as well, offering virtually no resistance to advancing American forces. By the end of July, the fighting had ended, and the war was over. Despite its short duration and limited number of casualties—fewer than 350 soldiers died in combat, about 1,600 were wounded, while almost 3,000 men died from disease—the war carried enormous significance for Americans who celebrated the victory as a reconciliation between North and South.

Growing Pains of Urbanization (1870-1900)

Introduction

"We saw the big woman with spikes on her head." So begins Sadie Frown's first memory of arriving in the United States. Many Americans experienced in their new home what the thirteen-year-old Polish girl had seen in the silhouette of the Statue of Liberty (Figure 19.1): a wondrous world of new opportunities fraught with dangers. Sadie and her mother, for instance, had left Poland after her father's death. Her mother died shortly thereafter, and Sadie had to find her own way in New York, working in factories and slowly assimilating to life in a vast multinational metropolis. Her story is similar to millions of others, as people came to the United States seeking a better future than the one they had at home. The future they found, however, was often grim. While many believed in the land of opportunity, the reality of urban life in the United States was more

chaotic and difficult than people expected. In addition to the challenges of language, class, race, and ethnicity, these new arrivals dealt with low wages, overcrowded buildings, poor sanitation, and widespread disease. The land of opportunity, it seemed, did not always deliver on its promises.

Politics in the Gilded Age

Mark Twain described the excesses of the late 19th century in a satirical novel, *The Gilded Age*, a collaboration with the writer Charles Dudley Warner. The title of the book has since come to represent the period from the 1870s to the 1890s. Twain mocks the greed and self-indulgence of his characters, including Philip Sterling.

Twain's characters find that getting rich quick is more difficult than they had thought it would be. Investments turn out to be worthless; politicians' bribes eat up their savings. The glittering exterior of the age turns out to hide a corrupt political core and a growing gap between the few rich and the many poor.

The Emergence of Political Machines

In the late 19th century, cities experienced rapid growth under inefficient government. In a climate influenced by dog-eat-dog Social Darwinism, cities were receptive to a new power structure, the political machine, and a new politician, the city boss.

The Political Machine

An organized group that controlled the activities of a political party in a city, the political machine also offered services to voters and businesses in exchange for political or financial support. In the decades after the Civil War, political machines gained control of local government in Baltimore, New York, San Francisco, and other major cities.

The machine was organized like a pyramid. At the pyramid's base were local precinct workers and captains, who tried to gain voters' support on a city block or in a neighborhood and who reported to a ward boss. At election time, the ward boss worked to secure the vote in all the precincts in the ward, or electoral district. Ward bosses helped the poor and gained their votes by doing favors or providing services. As Martin Lomasney, elected ward boss of Boston's West End in 1885, explained, "There's got to be in every ward somebody that any bloke can come to . . . and get help. Help, you understand; none of your law and your justice, but help." At the top of the pyramid was

the city boss, who controlled the activities of the political party throughout the city. Precinct captains, ward bosses, and the city boss worked together to elect their candidates and guarantee the success of the machine.

The Role of the Political Boss

Whether or not the boss officially served as mayor, he controlled access to municipal jobs and business licenses, and influenced the courts and other municipal agencies. Bosses like Roscoe Conkling in New York used their power to build parks, sewer systems, and waterworks, and gave money to schools, hospitals, and orphanages. Bosses could also provide government support for new businesses, a service for which they were often paid extremely well. It was not only money that motivated city bosses. By solving urban problems, bosses could reinforce voters' loyalty, win additional political support, and extend their influence.

Immigrants and the Machine

Many precinct captains and political bosses were first-generation or second-generation immigrants. Few were educated beyond grammar school. They entered politics early and worked their way up from the bottom. They could speak to immigrants in their own language and understood the challenges that newcomers faced. More important, the bosses were able to provide solutions. The machines helped immigrants with naturalization (attaining full citizenship), housing, and jobs—the newcomers' most pressing needs. In return, the immigrants provided what the political bosses needed—votes.

“Big Jim” Pendergast, an Irish-American saloonkeeper, worked his way up from precinct captain to Democratic city boss in Kansas City by aiding Italian, African-American, and Irish voters in his ward. By 1900, he controlled Missouri state politics as well.

Municipal Graft and Scandal

While the well-oiled political machines provided city dwellers with services, many political bosses fell victim to corruption as their influence grew.

Election Fraud and Graft

When the loyalty of voters was not enough to carry an election, some political machines turned to fraud. Using fake names, party faithfuls cast as many votes as were needed to win.

Once a political machine got its candidates into office, it could take advantage of numerous opportunities for graft, the illegal use of political influence for personal gain. For example, by helping a person find work on a construction project for the city, a political machine could ask the worker to bill the city for more than the actual cost of materials and labor. The worker then “kicked back” a portion of the earnings to the machine. Taking these kickbacks, or illegal payments for their services, enriched the political machines—and individual politicians.

Political machines also granted favors to businesses in return for cash and accepted bribes to allow illegal activities, such as gambling, to flourish. Politicians were able to get away with shady dealings because the police rarely interfered. Vocabulary extortion: illegal use of one’s official position to obtain property or funds Until about 1890, police forces were hired and fired by political bosses

The Tweed Ring Scandal

William M. Tweed, known as Boss Tweed, became head of Tammany Hall, New York City’s powerful Democratic political machine, in 1868. Between 1869 and 1871, Boss Tweed led the Tweed Ring, a group of corrupt politicians, in defrauding the city.

One scheme, the construction of the New York County Courthouse, involved extravagant graft. The project cost taxpayers \$13 million, while the actual construction cost was \$3 million. The difference went into the pockets of Tweed and his followers.

Thomas Nast, a political cartoonist, helped arouse public outrage against Tammany Hall’s graft, and the Tweed Ring was finally broken in 1871. Tweed was indicted on 120 counts of fraud and extortion and was sentenced to 12 years in jail. His sentence was reduced to one year, but after leaving jail, Tweed was quickly arrested on another charge. While serving a second sentence, Tweed escaped. He was captured in Spain when officials identified him from a Thomas Nast cartoon. By that time, political corruption had become a national issue.

Civil Service Replaces Patronage

The desire for power and money that made local politics corrupt in the industrial age also infected national politics.

Patronage Spurs Reform

Since the beginning of the 19th century, presidents had complained about the problem of patronage, or the giving of government jobs to people who had helped a candidate get elected. In Andrew Jackson's administration, this policy was known as the spoils system. People from cabinet members to workers who scrubbed the steps of the Capitol owed their jobs to political connections. As might be expected, some government employees were not qualified for the positions they filled. Moreover, political appointees, whether qualified or not, sometimes used their positions for personal gain.

Reformers began to press for the elimination of patronage and the adoption of a merit system of hiring. Jobs in civil service—government administration—should go to the most qualified persons, reformers believed. It should not matter what political views they held or who recommended them.

Reform under Hayes, Garfield, and Arthur

Civil service reform made gradual progress under Presidents Hayes, Garfield, and Arthur. Republican president Rutherford B. Hayes, elected in 1876, could not convince Congress to support reform, so he used other means. Hayes named independents to his cabinet. He also set up a commission to investigate the nation's customhouses, which were notoriously corrupt. On the basis of the commission's report, Hayes fired two of the top officials of New York City's customhouse, where jobs were controlled by the Republican Party. These firings enraged the Republican New York senator and political boss Roscoe Conkling and his supporters, the Stalwarts.

When Hayes decided not to run for reelection in 1880, a free-for-all broke out at the Republican convention, between the Stalwarts—who opposed changes in the spoils system—and reformers. Since neither Stalwarts nor reformers could win a majority of delegates, the convention settled on an independent presidential candidate, Ohio congressman James A. Garfield. To balance out Garfield's ties to reformers, the Republicans nominated for vice-president Chester A. Arthur, one of Conkling's

supporters. Despite Arthur's inclusion on the ticket, Garfield angered the Stalwarts by giving reformers most of his patronage jobs once he was elected.

On July 2, 1881, as President Garfield walked through the Washington, D.C., train station, he was shot two times by a mentally unbalanced lawyer named Charles Guiteau, whom Garfield had turned down for a job. The would-be assassin announced, "I did it and I will go to jail for it. I am a Stalwart and Arthur is now president." Garfield finally died from his wounds on September 19. Despite his ties to the Stalwarts, Chester Arthur turned reformer when he became president. His first message to Congress urged legislators to pass a civil service law.

The resulting Pendleton Civil Service Act of 1883 authorized a bipartisan civil service commission to make appointments to federal jobs through a merit system based on candidates' performance on an examination. By 1901, more than 40 percent of all federal jobs had been classified as civil service positions, but the Pendleton Act had mixed consequences. On the one hand, public administration became more honest and efficient. On the other hand, because officials could no longer pressure employees for campaign contributions, politicians turned to other sources for donations.

Business Buys Influence

With employees no longer a source of campaign contributions, politicians turned to wealthy business owners. Therefore, the alliance between government and big business became stronger than ever.

Harrison, Cleveland, and High Tariffs

Big business hoped the government would preserve, or even raise, the tariffs that protected domestic industries from foreign competition. The Democratic Party, however, opposed high tariffs because they increased prices. In 1884, the Democratic Party won a presidential election for the first time in 28 years with candidate Grover Cleveland. As president, Cleveland tried to lower tariff rates, but Congress refused to support him.

In 1888, Cleveland ran for reelection on a low-tariff platform against the former Indiana senator Benjamin Harrison, the grandson of President William Henry Harrison. Harrison's campaign was financed by large contributions from companies that wanted tariffs even higher than they were. Although Cleveland won about 100,000 more popular votes than Harrison, Harrison took a majority of the electoral votes and the presidency.

Once in office, he won passage of the McKinley Tariff Act of 1890, which raised tariffs to their highest level yet.

In 1892, Cleveland was elected again—the only president to serve two nonconsecutive terms. He supported a bill for lowering the McKinley Tariff but refused to sign it because it also provided for a federal income tax. The WilsonGorman Tariff became law in 1894 without the president's signature. In 1897, William McKinley was inaugurated president and raised tariffs once again. The attempt to reduce the tariff had failed, but the spirit of reform was not dead. New developments in areas ranging from technology to mass culture would help redefine American society as the United States moved into the 20th century.

Self-Assessment Questions

1. Explain the causes of Westward Expansion (1860–1900).
2. Discuss the effects of Westward Expansion on American society.
3. Describe the growth of industrialization in late 19th-century America.
4. Examine the rise of big business during the Industrial Age.
5. Write a short note on monopolies and trusts.
6. Explain the causes of rapid urbanization (1870–1900).
7. Discuss the problems faced by cities during urban growth.
8. Describe living and working conditions in industrial cities.
9. Explain the main features of politics in the Gilded Age.
10. Assess the impact of Gilded Age politics on American democracy.

Unit- III

The Progressive Era – McKinley- Spanish American War -T.D .Roosevelt - Square Deal- William Howard Taft - Dollar Diplomacy –Woodrow Wilson – New Freedom – World War I

Objectives

- To understand leadership from McKinley to Wilson.
- To the causes and outcomes of the Spanish–American War..
- To examine Progressive policies such as the Square Deal, Dollar Diplomacy.
- To assess the impact of Progressive on American society and politics.

Introduction

The Progressive Era

At the end of the Civil War in 1865, the United States was still primarily a rural and agricultural society. Business was conducted in local or regional markets by family farms and small firms owned and operated by single individuals or a small group of partners. The scale of production was modest, consumption for most was limited to life's necessities, and among white Americans, wealth was distributed without great gaps separating rich from poor. But by 1890, huge manufacturing corporations employing a succession of revolutionary new machines and processes had begun to create the modern American economy of mass production and consumption. Millions of farm workers had left the countryside for the cities to labor in the new industrial giants, and vast quantities of material wealth were being produced in the corporations and consumed by ordinary people across the country. With these rapid economic changes came an array of new conditions and problems that alarmed and confused Americans of the time: unprecedented disparities in the distribution of the newly created wealth, the transformation of previously independent, entrepreneurial artisans and merchants into wage-earning workers in large, hierarchical organizations, a growing industrial proletariat increasingly composed of impoverished immigrants crowded into urban slums, and the disproportionate, often corrupting influence of wealthy industrialists in the political system. The political reaction provoked by these economic and social changes in the

years between 1890 and the First World War defines the Progressive Era, a quarter century of reform in which Americans attempted to adjust their traditional system of political economy to the new realities of the industrial age.

The first and most important of these reforms was the Sherman Act, passed in 1890 in the midst of an impassioned national debate over whether and how government ought to be used to rein in the trusts, as the huge corporations came to be called. Some, pointing to the ever lower cost at which the trusts could produce enormous quantities of goods, argued that they were the inevitable outcome of technological progress and should be allowed to grow as large as necessary to efficiently meet the demand of consumers in the market. Others cited the growing market power accumulated by the trusts as they insatiably swallowed smaller firms, the deadening effects of hierarchical corporate planning on individual autonomy and initiative, the closing of entrepreneurial opportunity in now highly capital intensive industries, and the corruption bred by the infusion of great private wealth into democratic politics, and called for strict government regulation or outright destruction of firms that had grown too big. Unable to reconcile these sharply opposing positions in a clear or coherent policy that could command a legislative majority, Congress avoided resolving the issue by passing a terse, vague statute that made "restraint" or "monopolizing" of commerce a criminal offense and leaving it to the federal courts to decide what this actually meant, and thus what the policy of the United States toward the trusts and the new economy they heralded was to be. After more than twenty years of uncertain interpretation, during which both positions had their moments in the judicial sun and the nation endured a major economic depression and a wave of industrial consolidation in its wake, the Supreme Court in 1911 at last decided in favor of bigness fairly won in the market. In dismantling John D. Rockefeller's Standard Oil Company because of its "unreasonable" competitive behavior, the Court held that the mere size or market power of a corporation, no matter how great, would not violate the Sherman Act unless, like Standard Oil's, it was achieved through unfair or abusive means. This was the pivotal political outcome of the Progressive Era; once the decision for efficient wealth creation in large, hierarchical firms had been made, all that remained was to create the machinery of government needed to administer the policy and ameliorate the harsher economic and social consequences of large-scale industrial organization. Given the

weakness of the federal government created by the Framers a century before, the movement to achieve this adjustment began in the states and municipalities and was pursued on several fronts. The judicial acceptance of bigness and justifiable monopoly was complemented by local legislation to regulate the rates and operation of public utilities. The settlement house movement, led by Jane Addams of Hull House in Chicago, addressed the problem of urban poverty by attempting to meet the everyday needs of the poor through close contact with sympathetic social workers. It and the Social Gospel preached by religiously inspired progressives moved others to press successfully for state laws limiting hours of work and enforcing safer and healthier working environments in a broad range of industries, though many of these were struck down by the Supreme Court for infringing upon a "liberty of contract" the Court had read into the Fourteenth Amendment in 1897. To progressives, these new responsibilities for government seemed also to require an extension of democracy itself, a political process more open and receptive to the public's needs and less responsive to the partisan maneuverings and patronage characteristic of local politics. In several states, procedural reforms such as direct party primaries, public referenda and ballot initiatives, and the recall of public officials were instituted, and cities began to replace unsystematic government by party politicians with scientific administration by nonpartisan, expert city managers and commissions. The movement for women's suffrage gained strength throughout the period, culminating in the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment in 1920. On the national level, the Seventeenth Amendment, ratified in 1913, moved the election of United States Senators from the state legislatures to the voters themselves. The protective tariff, the federal government's chief source of revenue but seen by many as primarily a device for enriching the trusts, was significantly lowered and the nation's finances revolutionized by the introduction of the income tax in 1913. And the spectacle of Theodore Roosevelt imploring J. P. Morgan to save the nation's financial system during the Panic of 1907 eased the way for the creation of the Federal Reserve system six years later.

Reform had its darker side as well. The moralistic tone of many progressive reformers encouraged an element of coercion and social control in their proposals, illustrated by the temperance movement that succeeded in imposing Prohibition in 1920.

For many, progressivism also entailed a commitment to racial purity and cultural homogeneity, and with it a large measure of racism. Taking their lead from Roosevelt, progressives facing resistance from southerners fearful that a national government powerful enough to regulate industry would also be powerful enough to enforce racial integration bought their cooperation by turning away from the plight of African-Americans. Several leading progressives traced the nation's problems and the frightening specters of socialism and anarchism directly to the influx of immigrants from eastern and southern Europe, increasing sentiment for closing the borders that led to the sharp restrictions on immigration enacted early in the 1920s. And after the easy victory over Spain in 1898, the nation flirted with what supporters saw as a benevolent imperialism until a revolt in the Philippines exposed its costs and contradictions. Commitment to the "public interest," the elusive concept from which the progressive movement drew its moral inspiration and political strength, created a space large enough to include both friends of freedom and their illiberal opponents.

Indeed, the ideological primacy of the public interest has been the most important and permanent legacy of the Progressive Era. Before the Civil War, Americans generally understood political order in Lockean terms. Legitimate authority was the product of an agreement among free individuals whose validity depended on the continuing consent of those it bound. The state itself had neither life nor purposes of its own, but was simply an organizational device with limited powers created by individuals to promote their own welfare. But by 1900, through the efforts of such progressive intellectuals as John Bates Clark, Lester Ward, Richard T. Ely and the young Woodrow Wilson, this view had largely been supplanted by a democratic collectivism in which, like the German model that inspired its proponents, the individual was but a cell within the larger organism of society and the authority of the democratic state to articulate and act upon the interests of the living collective was unbounded. The success of the great corporations in harnessing the labors of thousands and turning them to the achievement of single purpose drew progressive reformers to a distinctively American ideal of scientifically informed control of social and political life in the service of a collectively defined public interest. Politics, as Wilson put it in 1887, could now be separated from administration; just as scientifically trained managers could rationally pursue profit in the interest of the

corporation, the institutions of democratic government could be devoted to identifying the interests of the social organism, and a corps of disinterested, expert administrators, equipped with the conceptual tools of the emerging social sciences, charged with furthering them. It was this commitment to nonpartisan, scientific administration in the public interest that united the many strands of progressive reform, and if many of the specific reforms of the period have proven ephemeral, the influence of the managerial vision through the twentieth century has been continuous and profound.

Early Life and Political Rise of William McKinley

William McKinley's journey began in modest surroundings, born on January 29, 1843, in Niles, Ohio. Coming from a large family, McKinley embraced the values of hard work and education early on, attending public schools and later pursuing higher education at Allegheny College in Pennsylvania. Although financial constraints cut his academic endeavors short, his resilience led him to various jobs, including teaching, to support his aspirations.

As the Civil War erupted in 1861, McKinley's course took a pivotal turn. Enlisting in the Union Army, he served with distinction in the 23rd Ohio Volunteer Infantry. Demonstrating valor and leadership, McKinley swiftly rose through the ranks from a private to a brevet major, earning respect and recognition for his bravery and strategic acumen. The experiences of war profoundly influenced McKinley's character and acquired leadership skills that would serve him well in public life.

Post-war, McKinley ventured into law, studying under an attorney in Poland, Ohio, before being admitted to the bar in 1867. His legal career, however, was soon intertwined with a burgeoning interest in politics. Inspired by the Republican Party's ideals and the Reconstruction era's pressing issues, McKinley commenced his political journey. He first served as the prosecuting attorney for Stark County, Ohio, from 1869, marking his entry into public service.

His path to political prominence was marked by a series of strategic moves and significant influences. Notably, Rutherford B. Hayes, fellow Ohioan and future president, became both mentor and ally. They had served together during the Civil War, and their bond facilitated McKinley's ascent within the Republican Party. McKinley's adept oratory skills and dedication to Republican principles won him a seat in the U.S. House

of Representatives in 1876, initiating a congressional career that would span over fourteen years.

In Congress, McKinley's legislative focus and ardent advocacy for protective tariffs garnered national attention. He championed the McKinley Tariff of 1890, which aimed to safeguard American industries by imposing high duties on imported goods. Despite some backlash over the tariff's economic repercussions, McKinley's unwavering commitment to economic nationalism buoyed his reputation as a protector of American labor and enterprise.

Moreover, McKinley's political philosophy was deeply shaped by his personal experiences and broader societal changes. His Civil War service instilled in him a profound sense of national unity and patriotism, while his legal career and legislative work provided a robust foundation for his policy perspectives. McKinley's belief in the Republican tenets of business prosperity, government support for industrial growth, and a robust national defense resonated with the American populace, setting the stage for his further political ascension.

In sum, William McKinley's early life, military service, and entry into politics were defined by a series of transformative experiences and pivotal influences. His dedication to public service, cultivated through education, wartime leadership, and legislative advocacy, underscored his rise through the political ranks. Equipped with a steadfast belief in protecting American interests and bolstering national prosperity, McKinley's formative years laid a sturdy foundation for his future role as a significant figure in American political history.

McKinley's Congressional Years and Path to the Presidency

William McKinley's Congressional years and his path to the presidency were pivotal phases that defined his political career and prepared him for the highest office in the land. During his tenure in Congress, which began in 1877 after being elected as a Republican representative from Ohio, McKinley quickly established himself as a dedicated and capable legislator. His focus on tariff issues, which would become the cornerstone of his economic policy, drew significant attention. He became a leading advocate for protective tariffs, arguing that they were essential for the prosperity of American industries and workers. His commitment to this cause was exemplified by the

McKinley Tariff of 1890, named after him, which raised average duties on imports to historically high levels. Despite the contemporary unpopularity of this legislation, particularly among farmers who felt the pinch of higher prices for imported goods, McKinley stood firm in his belief that such tariffs would protect American jobs and industries from foreign competition.

McKinley's tenure as Governor of Ohio from 1892 to 1896 further solidified his reputation as a pragmatic and effective leader. During his time as governor, he championed issues such as economic reform, labor rights, and veterans' benefits. He demonstrated a balanced approach to governance, blending progressive ideas with traditional values, and working to foster economic growth while addressing social issues. This ability to navigate complex political landscapes garnered him widespread respect and set the stage for his presidential ambitions.

The 1896 presidential campaign was a defining moment in McKinley's career, orchestrated with strategic brilliance by his close advisor and financier, Mark Hanna. McKinley faced significant challenges, including a depressed economy and the rising popularity of the Populist movement represented by his opponent, William Jennings Bryan. The central issue of the campaign was the nation's monetary policy, with McKinley advocating for the gold standard as a means to stabilize the economy and promote business confidence, while Bryan championed the free silver movement, which aimed to inflate the currency and aid indebted farmers.

Mark Hanna's role in McKinley's campaign cannot be overstated. A prominent businessman and political strategist, Hanna effectively managed McKinley's campaign finances and orchestrated a groundbreaking strategy that focused on mass communication and grassroots mobilization. Under Hanna's guidance, McKinley opted for a "front porch" campaign, where he addressed delegations and supporters from his home in Canton, Ohio, rather than traveling extensively across the country. This approach contrasted sharply with Bryan's vigorous nationwide speaking tour, which saw him deliver impassioned speeches to large crowds.

Despite the dynamic and energetic campaign led by Bryan, McKinley's message of stability, economic recovery, and protective tariffs resonated with voters, particularly in the industrial North and Midwest. The extensive use of pamphlets, posters, and

newspapers to disseminate McKinley's message helped reach a broad audience, and the financial contributions from businessmen who feared the economic repercussions of Bryan's silver policies bolstered the campaign's efforts.

Ultimately, McKinley's victory in the 1896 election marked a turning point in American political history. His success represented not just a win for the Republican Party but also a triumph for industrial capitalism and a reaffirmation of America's commitment to the gold standard. This election underscored the power of effective campaign management and set a precedent for future political campaigns in the United States.

McKinley's path to the presidency was characterized by his legislative acumen, his ability to address and adapt to economic and social issues, and his strategic use of campaign resources and tactics. These attributes helped him navigate the complex political environment of the late 19th century, enabling him to ascend to the presidency and lay the groundwork for significant national policies that would shape the future of the nation.

Economic Policies and the Gold Standard Debate

President McKinley's economic policies were at the heart of his administration and reflected his commitment to stabilizing and strengthening the American economy. One of McKinley's most notable economic visions was his unwavering support for the gold standard, which set the stage for a fierce national debate.

During the late 19th century, America was embroiled in a contentious debate over whether to adhere to the gold standard or to adopt free silver. The gold standard meant that the value of the U.S. dollar would be directly tied to a specific amount of gold, which was seen as a means to ensure economic stability and control inflation. On the other hand, advocates of free silver, including many agrarian and populist groups, argued that basing currency on both silver and gold (bimetallism) would inflate the currency supply, make it easier for farmers and others with debts to pay them off, and spur economic growth.

McKinley's staunch defense of the gold standard was part of his broader economic philosophy, which emphasized stability and conservative fiscal policies. He believed that sticking to the gold standard would protect the economy from the risks of

inflation and maintain the nation's financial credibility, especially focusing on the confidence it inspired among businessmen and investors. His economic policies were shaped significantly by his advisor, Mark Hanna, who not only played a crucial role in McKinley's rise to the presidency but also in formulating his financial strategies.

The debate reached its zenith during the 1896 presidential campaign, with McKinley, representing the Republican Party, solidly in favor of the gold standard, and his opponent, William Jennings Bryan, passionately advocating for free silver. Bryan's famous "Cross of Gold" speech captured the fervor of the free silver movement, but McKinley's message of economic stability and sound money ultimately resonated more with the electorate, particularly in industrial and urban.

Foreign Policy and the Spanish-American War

McKinley's foreign policy strategy was rooted in a belief that America needed to extend its influence beyond its borders to secure its place as a global power. His presidency, marked by the Spanish-American War, underscored this vision and shaped the future trajectory of American international relations. The conflict's origins lay in the Cuban struggle for independence from Spain, which had resonance across the United States, capturing the public's attention and stirring significant sentiment for intervention.

McKinley initially sought to resolve the conflict through diplomatic means, reflecting his cautious nature and preference for peaceful resolution. He pushed for Spain to grant Cuba autonomy, but as reports of Spanish atrocities against Cuban revolutionaries became widespread, public pressure for a more aggressive stance mounted. The tipping point came with the explosion of the USS Maine in Havana harbor on February 15, 1898, killing 266 American sailors. Although the cause of the explosion was never definitively determined, sensationalist journalism, known as "yellow journalism," whipped the American public into a fervor, clamoring for war.

Responding to the growing clamor for action, McKinley asked Congress for a declaration of war, which was granted on April 25, 1898. The war itself was comparatively brief but strategically significant. Key battles included the naval engagement in Manila Bay led by Commodore George Dewey, resulting in the decisive defeat of the Spanish Pacific fleet and the Battle of San Juan Hill, famously associated

with Theodore Roosevelt and his Rough Riders, which showcased American military might and tactical superiority.

On the diplomatic front, the conflict concluded with the Treaty of Paris in December 1898. The United States emerged as a victor, and the treaty had far-reaching consequences, marking the end of Spanish colonial rule in the Americas. Spain ceded control of Cuba, which became a U.S. protectorate under the Platt Amendment, and relinquished its sovereignty over Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines to the United States. These territorial acquisitions underscored a significant shift in American foreign policy from continental to overseas imperialism.

The Spanish-American War signified America's transition from a relatively isolated nation to an emergent world power. The victory imbued the nation with a newfound sense of confidence and expanded its geopolitical footprint. The annexation of the Philippines, and the ensuing Philippine-American War, however, sparked debates about imperialism and the role of the United States in global affairs. Critics argued that imperialism contradicted American democratic principles and entangled the nation in foreign conflicts, while proponents contended it was a manifestation of the country's destiny and duty to civilize and educate less developed nations.

McKinley's foreign policy pragmatism and the outcomes of the Spanish-American War set the stage for America's 20th-century trajectory as a burgeoning superpower. These events under McKinley's leadership not only showcased his ability to navigate complex international crises but also highlighted his vision of an assertive American presence on the global stage.

Progressive Era Policies and Domestic Achievements

William McKinley's presidency was marked by a clear commitment to progressive era policies and significant domestic achievements aimed at modernizing the American economy and addressing pressing social issues. One of McKinley's notable initiatives was his focus on infrastructure improvement. Understanding the pivotal role of infrastructure in economic development, McKinley championed various projects to enhance the nation's transportation networks. This included the expansion of railroads, which not only facilitated movement and commerce across the country but also helped in binding together geographically distant regions, thereby fostering national unity.

McKinley's administration also took significant strides in the realm of labor rights, which were becoming an increasing source of tension during the rapid industrialization of America. Recognizing the growing discontent among workers, McKinley supported arbitration and negotiation between labor and management, seeking peaceful resolutions to labor disputes. He believed that stability in labor relations was essential for continued economic growth and sought to balance the interests of workers and employers. A notable example of his commitment was the intervention in the coal strike of 1900, where his administration worked towards fairer wages and better working conditions for miners, setting a precedent for future labor-management relations.

In addition to labor issues, McKinley also acknowledged the importance of promoting innovation and industry as drivers of economic progress. His administration supported technological advancements and sought to create a favorable environment for industrial growth. This included the promotion of tariff policies designed to protect burgeoning American industries from foreign competition, thereby cultivating a self-sufficient and robust industrial base.

Despite his progressive ambitions, McKinley maintained a delicate balance with conservative principles. He was mindful of the fiscal prudence and limited government intervention valued by conservatives. His administration's economic policies reflect this balance, as he favored a tariff system that protected American industries while also being cautious about excessive government expenditure.

McKinley's pragmatic approach to governance allowed him to appeal to a broad political spectrum, garnering support from both progressives and conservatives. McKinley's domestic achievements were thus characterized by a blend of progressivism and conservatism, aimed at modernizing the economy while ensuring stability and growth. By addressing labor issues, supporting innovation, and improving infrastructure, his administration laid down a foundation that facilitated the United States' transition into the new century with enhanced economic capability and social harmony.

The 1900 Re-election Campaign and the Road to Assassination

The 1900 re-election campaign marked a critical juncture in William McKinley's presidency, pitting him once again against the populist Democrat William Jennings Bryan. As the incumbent, McKinley had the advantage of a solid record to run on,

including the economic revitalization that had unfolded during his first term and the successful conclusion of the Spanish-American War, which had expanded America's influence globally. The election was characterized by the juxtaposition of McKinley's appeal for stability and prosperity against Bryan's fervent advocacy for free silver and a populist approach.

McKinley's campaign, masterminded by his astute political advisor Mark Hanna, focused on themes of economic growth, national unity, and a strong international presence. The Republican platform emphasized the success of the gold standard in stabilizing the American economy, promising continued prosperity under its adherence. They touted the benefits of protective tariffs, which were seen as instrumental in fostering domestic industries. The rhetoric of the campaign leaned heavily on the positive outcomes of McKinley's first term, which resonated with a populace that had witnessed tangible improvements in employment and economic conditions.

Bryan, on the other hand, rejuvenated his previous campaign's focus on the plight of the common man, advocating for bimetallism and depicting McKinley as a president beholden to corporate interests. However, in the face of an improving economy and the patriotic fervor following the Spanish-American War, Bryan's message had less traction than it did in 1896. The Republicans were adept at framing their candidate as a steward of peace and prosperity, which was particularly compelling in a country eager to move away from economic instability and conflict.

Legacy and Impact of William McKinley's Presidency

William McKinley's presidency left an indelible mark on the United States, shaping the nation's trajectory in numerous ways. Although his time in office was cut short by assassination, the policies and actions he enacted have resonated throughout American history, highlighting his significant legacy and lasting impact.

One of McKinley's most prominent contributions was his role in steering the country towards a more assertive and influential position on the global stage. The Spanish-American War, fought under his leadership, resulted in the U.S. acquiring territories such as Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines. This expansion not only marked the nation's first significant foray into imperialism but also heralded the United States' emergence as a global power. McKinley's decision to embrace American

imperialism was not without controversy, but it undeniably altered the country's foreign policy, setting a precedent for future interventions and territorial expansions.

Economically, McKinley is often celebrated for his adept handling of the nation's financial health. His firm commitment to the gold standard provided much-needed stability at a time when the country was recovering from previous economic panics. This stance reassured both national and international investors, bolstering confidence in the U.S. economy. Furthermore, McKinley's emphasis on protective tariffs helped stimulate American industries by shielding them from foreign competition. These economic policies contributed to a period of significant industrial growth and prosperity, laying the groundwork for the economic boom of the early 20th century.

On the domestic front, McKinley's progressive inclinations, although moderate, positioned him as a transitional figure bridging the gap between conservative traditions and the burgeoning progressive movement. His efforts to address labor issues, while cautious, reflected a recognition of the changing dynamics within American society. He supported arbitration in labor disputes and took steps to improve the working conditions for American workers, aligning with some progressive ideals without fully alienating conservative supporters.

Another crucial aspect of McKinley's legacy lies in his political strategy and campaign innovations. His 1896 and 1900 presidential campaigns, masterminded by Mark Hanna, revolutionized political campaigning. The use of extensive fundraising, modern advertising techniques, and strategic media engagement set new benchmarks that would shape future electoral campaigns. These innovations highlight McKinley's understanding of the evolving political landscape and his ability to adapt and thrive within it.

Historical assessments of McKinley's presidency often grapple with the dualities of his term: his contributions to American imperialism and economic growth stand in contrast with the polarizing views they engendered. However, his leadership style, marked by pragmatism and a keen sense of national political currents, ensured that his presidency remained impactful and influential even beyond his tenure.

In summation, William McKinley's presidency had a profound and multifaceted impact on the United States. His foreign policies and territorial expansions repositioned

the nation on the global stage, while his economic strategies fostered industrial growth and prosperity. Domestically, his progressive yet cautious approach to labor issues and innovations in political campaigning heralded new eras in their respective fields. McKinley's legacy, thus, is one of significant transformation, laying crucial groundwork for the America that would emerge in the 20th century.

Spanish American War

History graduate student Greg Aydt wrote this article, winner of the Hamand History Graduate Writing Award, for Dr. Beck's seminar on Imperialism. Like the previous article, it attempts an alternative perspective to an often-viewed historical problem. Greg presented a paper at the Southern Illinois Regional Phi Alpha Theta Conference and is writing a thesis on Montana lynchings.

The traditional view of the Spanish-American War begins with the infamous explosion of the U.S. battleship Maine, and proceeds through convincing American army and navy victories. This narrative however, lacks one crucial item: the views of the Cuban people themselves. Even the very name assigned to the war itself seems to ignore this major participant, who was involved from the very beginning. The fight against Spain which the United States joined in 1898 already had been carried on by the Cuban people for several years. Traditionally, historians have viewed the entrance of the United States into the Cuban Revolution as a prerequisite for the defeat of Spain on the island. From the Cuban perspective, this interpretation is open to debate, as is the American motivation for entering the conflict.

Cuba's Second War for Independence began late in February of 1895. A previous attempt to overthrow the Spanish rulers of Cuba had been defeated in 1878, but the intervening years had not seen much improvement in the status of the Cuban people. While the use of the terms Cuban and Spanish may imply that the two sides were of different ethnic backgrounds, this is not necessarily the case. The Indian population of the island had essentially been eliminated when colonization first occurred, and no foreign immigration was allowed. Consequently, about four out of every five Cubans were actually Spaniards, or of second, third or fourth generation Spanish descent. The remainders, about one out of every five Cubans, were Creole mulattos and descendants of

former slaves from Africa. This meant that, for the most part, the Cuban Revolution was actually a civil war between republicans from Cuba and monarchists from Spain.

A Cuban patriot named José Martí organized the revolution from his base of operations in the United States. For years, Martí had been working among the Cuban emigrés, both in the United States and in nations throughout Latin America, attempting to plan a revolt against the Spanish government in Cuba. The revolutionary heartland was Florida, where there were sixty-one clubs devoted to Cuban independence. These clubs, known as *juntas*, asked their members to donate one tenth of their earnings to the independence movement. Many members also joined the newly formed Cuban Revolutionary Party during 1892. This party served as the political movement behind the revolution. While the *juntas* were most numerous in Florida, there was also an important independence group in New York. They contributed, not monetarily, but by obtaining the support of two key groups: the labor unions and the newspapers.

By 1894, Martí decided to launch the revolution. One of the primary reasons for his decision to launch the attack at this time was his fear that a growing imperialist movement in the United States might prompt annexation before independence. Martí had good reason to believe this, as U.S. Secretary of State James G. Blaine was a proponent of expansion. In fact, as early as 1881 Blaine had written, "[i]f ever ceasing to be Spanish, Cuba must necessarily become American and not fall under any other European domination." Martí also observed the attempt by the United States to annex Hawaii in 1893. Though the attempt did not succeed, it caused him to believe that Cuba might be the next target of American expansion. As Blaine wrote in 1881, "Hawaii ...holds in the western sea much the same position as Cuba in the Atlantic. It is the key to the maritime dominion of the Pacific States as Cuba is the key to the Gulf trade."

The similarities between Cuba and Hawaii were more than geographic. Hawaii's economy subsisted on a single crop; ninety-nine percent of the island's exports in 1890 consisted of sugar bound for the United States. When the United States began giving American growers a bounty of two cents per pound, Hawaiian sugar cane growers were devastated. Obviously, owners of sugar cane plantations would find annexation to be beneficial for their pocketbooks. Cuba's situation was almost identical. For this reason, Martí knew that if the United States attempted to bring Cuba into the Union, some

wealthy Cubans would support the move. In spite of their small numbers, these people presented a formidable threat to Martí because of their economic power.

A more immediate threat than the economic pressure caused even greater concern. Some Cubans advocated asking the United States to help a potential revolution by sending American troops to support the rebels in the field. From Martí's point of view, however, this was the last thing a Cuban revolution needed. He bitterly opposed seeking any military intervention by United States troops. Martí told why he opposed this in a letter to his friend and fellow patriot Gonzalo de Quesada. He wrote, "I don't want the principle established of putting our fortunes into a body where, because of its influence as a major country, the United States is to exercise the principal part." He expressed his fears less diplomatically, but perhaps more succinctly, when he wrote "[o]nce the United States is in Cuba, who will get her out?"

In 1894, the United States levied a 40 percent tariff on imported sugar. This led to an economic depression in Cuba, causing Cuban sugar producers to begin looking for a way to retain the United States as a possible outlet for excess sugar production. Martí knew that talk of annexation would soon be occurring, both in Havana and Washington. He had already decided that if Cuba was going to experience "the reality of independence," then she must win that independence of her own accord and retain her sovereignty throughout the revolution. With the threat of annexation in mind, Martí stated just before the revolution began, "Cuba must be free from Spain and the United States." After the revolt had begun, he described his reason for launching the attack so quickly. "The Cuban war has broken out in America in time to prevent ...the annexation of Cuba to the United States." José Martí's words drive home the point that he was concerned about both Spanish and American imperialism.

Martí recruited other military leaders to command the revolutionary forces in battle. He chose Máximo Gómez to act as the Commander-in-Chief of his army, and he also obtained the services of Antonio Maceo to lead a portion of the Cuban revolutionaries. Both of these men had been heroes of the earlier war against the Spanish in Cuba, so they would provide the insurrection with instant legitimacy for most of the Cuban people. Gómez personified the spirit of the revolution in the eyes of Cubans, and his dream was to become the George Washington of a newly liberated Cuban nation.

General Maceo also served as an inspiration to many Cubans. As a mulatto, his participation in the rebellion convinced the mulattos and former slaves living in Cuba that they too would benefit from the revolution's success.

While these men led the military battle in Cuba, another important battle raged in the United States. This fight was based in New York, where the local junta was filled with several powerful Cuban emigrés. The leader of this organization of unnaturalized Cubans and their supporters was Tomás Estrada Palma, a former schoolteacher now trying to free Cuba using his connections in New York. The goal of the junta was to spread news from the revolution among New York's influential newspaper reporters. Another key player in the United States was Martí's close friend and associate Gonzalo de Quesada. De Quesada, although he referred to himself as the Cuban Revolutionary Chargé d'Affaires, did not actually hold an official diplomatic post. Nonetheless, this did not prevent him from lobbying for the Cuban cause in Washington. Unlike Martí, the New York junta and de Quesada wanted United States intervention to quickly win the revolution for Cuba.

On May 19, 1895, the Spanish killed José Martí in battle. Not only had the Cuban Revolution lost the man who had painstakingly planned and organized the insurrection, but they had also lost the strongest voice against American intervention. To the very end, Martí warned his fellow revolutionaries to guard against possible United States' intervention. The day before he was killed, Martí began a letter to one of his many friends. The letter, though never finished, again expressed Martí's apprehensions about the course of the revolution. "It is my duty," he wrote, "to prevent, by the independence of Cuba, the United States from spreading over the West Indies and falling, with that added weight, upon other lands of our America." Certainly, Martí was aware of a danger that others either did not see, or chose to ignore; however, even Martí was not optimistic about his chances of accomplishing his goal. He concluded his statement by noting "I have lived inside the monster and know its insides-and my weapon is only the slingshot of David."

Traditionally, U.S. historians have viewed American intervention in Cuba in 1898 as saving the Cuban revolution from impending defeat. A close examination casts considerable doubt on this perspective. In February 1898, the Spanish general Ramón

Blanco ordered a large army into battle against General Gómez, intending to destroy Gómez's troops. The attack failed dismally. By March 1, Gómez reported that "[t]he enemy is crushed and in complete retreat from here, and the time which favored their operation passes without their doing anything." These are definitely not the words of a Commander-in-Chief whose army is on the verge of collapse. In fact, by 1898 it was Spain, not the Cuban revolutionaries, who was on the ropes. While the Spanish generally controlled the populated areas of the island, their armies could not defeat the Cuban rebels in battle.

Not only did the Cubans think they were winning the revolution, so did the American government. Also on March 1, 1898, the U.S. State Department described the status of the military situation on the island for the American Minister to Spain. The State Department noted that "the Spanish armies have not achieved any success over the Cubans in more than two months." The note also pointed out that General Blanco had "failed absolutely" in his attack on Gómez. Furthermore, it stated that "the Cubans continue to dominate the Eastern half of the island, and its columns are operating in the Western provinces without the Spaniards being able to stop them." Finally, it expressed the Department's view of Spain's desperate attempt to pacify the Cubans by offering them autonomy. This it called "an utter and complete failure." The report summed up the status of Cuba by commenting that "the social and economic situation of the country is worse than ever, and the national rehabilitation work appears more than the forces of the autonomous regime can cope with." If the United States government really thought the revolution was in danger of failure, they hid it well.

The revolution's military leaders did not feel that their armies needed direct assistance from the United States either. Martí may have been dead, but his policy was continued by Generals Maceo and Gómez. Maceo wanted the United States to recognize the belligerency of the Cuban Republic in a Congressional declaration. By doing this, the U.S. could then provide military equipment to the poorly supplied Cuban rebels. Maceo also knew the declaration would give the revolution a greater sense of moral legitimacy. His opinion on direct military intervention was clear, however. The New York World quoted Maceo saying "I should not want our neighbors to have to shed their blood for our cause. We can do that for ourselves." In a letter to the New York junta's leader, Maceo

left no doubt what he wanted, as well as what he did not want, from the United States: "Do you really want to cut the war down? Bring Cuba 25,000 to 35,000 rifles and a million bullets.... We Cubans do not need any other help."

Further, in yet another letter, Maceo proudly announced, "Cuba is winning its independence by the arms and hearts of its sons. She will be free in a short time without needing any other help." He also feared the end result of U.S. assistance. "Neither do I expect anything from the Americans. We must all depend on our own efforts. It is better to rise or fall without help than to contract debts of gratitude to a neighbor so powerful." In his final note on the topic, Maceo held his ground while acknowledging that many Cubans did not share his opinion: "Nor is American intervention so advantageous to the future of Cuba as most of our compatriots think."

General Gómez was even harsher in his critique of those Cubans who wanted the United States to step in militarily. Those Cubans who disregarded "the North American Republic's absorbing aspirations," in Gómez's opinion, were "morally" on the side of the Spanish. In his mind, to be for U.S. intervention meant to be against the success of the revolution. According to Gómez, "Cuba must not be beholden for its independence in any way, to foreign good graces." American newspaper writer Ambrose Bierce summarised Gómez's opinion in an apocryphal conversation he published on October 3, 1898. Responding to an American general, Bierce imagines Gómez saying, "[i]n other words, Cuba is to have no army of her own, but is to rely altogether upon you. You offer us the independence of a dependency."

The question of whether or not American intervention was necessary for Cuban independence has been debated, even within Cuba, since the Spanish-American War. Initially, most Cuban historians agreed with the consensus of American historians in the belief that American military intervention was indeed critical to the defeat of Spain and the success of the revolution. Gradually, however, Cuban historians began to change their views. By the time the Ninth Historical Congress of Cuba met in 1950, they could unequivocally declare that "Cuba does not owe its independence to the United States of North America, but to the efforts of its own people." The statement proceeds to say that Cuba "brought about even before the intervention of the United States in the Cuban-Spanish conflict the complete exhaustion of Spain's 'last man and last peseta'." Although

individual historians retained the traditional view, most determined that American assistance had been unnecessary and unwarranted.

In 1966, several Cuban historians expressed their opinions on the Cuban revolution and American intervention. They admitted their findings were only preliminary and more research needed to be done in Spanish and Cuban archives, but they generally agreed that while the U.S. invasion of Cuba caused the war to end more quickly than it would have otherwise, the end result was not really in doubt by early in 1898. The Spanish were going to be defeated; only the length of the war remained to be determined. As historian Sergio Aguirre of the University of Havana wrote, "[t]here is no doubt that the United States hastened the final decision, introducing into the struggle the 'knockout' punch. But victory for the Cubans would have come in the end." Aguirre based his opinions on the fact that the Spanish had no comparable response to the invasion of Western Cuba by the revolutionary armies. As he said, "[w]hy presume that this counter-strike would have been able to appear in 1898 or after?"

A more recent historian of Cuban history went one step further. Louis Pérez argued that the United States intervened in Cuba not because they wanted to help the Cubans defeat the Spanish, but because they saw their opportunity to obtain Cuba slipping away in a successful revolution. The U.S. government was well aware that Spain was about to lose Cuba. In 1898 William R. Day, the American Assistant Secretary of State, wrote a confidential memorandum stating that "it is now evident that Spain's struggle in Cuba has become absolutely hopeless." In Pérez's opinion, the U.S. intervened because "[t]he success of Cuban arms ...challenged, too, pretensions of colonial replacement." In other words, the United States could not allow Cuba to become an independent nation, because this would take away the possibility of relatively easy annexation. The United States had tried to annex Hawaii and failed. They wanted a better pretense to annex Cuba. Saving Cubans from the Spanish was an opportunity to assert control in Cuba, but this opportunity was about to disappear in a Spanish defeat

The force of this argument is supported by President William McKinley's war message to Congress in April 1898. While McKinley requested the authority to intervene militarily in Cuba, he did not state that the U.S. was acting in defense of Cuban independence. In fact, the concept of independence for Cuba was not mentioned at all.

The U.S. was entering Cuba to implement a "forcible intervention ...as a neutral to stop the war." This would entail "hostile constraint upon both the parties to the contest." Far from aiding the Cubans, the Americans were simply going to prevent either side from winning. Furthermore, the United States intended "to secure in the island the establishment of a stable government, capable of maintaining order and observing its international obligations." The President's message, however, made no mention of whether this government would be an independent Cuban government, or whether it would be under U.S. control. Congress would eventually force McKinley to accept the Teller Amendment, renouncing permanent control of the island, but Cuban independence was still not recognized as part of the compromise.

While the typical American historian interprets the sinking of the U.S. battleship Maine as an accidental factor which caused a great public outcry in the U.S., and ultimately the war with Spain, Pérez has a different interpretation. He believes that the United States government seized on the opportunity which the sinking of the Maine provided them. The Maine accident was used "as a contrived pretext for war rather than a chance precipitant." The public outcry "was not so much a spontaneous response to the destruction of the Maine as it was the result of deliberate and cynical manipulation by pro-war elements, principally the yellow press and expansionist politicians, who seized the occasion to advance larger policy goals." Rather than being swept along against their will with the rising tide of public opinion in favor of war, the President and Congress are seen as taking advantage of the accident to obtain what they already desired: war with Spain for control of Cuba.

There are Cuban historians who believe the American intervention was both necessary and beneficial for Cuba. In 1972, Guillermo de Zéndegui wrote an article in which he praised the United States for entering the Spanish-American War. He admitted that the Cuban patriots and the United States politicians occasionally did not see eye-to-eye on various matters, but he stated that "[t]he foreseeable risks in help from a nascent expansionist power, which at times appeared as serious as they were certain, were worth facing." This was because the U.S. was "the only nation in the Hemisphere at that time capable of standing up to Spain with force and, if it came to it, imposing a solution satisfactory to the Cuban cause." He was also quite supportive of the Congressional Joint

Resolution of April 13, 1898, which amounted to a declaration of war against Spain. He referred to it as "without doubt one of the grandest, most noble, and spontaneous acts in the history of inter-American relations." Similarly, he calls this entire period of American intervention in Cuba "an exemplary chapter" in U.S. history

He argued that Cuban patriots responded enthusiastically to the announcement that the U.S. was going to intervene in Cuba. As an example, he provided the story of the Spanish General Blanco's attempt to convince General Gómez to enter negotiations before the Americans actually entered Cuba. Blanco warned Gómez that the Yankees were ambitious foreigners anxious to annex the Cuban island. Gómez turned down the offer, informing the Spanish general that, "until now I have had only feelings of admiration for the United States. I have written to President McKinley and to General Miles thanking them for the American intervention in Cuba. I do not see the danger of our being exterminated by the United States, to which you refer in your letter. If that should happen, history will judge them." De Zéndegui considered this to be "irrefutable proof of the true feelings of the patriots at that time." Whether Gómez was speaking honestly, or just diplomatically, is difficult to judge. Based on Gómez's previous statements, it appears that he was simply unwilling to admit his true feelings about U.S. intervention in a diplomatic note to his bitter enemy. Nonetheless, De Zéndegui is an example of a Cuban historian who favored U.S. intervention.

The debate over the purposes and goals of U.S. intervention in Cuba provides an interesting example of the way in which different perspectives can lead to completely different interpretations of the same event. The truth is probably somewhere in the middle. By learning the Cuban viewpoint of the SpanishAmerican War, however, I believe the overall picture of what really happened is made clearer. Cubans and Americans should both benefit from the continuing exchange of ideas and dialogue between historians from these two viewpoints.

F.D .Roosevelt

Theodore Roosevelt—outdoorsman, Rough Rider, trust buster—is one of the four presidents memorialized on Mount Rushmore. The first U.S. president to make the conservation of natural resources a central function of government, his scientific understanding and firsthand knowledge of wildlife and natural history informed his

natural resource management policy decisions as president. To mark the sesquicentennial of his birth, we revisit his contributions to forest and conservation history.

Born to a wealthy New York merchant on October 27, 1858, Roosevelt was a weak and asthmatic child with a strong intellect. At a young age he pleaded for his father to bring him books on nature while he convalesced. As the boy exercised and the asthma attacks diminished over time, he could spend longer periods outdoors and travel farther to study nature. He pursued the study of ornithology in the manner of his time: reading, shooting, collecting skins, and documenting his collection. He kept field journals and made sketches of animals that he observed. Fitted with glasses to correct his weak vision at age 13, he could now see the world he had only heretofore read about

On one family trip abroad, in 1872, Roosevelt used his new shotgun to collect hundreds of bird specimens along the Nile River. Back home, he set out on ambitious field trips to the Adirondack Mountains and went moose hunting in Maine. His specimen collection and interest in natural history continued growing.

In the summer of 1874, the Roosevelt family rented a house in Oyster Bay, Long Island. Theodore was very excited by the bird life in the area and spent hours tramping the shoreline, woods, and fields of this naturalist's paradise. A frequent companion in these outings, Edith Carow, recalled that Theodore reeked of arsenic and his hands were often stained from taxidermy. Ten years later, he would purchase one hundred acres on Cove Neck, about two miles from the house his family had been renting, and build his sprawling country home, Sagamore Hill.

In 1876 Roosevelt entered Harvard, intent on becoming a naturalist. The next year, he copublished his first scientific work, "The Summer Birds of the Adirondacks in Franklin County, N.Y.," a well-reviewed four-page leaflet that listed ninety-seven species. Though he graduated in 1880 with a degree in natural history, he nonetheless found the modern "German method" of laboratory biology unappealing and began casting about for a career. He married Alice Lee and began attending Columbia Law School but soon got interested in political reform and left school. In 1882 he was elected to the New York Assembly and served with distinction for three years.

Roosevelt's interest in nature, outdoor exertion, and the challenge of big-game hunting led him to hunt bison in the Dakota Territory in 1883. Enraptured by what he

called the “solemn beauty” of the Badlands, he established a cattle ranch in the area where he shot his first bison. There he learned firsthand of the environmental hazards of overgrazing livestock.

Following the death of his wife and his mother, simultaneously on Valentine’s Day 1884, he took solace in the wide-open expanse of the northern plains. TR said that the Badlands looked the way that Poe sounds. In that hard country he overcame his grief and learned to overcome his fears. Run-ins with dangerous men, bad horses, blizzards, and grass fires tested his mettle. He learned a great deal about the land and how it was used and abused. While there, he came to this insight: “It is not what we have that will make us a great nation; it is the way in which we use it.”

He returned to New York in 1886. He lost the race for mayor of New York City but regained a presence in the Republican Party and was rewarded with appointments to the U.S. Civil Service (1889–1895), the New York City Police Commission (1895–1897), and the Navy, where he served as assistant secretary (1897–1898).

A few weeks after losing the election for mayor, he married his childhood friend Edith Carow and settled into Sagamore Hill. With Edith he would have five children. Their second son, Kermit, would later accompany his father on his African and Brazilian expeditions.

Roosevelt’s childhood interest in ornithology led to a lifelong pursuit of hunting and the study of wild animals. Besides the tangible results of the hunt, manifested in trophies mounted in museums around the world as well as his home, are some real contributions to natural history. In 1887, Roosevelt and several friends, including George Bird Grinnell, formed the Boone and Crockett Club, which would spearhead efforts to establish wilderness areas and federal forests in the 1890s. He wrote numerous magazine articles on hunting, wildlife, and outdoor life, and several of his thirty books are on natural history or animals. Each of his big hunting trips resulted in a book: *Hunting Trips of a Ranchman*, *Hunting the Grisly*, *Ranch Life and the Hunting Trail*, *The Wilderness Hunter*, *Outdoor Pastimes of an American Hunter*, *African Game Trails*, and *Through the Brazilian Wilderness*.

In 1898, Roosevelt resigned from the Navy to fight in the Spanish-American War. He came home a hero and was elected governor of New York. While governor, Roosevelt

maintained contact with people who he thought would help shape the future of the developing country. A notable visitor to the governor's mansion was the tall, cultured figure of Gifford Pinchot, chief of the forestry division in the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Roosevelt often tested new associates by challenging them to a strenuous hike, tennis match, or round of boxing. Pinchot no briefly addressed subjects that would define his presidency: social responsibility, relations between capital and labor, foreign policy, and conservation. Among these topics it is the concern with the conservation of natural resources that marks a shift in the presidency:

Wise forest protection does not mean the withdrawal of forest resources, whether of wood, water, or grass, from contributing their full share to the welfare of the people, but, on the contrary, gives the assurance of larger and more certain supplies. The fundamental idea of forestry is the perpetuation of forests by use.

At his behest, Congress passed the National Reclamation Act of 1902 and established the Bureau of Reclamation, which helped bring water to some three million acres of arid land in a dozen western states. The following year, he established the Pelican Island Bird Reserve in Florida by executive order. He created fifty-one wildlife reserves in all. These reserves formed the beginnings of the National Wildlife Refuge System.

A remarkable feature of Theodore Roosevelt's first term as president was his cross-country tour in 1903. Some historians believe it was the first time a president had actively run for reelection. He made frequent whistle-stop speeches and spoke for local Republican candidates, but he also found time to explore Yellowstone with John Burroughs and Yosemite with John Muir.

The western trip bolstered his commitment to preserving the natural grandeur of the national parks, as well as expanding the system to protect endangered areas. After visiting the Grand Canyon, he sought to prevent development of large resort hotels and excursion trains there, affirming that "nature has been to work on it, and man can only mar it." Passage of the Antiquities Act in 1906 gave the president the authority to declare such places national monuments without the approval of Congress. Roosevelt made good use of this authority, setting aside eighteen national monuments, including the Grand Canyon.

Elected to his own term in 1904, Roosevelt continued the effort to protect and scientifically manage the nation's forests and the interconnected streams and rivers that depended on the "great sponge" upstream. With the advice and support of Pinchot, he dissolved the Bureau of Forestry and transferred management of the 63 million acres of national forests from the Department of the Interior to the new U.S. Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture. During his administration, the federal forest system grew by nearly 130 million acres. In all, he extended federal protection to 230 million acres of land.

Roosevelt appointed the Inland Waterways Commission in 1907 and the national Conservation Commission in 1908. The goal of these efforts was to inventory the existing natural resources of the nation, especially forests and rivers, and make recommendations for managing them for the public benefit. Congressional opponents tried to stop these commissions, but Roosevelt thwarted them by having some of the reports printed and distributed with nonfederal money.

As Roosevelt's term wound down, he searched for a way to ensure that his conservation policies would continue without his guidance. His solution was to call a conference of all of the state governors to discuss the challenges of conservation. The Governors Conference on Conservation inspired many states to establish their own conservation agencies and increased the states' expectations of what the federal government would do to protect natural resources. This effort was so successful that a North American Conference on Conservation was held with Canada and Mexico to discuss natural resource issues that spanned international boundaries. Roosevelt tried to organize a world conference, but his term ran out before it could be organized. He felt that time was running out not just for him but for the country:

This nation began with the belief that its landed possessions were illimitable and capable of supporting all the people who might care to make our country their home; but already the limit of unsettled land is in sight, and indeed but little land fitted for agriculture now remains unoccupied save what can be reclaimed by irrigation and drainage. We began with an unapproached heritage of forests; more than half of the timber is gone.

Theodore Roosevelt left the White House in 1909 having fundamentally changed the attitudes and policies of the federal government toward the nation's natural resources. He had restructured and professionalized government land management agencies and made great strides toward informing the average citizen about the conditions of the nation's land and water.

After leaving the presidency, Roosevelt undertook an African expedition to collect specimens for the Smithsonian Institution. After his defeat in 1912 as a third-party candidate for president, he explored a newly discovered river in Brazil. The trip nearly killed him, but his party mapped the river and collected specimens. In Roosevelt's honor, Brazil renamed the river Rio Roosevelt (sometimes Rio Téodoro). His last years were spent at Sagamore Hill writing articles and reviews for various publications. Among his many accomplishments, Roosevelt's conservation work may be his greatest legacy

Square Deal

A Rough-Riding

President Theodore Roosevelt was not supposed to be president. In 1900, the young governor from New York was urged to run as McKinley's vice-president by the state's political bosses, who found Roosevelt impossible to control. The plot to nominate Roosevelt worked, taking him out of state office. However, as vice-president, Roosevelt stood a heartbeat away from becoming president. Indeed, President McKinley had served barely six months of his second term before he was assassinated, making Roosevelt the most powerful person in the government.

Roosevelt's Rise

Theodore Roosevelt was born into a wealthy New York family in 1858. An asthma sufferer during his childhood, young Teddy drove himself to accomplish demanding physical feats. As a teenager, he mastered marksmanship and horseback riding. At Harvard College, Roosevelt boxed and wrestled.

At an early age, the ambitious Roosevelt became a leader in New York politics. After serving three terms in the New York State Assembly, he became New York City's police commissioner and then assistant secretary of the U.S. Navy. The aspiring politician grabbed national attention, advocating war against Spain in 1898. His volunteer cavalry brigade, the Rough Riders, won public acclaim for its role in the battle at San

Juan Hill in Cuba. Roosevelt returned a hero and was soon elected governor of New York and then later won the vice-presidency

The Modern Presidency

When Roosevelt was thrust into the presidency in 1901, he became the youngest president ever at 42 years old. Unlike previous presidents, Roosevelt soon dominated the news with his many exploits. While in office, Roosevelt enjoyed boxing, although one of his opponents blinded him in the left eye. On another day, he galloped 100 miles on horseback, merely to prove the feat possible.

In politics, as in sports, Roosevelt acted boldly, using his personality and popularity to advance his programs. His leadership and publicity campaigns helped create the modern presidency, making him a model by which all future presidents would be measured. Citing federal responsibility for the national welfare, Roosevelt thought the government should assume control whenever states proved incapable of dealing with problems. He explained, “It is the duty of the president to act upon the theory that he is the steward of the people, and . . . to assume that he has the legal right to do whatever the needs of the people demand, unless the Constitution or the laws explicitly forbid him to do it.”

Roosevelt saw the presidency as a “bully pulpit,” from which he could influence the news media and shape legislation. If big business victimized workers, then President Roosevelt would see to it that the common people received what he called a Square Deal. This term was used to describe the various progressive reforms sponsored by the Roosevelt administration.

Using Federal Power

Roosevelt’s study of history—he published the first of his 44 books at the age of 24—convinced him that modern America required a powerful federal government. “A simple and poor society can exist as a democracy on the basis of sheer individualism,” Roosevelt declared, “but a rich and complex industrial society cannot so exist.” The young president soon met several challenges to his assertion of federal power.

Trustbusting

By 1900, trusts—legal bodies created to hold stock in many companies—controlled about four-fifths of the industries in the United States. Some trusts, like

Standard Oil, had earned poor reputations with the public by the use of unfair business practices. Many trusts lowered their prices to drive competitors out of the market and then took advantage of the lack of competition to jack prices up even higher. Although Congress had passed the Sherman Antitrust Act in 1890, the act's vague language made enforcement difficult. As a result, nearly all the suits filed against the trusts under the Sherman Act were ineffective.

President Roosevelt did not believe that all trusts were harmful, but he sought to curb the actions of those that hurt the public interest. The president concentrated his efforts on filing suits under the Sherman Antitrust Act. In 1902, Roosevelt made newspaper headlines as a trustbuster when he ordered the Justice Department to sue the Northern Securities Company, which had established a monopoly over northwestern railroads. In 1904, the Supreme Court dissolved the company. Although the Roosevelt administration filed 44 antitrust suits, winning a number of them and breaking up some of the trusts, it was unable to slow the merger movement in business.

1902 Coal Strike

When 140,000 coal miners in Pennsylvania went on strike and demanded a 20 percent raise, a nine-hour workday, and the right to organize a union, the mine operators refused to bargain. Five months into the strike, coal reserves ran low. Roosevelt, seeing the need to intervene, called both sides to the White House to talk, and eventually settled the strike. Irrked by the “extraordinary stupidity and bad temper” of the mine operators, he later confessed that only the dignity of the presidency had kept him from taking one owner “by the seat of the breeches” and tossing him out of the window.

Faced with Roosevelt's threat to take over the mines, the opposing sides finally agreed to submit their differences to an arbitration commission—a third party that would work with both sides to mediate the dispute. In 1903, the commission issued its compromise settlement. The miners won a 10 percent pay hike and a shorter, nine-hour workday. With this, however, they had to give up their demand for a closed shop—in which all workers must belong to the union—and their right to strike during the next three years.

President Roosevelt's actions had demonstrated a new principle. From then on, when a strike threatened the public welfare, the federal government was expected to

intervene. In addition, Roosevelt's actions reflected the progressive belief that disputes could be settled in an orderly way with the help of experts, such as those on the arbitration commission.

Railroad Regulation

Roosevelt's real goal was federal regulation. In 1887, Congress had passed the Interstate Commerce Act, which prohibited wealthy railroad owners from colluding to fix high prices by dividing the business in a given area. The Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC) was set up to enforce the new law but had little power. With Roosevelt's urging, Congress passed the Elkins Act in 1903, which made it illegal for railroad officials to give, and shippers to receive, rebates for using particular railroads. The act also specified that railroads could not change set rates without notifying the public.

The Hepburn Act of 1906 strictly limited the distribution of free railroad passes, a common form of bribery. It also gave the ICC power to set maximum railroad rates. Although Roosevelt had to compromise with conservative senators who opposed the act, its passage boosted the government's power to regulate the railroads.

Health and the Environment

President Roosevelt's enthusiasm and his considerable skill at compromise led to laws and policies that benefited both public health and the environment. He wrote, "We recognize and are bound to war against the evils of today. The remedies are partly economic and partly spiritual, partly to be obtained by laws, and in greater part to be obtained by individual and associated effort."

Regulating Foods and Drugs

After reading *The Jungle* by Upton Sinclair, Roosevelt responded to the public's clamor for action. He appointed a commission of experts to investigate the meatpacking industry. The commission issued a scathing report backing up Sinclair's account of the disgusting conditions in the industry. True to his word, in 1906 Roosevelt pushed for passage of the Meat Inspection Act, which dictated strict cleanliness requirements for meatpackers and created the program of federal meat inspection that was in use until it was replaced by more sophisticated techniques in the 1990s.

The compromise that won the act's passage, however, left the government paying for the inspections and did not require companies to label their canned goods with date-of-processing information. The compromise also granted meatpackers the right to appeal negative decisions in court.

Pure Food and Drug Act

Before any federal regulations were established for advertising food and drugs, manufacturers had claimed that their products accomplished everything from curing cancer to growing hair. In addition, popular children's medicines often contained opium, cocaine, or alcohol. In a series of lectures across the country, Dr. Harvey Washington Wiley, chief chemist at the Department of Agriculture, criticized manufacturers for adding harmful preservatives to food and brought needed attention to this issue. In 1906, Congress passed the Pure Food and Drug Act, which halted the sale of contaminated foods and medicines and called for truth in labeling. Although this act did not ban harmful products outright, its requirement of truthful labels reflected the progressive belief that given accurate information, people would act wisely.

Conservation and Natural Resources

Before Roosevelt's presidency, the federal government had paid very little attention to the nation's natural resources. Despite the establishment of the U.S. Forest Bureau in 1887 and the subsequent withdrawal from public sale of 45 million acres of timberlands for a national forest reserve, the government stood by while private interests gobbled up the shrinking wilderness.

In the late 19th century Americans had shortsightedly exploited their natural environment. Pioneer farmers leveled the forests and plowed up the prairies. Ranchers allowed their cattle to overgraze the Great Plains. Coal companies cluttered the land with refuse from mines. Lumber companies ignored the effect of their logging operations on flood control and neglected to plant trees to replace those they had cut down. Cities dumped untreated sewage and industrial wastes into rivers, poisoning the streams and creating health hazards.

Conservation Measures

Roosevelt condemned the view that America's resources were endless and made conservation a primary concern. John Muir, a naturalist and writer with whom Roosevelt

camped in California's Yosemite National Park in 1903, persuaded the president to set aside 148 million acres of forest reserves. Roosevelt also set aside 1.5 million acres of water-power sites and another 80 million acres of land that experts from the U.S. Geological Survey would explore for mineral and water resources. Roosevelt also established more than 50 wildlife sanctuaries and several national parks.

True to the Progressive belief in using experts, in 1905 the president named Gifford Pinchot as head of the U.S. Forest Service. A professional conservationist, Pinchot had administrative skill as well as the latest scientific and technical information. He advised Roosevelt to conserve forest and grazing lands by keeping large tracts of federal land exempt from private sale.

Conservationists like Roosevelt and Pinchot, however, did not share the views of Muir, who advocated complete preservation of the wilderness. Instead, conservation to them meant that some wilderness areas would be preserved while others would be developed for the common good. Indeed, Roosevelt's federal water projects transformed some dry wilderness areas to make agriculture possible. Under the National Reclamation Act of 1902, known as the Newlands Act, money from the sale of public lands in the West funded large-scale irrigation projects, such as the Roosevelt Dam in Arizona and the Shoshone Dam in Wyoming. The Newlands Act established the precedent that the federal government would manage the precious water resources of the West.

Roosevelt and Civil Rights

Roosevelt's concern for the land and its inhabitants was not matched in the area of civil rights. Though Roosevelt's father had supported the North, his mother, Martha, may well have been the model for the Southern belle Scarlet O'Hara in Margaret Mitchell's famous novel, *Gone with the Wind*. In almost two terms as president, Roosevelt—like most other progressives—failed to support civil rights for African Americans. He did, however, support a few individual African Americans.

Despite opposition from whites, Roosevelt appointed an African American as head of the Charleston, South Carolina, customhouse. In another instance, when some whites in Mississippi refused to accept the black postmistress he had appointed, he chose to close the station rather than give in. In 1906, however, Roosevelt angered many African Americans when he dismissed without question an entire regiment of African-

American soldiers accused of conspiracy in protecting others charged with murder in Brownsville, Texas.

As a symbolic gesture, Roosevelt invited Booker T. Washington to dinner at the White House. Washington— head of the Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute, an allblack training school—was then the African-American leader most respected by powerful whites. Washington faced opposition, however, from other African Americans, such as W. E. B. Du Bois, for his accommodation of segregationists and for blaming black poverty on blacks and urging them to accept discrimination.

Persistent in his criticism of Washington's ideas, Du Bois renewed his demands for immediate social and economic equality for African Americans. In his 1903 book *The Souls of Black Folk*, Du Bois wrote of his opposition to Washington's position.

Du Bois and other advocates of equality for African Americans were deeply upset by the apparent progressive indifference to racial injustice. In 1905 they held a civil rights conference in Niagara Falls, and in 1909 a number of African Americans joined with prominent white reformers in New York to found the NAACP—the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The NAACP, which had over 6,000 members by 1914, aimed for nothing less than full equality among the races. That goal, however, found little support in the Progressive Movement, which focused on the needs of middle-class whites. The two presidents who followed Roosevelt also did little to advance the goal of racial equality.

William Howard Taft

Born in the Mount Auburn section of Cincinnati, Ohio, on September 15, 1857, William Howard Taft was a physically active child, playing sports and taking dancing lessons despite his tendency to obesity. He loved baseball, and he was a good second baseman and a power hitter. Taft studied at Woodward High School, a well-regarded private school in Cincinnati, graduating in 1874 second in the class with a four-year grade point average of 91.5 out of 100.

At Yale University, Taft followed his father's advice to refrain from athletics lest his participation impede his academic progress. He graduated second in his class of 132 students and then went on to the University of Cincinnati Law School while working part

time as a courthouse reporter for the Cincinnati Commercial. Taft passed his bar exams in May 1880.

Living Up to High Expectations

Taft was raised in a large, close, and stimulating family. He had five siblings, two half brothers by his father's first marriage and two brothers and a sister born to his mother. The family identified with the Unitarian Church, subscribing to a belief in God but not the divinity of Christ. Taft's father, Alphonso Taft, was a lawyer and served as secretary of war and then attorney general in President Ulysses S. Grant's cabinet. President Chester A. Arthur appointed Taft's father to serve as minister (the title of ambassador in those days) to Austria-Hungary and Russia. A significant role model for William, Alphonso Taft was sensible, kind, gentle, and highly "Victorian"—a man who kept his emotions under rigid control. Politically active in the Republican Party, the senior Taft served on Cincinnati's city council and sought unsuccessfully the 1875 Republican nomination in the Ohio gubernatorial race. Alphonso had liberal views on women's rights, however, and encouraged Taft's mother, Louisa Maria Torrey Taft, in her independent ways and numerous outside activities and her intellectual curiosity. The energetic Louisa Taft organized a local and statewide kindergarten movement, an art association, book clubs, German and French clubs, and traveled widely with her husband on his diplomatic missions. Of the two parents, Louisa was the more curious and adventurous, often taking the family down paths none would have ventured on their own. Taft's father died in 1891.

William lived in constant fear of not meeting his parents' expectations. No matter how well he performed, he was anxious about their approval. When he graduated from high school in 1874, he chose for his graduation ceremony address the subject of women's suffrage, telling the audience about his progressive parents. Taft's large variations in his body weight, according to some scholars, stemmed from his social and family anxieties.

Political Ambitions

Taft married Helen "Nellie" Herron at her parents' home in Cincinnati on June 19, 1886. He was twenty-eight and she was twenty-five. Nellie equaled Taft's mother in intellect and energy. She accepted Taft's proposal for marriage in part because she saw

him as a partner to fulfill her hope of a life in national politics, and beyond that of parochial Cincinnati. Her father, a one-time law partner of Rutherford B. Hayes, had taken Nellie to the White House for President and Mrs. Hayes's twenty-fifth wedding anniversary. Young Nellie was so captivated that she vowed to one day be First Lady. In 1911, she would celebrate her own silver wedding anniversary at the White House, filling the mansion with nearly 4,000 guests.

Principally due to his father's political connections, Taft became assistant prosecutor of Hamilton County, Ohio, in 1881. Thereafter, he worked as a lawyer for a few years before being appointed judge of the Cincinnati Superior Court in 1887. From an early point in his career, he aspired to a seat on the U.S. Supreme Court. He was appointed U.S. solicitor general in 1890 (the third highest position in the Department of Justice). While living in Washington, D.C., as solicitor general, Taft became close to Theodore Roosevelt, then a civil service commissioner. Taft later petitioned his fellow Ohioan, President William McKinley, to obtain Roosevelt's appointment as assistant secretary of the Navy. Against his wife's preferences, in 1892 Taft accepted appointment as a judge of the Sixth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals with jurisdiction over Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, and Tennessee. While on that court, Taft also served, from 1896 to 1900, as a professor of law and dean of the University of Cincinnati Law School.

Governor General of the Philippines

Although content with his place on the Sixth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals as a possible stepping stone to the Supreme Court, Taft knew that it was not enough for Nellie Taft. She wanted the White House, and she seldom hid her irritation over Taft's judicial ambitions. When a telegram from President McKinley in January 1900 summoned Taft to Washington, Nellie suspected that something was in the works. She would welcome her husband's appointment to the Supreme Court as a way of moving back to Washington, but she hoped the meeting with McKinley would open other doors. Her hope was fulfilled.

Out of the victory in the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Islands had become a U.S. protectorate. McKinley wanted Taft to go to the islands to set up a civilian government. This entailed drafting and implementing laws, a constitution, an administration, and a civil service bureaucracy. A civil commission was established

toward that end, and McKinley offered to Taft the commission's presidency. Taft was hesitant to take this challenging job, in a distant corner of the world, but Republican leaders maintained that this task would distinguish him for future high office.

In going to the Philippines, Taft knew that he was stepping into a political storm. Seventy thousand U.S. soldiers were fighting in the islands to put down a rebellion of Filipino nationalists led by Emilio Aguinaldo. The ferocity of America's attempt to squash the rebellion was especially bloody and often horribly brutal. It left a black mark on the nation's honor, and the "yellow press" had a field day attacking U.S. conduct against the Filipinos. Additionally, political opposition was growing to what critics charged were McKinley's imperialist policies. But Nellie, surprised and overjoyed, urged Taft to take the job. The two traveled with their three children to the islands, where they lived like royalty for the next several years.

Upon arriving in the islands, Taft immediately clashed with the military governor, General Arthur MacArthur (the father of General Douglas MacArthur of World War II and Korean War fame). Taft viewed the military control of the islands as too brutal and unsympathetic to the islanders. Obtaining McArthur's removal after the capture of Aguinaldo, Taft quickly set to work drafting the Island's constitution. It included a Bill of Rights that was nearly identical to the first ten amendments to the U.S. Constitution, with the notable absence of the right to trial by jury. Central to the new governance structure was the role of civil governor, a post to which Taft was appointed. He established a civil service system, a judicial system, English-language public schools, a transportation network, and health care facilities. He also negotiated with the Vatican (the Roman Catholic papal headquarters in Rome) to purchase 390,000 acres of church property in the Philippines for \$7.5 million. Taft distributed this land by way of low-cost mortgages to tens of thousands of Filipino peasants.

While in the Philippines, Taft had twice turned down President Roosevelt's offer of a Supreme Court appointment in order to finish his work in the Islands. Taft was loved and supported by many Filipino residents for his evenhanded governance. In Taft's own view, the Filipinos were not yet capable of governing themselves, and he believed that it would take years before self-rule would work. He foresaw a long period of U.S. instruction and protection of the islands through which the "immature" culture could be

raised by American tutelage to capacities for independent governance. The Philippines did not achieve self-rule and independence until 1946.

Secretary of War

Had it not been for the opportunity to become Roosevelt's secretary of war, Nellie Taft would have urged her husband to stay in the Philippines. Taft accepted Roosevelt's offer because he believed that as secretary of war he would continue to oversee affairs in the Islands. During his four years as secretary of war (1904-1908), Taft became Roosevelt's chief agent, confidant, and troubleshooter in foreign affairs. He supervised the construction of the Panama Canal, made several voyages around the world for the President, supervised affairs in the Philippines, and functioned as the provisional governor of Cuba. He traveled more than any other cabinet minister, with over 255 days of his four years spent abroad on special missions. He was gone so often that the press began questioning his huge travel expenses—partly because he almost always took Nellie and at least one or two of his children along. Concerned about the public's opinion, Roosevelt asked Taft to have the voyages funded by Taft's wealthy brother, Charles, who already was underwriting much of Taft's living expenses in Washington, D.C. (In 1904, Charles—who had married a wealthy Ohio heiress—gave William 1,000 shares of Cleveland Gas Company stock, which added \$8,000 a year to his income, a large sum in those days.) Always eager to help his brother, Charles Taft assumed the lion's share of William's travel expenses.

Dollar Diplomacy

The Dawes Plan, when Europe had to go cap in hand to creditor U.S.A. for the wherewithal to save itself from collapse, marked the shifting of the centre of gravity of world capitalism from London to New York, and the growing subordination of Europe itself to the new creditor Power, just as previously more backward countries had been subjugated to groups of European capital itself. And faced with this startling new phenomenon, our Socialist theorists displayed some very strange reactions. Some claimed it as a new epoch of "peaceful capitalism", in which the conflicts of Europe had found rest and harmony beneath the wiser counsels of America. Others sought to rally the English workers in a mad, hybrid nationalism against "the domination of Wall Street."

But the truth was , if one surveyed it calmly , that Imperialism, though it had changed its raiment , had not changed its soul . The kid -gloves of the Dawes Scheme only concealed the claw of the exploiter , eager to do in Central Europe what previously it had done in Africa and Central America and in China . Now we discern that the honeyed tongues of Locarno do no more than hide the zeal of a declining Imperialism to buttress its position against disintegrating forces at its centre and on its frontiers , and to dispute the dominance of the new World Power .

Two books recently published by the Viking Press of New York * deal with the rapid rise of this new imperialist Power . Neither of them analyses the factors which have shaped this new trend of world events , nor do they examine the political significance of it today - -this they make no pretence to do . Robert W. Dunn collects together in useful reference form the various investments of American capital in foreign countries , classifying them according to countries , and by Government and industrial securities . The significant fact which is the import of this survey is that , whereas in 1914 U.S.A. was indebted to other countries to the extent of \$2,500,000,000- \$3,000,000,000 , her position has now so changed as to show an increase in the aggregate American foreign investments by \$6,400,000,000 at the end of 1924 to a total of about \$9,000,000,000 . This is in addition to some \$12,000,000,000 owed by foreign Governments to the U.S. Government ; and in addition to a redemption of previous debt (through re-purchase by Americans of American securities previously held by foreigners) to the amount of \$ 2,000,000,000 . The result is that U.S.A. capitalism is now creditor to the rest of the world to the amount of something like \$ 17,000,000,000 (somewhere the same as the British figure in 1914 , which has since declined considerably)—a total which the author thinks may well increase rapidly in the forthcoming years . The other book -by Scott Nearing and Joseph Freeman - tells the story of American imperialist expansion in China, Central America and the Near East since 1890, and so does for U.S.A. Imperialism in rather less detail what Leonard Woolf did for the tale of British Imperialism in Africa.

Previously absorbed in the problems of her own internal development, U.S.A. capitalism , though late in the field , showed itself a ready disciple of the imperialist methods which European Powers had already learned to employ . In fact, in reading this book one is struck by the surprising similarity of the story to that told by Woolf of the

scramble for Africa . Change the names and a few geographical details , and the various stories jumbled together might scarcely be distinguished one from the other . Always the same stages : foreign investment ; influence by the investing financiers on their own government to bring diplomatic " pressure " to bear in their interests ; against this " pressure " the debtor concerned protests or revolts ; and then behind the " pressure " comes the " mailed fist " of warships and marines , aeroplanes and machine-guns , employed in the interests of " property and order ." The final state of affairs is a puppet government , financed by the imperialist country and fettered by controlling regulations and foreign advisers ; in which subject position the debtor has little more choice in raising money, in the placing of contracts for development work, or in giving concessions to work her raw material resources than had the colonies of the 17th and 18th centuries in their dealings with the mercantilist Mother Country. Modern usury is conducted on an international scale and our Shylocks are the lords of the earth.

The American chapter in the Chinese story does not begin until 1898 , when U.S.A. gained the Philippine Islands after her victory in the Spanish -American War. In that year American interests , in the shape of the American Chinese Development Company , obtained their first concession for the building of part of the line of railway from Peking to Canton . Eager to get a footing in a country where rival Powers had already carved for themselves " spheres of influence , " the U.S. Government in the next year announced its policy of "The Open Door , " recognising equal opportunity intrade for all nations . Six years later there followed the attempt to secure a foothold in Manchuria , where Japan was also active , from which dates the ever widening rivalry between these two Pacific Powers . Under the administration of President Taft in 1909 the policy of expansion secured official support , and a group of American bankers , headed by J. P. Morgan , was organised to finance any concessions for rail roads which American capitalists might obtain from the Chinese Government . Two years later , in co-operation with Britain, Germany and France , she negotiated with the Chinese Government a loan for developing Manchuria and reforming the currency , and as security the creditors obtained a mortgage on numerous indirect taxes , which could not henceforth be decreased without the creditors ' permission .

But it was not until after the world war that the U.S.A. had sufficient capital to give her the dominant position as usurer and concessionaire in the Far East. The united front of foreign money lenders was re-formed in 1920 in the new Chinese Consortium ; and of the Powers participating , the U.S.A. alone (and to a lesser extent Japan) had capital in abundance to spare ; with the result that most of the loans floated by the Consortium are in practice mainly financed from Wall Street. In addition , the U.S.A. has secured considerable political success by means of the Washington Conference , both in terminating the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, and in securing the return by Japan to China of the important province of Shantung . A free-handed usurer and controller of numerous educational establishments in China, U.S.A. Imperialism is playing for the moment the role of the "liberal " Power, sympathetic to China's needs , in strong contrast to the hated Japan-a tactic as plausible in its show of disinterestedness as the earlier affirmations of the principle of the Open Door .

But though less topical , the story of the rapid encroachment of control by Washington and Wall Street over the republics of Central America is in some ways more interesting . In the case of Panama a highly strategic region by reason of the projected canal -interest Starts in 1903 when a rising was organised by persons sympathetic to U.S.A. against the Columbian Government , to which the territory had formerly belonged . The T "impartial impartial " action of the U.S. Government consisted in preventing the Columbian Government from landing troops on the isthmus to quell the revolt ,and ten days after the rebellion unrecognizing the rebel party as governors of the new independent State of Panama . Fifteen days after the rebellion the U.S. Government signed a treaty with the new Panama republic by which the former obtained perpetual lease of the canal zone.

In Mexico it was the familiar story of rivalry between American and British oil interests , to the latter of which the President ,Diaz , had shown especial favour. In 1910 Madero, representative of bourgeois against feudal interests , organised a revolution ; and there was considerable suspicion (though no actual proof) of the actual financing of his cause by American oil interests . After a brief two years ' triumph, Madero was in turn overthrown by Huerta who reverted to the old Diaz policy , and drew special support from and gave concessions to the English Cowdray interests a fact which drew from the

Democratic President Wilson the canting declaration : " We can have no sympathy with those who seek to seize the power of government to advance their own personal interest ," and the refusal to recognise the Huerta regime . From the end of 1913 onwards a persistent attempt was made to force Huerta's overthrow . Pressure prevented his securing a loan in Europe, with the result that Huerta had to suspend payment of interest on government bonds in January , 1914 ; while Britain was gradually detached from diplomatic support of the Mexican Government . Meanwhile , a fresh rising under Carranza and Villa had broken out in the north , and Washington , which had formerly placed an embargo on the import of arms into Mexico , in February , 1914 , removed it, admittedly with the intention of strengthening the rebel forces and hastening Huerta's fall.

All this time the oil interests were agitating for active intervention by U.S. land and naval forces ,and accordingly in April , seizing upon two absurdly inadequate pretexts of " insults to the flag , "American battleships were dispatched to Vera Cruz , and blue jackets and marines were landed to occupy the town . As a result ,Huerta was defeated , and Carranza installed as President.

But Carranza himself proved to be no such docile instrument as the American oil interests had hoped ; and in 1917 and 1918 he proceeded to nationalize all mineral rights and to impose a tax on petroleum . This selfish show of independence drew stern protests from the U.S. Department of State ,and the oil companies proceeded to pay Pelaez , a rich brigand , \$200,000 a month to make trouble . against the Government , and persuaded President Wilson at the Peace Conference to oppose the entry of Mexico on an equal footing into the League of Nations.

More blatant still was the rapacious policy towards San Domingo and Nicaragua. In the former case , the San Domingo Improvement Co. , a New York concern , bought in 1893 the debt of £170,000 which a Dutch company had loaned to the Dominican Government . When , ten years later , financial difficulties prevented the republic from paying the interest , the U.S. Government demanded the right to control and collect the revenues of the republic ,paying 55per cent of them over to the bondholders and the remainder to the Dominican Government , and to prohibit any increase in debt or lowering of taxes if it thought fit. The result of this financial control was a national insurrection in 1916 ; and on this excuse U.S. battleships entered the roadstead of San

Domingo City , landed a large force of marines , and proceeded to take over the whole of the Dominican customs, treasury , army and police with American officials , and to refuse to pay over to the Government the latter's share of the customs . A new President was elected; but the U.S. Government refused him recognition unless he signed a treaty making the country a virtual protectorate . A deadlock ensued , martial law was declared in 1916, and a military dictatorship and military terror was instituted . This lasted until 1924 , during which period loans were raised with New York bankers , the interest on which the people of San Domingo had to pay ; and the dictatorship was only finally terminated when a puppet President under the muzzles of U.S. rifles signed the treaty which made his country a virtual protectorate.

And Nicaragua -but why need the story be told over again , since the details of each case are so tragically similar to those of every other ? Here we have the same story : American investments ; a canal project and a valuable naval base . President Zelaya resists the " encroaching " attempts of the U.S. Government . In 1909 a revolution against Zelaya breaks out ; Washington first covertly then overtly , supports the rebels ; and Zelaya is forced to resign . An American loan to the rebel government follows , secured by U.S. control of the customs ; and a warship is sent to the capital in order to damp down popular opposition to the proposal by its "moral effect . " The final position of the republic in 1918 was a debt to U.S.A. of a million dollars ; her railways and bank controlled by New York capital ; an American collector of customs ; a High Commission , composed of two Americans and one Nicaraguan , controlling State expenditure ; her constabulary trained and officered by Americans . In Haiti and Cuba the succession of events was not dissimilar.

The results of the war have lain Europe open as a similar tempting hunting ground - for U.S.A. finance -capital. The Dawes Scheme for Germany shows the floating of a reconstruction loan, secured against certain taxes and the revenues of the railways, a new Bank of Issue ,whose board contains seven non Germans - out of fourteen , and a number of "controllers " to supervise the economic life of the country. There has even been talk of a "Dawes Plan for France"; and the present plight of French Government finances is the result of failure to accept the terms which Wall Street wishes to impose . In the Near East, too , American finance is raising its voice amid the claims of France and Britain.

Armed with the concession given to Admiral Chester in 1909, U.S.A. is seeking to become the heir of Germany to the Bagdad Railway Scheme; and here her claims complied with the British bulldog hold on Mosul . So great was the pressure , and so eloquently did the minions of Standard Oil preach the gospel of the Open Door at the Lausanne Conference , in protest against British monopoly exclusiveness , that the company was admitted to a 25 per cent share in the Turkish Petroleum Company , in which Shell holds chief sway. Mr. Hearing's story leaves us , like the first installment of a serial, at the confirmation of the Chester concession by the Angora Government , and the Ottoman American Development Company preparing to " carry out its plans for building the Bagdad Railway , and to work its oil and mineral claims."

Hearing's book tells its story in a very readable and com prehensile way ,with a studied objectivity and a careful verification of every fact ; and the book should without fail find a place alongside Woolf and Earle and Delays and Carnot in our library of Imperialism . But we should not halt at the mere telling of the story . It is important for us to think out further its relevance to the actual political situation as it faces us to-day. If we do this ,we shall neither conclude that capitalism has changed its nature and become stable and peace -loving nor that our first task lies in preaching a crusade against Wall Street . We shall see that Imperialism has done no more than enter amore complicated stage , which because of its very complexity contains more germs of a second August , 1914 , than did the pre -1914 situation itself . On the one side is workers ' Russia -on the "up grade - " gathering to her standard the exploited nationalities of the East and the gradually arousing workers of the West . On the other side is U.S.A. capitalism , strong , confident and also on the "up grade - ' extending her power and influence westward across the Pacific to challenge the Asiatic hegemony of the "Yellow Dragon , " and east ward across the Atlantic to Europe itself and to the Near East . Between the two lies Europe -indebted and struggling against the forces of economic decline ; of the one part the new colonial " countries of Central Europe , stabilized temporarily at the expense of their working class , of the other part Britain , proudly disputing the supremacy of her new creditor -Britain that was formerly creditor of the world -marshalling the continental nations to her side , maintaining her competitive position by depressing the standard of life of her workers ,and acting as the fulcrum of reaction towards the class struggle in

Europe and the rising national struggle on the borders of her Empire . This situation it is our duty to show in all its dramatic vividness to the movement- a situation which demands no neutral attitude towards Imperialism , nor an opposition merely to one Imperialism as more oppressive than the rest ; but a situation which demands a world united front of all elements oppressed by Imperialism who find in that exploiting system a common foe . Those who obscure the issue or fail to grasp its implications will be submerged as miserably as the old 2nd International in the new war of Empires which is already taking shape in the womb of history as surely as was the case between 1905 and 1910 .

Woodrow Wilson

Introduction

This largely dry essay on public administration, published by Woodrow Wilson during the time he taught at Bryn Mawr College, makes a revolutionary argument for a professional centralized administration in the United States. Introducing a novel distinction between politics and administration, Wilson demands a bureaucracy that would govern independently from the elected branches of government. In doing so, he walls off the founding principles of consent of the governed and the separation of powers from the emerging new science of administration.

The essay, published in the *Political Science Quarterly* in July 1887, advocates a trained bureaucracy that has the expertise and the will to oppose popular opinion when they deem it necessary. In contrast to the founding principle of equality—meaning that claims to superior wisdom cannot justify rule and that legitimate government is based on the consent of the governed—Wilson argues that expertise is a title to rule.

Wilson's faith in the rule of experts is coupled with a profound distrust of republican self-government: "The bulk of mankind is rigidly unphilosophical, and nowadays the bulk of mankind votes." Democracy has empowered thousands upon thousands of the "selfish, ignorant, timid, stubborn, or foolish," who come from a mix of different nationalities. All hope is not lost, however, since there are "hundreds who are wise." Wilson's charge is to recruit for the bureaucracy from these wise hundreds, produce more of them, and "open for the public a bureau of skilled, economical administration."

Wilson realizes that such a view of administration is a hard sell to Americans, who prefer democracy to “officialism.” Thus, reformers must eschew “theoretical perfection” and defer to “American habit” and know-how. In turn, Americans, Wilson admonishes, need to rid themselves of “the error of trying to do too much by vote. Self-government does not consist in having a hand in everything, any more than housekeeping consists necessarily in cooking dinner with one’s own hands” (emphasis added). Wilson would replace amateur cooks with professionals. Eventually the entire household will be run by professionals. The practice of self-government through elected officials will be lost as “considerate, paternal government” fulfills all needs. The master of the house will become utterly dependent on his professional retinue.

The trained servants will tutor the people by improving public opinion and thereby even ultimately ruling them. The bureaucracy would educate the electorate. Wilson modestly claims that his ideal is “a civil service cultured and self-sufficient enough to act with sense and vigor, and yet so intimately connected with the popular thought, by means of elections and constant public counsel, as to find arbitrariness of class spirit quite out of the question.” Yet once the bureaucracy, aided by the universities, asserts itself against the elected branches and the people in the name of its expertise, the people could no longer defend themselves.

Political Science Quarterly July 1887

I suppose that no practical science is ever studied where there is no need to know it. The very fact, therefore, that the eminently practical science of administration is finding its way into college courses in this country would prove that this country needs to know more about administration, were such proof of the fact required to make out a case. It need not be said, however, that we do not look into college programmes for proof of this fact. It is a thing almost taken for granted among us, that the present movement called civil service reform must, after the accomplishment of its first purpose, expand into efforts to improve, not the personnel only, but also the organization and methods of our government offices: because it is plain that their organizations and methods need improvement only less than their personnel. It is the object of administrative study to discover, first, what government can properly and successfully do, and, secondly, how it can do these proper things with the utmost possible efficiency and at the least possible

cost either of money or of energy. On both these points there is obviously much need of light among us; and only careful study can supply that light. Before entering on that study, however, it is needful:

- I. To take some account of what others have done in the same line; that is to say, of the history of the study.
- II. To ascertain just what is its subject-matter.
- III. To determine just what are the best methods by which to develop it, and the most clarifying political conceptions to carry with us into it. Unless we know and settle these things, we shall set out without chart or compass.

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

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

But such was not the case. No one wrote systematically of administration as a branch of the science of government until the present century had passed its first youth and had begun to put forth its characteristic flower of the systematic knowledge. Up to our own day all the political writers whom we now read had thought, argued, dogmatized only about the constitution of government; about the nature of the state, the essence and seat of sovereignty, popular power and kingly prerogative; about the greatest meanings lying at the heart of government, and the high ends set before the purpose of government by man's nature and man's aims. The central field of controversy was that great field of theory in which monarchy rode tilt against democracy, in which oligarchy would have built for itself strongholds of privilege, and in which tyranny sought opportunity to make good its claim to receive submission from all competitors. Amidst this high warfare of principles, administration could command no pause for its own consideration. The

question was always: Who shall make law, and what shall that law be? The other question, how law should be administered with enlightenment, with equity, with speed, and without friction, was put aside as “practical detail” which clerks could arrange after doctors had agreed upon principles.

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

I have said that all this was true of “early times”; but it was substantially true also of comparatively late times. One does not have to look back of the last century for the beginnings of the present complexities of trade and perplexities of commercial speculation, nor for the portentous birth of national debts. Good Queen Bess, doubtless, thought that the monopolies of the sixteenth century were hard enough to handle without burning her hands; but they are not remembered in the presence of the giant monopolies of the nineteenth century. When Blackstone lamented that corporations had no bodies to be kicked and no souls to be damned, he was anticipating the proper time for such regrets by a full century. The perennial discords between master and workmen which now so often disturb industrial society began before the Black Death and the Statute of Laborers; but never before our own day did they assume such ominous proportions as they wear now. In brief, if difficulties of governmental action are to be seen gathering in other centuries, they are to be seen culminating in our own

This is the reason why administrative tasks have nowadays to be so studiously and systematically adjusted to carefully tested standards of policy, the reason why we are having now what we never had before, a science of administration. The weightier debates of constitutional principle are even yet by no means concluded; but they are no longer of more immediate practical moment than questions of administration. It is getting to be harder to run a constitution than to frame one.

Here is Mr. Bagehot's graphic, whimsical way of depicting the difference between the old and the new in administration:

In early times, when a despot wishes to govern a distant province, he sends down a satrap on a grand horse, and other people on little horses; and very little is heard of the satrap again unless he send back some of the little people to tell what he has been doing. No great labour of superintendence is possible. Common rumour and casual report are the sources of intelligence. If it seems certain that the province is in a bad state, satrap No. 1 is recalled, and satrap No. 2 sent out in his stead. In civilized countries the process is different. You erect a bureau in the province you want to govern; you make it write letters and copy letters; it sends home eight reports per diem to the head bureau in St. Petersburg. Nobody does a sum in the province without some one doing the same sum in the capital, to "check" him, and see that he does it correctly. The consequence of this is, to throw on the heads of departments an amount of reading and labour which can only be accomplished by the greatest natural aptitude, the most efficient training, the most firm and regular industry.

There is scarcely a single duty of government which was once simple which is not now complex; government once had but a few masters; it now has scores of masters. Majorities formerly only underwent government; they now conduct government. Where government once might follow the whims of a court, it must now follow the views of a nation.

And those views are steadily widening to new conceptions of state duty; so that, at the same time that the functions of government are everyday becoming more complex and difficult, they are also vastly multiplying in number. Administration is everywhere putting its hands to new undertakings. The utility, cheapness, and success of the government's postal service, for instance, point towards the early establishment of

governmental control of the telegraph system. Or, even if our government is not to follow the lead of the governments of Europe in buying or building both telegraph and railroad lines, no one can doubt that in some way it must make itself master of masterful corporations. The creation of national commissioners of railroads, in addition to the older state commissions, involves a very important and delicate extension of administrative functions. Whatever hold of authority state or federal governments are to take upon corporations, there must follow cares and responsibilities which will require not a little wisdom, knowledge, and experience. Such things must be studied in order to be well done. And these, as I have said, are only a few of the doors which are being opened to offices of government. The idea of the state and the consequent ideal of its duty are undergoing noteworthy change; and "the idea of the state is the conscience of administration." Seeing every day new things which the state ought to do, the next thing is to see clearly how it ought to do them.

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

But where has this science grown up? Surely not on this side the sea. Not much impartial scientific method is to be discerned in our administrative practices. The poisonous atmosphere of city government, the crooked secrets of state administration, the confusion, sinecurism, and corruption ever and again discovered in the bureaux at Washington forbid us to believe that any clear conceptions of what constitutes good administration are as yet very widely current in the United States. No; American writers have hitherto taken no very important part in the advancement of this science. It has found its doctors in Europe. It is not of our making; it is a foreign science, speaking very little of the language of English or American principle. It employs only foreign tongues; it utters none but what are to our minds alien ideas. Its aims, its examples, its conditions, are almost exclusively grounded in the histories of foreign races, in the precedents of foreign systems, in the lessons of foreign revolutions. It has been developed by French and German professors, and is consequently in all parts adapted to the needs of a compact state, and made to fit highly centralized forms of government; whereas, to answer our

purposes, it must be adapted, not to a simple and compact, but to a complex and multiform state, and made to fit highly decentralized forms of government. If we would employ it, we must Americanize it, and that not formally, in language merely, but radically, in thought, principle, and aim as well. It must learn our constitutions by heart; must get the bureaucratic fever out of its veins; must inhale much free American air.

If an explanation be sought why a science manifestly so susceptible of being made useful to all governments alike should have received attention first in Europe, where government has long been a monopoly, rather than in England or the United States, where government has long been a common franchise, the reason will doubtless be found to be twofold: first, that in Europe, just because government was independent of popular assent, there was more governing to be done; and, second, that the desire to keep government a monopoly made the monopolists interested in discovering the least irritating means of governing. They were, besides, few enough to adopt means promptly

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

On this side the sea we, the while, had known no great difficulties of government. With a new country in which there was room and remunerative employment for

everybody, with liberal principles of government and unlimited skill in practical politics, we were long exempted from the need of being anxiously careful about plans and methods of administration. We have naturally been slow to see the use or significance of those many volumes of learned research and painstaking examination into the ways and means of conducting government which the presses of Europe have been sending to our libraries. Like a lusty child, government with us has expanded in nature and grown great in stature, but has also become awkward in movement. The vigor and increase of its life has been altogether out of proportion to its skill in living. It has gained strength, but it has not acquired deportment. Great, therefore, as has been our advantage over the countries of Europe in point of ease and health of constitutional development, now that the time for more careful administrative adjustments and larger administrative knowledge has come to us, we are at a signal disadvantage as compared with the transatlantic nations; and this for reasons which I shall try to make clear.

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

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

Such was the case in Prussia, for instance, where administration has been most studied and most nearly perfected. Frederic the Great, stern and masterful as was his rule, still sincerely professed to regard himself as only the chief servant of the state, to

consider his great office a public trust; and it was he who, building upon the foundations laid by his father, began to organize the public service of Prussia as in very earnest a service of the public. His no less absolute successor, Frederic William III, under the inspiration of Stein, again, in his turn, advanced the work still further, planning many of the broader structural features which give firmness and form to Prussian administration to-day. Almost the whole of the admirable system has been developed by kingly initiative.

Of similar origin was the practice, if not the plan, of modern French administration, with its symmetrical divisions of territory and its orderly gradations of office. The days of the Revolution of the Constituent Assembly were days of constitution-writing, but they can hardly be called days of constitution-making. The revolution heralded a period of constitutional development,—the entrance of France upon the second of those periods which I have enumerated,—but it did not itself inaugurate such a period. It interrupted and unsettled absolutism, but it did not destroy it. Napoleon succeeded the monarchs of France, to exercise a power as unrestricted as they had ever possessed.

The recasting of French administration by Napoleon is, therefore, my second example of the perfecting of civil machinery by the single will of an absolute ruler before the dawn of a constitutional era. No corporate, popular will could ever have effected arrangements such as those which Napoleon commanded. Arrangements so simple at the expense of local prejudice, so logical in their indifference to popular choice, might be decreed by a Constituent Assembly, but could be established only by the unlimited authority of a despot. The system of the year VIII was ruthlessly thorough and heartlessly perfect. It was, besides, in large part, a return to the despotism that had been overthrown.

Among those nations, on the other hand, which entered upon a season of constitution-making and popular reform before administration had received the impress of liberal principle; administrative improvement has been tardy and half-done. Once a nation has embarked in the business of manufacturing constitutions, it finds it exceedingly difficult to close out that business and open for the public a bureau of skilled, economical administration. There seems to be no end to the tinkering of constitutions.

Your ordinary constitution will last you hardly ten years without repairs or additions; and the time for administrative detail comes late.

Here, of course, our examples are England and our own country. In the days of the Angevin kings, before constitutional life had taken root in the Great Charter, legal and administrative reforms began to proceed with sense and vigor under the impulse of Henry II's shrewd, busy, pushing, indomitable spirit and purpose; and kingly initiative seemed destined in England, as elsewhere, to shape governmental growth at its will. But impulsive, errant Richard and weak, despicable John were not the men to carry out such schemes as their father's. Administrative development gave place in their reigns to constitutional struggles; and Parliament became king before any English monarch had had the practical genius or the enlightened conscience to devise just and lasting forms for the civil service of the state.

The English race, consequently, has long and successfully studied the art of curbing executive power to the constant neglect of the art of perfecting executive methods. It has exercised itself much more in controlling than in energizing government. It has been more concerned to render government just and moderate than to make it facile, well-ordered, and effective. English and American political history has been a history, not of administrative development, but of legislative oversight,—not of progress in governmental organization, but of advance in law-making and political criticism. Consequently, we have reached a time when administrative study and creation are imperatively necessary to the well-being of our governments saddled with the habits of a long period of constitution-making. That period has practically closed, so far as the establishment of essential principles is concerned, but we cannot shake off its atmosphere. We go on criticizing when we ought to be creating. We have reached the third of the periods I have mentioned,—the period, namely, when the people have to develop administration in accordance with the constitutions they won for themselves in a previous period of struggle with absolute power; but we are not prepared for the tasks of the new period.

Such an explanation seems to afford the only escape from blank astonishment at the fact that, in spite of our vast advantages in point of political liberty, and above all in point of practical political skill and sagacity, so many nations are ahead of us in

administrative organization and administrative skill. Why, for instance, have we but just begun purifying a civil service which was rotten full fifty years ago? To say that slavery diverted us is but to repeat what I have said—that flaws in our constitution delayed us.

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

It is better to be untrained and free than to be servile and systematic. Still there is no denying that it would be better yet to be both free in spirit and proficient in practice. It is this even more reasonable preference which impels us to discover what there may be to hinder or delay us in naturalizing this much-to-bedesired science of administration.

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

In government, as in virtue, the hardest of things is to make progress. Formerly the reason for this was that the single person who was sovereign was generally either selfish, ignorant, timid, or a fool,—albeit there was now and again one who was wise. Nowadays the reason is that the many, the people, who are sovereign have no single ear

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

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

The first step is not less difficult than the second. With opinions, possession is more than nine points of the law. It is next to impossible to dislodge them. Institutions which one generation regards as only a makeshift approximation to the realization of a principle, the next generation honors as the nearest possible approximation to that principle, and the next worships the principle itself. It takes scarcely three generations for the apotheosis. The grandson accepts his grandfather's hesitating experiment as an integral part of the fixed constitution of nature.

Even if we had clear insight into all the political past, and could form out of perfectly instructed heads a few steady, infallible, placidly wise maxims of government

into which all sound political doctrine would be ultimately resolvable, would the country act on them? That is the question. The bulk of mankind is rigidly unphilosophical, and nowadays the bulk of mankind votes. A truth must become not only plain but also commonplace before it will be seen by the people who go to their work very early in the morning; and not to act upon it must involve great and pinching inconveniences before these same people will make up their minds to act upon it.

And where is this unphilosophical bulk of mankind more multifarious in its composition than in the United States? To know the public mind of this country, one must know the mind, not of Americans of the older stocks only, but also of Irishmen, of Germans, of negroes. In order to get a footing for new doctrine, one must influence minds cast in every mould of race, minds inheriting every bias of environment, warped by the histories of a score of different nations, warmed or chilled, closed or expanded by almost every climate of the globe.

So much, then, for the history of the study of administration, and the peculiarly difficult conditions under which, entering upon it when we do, we must undertake it. What, now, is the subject-matter of this study, and what are its characteristic objects?

The field of administration is a field of business. It is removed from the hurry and strife of politics; it at most points stands apart even from the debatable ground of constitutional study. It is a part of political life only as the methods of the counting house are a part of the life of society; only as machinery is part of the manufactured product. But it is, at the same time, raised very far above the dull level of mere technical detail by the fact that through its greater principles it is directly connected with the lasting maxims of political wisdom, the permanent truths of political progress. The object of administrative study is to rescue executive methods from the confusion and costliness of empirical experiment and set them upon foundations laid deep in stable principle

It is for this reason that we must regard civil-service reform in its present stages as but a prelude to a fuller administrative reform. We are now rectifying methods of appointment; we must go on to adjust executive functions more fitly and to prescribe better methods of executive organization and action. Civil-service reform is thus but a moral preparation for what is to follow. It is clearing the moral atmosphere of official life by establishing the sanctity of public office as a public trust, and, by making service

unpartisan, it is opening the way for making it businesslike. By sweetening its motives it is rendering it capable of improving its methods of work.

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

This is distinction of high authority; eminent German writers insist upon it as of course. Bluntschli, for instance, bids us separate administration alike from politics and from law. Politics, he says, is state activity “in things great and universal”, while “administration, on the other hand,” is “the activity of the state in individual and small things. Politics is thus the special province of the statesman, administration of the technical official.” “Policy does nothing without the aid of administration”; but administration is not therefore politics. But we do not require German authority for this position; this discrimination between administration and politics is now, happily, too obvious to need further discussion.

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

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

about incognito to most of the world, being confounded now with political “management,” and again with constitutional principle.

Perhaps this ease of confusion may explain such utterances as that of Niebuhr’s: “Liberty,” he says, “depends incomparably more upon administration than upon constitution.” At first sight this appears to be largely true. Apparently facility in the actual exercise of liberty does depend more upon administrative arrangements than upon constitutional guarantees; although constitutional guarantees alone secure the existence of liberty. But upon second thought—is even so much as this true? Liberty no more consists in easy functional movement than intelligence consists in the ease and vigor with which the limbs of a strong man move. The principles that rule within the man, or the constitution, are the vital springs of liberty or servitude. Because independence and subjection are without chains, are lightened by every easyworking device of considerate, paternal government, they are not thereby transformed into liberty. Liberty cannot live apart from constitutional principle; and no administration, however perfect and liberal its methods, can give men more than a poor counterfeit of liberty if it rest upon illiberal principles of government.

A clear view of the difference between the province of constitutional law and the province of administrative function ought to leave no room for misconception; and it is possible to name some roughly definite criteria upon which such a view can be built. Public administration is detailed and systematic execution of public law. Every particular application of general law is an act of administration. The assessment and raising of taxes, for instance, the hanging of a criminal, the transportation and delivery of the mails, the equipment and recruiting of the army and navy, etc., are all obviously acts of administration; but the general laws which direct these things to be done are as obviously outside of and above administration. The broad plans of governmental action are not administrative; the detailed execution of such plans is administrative. Constitutions, therefore, properly concern themselves only with those instrumentalities of government which are to control general law. Our federal constitution observes this principle in saying nothing of even the greatest of the purely executive offices, and speaking only of that President of the Union who was to share the legislative and policy-making functions

of government, only of those judges of highest jurisdiction who were to interpret and guard its principles, and not of those who were merely to give utterance to them.

This is not quite the distinction between Will and answering Deed, because the administrator should have and does have a will of his own in the choice of means for accomplishing his work. He is not and ought not to be a mere passive instrument. The distinction is between general plans and special means. There is, indeed, one point at which administrative studies trench on constitutional ground-or at least upon what seems constitutional ground. The study of administration, philosophically viewed, is closely connected with the study of the proper distribution of constitutional authority. To be efficient it must discover the simplest arrangements by which responsibility can be unmistakably fixed upon officials; the best way of dividing authority without hampering it, and responsibility without obscuring it. And this question of the distribution of authority, when taken into the sphere of the higher, the originating functions of government, it is obviously a central constitutional question. If administrative study can discover the best principles upon which to base such distribution, it will have done constitutional study an invaluable service. Montesquieu did not, I am convinced, say the last word on this head.

To discover the best principle for the distribution of authority is of greater importance, possibly, under a democratic system, where officials serve many masters, than under others where they serve but a few. All sovereigns are suspicious of their servants, and the sovereign people is no exception to the rule; but how is its suspicion to be allayed by knowledge? If that suspicion could but be clarified into wise vigilance, it would be altogether salutary; if that vigilance could be aided by the unmistakable placing of responsibility, it would be altogether beneficent. Suspicion in itself is never healthful either in the private or in the public mind. Trust is strength in all relations of life; and, as it is the office of the constitutional reformer to create conditions of trustfulness, so it is the office of the administrative organizer to fit administration with conditions of clear-cut responsibility which shall insure trustworthiness.

And let me say that large powers and unhampered discretion seem to me the indispensable conditions of responsibility. Public attention must be easily directed, in each case of good or bad administration, to just the man deserving of praise or blame.

There is no danger in power, if only it be not irresponsible. If it be divided, dealt out in shares to many, it is obscured; and if it be obscured, it is made irresponsible. But if it be centered in heads of the service and in heads of branches of the service, it is easily watched and brought to book. If to keep his office a man must achieve open and honest success, and if at the same time he feels himself entrusted with large freedom of discretion, the greater his power the less likely is he to abuse it, the more is he nerved and sobered and elevated by it. The less his power, the more safely obscure and unnoticed does he feel his position to be, and the more readily does he relapse into remissness.

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

To whom is official trustworthiness to be disclosed, and by whom is it to be rewarded? Is the official to look to the public for his meed of praise and his push of promotion, or only to his superior in office? Are the people to be called in to settle administrative discipline as they are called in to settle constitutional principles? These questions evidently find their root in what is undoubtedly the fundamental problem of this whole study. That problem is: What part shall public opinion take in the conduct of administration?

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

In those countries in which public opinion has yet to be instructed in its privileges, yet to be accustomed to having its own way, this question as to the province of public opinion is much more ready soluble than in this country, where public opinion is wide awake and quite intent upon having its own way anyhow. It is pathetic to see a whole book written by a German professor of political science for the purpose of saying

to his countrymen, "Please try to have an opinion about national affairs"; but a public which is so modest may at least be expected to be very docile and acquiescent in learning what things it has not a right to think and speak about imperatively. It may be sluggish, but it will not be meddlesome. It will submit to be instructed before it tries to instruct. Its political education will come before its political activity. In trying to instruct our own public opinion, we are dealing with a pupil apt to think itself quite sufficiently instructed beforehand.

The problem is to make public opinion efficient without suffering it to be meddlesome. Directly exercised, in the oversight of the daily details and in the choice of the daily means of government, public criticism is of course a clumsy nuisance, a rustic handling delicate machinery. But as superintending the greater forces of formative policy alike in politics and administration, public criticism is altogether safe and beneficent, altogether indispensable. Let administrative study find the best means for giving public criticism this control and for shutting it out from all other interference

But is the whole duty of administrative study done when it has taught the people what sort of administration to desire and demand, and how to get what they demand? Ought it not to go on to drill candidates for the public service?

There is an admirable movement towards universal political education now afoot in this country. The time will soon come when no college of respectability can afford to do without a well-filled chair of political science. But the education thus imparted will go but a certain length. It will multiply the number of intelligent critics of government, but it will create no component body of administrators. It will prepare the way for the development of a sure-footed understanding of the general principles of government, but it will not necessarily foster skill in conducting government. It is an education which will equip legislators, perhaps, but not executive officials. If we are to improve public opinion, which is the motive power of government, we must prepare better officials as the apparatus of government. If we are to put in new boilers and to mend the fires which drive our governmental machinery, we must not leave the old wheels and joints and valves and bands to creak and buzz and clatter on as best they may at bidding of the new force. We must put in new running parts wherever there is the least lack of strength or adjustment. It will be necessary to organize democracy by sending up to the competitive

examinations for the civil service men definitely prepared for standing liberal tests as to technical knowledge. A technically schooled civil service will presently have become indispensable.

I know that a corps of civil servants prepared by a special schooling and drilled, after appointment, into a perfected organization, with appropriate hierarchy and characteristic discipline, seems to a great many very thoughtful persons to contain elements which might combine to make an offensive official class,—a distinct, semi-corporate body with sympathies divorced from those of a progressive, free-spirited people, and with hearts narrowed to the meanness of a bigoted officialism. Certainly such a class would be altogether hateful and harmful in the United States. Any measure calculated to produce it would for us be measures of reaction and of folly.

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

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

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

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

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

It is abundantly safe nowadays to insist upon this actual likeness of all governments, because these are days when abuses of power are easily exposed and arrested, in countries like our own, by a bold, alert, inquisitive, detective public thought and a sturdy popular self-dependence such as never existed before. We are slow to appreciate this; but it is easy to appreciate it. Try to imagine personal government in the United States. It is like trying to imagine a national worship of Zeus. Our imaginations are too modern for the feat.

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

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

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

It is the more necessary to insist upon thus putting away all prejudices against looking anywhere in the world but at home for suggestions in this study, because nowhere else in the whole field of politics, it would seem, can we make use of the historical, comparative method more safely than in this province of administration.

Perhaps the more novel the forms we study the better. We shall the sooner learn the peculiarities of our own methods. We can never learn either our own weaknesses or our own virtues by comparing ourselves with ourselves. We are too used to the appearance and procedure of our own system to see its true significance. Perhaps even the English system is too much like our own to be used to the most profit in illustration. It is best on the whole to get entirely away from our own atmosphere and to be most careful in examining such systems as those of France and Germany. Seeing our own institutions through such media, we see ourselves as foreigners might see us were they to look at us without preconceptions. Of ourselves, so long as we know only ourselves, we know nothing.

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

Our own politics must be the touchstone for all theories. The principles on which to base a science of administration for America must be principles which have democratic policy very much at heart. And, to suit American habit, all general theories

must, as theories, keep modestly in the background, not in open argument only, but even in our own minds,—lest opinions satisfactory only to the standards of the library should be dogmatically used, as if they must be quite as satisfactory to the standards of practical politics as well. Doctrinaire devices must be postponed to tested practices. Arrangements not only sanctioned by conclusive experience elsewhere but also congenial to American habit must be preferred without hesitation to theoretical perfection. In a word, steady, practical statesmanship must come first, closet doctrine second. The cosmopolitan what-to-do must always be commanded by the American how-to-do-it.

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

This interlacing of local self-government with federal self-government is quite a modern conception. It is not like the arrangements of imperial federation in Germany. There local government is not yet, fully, local self-government. The bureaucrat is everywhere busy. His efficiency springs out of esprit de corps, out of care to make ingratiating obeisance to the authority of a superior, or at best, out of the soil of a sensitive conscience. He serves, not the public, but an irresponsible minister. The question for us is, how shall our series of governments within governments be so administered that it shall always be to the interest of the public officer to serve, not his superior alone but the community also, with the best efforts of his talents and the soberest service of his conscience? How shall such service be made to his commonest interest by contributing abundantly to his sustenance, to his dearest interest by furthering his ambition, and to his highest interest by advancing his honor and establishing his character? And how shall this be done alike for the local part and for the national whole?

If we solve this problem we shall again pilot the world. There is a tendency—is there not?—a tendency as yet dim, but already steadily impulsive and clearly destined to prevail, towards, first the confederation of parts of empires like the British, and finally of great states themselves. Instead of centralization of power, there is to be wide union with tolerated divisions of prerogative. This is a tendency towards the American type of

governments joined with governments for the pursuit of common purposes, in honorary equality and honorable subordination. Like principles of civil liberty are everywhere fostering like methods of government; and if comparative studies of the ways and means of government should enable us to offer suggestions which will practicably combine openness and vigor in the administration of such governments with ready docility to all serious, well-sustained public criticism, they will have approved themselves worthy to be ranked among the highest and most fruitful of the great departments of political study. That they will issue in such suggestions I confidently hope.

New Freedom

Historians have struggled to give a clear definition to the progressive movement. In general, it was a mood among middle-class professionals that order needed to be imposed on the chaotic American free enterprise system. Progressives addressed most of the same concerns as the Populists, but did so from a broader base, in a less angry, alienated, and apocalyptic way, for many progressives were themselves the products of the economic system that they sought to reform. Thus, the progressive movement was thoroughly ambivalent, and progressives frequently took opposite sides on many issues, and produced contradictory legislation, and often faced unintended consequences. But the one unifying theme of progressivism was statism: At one level or another, progressives called for increased governmental power to deal with social problems. It was in this period that the term “liberal” was inverted from its nineteenth century laissez-faire to its twentieth century big-government definition.

Progressives usually favored the expansion of executive power, seeing nineteenth-century politics dominated by legislatures and courts, and above all by corrupt parties in cahoots with business interests. Woodrow Wilson, an academic political scientist before entering politics, was a pivotal progressive theorist. Wilson was the first prominent thinker to argue that the founders’ constitutional system had become obsolete and needed to be radically altered. Reflecting the evolutionary ethos of the era, Wilson argued that a constitution was an organism that must grow and adapt, or die. Federalism, separation of powers, checks-and-balances—the various devices by which the Constitution limited government power—now rendered the government incapable of dealing with contemporary problems.

There is one great basic fact which underlies all the questions that are discussed on the political platform at the present moment. That singular fact is that nothing is done in this country as it was done twenty years ago.

We are in the presence of a new organization of society. Our life has broken away from the past. The life of America is not the life that it was twenty years ago; it is not the life that it was ten years ago. We have changed our economic conditions, absolutely, from top to bottom; and, with our economic society, the organization of our life. The old political formulas do not fit the present problems; they read now like documents taken out of a forgotten age. The older cries sound as if they belonged to a past age which men have almost forgotten. Things which used to be put into the party platforms of ten years ago would sound antiquated if put into a platform now. We are facing the necessity of fitting a new social organization, as we did once fit the old organization, to the happiness and prosperity of the great body of citizens; for we are conscious that the new order of society has not been made to fit and provide the convenience or prosperity of the average man. The life of the nation has grown infinitely varied. It does not centre now upon questions of governmental structure or of the distribution of governmental powers. It centers upon questions of the very structure and operation of society itself, of which government is only the instrument. Our development has run so fast and so far along the lines sketched in the earlier day of constitutional definition, has so crossed and interlaced those lines, has piled upon them such novel structures of trust and combination, has elaborated within them a life so manifold, so full of forces which transcend the boundaries of the country itself and fill the eyes of the world, that a new nation seems to have been created which the old formulas do not fit or afford a vital interpretation of.

We have come upon a very different age from any that preceded us. We have come upon an age when we do not do business in the way in which we used to do business—when we do not carry on any of the operations of manufacture, sale, transportation, or communication as men used to carry them on. There is a sense in which in our day the individual has been submerged. In most parts of our country men work, not for themselves, not as partners in the old way in which they used to work, but generally as employees—in a higher or lower grade—of great corporations. There was a time when

corporations played a very minor part in our business affairs, but now they play the chief part, and most men are the servants of corporations.

You know what happens when you are the servant of a corporation. You have in no instance access to the men who are really determining the policy of the corporation. If the corporation is doing the things that it ought not to do, you really have no voice in the matter and must obey the orders, and you have oftentimes with deep mortification to cooperate in the doing of things which you know are against the public interest. Your individuality is swallowed up in the individuality and purpose of a great organization

It is true that, while most men are thus submerged in the corporation, a few, a very few, are exalted to a power which as individuals they could never have wielded. Through the great organizations of which they are the heads, a few are enabled to play a part unprecedented by anything in history in the control of the business operations of the country and in the determination of the happiness of great numbers of people.

Yesterday, and ever since history began, men were related to one another as individuals. To be sure there were the family, the Church, and the state, institutions which associated men in certain wide circles of relationship. But in the ordinary concerns of life, in the ordinary work, in the daily round, men dealt freely and directly with one another. Today, the everyday relationships of men are largely with great impersonal concerns, with organizations, not with other individual men.

Now this is nothing short of a new social age, a new era of human relationships, a new stage-setting for the drama of life.

There has come over the land that un-American set of conditions which enables a small number of men who control the government to get favors from the government; by those favors to exclude their fellows from equal business opportunity; by those favors to extend a network of control that will presently dominate every industry in the country, and so make men forget the ancient time when America lay in every hamlet, when America was to be seen in every fair valley, when America displayed her great forces on the broad prairies, ran her fine fires of enterprise up over the mountain-sides and down into the bowels of the earth, and eager men were everywhere captains of industry, not employees; not looking to a distant city to find out what they might do, but looking about among their neighbors, finding credit according to their character, not according to their

connections, finding credit in proportion to what was known to be in them and behind them, not in proportion to the securities they held that were approved where they were not known. In order to start an enterprise now, you have to be authenticated, in a perfectly impersonal way, not according to yourself, but according to what you own that somebody else approves of your owning. You cannot begin such an enterprise as those that have made America until you are so authenticated, until you have succeeded in obtaining the good-will of large allied capitalists. Is that freedom? That is dependence, not freedom.

We used to think in the old-fashioned days when life was very simple that all that government had to do was to put on a policeman's uniform, and say, "Now don't anybody hurt anybody else." We used to say that the ideal of government was for every man to be left alone and not interfered with, except when he interfered with somebody else; and that the best government was the government that did as little governing as possible. That was the idea that obtained in Jefferson's time. But we are coming now to realize that life is so complicated that we are not dealing with the old conditions, and that the law has to step in and create new conditions under which we may live, the conditions which will make it tolerable for us to live.

Let me illustrate what I mean: It used to be true in our cities that every family occupied a separate house of its own, that every family had its own little premises, that every family was separated in its life from every other family. That is no longer the case in our great cities. Families live in tenements, they live in flats, they live on floors; they are piled layer upon layer in the great tenement houses of our crowded districts, and not only are they piled layer upon layer, but they are associated room by room, so that there is in every room, sometimes, in our congested districts, a separate family. In some foreign countries they have made much more progress than we in handling these things. In the city of Glasgow, for example (Glasgow is one of the model cities of the world), they have made up their minds that the entries and the hallways of great tenements are public streets. Therefore, the policeman goes up the stairway and patrols the corridors; the lighting department of the city sees to it that the halls are abundantly lighted. The city does not deceive itself into supposing that great building is a unit from which the police

are to keep out and the civic authority to be excluded, but it says: "These are public highways, and light is needed in them, and control by the authority of the city."

I liken that to our great modern industrial enterprises. A corporation is very like a large tenement house; it isn't the premises of a single commercial family; it is just as much a public affair as a tenement house is a network of public highways....

I used to say, when I had to do with the administration of an educational institution,¹ that I should like to make the young gentlemen of the rising generation as unlike their fathers as possible. Not because their fathers lacked character or intelligence or knowledge or patriotism, but because their fathers, by reason of their advancing years and their established position in society, had lost touch with the processes of life; they had forgotten what it was to begin; they had forgotten what it was to rise; they had forgotten what it was to be dominated by the circumstances of their life on their way up from the bottom to the top, and, therefore, they were out of sympathy with the creative, formative, and progressive forces of society.

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

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

Are those thoughtful men who fear that we are now about to disturb the ancient foundations of our institutions justified in their fear? If they are, we ought to go very slowly about the processes of change. If it is indeed true that we have grown tired of the

institutions which we have so carefully and sedulously built up, then we ought to go very slowly and very carefully about the very dangerous task of altering them. We ought, therefore, to ask ourselves, first of all, whether thought in this country is tending to do anything by which we shall retrace our steps, or by which we shall change the whole direction of our development?

I believe, for one, that you cannot tear up ancient rootages and safely plant the tree of liberty in soil which is not native to it. I believe that the ancient traditions of a people are its ballast; you cannot make a tabula rasa² upon which to write a political program. You cannot take a new sheet of paper and determine what your life shall be tomorrow. You must knit the new into the old. You cannot put a new patch on an old garment without ruining it; it must be not a patch, but something woven into the old fabric, of practically the same pattern, of the same texture and intention. If I did not believe that to be progressive was to preserve the essentials of our institutions, I for one could not be a progressive.

One of the chief benefits I used to derive from being president of a university was that I had the pleasure of entertaining thoughtful men from all over the world. I cannot tell you how much has dropped into my granary by their presence. I had been casting around in my mind for something by which to draw several parts of my political thought together when it was my good fortune to entertain a very interesting Scotsman who had been devoting himself to the philosophical thought of the seventeenth century. His talk was so engaging that it was delightful to hear him speak of anything, and presently there came out of the unexpected region of his thought the thing I had been waiting for. He called my attention to the fact that in every generation all sorts of speculation and thinking tend to fall under the formula of the dominant thought of the age. For example, after the Newtonian Theory of the universe had been developed, almost all thinking tended to express itself in the analogies of the Newtonian Theory, and since the Darwinian Theory has reigned amongst us, everybody is likely to express whatever he wishes to expound in terms of development and accommodation to environment.

Now, it came to me, as this interesting man talked, that the Constitution of the United States had been made under the dominion of the Newtonian Theory. You have only to read the papers of *The Federalist* to see that fact written on every page. They

speak of the “checks and balances” of the Constitution, and use to express their idea the simile of the organization of the universe, and particularly of the solar system—how by the attraction of gravitation the various parts are held in their orbits; and then they proceeded to represent Congress, the judiciary, and the President as a sort of imitation of the solar system

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sometimes, when I think of the growth of our economic system, it seems to me as if, leaving our law just about where it was before any of the modern inventions or developments took place, we had simply at haphazard extended the family residence, added an office here and a workroom there, and a new set of sleeping rooms there, built up higher on our foundations, and put out little lean-tos on the side, until we have a structure that has no character whatever. Now, the problem is to continue to live in the house and yet change it.

Well, we are architects in our time, and our architects are also engineers. We don't have to stop using a railroad terminal because a new station is being built. We don't have to stop any of the processes of our lives because we are re-arranging the structures in which we conduct those processes. What we have to undertake is to systematize the foundations of the house, then to thread all the old parts of the structure with the steel which will be laced together in modern fashion, accommodated to all the modern knowledge of structural strength and elasticity, and then slowly change the partitions, relay the walls, let in the light through new apertures, improve the ventilation; until finally, a generation or two from now, the scaffolding will be taken away, and there will be the family in a great building whose noble architecture will at last be disclosed, where men can live as a single community, co-operative as in a perfected, co-ordinated beehive, not afraid of any storm of nature, not afraid of any artificial storm, any imitation of thunder and lightning, knowing that the foundations go down to the bedrock of principle, and knowing that whenever they please they can change that plan again and accommodate it as they please to the altering necessities of their lives.

But there are a great many men who don't like the idea. Some wit recently said, in view of the fact that most of our American architects are trained in a certain École in Paris, that all American architecture in recent years was either bizarre or "Beaux Arts." I think that our economic architecture is decidedly bizarre; and I am afraid that there is a good deal to learn about matters other than architecture from the same source from which our architects have learned a great many things. I don't mean the School of Fine Arts at Paris, but the experience of France; for from the other side of the water men can now hold up against us the reproach that we have not adjusted our lives to modern conditions to the same extent that they have adjusted theirs. I was very much interested in some of

the reasons given by our friends across the Canadian border for being very shy about the reciprocity arrangements. They said: "We are not sure whither these arrangements will lead, and we don't care to associate too closely with the economic conditions of the United States until those conditions are as modern as ours." And when I resented it, and asked for particulars, I had, in regard to many matters, to retire from the debate. Because I found that they had adjusted their regulations of economic development to conditions we had not yet found a way to meet in the United States.

Well, we have started now at all events. The procession is under way. The stand-patter doesn't know there is a procession. He is asleep in the back part of his house. He doesn't know that the road is resounding with the tramp of men going to the front. And when he wakes up, the country will be empty. He will be deserted, and he will wonder what has happened. Nothing has happened. The world has been going on. The world has a habit of going on. The world has a habit of leaving those behind who won't go with it. The world has always neglected stand-patters. And, therefore, the stand-patter does not excite my indignation; he excites my sympathy. He is going to be so lonely before it is all over. And we are good fellows, we are good company; why doesn't he come along? We are not going to do him any harm. We are going to show him a good time. We are going to climb the slow road until it reaches some upland where the air is fresher, where the whole talk of mere politicians is stilled, where men can look in each other's faces and see that there is nothing to conceal, that all they have to talk about they are willing to talk about in the open and talk about with each other; and whence, looking back over the road, we shall see at last that we have fulfilled our promise to mankind. We had said to all the world, "America was created to break every kind of monopoly, and to set men free, upon a footing of equality, upon a footing of opportunity, to match their brains and their energies." And now we have proved that we meant it.

Causes of the World War

The causes of the first world war are so complex that any attempt to describe them adequately would involve nothing less than the writing of the diplomatic history of Europe since 1870. In fact we may have to go back to 1789 or even to the age of Louis XIV. The causes of this war are to be sought in the conjunction of various forces and

tendencies which had been operating for a long time among the nations of Europe. However, let us look into some of the important factors which led to the first world war.

The System of Secret

Alliances The most significant cause of the war was the system of secret alliances. This was, as a matter of fact, the handiwork of Bismarck, who tried to build a network of such alliances against Germany's enemies after the Franco-Prussian War of 1870. This move slowly divided Europe into rival armed camps which confronted each other. The system of alliances, as you can guess, helped on some occasions in preserving peace, in as much as the members within one group often held their friends or allies in restraint from provoking war. But it also made it inevitable that if a war did come, it would involve all the great powers of Europe.

From 1871 to 1890 Bismarck was the arbiter of European politics. As the Chancellor of the new German Empire he wanted peace and declared that Germany was a "satiated" country. He knew that war, which had brought to Germany power and international prominence, would, if risked again, bring her only destruction. Bismarck thus stood for the maintenance of status quo and the preservation of the new Balance of Power which he had created by his system of alliances. He knew that France was Germany's irreconcilable enemy, particularly after the ignominy of 1870. So Bismarck's diplomatic skill and political insight were employed in building up alliances for the protection of Germany. The enemy of Germany was France, and Bismarck's achievement was the diplomatic isolation of the country. In pursuit of this policy, Germany entered into an alliance with Austria in 1879 with a commitment of reciprocal protection in case Russia should attack either Power. Three years later in 1882, Bismarck fomented the Franco-Italian rivalry over Tunis and persuaded Italy to forget her hereditary enmity towards Austria. A secret Triple Alliance was forged in 1882 between Germany, Italy and Austria, explicitly defensive, in part against France, in part against Russia.

France, rendered powerless since the Franco-Prussian War, looked upon this formidable alliance with grave concern. So long as Bismarck was at the helm he maintained the system of Balance of Power which he had completed by his Re-Insurance Treaty with Russia in 1887. The nightmare of isolation haunted France. But after Bismarck ceased to be German Chancellor in 1890, his successors abandoned his skillful

diplomacy. Some bitterness arose between Russia and Germany at the Berlin Congress over the settlement of the Eastern Question. France took advantage of this situation and proceeding cautiously, was successful in forming an alliance with Russia in 1891. Thus was formed the Dual Alliance which ended the period of isolation of France and served as a counterweight to the Triple Alliance. The abandonment of Bismarckian diplomacy by Germany led to some rethinking in the British diplomatic circles. The German Emperor did not believe that Germany was a "satiated Power" and called for an ambitious policy of a World Empire. He also declared that the future of Germany lay upon the sea. This change in German policy was alarming enough for England and forced her to come out of the state of "splendid Isolation". It drew Britain closer to the Dual Alliance. In 1904, she made an agreement of Entente Cordiale with France resolving all mutual differences. This was followed by a similar agreement with Russia in 1907. Thus France, Russia and England formed a separate political group called Triple Entente. As the Triple Alliance confronted the Triple Entente, the condition of Europe became one of "armed peace". The continental powers of Europe, though at peace with the another, kept a jealous watch upon their neighbours and so atmosphere of fear and suspicion prevailed in Europe.

There being apprehensions about the coming catastrophe, all the Powers busied themselves with making feverish military preparations. This was the result of the split of Europe into two rival camps.

This division of Europe into two rival armed camp has to be seen in the context of growth and expansion of Imperialism when European countries, seized with lust for trade and territories, were acquiring new colonies and contending against each other. Naturally to make a mark in international politics by their material strength, it was necessary to build up militarily and politically.

Militarism

Militarism was actually closely connected with the system of secret alliances and was the second important cause of the war. This system of maintaining large armies actually began with the French during the Revolution and was later continued under Napoleon. It was extended and efficiently developed by Bismarck during the unification of Germany. After the Franco-Prussian war in 1870 the military and naval ornaments of

all the Great powers tended to grow larger and larger. This armed race was quickened generally in the name of self defence. It created fear and suspicion among the nations. If one of the countries raised the strength of its army, built strategic railways, its fearful neighbours were immediately frightened into doing likewise. So the mad race in armaments went on in a vicious circle, particularly after the Balkan wars of 1912-13. Anglo-German Naval rivalry was one of the contributory causes of the war.

Militarism meant also the existence of a large body of military and naval personnel, who were psychologically tuned to the "inevitability" of an early war. To these professionals war held out the prospect of quick promotion and great distinction. It should not imply that they urged war for selfish motives and personal advancement. Nevertheless, the opportunity to put into practice the results of their preparation for war could not possibly have failed to produce its psychological effect.

Nationalism

Another very important cause of the war was the wave of nationalism which swept all over Europe. It was actually one of the heritages of the French revolution. The resounding triumph of nationalism in Italy and Germany invested it with new vigour and made it a potent force in politics. The unifications of Italy and Germany were possible mainly because Cavour and Bismarck were successful in arousing the spirit of nationalism. In the process it inflamed the racial pride of the people, stimulated them to exalt their country above all others, and made them arrogant in their attitude towards their neighbours. It was the excessive favour of nationalism that intensified the rivalries of states like Germany and led them to engage in a spirited naval and military competition. It was that which led the European powers to squabble over their interests in Asia, Africa and the Balkans. It was the outraged nationalism of the French people that kept alive their spirit of revenge for the loss of Alsace and Lorraine and made France the bitterest enemy of Germany. From 1866 onwards relations between France and Germany remained tense. Napoleon III, had behind him an aggrieved national opinion which nursed bitter jealousies against Prussia's strength. The delirium of nationalistic upsurge, manifested in the outbreak of Franco-Prussian war in 1870, opened a new era of popular hysteria in international relations. There was also a cry of *Itali irredenta* (unredeemed Italy) which was the expression of the national ambition of Italy to wrest from Austria the Italian

speaking distinct and the Trinitron which made Italy look to Germany for support. There venalities along the western fringes of the tsarist Empire. Poles and Ukrainian, Lith s and Finns continued to exert a strong centrifugal pull on the Empire after 1870. The ltg policy towards these nationalities was of intense Justification' especially under .; Alexander 111 between 188 1 and 1894. It had the effect of turning the most extreme pa ' ' of these national groups towards the Lastly, the un assuaged national aspirations of the Balkan peoples made the Balkan Peninsula a veritable tinder box which before long set all Europe ablaze. As a matter of fact the' exuberant spirit of nationalism was at the back of most of the occurrences that gravitated towards the war.

Russian Social Revolutionaries, who soon established links all over the region. These local movements represented the spirit of radical nationalism which was in ascendancy during this period.

Newspapers, Press and the Public Opinion

Another underlying cause of the Great War was the poisoning of public opinion by the ' newspapers in almost all the European countries. The newspapers were often inclined to inflame nationalistic feelings by distorting and misrepresenting the situation in foreign countries. On several occasions when peaceful solution of the complex international problems could be possible the jingoistic tone of the newspapers in the countries involved in the conflict spoiled matters. The popular press went very far sometimes to produce results in national and international politics. As early as 1870 the publishing of the Ems telegram by Bismarck immediately inflamed and embittered the extreme nationalist opinion in Paris and precipitated the Franco-Prussian War. This shows the incalculable harm the press could do in creating tension in European politics.

The Immediate Cause

The Austrian Habsburg Empire had to reckon with the challenge of surging nationalism since 1900. It was difficult to keep in check the multi-national Empire, especially when political and military leadership in Vienna lay in the hands of people like Count Berchtold and Conrad. They saw in Serbia another Piedmont or another Prussia and were reminded of the ignominious defeats their country had suffered in 1859 & 1866 at the hands of Cavour and Bismarck in the process of Italian and German unifications. By 1914, there had emerged a comparable movement for national unification of all Slav

people under the leadership of Serbia. It was a small country of just five million people but had the energy and drive to make itself the nucleus of a future Yugoslavia.

Serbia was not only the sorest thorn in Habsburg flesh, and an impediment to Pan-German designs, she was also the spearhead of Entente influence in the Balkans. In fact, she could serve as a useful wedge in the German-Austrian-Turkish combination. The crisis caused by Sarajevo therefore, did not remain a quarrel between Austria and Serbia but took the form of a trial of strength between the two grand alliances.

The incident which led to war was the murder of the heir to the Habsburg throne by a fanatic whose connection with the Serbian government could not be established. The Arch duke Franz Ferdinand and his wife, visited Bosnian, capital of Sarajevo on 28th June 1914 and was murdered by the Austrian Sero, Gavrilo Princip. Vienna regarded the murder by Serbia as a provocation for war. Austria made demands which were bound to be rejected by Serbia. So Vienna declared war on 28th July. The bonds of the alliance held firm, and the two armed camps clashed at last. Sir Edward Grey, the British foreign secretary commented, "the lamps are going out all over Europe, we shall not see them lit again in our lifetime."

Consequences of the War

You will see that the war on 1914 was in many ways entirely novel in human history. There had been wars in Europe before, involving many states. This one, however, was a general conflict between highly organised states that had at their command all the resources of modern technology and were well-equipped to find new methods of destruction and defence. It was the first war to dislocate the entire international economy which had taken the whole of the 19th century to grow and take that shape. It was fought with determination and desperation by the belligerents because they believed that it was a war for survival and for high ideals; it was fought on land, and above land, on sea and under the sea. New resources of economic and even psychological warfare were tapped because it was a war of the masses. It was a war between the peoples and not merely by armies and navies. It soon reached a point where military or civilian leaders found it most difficult to keep under check its future course of development. Obviously any such conflict was bound to have far reaching consequences. We shall look at some of them here.

Loss of Human Lives

During the war considerable detection was done in terms of men and material. Millions of lives were lost. Russia was the heaviest loser with a toll of 2 million, Germany of nearly 2 million, France along with her colonies lost over one and a quarter million, Austria nearly one and a quarter million and the British Empire nearly 1 million. The U.S.A. lost around 1 lakh men. Some ten million men lost their lives and most of these were under forty years. More than twice that number were injured and almost maimed forever. The French calculations brought out that between 1914 and 1917 one Frenchman was killed every minute. This was certainly an unprecedented rate of casualties in any European warfare. This massive loss of human life definitely affected the structure of population both in sex and in age groups. The loss of life among women was much lower. Thus in Great Britain in 1911 there were 1067 females to every 1000 males, 1921 the ratio changed to 1093 to every 1000 males. This disequilibrium led to many social complexities and other related problems in the society.

Social and Economic Changes

The war, in all the countries, had the effect of accelerating the emancipation of women wherever the movement had started before 1914. Women over 30 were granted parliamentary vote in Britain in 1918. It happened because the war required a national effort and in modern warfare civilian morale and industrial production had become as important as fighting by the armed forces themselves. Women participated in all activities and worked on factories, shops, offices and voluntary services, hospitals and schools. They worked hand in hand with men and so won their claim of equality with them. It became easier now for them to find work in industry and business, as traditional impediments were removed. Even the barriers of class and wealth were weakened to quite a great extent by the "fellowship of the trenches". Social ethics changed quite significantly and the 'war profiteers' became a special subject of scorn and hatred.

As compared to the previous European wars, the cost of war was certainly astronomical. During the 20 years war with Napoleon, Great Britain's debt had increased eightfold, while during four years between 1914 and 1918, it went up twelvefold. It was estimated that the total loss inflicted on warring nations was about 186 billion dollars. When this huge money was siphoned off into destructive channels, human welfare,

whether health or other facilities, inevitably suffered. The whole fabric of prewar civil flow of world trade, was violently disrupted. This economic dislocation T tally proved lathe to be the most intractable result of the war. The war had undermined the foundations of Europe's industrial supremacy and after a gap of four years, when Europe began to lick its wounds and resumed its trade, it found that it was lagging far behind other countries. The U.S.A. made considerable progress in its exports, and in South America and India, new home industries came up and developed. Japan entered the textile trade and flooded the Chinese, Indian and South American markets with its goods. The pattern of international trade was completely changed. When the European leaders gave a call for restoration of normalcy which meant going back to the world of 1913, they failed to realize that a modern war is also a revolution and the world of 1913 was as much a part of history now as the Habsburg and Romanoff Empires. It has been pointed out, that all the economic slogans of the post-war years, strangely enough, began with the prefix re: reconstruction, recovery, reparations, retrenchment, repayment of war debts, restoration of the gold standard etc.

In the post war period, the triumphant nationalism in the Balkans proved violently intolerant of any settlement falling short of a balanced national economy. Nations with infant industries wanted to protect them and old industrial powers like Britain and others felt that it was necessary to safeguard their shattered economies against the competition of new rivals.

France was helped to recover economically by the restoration of Alsace and Lorraine and by the cession of Saar Coal mines for 15 years. But there were certain other economic problems which could not be solved through mere reparations from Germany. Belgium, for example had her vital railway system disjointed by the demolition of its 2400 miles of track, and only 80 locomotives remained in the country at the end of the war. Of her 51 steel mills, more than half were destroyed and others seriously damaged. This was actually true of all other countries. The initial stages of recovery were really a sad story because it involved finding work for the demobilized soldiers, homes for the people, and reconverting of industry to peacetime productions.

Democratic Ideals

Despite all its devastating consequences the war brought democratic ideals and institutions to peoples who had not been acquainted with them before. The war had been declared 'to make the world safe for democracy'. So obviously, the newly independent states were keen to set up democratic institutions. In one country after another, new democratic constitutions were adopted. Germany herself gave a lead by setting up a Weimar Republic, one of the most completely democratic paper constitutions ever written. It was modeled on the American, French, British and Swiss democracies. But the bane of the new democracy was that it was superimposed upon a social order that had changed surprisingly little. The only common sentiment which bound the people was the universal national resentment against their defeat and the terms of peace imposed on them by the Allies. The new regime could not last long because it had no constructive ability to run its administration on democratic lines.

Similarly in other European states the democratic institutions where ever set up, remained fragile because of their patch-work structure. For a short while after then of the war democracy came into vogue throughout Europe. The war provided to democratic forces all over the world. It was soon discovered that western political invitations of parliamentary government were implanted in countries that had little or no experience in any sort of self-government. Nationalistic passions that had been aroused to a fever pitch by the war were responsible for the experiments but the social and economic life was still much less advanced than in the West and this proved to be the proverbial stumbling block. Even in the colonial empires of European powers the urge for self-government and freedom got a stimulus.

The Conference of Paris, 1919

The Conference of 1919 was a more representative body than the Congress of Vienna in 1815 had been. There were no crowned heads now and most of the countries were represented by their Premiers and foreign ministers. The only exceptions were President Woodrow Wilson and King Albert. In all, thirty two states were represented. The time, place, composition, organization and procedure of the conference all had some impact upon what it was able to achieve.

As far as time is concerned, it was held nine weeks after the signing of the armistice with Germany and was mainly timed according to the internal political consideration in the U.S.A. and Great Britain. President Wilson decided to attend in person and so the conference was delayed till he delivered his 'State of the Union' message to the Congress in December. In Britain also Lloyd George wanted the elections before the conference, which were held in mid December. At the height of victory slogans like 'Hang the Kaiser,' 'Make Germany Pay' and 'Home fit for Heroes' were raised. The election results drastically changed the composition of the House of commons because 'hard-faced men who looked as if they had done well out of the war' entered the Parliament. The timing of the elections, being what it was, this should have hardly been surprising.

The venue of the conference was also a well-planned decision. Initially Geneva was suggested but President Wilson preferred Paris where American forces were stationed in large numbers. It could also have been symbolic because the first German Empire had been declared in the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles in 1871. Besides, Premier George Clemenceau, who was the senior most leader in the conference and was thus to preside over the deliberations of the Conference remembered Sedan well when France had been defeated after the Franco-Prussian war and the choice of Paris was to be an answer to that defeat.

The composition of the conference was even more important. It was represented not only by 'the Allies' but also by the 'Associated Powers'. Toward the end of the war many countries entered war mainly to be a party to the final settlement. The three major omissions were: the , neutral powers; the Russians, who were still engaged in civil war and the war of intervention; and the former enemies, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey. The absence of these powers was significant in view of the developments in future. The absence of Germany in particular gave peace in Europe in the form of Diktat, an imposed arrangement for which the Germans felt no responsibility or respect. This was to prove as one of the basic weaknesses in the settlement.

The conference of Paris was certainly the biggest peace conference ever held anywhere in the world, despite its limitations. There were 32 official delegations which covered 314 of the world's population. But, as the war itself was a war of great powers,

here too, over-all control was exercised by a council of ten. This body comprised 2 members each of the 'Big Five' including U.S.A., Britain, France, Italy and Japan. Japan soon lost interest and stayed away and by the close of April 1919, Italy also left. Ultimately the famous 'Big Three' ran the entire show. These 'Big Three' as you must be aware, were represented by President Wilson of USA, Premier Clemenceau of France and Prime Minister Lloyd George of Britain. As pointed out earlier, the conference was finally a compromise between the two conflicting personalities of Wilson and Clemenceau. Wilson was an idealist, committed to the principles of democracy and the covenant of the League of Nations. Clemenceau, on the other hand, was an old-fashioned realist obsessed with hatred for Germany for whom French security was a matter of 'prime concern.

The conference, therefore, turned out to be a conflict between the impulses of idealism and of realism. Besides this, we cannot ignore the conflicts of impulses which raged within the hearts of all nations and of most statesmen. The conference was, like the minds of men in 1919, haunted by a tension between hopes and ideals on the one hand and vindictiveness and vengeance on the other which were natural reactions of people who had undergone oppression and whose latest experiences reflected hatred and fear. You can yourself imagine, why a conference with this background could not achieve any tangible results. It was harsh where it could well be lenient and weak when it was better to be strong. In the words of historian David Thomson "....the Paris Conference must stand in history as a conspicuous failure; but it was an over-all failure of human intelligence and wisdom, and in part of a failure of organisation and method. This was not due to either an excess of realism or a lack of idealism, but rather to a misapplication of both."

The New Balance of Power

As you have read earlier, the Great War was not merely a war but a revolution in all walks of life. Lie socio-economic and political dislocation of tremendous magnitude, there was also a problem of temporary redistribution of the balance of power in the world. As a consequence of this war, there was a military and political collapse of the old Russian, Austro-Hungarian; German and Turkish empires. The pre-war German and

Austrian dominance, for a time, came to an end. The supreme task before the peacemakers was to see that Germany is kept in check and also, weakened militarily.

Another problem was to redraw the map of eastern and central Europe in the light of newly emerging realities of national grouping, economic viability and military security.

To weaken Germany several measures were taken. German forces were asked to evacuate all the occupied territories. Alsace and Lorraine were restored to France. Germany was not to fortify the left bank of the Rhine. Her army was reduced to 100,000 men. She was prevented from arms production. Similar stringent measures were taken on naval and colonial matters. German navy was not to exceed six battleships of 10,000 tons, twelve destroyers and twelve torpedo boats. No submarines were allowed. Germany had to give up all her rights over colonies. German empire was distributed under the mandate to the allied powers on the basis of the existing pattern of occupation. Later, the League of Nations was assigned the task of monitoring the administration of these mandated territories.

The second important problem, as you were told earlier, was the reshaping of Eastern Europe. The 'Eastern Question' had been an intractable issue before the Western European powers for a long time and the Great war further aggravated it. The old Austrian empire was forced to cede most of its territories to Italy and other newly emerging nations in Eastern Europe. Hungary, the other half of the Habsburg Empire, received even harsher treatment. Serbia was the chief beneficiary which was transformed into the new southern slav kingdom of Yugoslavia

Turkey itself went through an internal political upheaval as a consequence of defeats in the war. Mustapha Kemal led a nationalist upsurge against the treaty of Serves, which was held between Turkey and the allied powers. Due to this pressure, a new treaty of Lausanne was signed in 1923. Kemal gave up all claims over the Arab majority areas and renounced the Islamic basis of the Turkish State. A new Turkish Republic was established under Mustapha Kemal's president ship.

This resettlement of Eastern Europe, you can imagine, created nearly as many problems as it solved. It created a number of middle sized powers such as Poland, Rumania and Yugoslavia. It led to the growth of Arab nationalism and Zionist hopes of a

Jewish national home in Palestine, which created complications which still creates international tension. The settlement also introduced a new problem of minority rights and its preservation

The whole settlement of Eastern Europe was actually made in the light of fear of the spread of Bolshevism into Europe. In the words of Historian David Thomson: There was a strong inclination to make the eastern states, from Finland down to Poland and Rumania, as large and strong as possible in order to serve as a cordon sanitaria, a quarantine zone to keep back the tide of communism.

The New International Machinery

The League of Nations was a world organization contrived to replace the old system of 'power politics.' It was a machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes and arbitration which replaced the old methods of secret diplomacy and separate alliances and quest for a balance of power. You are aware of the peculiarities of the international situation in Europe in 1914. It has been described as 'international anarchy' but it was actually semi-anarchy where the colonial and dynastic and national disputes threw the whole of Europe into terrifying ordeal of war.

The scheme of the League of Nations was sponsored with great fervour by President Wilson. This was eventually modified to conform with British and French proposals. The league, in one way, was an elaborate revival of the idea of a Concert of Europe into an international concert. In another light it was something new and different as here each participant swore to settle any mutual dispute through peaceful means and to share the responsibility in the event of aggression.

The league was not at all a government but was a sort of facility to be used by all governments to maintain peace. We find that it was a very well meaning and sensible body but could be successful only if certain assumptions about the post war world proved correct. The major assumption was that all governments would want peace, a reasonable one due to the revulsion against slaughter and destruction. This assumption sounded more reasonable because, as you have seen in the earlier pages, there was growth of democratic states which were supposed to be more peace loving than the earlier autocracies and dynastic empires. However, as pointed out earlier these democratic constitutions proved fragile and interest in pursuing democratic ideals was short-lived. The hope that

contented nationalism would move towards pacification also soon dispelled. So in view of these believed assumptions, the League of Nations could not acquire the vitality and vigor of action which it required.

The failure of USA to become a member of the League and exclusion of Germany and Russia made it a mere buttress of the settlement. Japan was also lukewarm in its response. Only the British Commonwealth, France and Italy were its members. Italy soon defied it through its aggressive policy under the Fascist leader Mussolini. The League failed in its supreme task of preserving peace. However, it did succeed in solving some minor disputes. Wherever the states sincerely submitted disputes to the procedure of conciliation, it worked well. It successfully settled the dispute between Sweden and Finland over the Aaland Islands. On three occasions the league successfully intervened in the disturbed Balkan area. The league also settled the Iraq and Turkey border issue. As pointed out earlier, the League did not have an effective machinery to enforce its decisions and so failed to maintain peace where the Big Powers were involved.

Our aim here was to put forward before you the main causes and consequences of the First World War. You must have noticed that the only common and agreed objective of the Allies in 1914 was to crush Germany and diminish its hegemony in Europe. They did not go to war to bring about communist revolution in Russia, to destroy old Empires, to establish new Arab Kingdoms or even to begin a new experiment of a League of Nations. The richest fruits were harvested by the semi-belligerents or non-belligerents. U.S.A. became a great economic power, Japan gained economic and naval strength in the Pacific, and India made great progress towards self-government. The victorious Allies, inspired of achieving certain particular aims, bequeathed to the world a most burdensome legacy of devastation, debt, poverty, refugees, minority problems and inter-allied frictions.

Unit- III

The Progressive Era – McKinley- Spanish American War -T.D .Roosevelt - Square Deal- William Howard Taft - Dollar Diplomacy –Woodrow Wilson – New Freedom – World War I

Self-Assessment Questions

1. Explain the origin, aims, and key reforms of the Progressive Era.
2. Analyze McKinley's leadership and the causes and results of the Spanish–American War.
3. Discuss the role of the Spanish–American War in shaping American imperialism.
4. Assess Theodore Roosevelt's leadership and domestic reforms.
5. Examine the principles, goals, and achievements of Roosevelt's Square Deal.
6. Evaluate Taft's presidency, focusing on Dollar Diplomacy.
7. Discuss the continuity and changes in Progressive reforms from Roosevelt to Taft.
8. Analyze Wilson's New Freedom and its impact on U.S. politics and economy.
9. Compare the Progressive policies of Roosevelt and Wilson.
10. Examine the causes, course, and effects of U.S. involvement in World War I.

Unit- IV

Inter War Years - Great Depression – Franklin D. Roosevelt – New Deal -World War II - USA becomes a World Power -Cold war – Truman Doctrine - Eisenhower– John F. Kennedy – Lyndon B. Johnson - Civil Rights Movement – Martin Luther King - Richard Nixon – Vietnam War

Objectives

- To understand the Interwar period, Great Depression, and New Deal.
- To analyze World War II and the rise of the USA as a world power.
- To examine Cold War policies and key U.S. leaders.
- To assess the Civil Rights Movement, Nixon, and the Vietnam War.

Inter War Years

The first half of the twentieth century is known in history as the era of world wars. The First World War was considered by many to be ‘a war to end all wars’. Yet, the developments during the next twenty years, led the world into another war-more destructive, more widespread and much larger in scale. In order to understand the reasons for the outbreak of this war, we need to study the inter-war period in detail.

The end of the First World War did not end the rivalries between the European nation. Even the peace Treaties failed to ensure peace. The treaties were harsh on the defeated countries and thus sowed the seeds of future conflicts. They even failed to satisfy the territorial ambitions of some of the allied powers. In many of the countries strong dictators rose to power and spread the message of national chauvinism. The most important fact was that, imperialism, the basic cause of war, was not destroyed.

The Russian Revolution and the emergence of the Soviet Union also divided the world into two groups-those who favored the revolution and those who fear effects. Most of the west European countries belonged to the latter group. They considered socialism to be a threat to their social and economic systems. Soviet Russia was also anti-imperialist and supported the freedom struggles in the colonies of Asia and Africa. This chapter will tell you how all these combined to create conditions for another war.

The Peace Treaties

The First World War ended with the signing of the peace treaties at a conference held in Paris. The important leaders at the conference were the U.S. President Woodrow Wilson, the British Prime Minister Lloyd George, and the French Prime Minister George Clemenceau.

League of nations:

One of the first acts of the peace conference was the decision to create a world organization, called the League of Nations, for the promotion of 'international cooperation, peace and security. The Covenant (formal agreement) of the League was approved in April 1919.

The agreement required all member to reduce armaments in the interest of peace. If any member country resorted to war, then collective action would be taken against that country. The trade relations with the aggressor country would also be cut off. However, the League of Nations could never be an effective organization. Two major countries- Soviet Union and Germany - were not allowed to become its members for many years. United States, despite its leading role in the formation of the League, decided not to join it. Hence, when aggression began in the 1930s, the League failed to prevent it.

The Treaty of Versailles:

The peace treaties were to be based on President Wilson's peace proposals or Fourteen Points, which promised to bring in an era of peace, freedom, democracy, selfdetermination (the right to have a say in one's own government). But these principles were ignored when the allies signed the Treaty of Versailles with Germany.

According to the treaty:

1. Germany was blamed as the aggressor and forced to accept responsibility for the damage caused to the Allies during war.
2. Germany was to pay \$6,600 million as compensation to them.
3. The German coal mining area in Saar valley was put under the control of the league for 15 years, while the mines were transferred to France for that period.
4. The newly created state of Poland (see Map.1) was provided a corridor which give her an outlet to the Baltic Sea. This corridor separated East Prussia from the

rest of Germany. The port of Danzig, which lay in the corridor, was made a free city.

5. The strength of the German army was to be limited to 100,000 and it was permitted to have any air force or navy.
6. Germany's colonial possessions were divided amongst the victorious powers. We shall read more about the territories lost by Germany after a study of the map of Europe.

Germany was made to sign this treaty under threat of invasion. In fact no German representative was invited to attend the conference. So the Germans called it a "dictated peace".

The Changed Map of Europe 2 Block

A study of the post-war map of Europe shows us that almost all European countries emerge from war with changed frontiers. Germany surrendered Alsace Lorraine to France, which it had captured in 1871. In the north it gave up some areas to Belgium and Denmark. The area given to Poland has already been mentioned. Apart from losses in Europe, Germany also gave up right on its African colonies and privileges in China. Thus, after war, the Germans were a discontented lot.

Italy has fought the war on the Allied side to satisfy her territorial ambitions in Austria, Turkish Empire and Africa. But all that Italy gained from the peace settlement was a small part of Austria.

Russia suffered more casualties in war than all the Allies put together. It withdrew from war in March 1918 after signing a treaty with Germany. By this treaty it accepted the independence of Poland, Finland and the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. Added to this were the problems of civil war, military intervention and economic collapse

Poland, which had disappeared from the map in 1815, after being annexed by the three empires of Austria, Prussia and Russia, now reappeared when the three empires declined together. However, the old enmity with the new neighboring countries could not be wiped out so easily.

By a separate treaty, Austria was reduced to a small state and it lost all its imperial glory. Austria recognized the independence of the newly formed countries of

Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. You would remember that Italy had also gained some territory at the cost of Austria. All the newly formed countries had to deal with the problems of border disputed, political upheavals and economic difficulties.

The treaty with Turkey resulted in the complete dismemberment of the Turkish Empire. Turkey lost its Arab possessions in North Africa, in Southwest Asia and almost all its territories in Europe. Some of these territories came under British and French control as mandates. Russia and Greece also gained some areas. Turkey was thus reduced to a small state. The Turks rose in rebellion against the treaty under the leadership of Mustafa Komal. The Sultan was removed from power and a republic was established in Turkey in 1923 with Mustafa Kemal as its first president. He began the process of modernization of the country. The people called him 'ATATURK' or Father of the Turks.

You have just read about the changes that occurred in various European countries. An understanding of these changes tells us that most countries remained dissatisfied with the peace treaties. Was another re-division of the world necessary?

Was another war the only solution? This chapter will help you find the answers.

Rise of Totalitarian Regimes

The immediate post war years were full of problems for almost all countries of Europe. These included reorganization of the economy, resettlement of the survivors of war, and growing unemployment. The working classes in many countries tried to organize socialist revolutions on the Soviet pattern, but they were ruthlessly suppressed. In their place, strong, anti-democratic movements arose in Hungary, Poland, Italy, Portugal, Germany and Spain, which can generally be termed as 'Fascist'.

Emergence of Fascism in Italy:

The term 'Fascism' is of Italian origin and was first used for the movement started by Beni to Mussolini in Italy. The fascists adopted as their symbol 'the fasces' or a bundle of rods, which represented state power. The main features of these movements were opposition to democracy and socialism, establishment of dictatorial rule, extreme nationals and militarism.

Mussolini made eloquent speeches about the glory of ancient Roman Empire and urged people to restore Italy's honor. Many ex-soldiers, after listening to his speeches,

joined his armed gangs, which was a private army called 'Blackshirts'. Mussolini used these gangs to break up strikes and to spread terror among the socialists and communists. The ruling classes of Italy did not curb their action because they also wanted to prevent a socialist revolution.

In 1921, Mussolini set up the National Fascist Party. In October next year, he sent 30,000 of his Blackshirts in a march on Rome. The government surrendered without a fight and the king asked Mussolini to form the new government. By 1928, Mussolini had destroyed all parliamentary opposition and had begun to rule as a dictator. All non fascist parties were banned. He used imprisonment torture and organized killings to suppress the socialists and the communists. He set up the Fascist Grand Council and took the title of II Duce of The Leader. He tried to make Italy a great power by advocating a policy of war and expansion.

Hitler and Nazi Germany:

You already know about the humiliating defeat of Germany and the downfall of its monarchy. In 1919, a Republican form of government was established under a new constitution, which provided for a President, a Chancellor and an elected Parliament. During the world war, Adolf Hitler had been a soldier in the German army and had fought bravely for four years, winning an Iron Cross. Disappointed at Germany's defeat, he now decided to join politics. In 1921, Hitler's powerful speeches and his organizational skills made him the leader of the National socialist German Workers' Party, in short, the Nazi party. Like Fascists, it had its own army called the 'Storm Troopers' or the 'Brownshirts.' By 1930, the Brown shirts number about 100,000 men.

The aim of Nazi policies was to wipe out the humiliation of Versailles and to make Germany powerful and feared in the world. The Nazis were similar to Fascism in their opposition to democracy, civil liberties and socialism. They used brutal force to crush any opposition.

Hitler put the blame for Germany's defeat in war on the Jews, so extermination of the Jewish race became an important feature of Nazism. He believed in the purity and superiority of the German race-calling them pure blood Aryans-and wanted the union of all Germans to create a Greater Germany. A very large section of the people were marked

by the Nazi politics. They appealed to the national pride of Germans and gained support for Nazi politics.

The economic development of the 1930s helped in Hitler's rise to power. A severe depression hit America and Europe. As a result almost 8 million workers in Germany became unemployed. The Nazi party now began to spread its influence. The Communists and the Socialists failed to unite against the Nazis. Consequently, the Nazi party, which had won only 12 seats in the Parliament in 1928, became the single Largest party in 1932. President Hindenburg appointed Hitler as Chancellor and asked him to form the new government.

Soon after coming to power, Hitler unleashed a reign of terror. All democratic principles were put aside. In February 1933, the Nazis set the Parliament building on fire and put the blame on the socialists and communists. Over 60,000 people were imprisoned or sent to concentration camps. By mid-1933 all political parties, other than the Nazi party, were banned. Following Hindenburg's death on August 2 1934, Hitler became the President of Germany. An organized campaign for the total extermination of Jews was launched. Simultaneously a programme of militarization was introduced. The victory of Nazism brought the world closer to war.

Military Fascism in Japan:

Japan had been the only country in Asia to escape colonization. By the end of the nineteenth century, Japan's expansionist policy led her to a war with China. The defeat of China enabled Japan to gain a foothold in the country. In 1905, Japan defeated Russia in war and took over Manchuria, the Russian sphere of influence in China. This was the first instance of an Asian country defeating a mighty European nation in war. Later Japan also annexed Korea.

The outbreak of the First World War gave her a chance to acquire Germany's possessions in China and some German-held islands in the Pacific. After the war the League gave her the mandate over the islands. By this time, Japan's military had become a dominating force in society. It destroyed democracy within the country and advocate of extreme nationalism and expansionism. In less than fifty years Japan changed from a peaceful country to an aggressive military power. During one 1930s she was to establish

close relations with the fascist governments of Germany and Italy for another re-division of the world.

The Great Depression and its Effects

A significant development after the First World War was the decline in the supremacy of Europe and the growing importance of the United States of America. While the war damaged the economy of the European countries, the U.S. economy became stronger. No war was fought on the U.S. soil and the industrial expansion also continued during war as it supplied arms and other materials to the Allies. However, a decade later serious economic problems arose in the country, which later spread to the rest of Europe.

You know that America followed the capitalist system of production, in which maximum profit was made by the owners of industry. Most of the workers, however, lived below the poverty line. Thus, not many people had the means to buy goods, which were being produced by the industries. So ‘overproduction’ and ‘maldistribution of purchasing power’ were the two main causes of The Great Depression, which hit U.S.A. in Oct. 1929 and then spread worldwide. The Crisis began with a fall in the share prices leading to a collapse of the U.S. stock market. In one day, nearly 16 million shares were sold on the New York stock exchange. During the next four years, almost 9000 banks closed operations and millions of people lost their life’s savings. As goods remained unsold, thousands of factories shut down, resulting in unemployment, poverty and starvation.

Most of the European countries, except Soviet Union, also suffered as they had become dependent on the U.S. economy, especially on the American bank. The effects of the crisis in these countries were similar. The number of unemployed in the world rose to over 50 million, of which 15 million were in U.S. alone. The economic crisis also affected the political conditions in these countries. In U.S. the Democratic Party came to power with Franklin D. Roosevelt as President. He introduced a programme of economic reform and social welfare called New Deal. In Britain and France, labour friendly governments came to power. Though fascist movements arose in Britain and France they were not successful. In Germany and Italy as you have read above, post war discontent and Depression led to victories of fascist parties.

During the 1930s the foreign policies of U.S, Britain and France were also similar. They did not adopt a strong position against the fascists. Their main concern was to check the spread of socialist ideas and workers' movements. Thus when fascist aggression began, they did nothing to check it. Instead they chose to appease Fascism in the hope that it would destroy communism.

Developments in the USSR

We have already discussed Russia's participation in war and the Russian Revolution. This was followed by a civil war and the allied military intervention. All this had resulted in the collapse of the Russian economy. There was a severe shortage of food and the industrial production declined drastically.

The consequent famine worsened the conditions further

Lenin was forced to take strict measures. The soviet government forcibly seized surplus food from rich farmers (kulaks), to feed the rest of the population. Nothing could be bought or sold in the markets. The industrial produce was distributed to the workers in lieu of wages. People were encouraged and even forced to work for the good of their fellow men rather than for motive. This grim state of affairs, which lasted from 1918–1921. was called 'War Communism'.

The fierce opposition to this system mainly from the peasantry and some members of his above party led Lenin to replace it by the New Economic Policy in 1921. The harsh measures of War Communism were withdrawn. Now the peasant gave one-tenth of their produce as tax and were allowed to sell the rest in the open markets. Though most of the industries remained under state control, yet smaller industries were given back to private owners. Payment of wages in cash was reintroduced.

A new constitution was introduced in 1924, under which Russia became the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic. But after Lenin's death in 1924 a fierce power struggle arose within the party. There were serious differences among the senior leaders over the policies to be followed. Finally, Stalin, emerged victorious, became the General Secretary of the Communist Party, and soon assumed great powers.

Within a few years, the U.S.S.R. started a vigorous program of industrialization through a series of Five Years Plans. The first plan was introduced in 1929. One of the aims of the Plan was to bring about changes in agriculture. After the revolution,

agricultural land had been redistributed among peasants resulting in millions of small, less productive land holdings. To increase production, the government promoted the idea of Collectivization of small farms. The peasants were both encouraged and forced to give up private ownership of farms, land was pooled and they had to become members and joint owners of the collective farms. The kulaks, who opposed collectivization, were severely dealt with. It is estimated that thousands perished during this period.

The main effort of the plan was towards industrialization. Here the success was greater and soon Soviet Russia emerged a major, industrial power in the world. It is important to remember that the capitalist economies at this time faced a severe economic crisis. The Soviet example of a successful socialist economy stood out and was adopted later by many colonies after independence. Most of the European countries and U.S.A., however, did not recognize Soviet Russia till 1933. It became a member of the League of Nations only in 1934. The hostility towards Soviet Union continued even after this. When fascist aggression began in the 1930s, Soviet Union was the only major power that actively opposed them.

Japanese invasion of Manchuria

The first major act of aggression was the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931. Trouble began with an explosion on the Japanese railway line and Japanese military officers used it as an excuse to take over Manchuria. China appealed to the League of Nations but no action was taken. Japan quit the League of Nations and it launched another attack on China in 1937.

Italy takes over Ethiopia in 1935,

Italy invaded Ethiopia and an appeal was made to the League. The League condemned Italy as an aggressor and put a ban on the sale of arms to Italy. By 1936, however, Italy completed the conquest of Ethiopia and the League, once again, failed to resist aggression.

Expansion of Nazi Germany

In our study of Hitler's rise to power, we saw that he became the Chancellor as well as the President of Germany. He then started the process of re-militarization of Germany in violation of the Treaty of Versailles.

The German troops entered Rhineland, which had been demilitarized by the treaty. Moreover, the troops now numbered 800,000 as against the Treaty limit of 100,000. The absence of any retaliatory action by France and Britain gave Hitler increased confidence to build up an Air force and a Navy. The Saar valley was also reunited with Germany. In 1936, Hitler and Mussolini signed the Rome-Berlin Axis, and in 1937, they signed the Anti-Comintern Pact with Japan.

Hitler's next Plan was the annexation of Austria. The union of Austria and Germany or the Anschluss was completed in 1938. The same year, at a conference in Munich, Britain and France signed the Munich Pact. By this pact, they agreed to the German occupation of Sudetenland in Czechoslovakia. The Czechs had no role in these talks. Germany wanted Sudetenland because this area had a large German population and was the hub of coal chemical and iron and steel industries. A few months later, Germany took over the whole of Czechoslovakia. The Munich Pact was the last act of appeasement by the western powers.

A dress rehearsal of Second World War

The first example of joint German-Italian aggression was seen during the Spanish Civil War (1936–39). It had serious consequence for the entire world and is considered to be a dress rehearsal of the Second World War.

In 1936, a Popular Front Government, comprising the socialists, communists and other anti fascist parties, came to power in Spain. They formed a democratic republic under the leadership of General Franco, a section of the army planned to overthrow this government. Germany and Italy gave armed support to Franco's men and German aircrafts carried out air raids on Spanish towns and villages. They captured many parts of the country and terrorized people into submission.

The Republican government appealed for help but Britain, France and U.S.A. accepted a policy of non-intervention. Only the Soviet Union offered to help the Republicans. The anti-fascists from all over the world came together to form an International Brigade to fight for the Republic. Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru went to Spain to offer the support of the Indian Freedom Movement to the Republic. The Spanish Civil War was no longer a Spanish affair as thousands of non-Spaniards sacrificed their lives to save the Republic from the fascists. The civil war continued for three years. By 1939,

Spain fell to the fascists and the new government was recognized by most of the western powers.

Towards Poland

You can understand that the policy of appeasement adopted by the western powers encouraged the fascist towards more aggression. The Soviets demanded an antifascist alliance but the western powers did not agree. To protect its own interests the USSR signed a Non-Aggression pact with Germany in August 1939. Hitler now directed his attention towards Poland. He wanted both, the Danzig Free City and the Polish Corridor, which, you remember, had separated East Prussia from the rest of Germany. The British and French governments declared that they would attack Germany if it invaded Poland. But Hitler could not be stopped now. On September 1, 1939, Germany invaded Poland. Two days later, Britain and France declared war on Germany. The Second World War had begun.

The World at War

We have just read that the invasion of Poland marked the beginning of the Second World War. The German army crossed the Polish frontier from the west and completed the conquest of Poland in three weeks. Despite declaration of war, no help reached Poland. The Soviet Red Army took the opportunity to get back the territories which had earlier been part of the Russian empire. By 1940, the Russians had taken over the Baltic States Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania-and forced a treaty on Finland. As there was little actual fighting for the first six months, this period is known as 'the period of Phony War'.

On 9th April, 1940 the German forces launched an attack on Norway and Denmark and conquered them. Next to fall were the neutral countries of Belgium, Holland and Luxemburg. This was followed by the invasion of France. The German armies occupied the capital city of Paris, almost without a fight, on June 14, 1940. The French government surrendered and Germany occupied the northern half of France. The other half remained under the French and was called Vichy France. They collaborated with the Nazis. The swift takeover of European countries by Hitler is called 'lightning war'

Meanwhile, about 350,000 British, French and Belgian troops, who did not surrender, reached Dunkirk on the Northern coast of France, from where they marched to

Britain. Among them was Charles , a colonel in the French army, who started the 'Free France' movement in Britain to fight Nazi Germany.

The battle for Britain

With the conquest of west Europe almost complete, Hitler turned his attention to Britain. The invasion of Britain or 'Operation Sea-Lion' was only possible if the German army could cross the English Channel. This meant that the Royal Air Force and the Royal Navy had to be put out of action.

During the development discussed above, there was a change of government in Britain. The British Prime Minister Chamberlain, who had signed the Munich pact had resigned and Winston Churchill took over as the new Prime Minister of a coalition government. In August 1940, the German Air Force (Luftwaffe) began its campaign over British skies and carried out air raids on British ports and cities. The RAF in their Spitfires and Hurricanes carried out air raids on British ports and cities. The Germans began night raids on large cities, especially London. The aerial fights between the R.A.F and Luftwaffe came to be known as 'dogfights'. Churchill's powerful speeches kept the morale of the people high and the British Air force caused severe damage to the Luftwaffe.

By November 1940 Operation Sea-Lion was indefinitely put off

The expansion of war

On September 27 1940, Germany, Italy and Japan signed a Tripartite Pact at Berlin, promising to give full support to each other in the event of an attack. The three Axis powers also agreed upon the leadership of Germany and Italy in the establishment of a new order in Europe and Japan's similar leadership in Asia. Some other countries like Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria also joined the pact.

Meanwhile, war had spread to other parts of Europe and Africa. Italy invaded Greece, but faced stiff resistance. However, German troops succeeded in capturing Greece, Yugoslavia and parts of North Africa. Italian and British forces clashed over several territories in Africa and this conflict was to continue for another two years.

Germany turns against Soviet Union

A new chapter opened in the war with Hitler's decision to invade Soviet Union. The Non-Aggression pact was forgotten and 'Operation Barbarossa' was launched on June 22 1941, without a formal declaration of war. The German army rapidly advanced

on three fronts—Leningrad, Moscow and Kiev—and the Soviet army taken by Surprise, fell back. The soviet appeal for help had positive results at this times and Britain and U.S.A. gave support.

Hitler had hoped to end the war before the onset of winter. By early October, Moscow was besieged. But, by then, Russian Winters set in. Within a month, temperatures dropped to -40 degrees C. Neither the German soldiers nor their equipment could stand up to the extreme cold. By December, the Russian counter-attack started and the German forces were driven back. The threat to Moscow was over. Operation Barbarossa had failed, but the Germans would accept total defeat only after suffering another Russian winter, and a heroic resistance from the Soviet Red Army.

A global war

Since the outbreak of war, U.S. had been sympathetic to Britain, allowing her to buy arms, first on a 'Cash and carry' basis and then on a 'Lend – lease' system. The latter deal was extended to the Soviet Union also in November 1941. However, U.S. was opposed to direct entry into the war.

However, on December 7, 1941, Japan launched a surprise attack on the American naval base at Pearl Harbor in Hawaii. This resulted in the destruction of the American Pacific Fleet and the death of over 2000 soldiers. On December 8, US declared war on Japan and, a few days later on Germany and Italy. The war had become truly global. After Pearl Harbor, the Japanese advanced rapidly in the Far East, capturing Thailand, Malaya, Singapore, Hong Kong, Philippines and Burma, by the middle of 1942. The fascist countries had reached the peak of their power.

The battle of Stalingrad

During the summer of 1942, Hitler's army continued its offensive in the Soviet Union. Hitler again hoped for victory but the advance of the German army was checked at Stalingrad. By November, the German armies were in an around Stalingrad, but they were encircled by the Soviet troops. All supplies to the German army cut off. The Russian winter again took its toll and by January 31, 1943, the German army had collapsed. Germany and their allies lost almost 250,000 men in the battle, which marked the turning point in the war. Soviet Union also suffered very heavy losses in terms of dead and wounded.

The beginning of the end

Meanwhile the war in North Africa had developed into a battle between the Western Eighth Army under General Montgomery and the German Afrika Korps under General Rommel, who had been sent by Hitler to help the Italian troops. In August 1942, Rommel began to move towards Egypt. The decisive battle was fought at El Alamein on the north coast of Egypt in October 1942, which led to Rommel's retreat.

By the summer of 1943, the Allies had taken over North Africa. In July, they invaded Sicily. Mussolini's government was overthrown and Italy surrendered unconditionally. The German troops immediately marched into northern Italy and rescued Mussolini, who set up his government under German protection. On the Eastern front, the Soviet Red Army forced Hitler's army to retreat along the route on which they had set out so confidently two and a half years before.

Most of the East European countries—Poland, Romania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary—were liberated. The fascists were also driven out of Greece, Yugoslavia and Albania. In June 1944, the Allies opened the Second Front in Western Europe. On June 6—D-Day—the first of the Allied troops landed on the beaches of Normandy in the North coast of France. The landings had been planned in total secrecy and they took the Germans by surprise. Commanded by General Eisenhower, they broke through the German line of defence and liberated Brussels, Paris and Luxemburg by September.

Surrender

By the fascist powers By the spring of 1945, the end of war was in sight. The allied troops had taken over many cities in Italy. In April, there was an uprising in Fascist occupied areas. On April 28, Mussolini was captured and executed, thus putting an end to fascism in Italy. The downfall of Germany was now certain. The Allied troops entered Germany from three directions – the south, the northwest and the east and as the Soviet army reached Berlin, Hitler committed suicide. On May 7, Germany surrendered unconditionally.

The fall of Japan

The war in Asia and the Pacific continued even after Germany's surrender. Despite American and British victories in the Pacific and the Far East, Japan still held out. On August 6, 1945, U.S. dropped the first atom bomb on the Japanese city of

Hiroshima. Fifty thousand people were killed and large parts of the city were leveled to the ground. Two days later, a second bomb destroyed the city of Nagasaki and forced Japan to surrender.

The Second world war came to an end. More than 50 countries had been involved in war. Another international organization – The United Nations Organization – was set up to maintain peace in the world. But the two super powers – U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. – would soon try to divide the world into two power blocs, creating a situation of Cold War.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

Franklin Delano Roosevelt (January 30, 1882 to April 12, 1945) was the 32nd American president. FDR, as he was often called, led the United States through the Great Depression and World War II, and greatly expanding the powers of the federal government through a series of programs and reforms known as the New Deal.

Stricken with polio in 1921, Roosevelt spent much of his adult life in a wheelchair. A whole generation of Americans grew up knowing no other president, as FDR served an unprecedented four terms in office. Roosevelt's social programs reinvented the role of government in Americans' lives, while his presidency during World War II established the United States' leadership on the world stage.

Fireside Chats

On March 12, 1933, just eight days after first taking office, Roosevelt initiated his first of more than 30 fireside chats. Broadcast live on the radio from the White House, the earnest and accessible speeches were a powerful tactic to rally American support around FDR's New Deal and World War II policies.

FDR and the New Deal

Within his first 100 days after taking office in March of 1933, Roosevelt called for a "New Deal" for Americans, proposing sweeping economic reforms to address the Great Depression.

The greatest crisis in American history since the Civil War, 13 million Americans were unemployed and hundreds of banks were closed. Roosevelt ordered the temporary closure on all banks to halt the run on deposits.

He formed a "Brain Trust" of economic advisers who designed the "alphabet agencies" such as the AAA (Agricultural Adjustment Administration), to support farm prices by reducing agricultural production through subsidies; the CCC (Civilian Conservation Corps), to employ young unmarried men to work refurbishing public lands and national parks; and the NRA (National Recovery Administration), which regulated wages and prices.

Other agencies insured bank deposits, regulated the stock market, subsidized mortgages and provided relief to the unemployed.

By 1936 the U.S. economy showed signs of improvement: Gross national product was up 34 percent, and unemployment had dropped from 25 percent to 14 percent. But Roosevelt faced criticism for increased government spending, unbalanced budgets and what some perceived as a move toward socialism.

During the mid-1930s, several New Deal acts were declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. Roosevelt retaliated by proposing to "pack" the court with justices more favorable to his reforms.

Many in Congress, including some Democrats, rejected the idea. By 1938, negative publicity, a continuing sluggish economy and Republican victories in midterm elections virtually ended Roosevelt's ability to pass more reform legislation.

Polio and Paralysis

In 1921 at the age of 39, Franklin D. Roosevelt was diagnosed with polio while vacationing at Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada. At first refusing to accept that he was permanently paralyzed, Roosevelt tried numerous therapies and even bought the Warm Springs resort in Georgia seeking a cure.

Despite his efforts, he never regained the use of his legs. He later established a foundation at Warm Springs to help others, and instituted the March of Dimes program that eventually funded an effective polio vaccine.

For a time, Roosevelt was resigned to being a victim of polio, believing his political career to be over. But his wife Eleanor and political confidante Louis Howe encouraged him to continue on. Over the next several years, Roosevelt worked to improve his physical and political image. He taught himself to walk short distances in his braces. And he was careful not to be seen in public using his wheelchair.

When and Where was FDR Born

Franklin Delano Roosevelt was born on January 30, 1882, in Hyde Park, New York.

Family, Early Life and Education

FDR was born into a wealthy family as the only child of James Roosevelt and Sara Ann Delano Roosevelt. The Roosevelts had been prominent for several generations, having made their fortune in real estate and trade, and lived at Springwood, their estate in the Hudson River Valley of New York State.

While growing up, Franklin D. Roosevelt was surrounded by privilege and a sense of self-importance. He was educated by tutors and governesses until age 14, and the entire household revolved around him, with his mother being the dominant figure in his life even into adulthood. His upbringing was so unlike the common people whom he would later champion.

In 1896, Roosevelt attended Groton School for boys, a prestigious Episcopal preparatory school in Massachusetts. The experience was a difficult one for him, as he did not fit in with the other students. Groton men excelled in athletics and Roosevelt did not. He strived to please the adults and took to heart the teachings of Groton's headmaster, Endicott Peabody, who urged students to help the less fortunate through public service.

After graduating from Groton in 1900, Roosevelt entered Harvard University, determined to make something of himself. Though only a "C" student, he was a member of the Alpha Delta Phi fraternity, editor of the Harvard Crimson newspaper and received his degree in only three years. However, the general consensus by his contemporaries was that he was underwhelming and average.

Roosevelt went on to study law at Columbia University Law School and passed the bar exam in 1907, though he didn't receive a degree. For the next three years, he practiced corporate law in New York, living the typical upper-class life. But he found law practice boring and restrictive. He set his sights on greater accomplishments.

Eleanor Roosevelt

Franklin D. Roosevelt married Eleanor Roosevelt, his fifth cousin and the niece of his distant relative and idol, Theodore Roosevelt, on March 17, 1905. The couple became engaged during Roosevelt's last year at Harvard.

In 1914, Roosevelt developed a relationship with Lucy Mercer, his wife's social secretary, which evolved into a love affair. When Eleanor discovered the affair, she gave Franklin an ultimatum in 1918 to stop seeing Lucy or she would file for divorce. He agreed but continued to secretly see Mercer over the years.

New York State Senate

In 1910, at age 28, Roosevelt was invited to run for the New York state senate. He ran as a Democrat in a district that had voted Republican for the past 32 years. Through hard campaigning and the help of his name, he won the seat in a Democratic landslide.

As a state senator, Roosevelt opposed elements of the Democratic political machine in New York. This won him the ire of party leaders but gained him national notoriety and valuable experience in political tactics and intrigue.

During this time, he formed an alliance with Louis Howe, who would shape his political career for the next 25 years. Roosevelt was re-elected to the state senate in 1912 and served as chair of the agricultural committee, passing farm and labor bills and social welfare programs.

During the 1912 National Democratic Convention, Roosevelt supported presidential candidate Woodrow Wilson and was rewarded with an appointment as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, the same job Theodore Roosevelt had used to catapult himself to the presidency.

Roosevelt was energetic and an efficient administrator. He specialized in business operations, working with Congress to get budgets approved and systems modernized, and he founded the U.S. Naval Reserve. But he was restless in the position as "second chair" to his boss, Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels, who was less enthusiastic about supporting a large and efficient naval force.

National Politics

In 1914, Roosevelt decided to run for the U.S. Senate seat for New York. The proposition was doomed from the start, as he lacked White House support. President

Wilson needed the Democratic political machine to get his social reforms passed and ensure his re-election.

He could not support Franklin Roosevelt, who had made too many political enemies among New York Democrats. Roosevelt was soundly defeated in the primary election and learned a valuable lesson that national stature could not defeat a well-organized local political organization.

Still, Roosevelt took to Washington politics and found his career thriving as he developed personal relationships. At the 1920 Democratic Convention he accepted the nomination for vice president, as James M. Cox's running mate. The pair was soundly defeated by Republican Warren G. Harding in the general election, but the experience gave Roosevelt national exposure.

Roosevelt repaired his relationship with New York's Democratic political machine. He appeared at the 1924 and 1928 Democratic National Conventions to nominate New York governor Al Smith for president, which increased his national exposure.

New York Governor

In 1928, outgoing New York governor Al Smith urged Franklin D. Roosevelt to run for his position. Roosevelt was narrowly elected, and the victory gave him confidence that his political star was rising. As governor, FDR believed in progressive government and instituted a number of new social programs.

FDR's Presidential Elections

Following the stock market crash of 1929, Republicans were being blamed for the Great Depression. Sensing opportunity, Roosevelt began his run for the presidency by calling for government intervention in the economy to provide relief, recovery and reform. His upbeat, positive approach and personal charm helped him defeat Republican incumbent Herbert Hoover in November, 1932.

When FDR ran for his second term in 1936, he was re-elected to office on November 3, 1936 in a landslide against Alfred M. "Alf" Landon, the governor of Kansas.

Early in 1940, Roosevelt had not publicly announced that he would run for an unprecedented third term as president. But privately, in the middle of World War II, with

Germany's victories in Europe and Japan's growing dominance in Asia, FDR felt that only he had the experience and skills to lead America in such trying times

At the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, Roosevelt swept aside all challengers and received the nomination. In November, 1940, he won the presidential election against Republican Wendell Willkie.

As the end of FDR's third term as president neared, the U.S. was deeply involved in war, and there was no question that he would run for a fourth term. Roosevelt selected Missouri Senator Harry S. Truman as his running mate, and together they defeated Republican candidate Thomas E. Dewey in the presidential election of 1944, carrying 36 of the 48 states.

Foreign Policy

In 1933 Franklin D. Roosevelt stepped away from the unilateral principle of the Monroe Doctrine and established the Good Neighbor Policy with Latin America. Since the end of World War I, America had held an isolationist policy in foreign affairs, and by the early 1930s, Congress passed the Neutrality Acts to prevent the United States from becoming entangled in foreign conflicts.

However, as military conflicts emerged in Asia and Europe, Roosevelt sought to assist China in its war with Japan and declared that France and Great Britain were America's "first line of defense" against Nazi Germany.

World War II

In 1940, Roosevelt began a series of measures to help defend France and Britain from Nazi aggression in World War II, including the Lend-Lease agreement, which Congress passed as the Lend-Lease Act in 1941.

During early 1941, with war raging in Europe, Franklin D. Roosevelt pushed to have the United States' factories become an "arsenal of democracy" for the Allies—France, Britain and Russia. As Americans learned more about the war's atrocities, isolationist sentiment diminished.

Roosevelt took advantage, standing firm against the Axis Powers of Germany, Italy and Japan. Bipartisan support in Congress expanded the Army and Navy and increased the flow of supplies to the Allies.

However, any hopes of keeping the United States out of war ended with the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941.

Japanese Internment

Within a few months after declaring war, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066, ordering all persons of Japanese descent to leave the West Coast. As a result, 120,000 people, many American citizens, were sent to internment camps located inland.

Oddly, no such order applied to Hawaii, where one-third of the population was of Japanese descent, nor to Americans of Italian or German ancestry living in the United States. Nearly all Japanese Americans along the West Coast were forced to quit their jobs and sell their property and businesses at a tremendous loss. Their entire social order was turned upside down as families were given just days to leave their homes and neighborhoods and be transported to the internment camps.

During World War II, Franklin Roosevelt was a commander in chief who worked with and sometimes around his military advisers. He helped develop a strategy for defeating Germany in Europe through a series of invasions, first in North Africa in November 1942, then Sicily and Italy in 1943, followed by the D-Day invasion of Europe in 1944. At the same time, Allied forces rolled back Japan in Asia and the eastern Pacific. During this time, Roosevelt promoted the formation of the United Nations.

In February, 1945, Franklin Roosevelt attended the Yalta Conference with British Prime Minister Winston Churchill and Soviet General Secretary Joseph Stalin to discuss postwar reorganization. He then returned to the United States and the sanctuary of Warm Springs, Georgia.

Death

On the afternoon of April 12, 1945, Franklin D. Roosevelt suffered a massive cerebral hemorrhage and died. The stress of World War II had taken its toll on his health, and in March, 1944, hospital tests indicated he had atherosclerosis, coronary artery disease and congestive heart failure.

By Roosevelt's side at his death were two cousins, Laura Delano and Margaret Suckley, and his former mistress Lucy Mercer Rutherford (by then a widow), with whom he had maintained his relationship.

Within hours of Roosevelt's passing, Vice President Harry S. Truman was summoned to the White House where he took the oath of office. FDR's sudden death shook the American public to its core. Though many had noticed that he looked exhausted in photographs and newsreels, no one seemed prepared for his passing.

USA becomes a World Power

The United States (US) established itself as a great power in the early 20th century. America's economic dynamism enabled it to become pivotal in both regional and world politics (Brzezinski, 1997: 4). The path was forged through continuous application of US's growing power; hard and soft alike. America shaped its regional milieu to best serve security and material ends. In the period studied (1898-1918) US foreign policy is characterised by interventionism and the use of military might to further America's vital interests: security and economic well-being. America also exerted other forms of power. Notably, US gained influence in international diplomacy, swaying global events. To elucidate US's rise to world-power status, we will focus on specific case-studies, assessing them with the help of the three levels of analysis.

We begin this essay analyzing American economic growth, its sources and its implications for US power and foreign policy. Economic power set the foundations of American power, facilitating leaders to pursue 'grand' policies. In this essay we examine how this immense wealth was transformed into great power. Enlightened Presidents and top decision-makers with their visions and strategies were crucial in this crusade to power. McKinley's shaping of America's milieu with its positive implications for security and trade were critical starting points. Moreover, Roosevelt's building of the Panama Canal, his effective defence strategy and his diplomatic achievements were also fundamental. The personal beliefs, values and ideologies of the ruling elite are considered when analyzing these policies. Mahan's geopolitical suggestions and their influence on policy-making were also decisive. Involvement in WWI established America in a prominent position among world powers. Wilson's sense of timing, effective planning and successful carrying-out of US participation in WWI propelled America to the top of the world order.

Economic Growth (1890-1920) and its Implications for America's Rise to Power

Economic expansion was crucial in US's rise to world-power status. It enabled its leadership to build a powerful nation. Primarily, it financed America's major defence, the navy. Moreover, through international trade and cooperation, US's values, beliefs and cultural influences were conveyed. Additionally, US's soft power was crucial in attracting immigrants. US's rising population provided a solid basis for further growth in agriculture and industry. The sources of American wealth, summarized in Kennedy, were largely linked to geology and geography. US territory was rich in minerals, oil and auspicious for agriculture. Commodities, industrial and agricultural produce, aided by railways reached efficiently America's domestic market or were traded internationally through, progressively more, US-supervised sea-routes. Kennedy concludes that America's unique geographical location offered a higher degree of security than European states.

Enlightened individuals from the economic sphere like Carnegie, Morgan, and Rockefeller were fundamental not only in accumulating huge wealth, but also for the technological innovation furthered by their firms. Importantly the politicoeconomic elites employed wisely their wealth. They invested in Research and Development, built top academic-technological institutions and continuously expanded their firms and Economies-of-Scale. Technological innovation ameliorated production methods, improved infrastructure and enhanced output quality and performance. US's up-and-coming capabilities facilitated decision-makers to undertake projects of significant political and commercial value. Notably, the Panama Canal was built despite the huge challenges-difficulties posed. US also drew international attention through leading innovators like Edison, Bell and the brothers Wright.

Our comparative analysis suggests that US gradually gained an impressive economic lead. In 1900 US concentrated 38% of world's wealth, 13% more than Britain. By 1914 US produced roughly equal coal as Britain and Germany together, its national income surpassed that of the next four economies combined and, in 1919, overtook Europe as the region possessing the larger economic output. Economic power paved-the-way for other forms of power: soft, latent and hard. Wise utilization of America's wealth and the strengths it conveyed, allowed US to assume a leading international role.

The Spanish-American-Cuban-Filipino War in 1898

“The immediate aim of the war was the eviction of the Spanish from Cuba; its long-term implication was catapulting the US into the first rank of world powers.”

In 1898 US declared war on Spain and crushed the waning Empire, destroying its fleet outside Santiago harbour in Cuba. Clear defence and strategic considerations lay behind the war with Spain. They were largely driven by security maximization and cost-benefit calculations. America was facing a winnable war which would bring gains in terms of influence, security and trade. Additionally, public opinion and Congress largely favoured intervention. The victory fortified US's advantageous grip on the Caribbean, building a naval base in Cuba and annexing Puerto Rico. Moreover, it extended US's influence into the Pacific through the annexation of the Philippines and Guam. It also conveyed a strong global message that the US will use military might to repel expansionary attempts in its regional milieu. Furthermore, it demonstrated the power and effectiveness of America's new navy which would deter opportunistic states and protect US interests across both oceans.

Washington's new strategic thinking was principally outcome of Mahan's naval strategy. Mahan emphasized the need for a powerful navy and the creation of “coaling stations” in strategic regions with significance in world trade. Mahan expected these to become areas of great power rivalry. Based on these, McKinley, his administration and especially Roosevelt believed that simultaneous attacks against the Spanish fleet were required in both the Philippines and Cuba. Kennan argues that Roosevelt long felt US ought to take the Philippines. The Philippines were seen as one of the most strategic points in East Asia and the Pacific. The islands of the Caribbean were also important in view of a proposed Trans-Isthmian Canal. These would maximize US's security and trade capabilities.

There was also an important symbolism in expelling Spain from the New World. Spain came first to the region and left last. Therefore, its expulsion signified the end of a circle of colonial rule in the American Continent. Henceforth America was the sole power centre in the Western Hemisphere. It was a regional strategy with the international message that US must be acknowledged as “world power”.

America – an Imperial Power with a Global Reach

Hay's "Splendid little war" was the easiest labour any nation ever endured in giving birth to an empire.

US fought a bloody three-year war to defeat the Filipino insurgents but secured a point of trading and geostrategic importance. Controlling the Philippines meant controlling a strategic gateway to China's market and a vital naval base in Subic Bay. It is also crucial to emphasize the instrumental role of US "imperialists", including Mahan, Roosevelt and Lodge. They found a champion in McKinley, whose religious convictions guided his policy of civilizing and Christianizing the Filipino's. Besides religious drives, parts of the press were also crucial in pushing for the war. Customarily wars left the warring parties with large debts. McKinley was instrumental however in planning how to cover as fully as possible the war expenses and escaping debt. McKinley importantly avoided practices that would have rendered US dependent, with negative repercussions on its economy.

Following the Teller Amendment, US established a protectorate in Cuba and built "Mahan's" base in Guantanamo. The naval and military victories were crucial in an additional way. They created enthusiasm in both public and Congress enabling McKinley to annex Hawaii as a necessary military and naval base en route to Manila and Shanghai. Also, Roosevelt deemed that the Philippines, located distantly, would be hard to defend. Therefore, newlyacquired Hawaii increased US's capacity to defend them. Guam had a similar function, linking Hawaii and the Philippines. In 1899 US divided Samoa with Germany, obtaining the island of Wake. An invisible line linked US-Cuba-Hawaii-WakeGuam-Philippines-China. Mahan's vision became reality in the Pacific; US commanded considerable influence in this most strategic region.

Hay and the "Open Door" Policy to China

State Secretary Hay originally expressed the "Open Door" policy. All great powers maintained physical and commercial presences in China. Hay proposed a fair, universal platform for trading relations based on free market principles. The policy was essential, highlighting the influence of American ideas in international diplomacy. Equally influential was Hay's message to respect the "territorial and administrative integrity of China". With his policies towards China, Hay achieved big diplomatic

successes without substantive backing of hard power. America helped prevent a possible disintegration of China, setting conditions for advantageous Sino American relations. Also vitally, Hay's policy founded the special relationship with the UK. Hay's experience as US's ambassador in London facilitated the diplomatic successes with Britain. Hay managed to change US's perception of Britain as its major enemy. He persuaded Roosevelt that Britain held America's worldview and had shared interests. Most crucially, Hay settled all border and territorial disputes with Britain setting the conditions for a long and stable alliance. US sealed a decisive coalition with the world's chief colonial power, with positive spillovers to its security and trade.

Roosevelt's Presidency and the Trans-Isthmian Canal

Roosevelt's main vision, also advocated by Mahan, was to build a Trans-Isthmian canal. In 1900 Hay negotiated a treaty with Britain allowing US to build a neutral and unfortified canal. Crucially, President Roosevelt refused to accept the treaty unless it allowed America to protect the canal with its navy. The second Hay- Pauncefote agreement granted this. The renegotiated treaty safeguarded US interests in the canal, protecting the investment and allowing it to exercise leverage on regional politics. By 1902 Senate concluded that the canal should be built in Panama . Colombian Senate's rejection of the US offered treaty in 1903, enabled Roosevelt to support and recognize Panama's independence. Roosevelt sent six US battleships, menacing and deterring Colombia from neutralizing Panama's revolt. Following Panama's secession, Hay signed a treaty with Bunau-Varilla granting US "titular sovereignty" over a ten-mile-wide strip.

The canal, completed in 1914, boosted trade, brought revenue from tolls, and reduced by two-thirds the distance from Puget-Sound to Cuba. Mahan emphasized that it supplied the navy with means of communication between the Atlantic and the Pacific. In parallel, it enabled the US to control more efficiently its dependencies and especially Philippines. Navy's competence doubled and the supply of raw materials greatly accelerated. The canal simultaneously augmented the navy-based US defence capabilities and encouraged-facilitated domestic and international trade. US's navy could respond to a two-ocean naval warfare more quickly and effectively than ever before. The canal proved significant in supplying US forces overseas in numerous crises. Once completed, America gained an unparalleled advantage in terms of naval balance of-power. Notably,

Britain withdrew its naval squadron from the West Indies in tacit recognition of the transfer of regional naval supremacy to the US. The Canal's importance radiated outward, making America particularly concerned with the stability of the regions around the canal, expanding US's sphere of influence

Theodore Roosevelt's Deterrence & Diplomacy: Advocate of War, President of Peace

"Immense armaments are onerous, but by the mutual respect and caution they enforce, they present a cheap alternative, certainly in misery, probably in money, to frequent devastating wars preceding the era of general military preparation."

Roosevelt frequently threatened, intimidated and used the word "war". However, he generally refrained from actually implementing these threats. His 1901 annual speech cautioned North Americans and Europeans alike. Nevertheless, he privately hoped that both sides would restrain themselves. This divergence between his public and private statements may explain his (deterrence) strategy. Mahan's above quote contains elements of such a strategy: building a robust army is an effective and socio-economically beneficial way to avoid war. We would argue that Roosevelt's "corollary" to the Monroe Doctrine (1904) was more part of this strategy than a desire to wage conflicts. Roosevelt used "extended executive powers" to swiftly pursue preventive rather than aggressive strategies. The "corollary" was essentially an expansion of US's sphere of influence; US would intervene, if needed, "as a policeman" to protect the interests of American Nations.

The following instances underline Roosevelt's strategy. In 1902 Roosevelt sent armed forces to Alaska saying he was ready to fight Canada over a border dispute. Without any shots fired, using diplomacy, he won a settling in America's favour. Moreover, prevention worked in Colombia, winning Panama's independence without American casualties. In the Dominican Republic Roosevelt used his "corollary" to achieve two ends. Firstly, to protect and expand US commercial interests in the country and the region. Secondly, to pacify the Dominican civil war while obstructing potential foreign interventions. This benefited America's economy and demonstrated the credibility and determination of its leadership. US would serve as a gendarme and tax collector in the region. Roosevelt sought an end to foreign interventions like the German in Nicaragua in 1902 (op. cit). Essentially, he declared a US's "mare nostrum", extending

its sphere of influence, security and economic wellbeing. In all above mentioned cases, armed forces mainly accompanied diplomatic political efforts. The Dominican example was an effort to pre-empt unwelcome interventions, while promoting and safeguarding US interests.

In parallel, Roosevelt kept building-up the navy. In 1907, following a war scare with Japan, he sent the new-fangled navy to an around-the-world voyage. Twenty-two firstclass battleships cruised longer than any navy before. This had two important dimensions. It highlighted US's military reach, emphasizing to Japan and Europe its capacity to defend its interests. This would also contribute in averting hostilities with Japan. Secondly, as Dalton points out, the cruise enabled Roosevelt to build congressional support for increased naval spending. Consequently, in 1920, the American navy matched the British.

In 1915 Roosevelt advocated preparedness; once prepared for war, US would actually keep conflict away. President Wilson pursued this line in the navy but not in the marines. US power deterred both Japan and European powers from challenging it militarily. All above mentioned incidents could be characterised as part of a rather successful deterrence strategy. This approach reinforced US's power, furthered American interests, sealed diplomatic victories and averted conflicts. With few exceptions, including the inherited Filipino and Cuban crises, "Hamiltonian" Roosevelt, arguably, refrained from war with positive spillages to US economic growth.

The US as a 'Force for Good' or Early Attempts for a Leading American Role in International Diplomacy

US importance in international diplomacy also mounted under Roosevelt. Roosevelt believed fervently in America's mission; that America's influence must rise to benefit all those benighted people who weren't born in America. This was connected to his broader "Progressivism principles": social-Darwinism, moralism and nationalism. It was America's moral duty to be a force for good in the world and its responsibility to ensure international order. The President dynamically demonstrated America's diplomatic capacity when he successfully mediated the Russian-Japanese war in 1905. McDougall stresses its importance in elevating American influence and brokering balance-of-power. The 1905 success was confirmed in the following year, when

Germany invited Roosevelt's mediation over the Moroccan crisis. The Algeiras Conference attracted international attention, enhancing US-Roosevelt's role as peace-broker. This peace-mediation was more collective, promoting international cooperation. Interstate cooperation strengthens ties and promotes peace; in this instance it prevented a Franco-German war. Arguably, US had not only a say but also a sway in global issues. Roosevelt's mediation achieved both of its aims: maintain the French-British alliance and contain Germany. Roosevelt also pushed for the Second Hague Conference, encouraging amity and the settlement of European disputes. US engagement was crucial as America participated in global decision-making, sharing its distinct intellectual-diplomatic capital with another 43 nations and leading efforts for international prosperity. Roosevelt's Presidency enforced, furthered and, through deterrence, prevention and effective diplomacy, set the conditions for peaceful expansion of US's power.

Wilson, WWI and US at the top of the World

“The ideological offensive led by President Wilson during WWI was the defining moment for the US in the twentieth century.”

Wilsonianism delayed US's entrance in WWI. For three-years Wilson tried to negotiate a “peace without victory”. Wilson and the majority in Congress and Senate did not want physical engagement in WWI. He advocated a “just peace”, but the Allies saw no alternative to total victory. An important trigger was the Zimmerman telegram. Wilson's ethics and morality were shaken by Germany's tactics. The realization that his vision of “peace without victory” and the establishment of a League of Nations are not possible with “militaristic and antidemocratic” Germany led Wilson to support intervention. In April 1917, US declared war on Germany.

The US entered WWI primarily because Germany resumed unrestricted submarine warfare which harmed American interests. Economic and emotional ties to the Allies made the continuation of trade with Britain and France imperative. Opposition, led by the nationalists pressed for intervention. Moreover, economic lobbies, mainly banks supporting Britain with huge loans, had a stake in Allied victory. For Wilson, WWI was the bitter part of a long-run peacekeeping effort. Victory would signify the end of all wars, make world safe for democracy, and establish solid foundations for his League of Nations. Diplomacy would become the only means of conflict resolution. Wilson also

believed that the war was in its final stages and that America's participation would lead to a swifter end.

Victory in WWI solidified and exemplified US's rise to global power status. America was established as a Great Power. The fact that American resources crucially allowed the allies to prevail gave America enormous influence in European and global affairs. Critically, America was one of the "Big Four" in the Paris Peace Treaties, deciding concurrently the future of Europe and of the rest of the world. The weakening of Germany and Britain accelerated US's rise to the top of the world order. It increased America's economic pre-eminence and security. The exhaustion of Germany, Britain and France led to a comparative increase in US's economic and military reach. The post-war balance-of-power was also auspicious for America. It prevented Germany from becoming Europe's hegemon and protected America's allies. Concluding, the waning of the other great powers increased US's security and dominance in the Western Hemisphere, making it unthinkable for any European power to challenge this.

Cold war

What is Cold War?

As the World War II drew to its end, the harmony that had existed between the USSR and the USA and the British empire began to evaporate and the old suspicions came to fore again. Relations between Soviet Russia and the west soon became so difficult that although no actual armed conflict took place directly between the two opposing camps, the decade after 1945 saw the first phase of Cold War which continued, inspite of several 'Thaws' into the 1980s. Cold war meant that instead of allowing their mutual hostility to manifest in armed conflict, the two sides attacked each other with propaganda and economic measures and with a general policy of non-cooperation.

A state of military and political tension between the Western Bloc comprising of the USA, its NATO allies and some others and the powers in the Eastern Bloc comprising of the Soviet Union along with its allies from the Warsaw Pact post World War II is known as the Cold War. The term "cold" signifies absence of fighting on a large-scale directly between the two opponents despite major regional wars, termed proxy wars, supported by both the sides. The USSR and the USA were left as two superpowers with

political and economic differences as a result of the Cold War that split the temporary wartime alliance against the Nazi Germany.

The Cold War that took place between the Soviet Union and the United States lasted for decades. The Cold War was at its peak in the period of 1948–53. The Cold War tensions relaxed somewhat between 1953 to 1957. The Warsaw Pact, which was a unified military organisation, was formed in the year 1955. Then in the period of 1958-1962, again cold war became intense. Intercontinental ballistic missiles were being made by the Soviet Union as well as the United States. The Soviets began installing their missiles in Cuba secretly and these could be used to launch nuclear attacks on the cities of U.S. Throughout the entire cold war duration, the Soviet Union and the United States avoided direct Military confrontation in Europe.

Causes of Cold War

The most important reason for the ‘outbreak’ of the Cold War was the Western countries’ fear of communism.

- Increase in the might of the Soviet Union, emergence of governments ruled by communist parties in Eastern and Central Europe and the growing strength of communist parties in many parts of the world, alarmed the governments of the United States, Britain and other West European countries.
- In 1949, the victory of the Communist Party of China in the civil war which had been raging there for about two decades added to the alarm.
- United States openly declared that her policy was to prevent the spread of communism.
- One of the objectives of the massive economic aid that the United States gave to West European countries was also to ‘contain’ communism.
- United States began to look upon every development in the world from this standpoint, whether it promoted or helped in checking communism.
- Britain and West European countries became aligned with the United States and began to follow a policy mainly aimed at curbing the growth of communism.

Potsdam conference

The Potsdam conference was held at Berlin in 1945 among US, UK and Soviet Union to discuss:

- Immediate administration of defeated Germany.
- Demarcation of boundary of Poland.
- Occupation of Austria.
- Role of the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe.
- Soviet Union wanted some portion of Poland (bordering Soviet Union) to be maintained as a buffer zone. However, the USA and UK didn't agree to this demand.
- Also, the USA did not inform the Soviet Union about the exact nature of the atomic bomb, dropped on Japan. This created suspicion in Soviet Union about the intentions of western countries, embittering of the alliance.
- This created suspicion in the Soviet leadership.

Truman's Doctrine

- Truman Doctrine was announced on March 12, 1947, by US President Harry S. Truman.
- The Truman Doctrine was a US policy to stop the Soviet Union's communist and imperialist endeavors, through various ways like providing economic aid to other countries.
- For example, US appropriated financial aid to support the economies and militaries of Greece and Turkey.
- Historians believe that the announcement of this doctrine marked the official declaration of the Cold War.

Iron Curtain

- Iron Curtain is the political, military, and ideological barrier erected by the Soviet Union after World War II to seal off itself and its dependent eastern and central European allies from open contact with the West and other noncommunist areas.
- On the east side of the Iron Curtain were the countries that were connected to or influenced by the Soviet Union, while on the west side were the countries that were allies of the US, UK or nominally neutral.

Important Events of the Cold

War Berlin Blockade 1948

- As the tension between Soviet Union and Allied countries grew, Soviet Union applied Berlin Blockade in 1948.
- The Berlin Blockade was an attempt by the Soviet Union to limit the ability of Allied countries to travel to their sectors of Berlin.
- Further, on August 13, 1961, the Communist government of the German Democratic Republic began to build a barbed wire and concrete wall (Berlin Wall) between East and West Berlin.
- It primarily served the objective of stemming mass emigration from East Berlin to West Berlin.
- Except under special circumstances, travelers from East and West Berlin were rarely allowed across the border.
- This Berlin Wall served as a symbol of the Cold War (US and Soviet Union), until its fall in 1989.

The Marshall Plan vs The Cominform

The Marshall Plan

- In 1947, American Secretary of State George Marshall, unveiled European Recovery Programme (ERP), which offered economic and financial help wherever it was needed.
- One of the aims of the ERP was to promote the economic recovery of Europe. However, this was an economic extension of the Truman Doctrine.

The Cominform

- The Soviet Union denounced the whole idea of Marshall Plan as 'dollar imperialism.
- Therefore, the Cominform (the Communist Information Bureau) - was launched in 1947, as the Soviet response to the Marshall Plan.
- It was an organization to draw together mainly Eastern Europe countries.

NATO vs Warsaw Pact

NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization)

- The Berlin blockade showed the West's military unreadiness and frightened them into making definite preparations.
- Therefore, in 1948, mainly the countries of western Europe signed the Brussels Defence Treaty, promising military collaboration in case of war.
- Later on Brussels Defence Treaty was joined by the USA, Canada, Portugal, Denmark, Iceland, Italy and Norway. This led to the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in April 1949.
- NATO countries agreed to regard an attack on any one of them as an attack on all of them, and placing their defence forces under a joint command.

Warsaw Pact

- The Warsaw Pact (1955) was signed between Russia and her satellite states shortly after West Germany was admitted to NATO.
- The Pact was a mutual defense agreement, which the Western countries perceived as a reaction against West Germany's membership of NATO.

Space Race

- Space exploration served as another dramatic arena for Cold War competition.
- In 1957, Soviet Union launched Sputnik I, the world's first artificial satellite and the first man-made object to be placed into the Earth's orbit.
- In 1958, the U.S. launched its own satellite called Explorer I.
- However, this space race was won by the US, when it successfully landed, the first man (Neil Armstrong) on the surface of the moon in 1969.

Cuban Missile Crisis

The USSR deployed nuclear missiles in Cuba which were ready to be launched onto the cities of the USA. The USA responded with a naval blockade of Cuba and both superpowers are on the verge of war. The standoff ended after 13 days when the USSR withdrew the missiles.

Vietnam War (1960s – 1975)

- In 1965, US sent troops to aid south Vietnam in its war against communist north Vietnam, which was supported by Soviets & Chinese.

- By the time US troops left in 1973, 58k Americans had died. War ended in 1975 with communist forces overrunning the south.

Prague spring 1968

- Leaders of Czechoslovakia's communist party attempted to institute reforms including loosening control over media & introducing multiparty democracy.
- Soviet troops invaded & the reforms were halted.

Afghan invasion 1979

- Soviet troops invaded Afghanistan in support of marxist government, which was battling insurgents known as mujaheddin (aided by US & Pakistan).
- After 10 years of wars soviet troops retreated in 1989.

End of the Cold War

The afghan invasion resulted in the drain of economic and military resources of USSR and added with the open policy of Mikhail Gorbachev marked by two characteristics i.e. Glasnost (openness) and Perestroika (restructuring), the USSR tottered to its disintegration. Finally, in 1991, Soviet Union collapsed due to multiple factors which marked the end of the Cold War, as one of the superpowers was weakened. The end of the Cold War marked the victory of the US and the bipolar world order turned into a unipolar.

The Truman Doctrine, 1947

With the Truman Doctrine, President Harry S. Truman established that the United States would provide political, military and economic assistance to all democratic nations under threat from external or internal authoritarian forces. The Truman Doctrine effectively reoriented U.S. foreign policy, away from its usual stance of withdrawal from regional conflicts not directly involving the United States, to one of possible intervention in far away conflicts.

The Truman Doctrine arose from a speech delivered by President Truman before a joint session of Congress on March 12, 1947. The immediate cause for the speech was a recent announcement by the British Government that, as of March 31, it would no longer provide military and economic assistance to the Greek Government in its civil war against the Greek Communist Party. Truman asked Congress to support the Greek

Government against the Communists. He also asked Congress to provide assistance for Turkey, since that nation, too, had previously been dependent on British aid.

At the time, the U.S. Government believed that the Soviet Union supported the Greek Communist war effort and worried that if the Communists prevailed in the Greek civil war, the Soviets would ultimately influence Greek policy. In fact, Soviet leader Joseph Stalin had deliberately refrained from providing any support to the Greek Communists and had forced Yugoslav Prime Minister Josip Tito to follow suit, much to the detriment of Soviet-Yugoslav relations. However, a number of other foreign policy problems also influenced President Truman's decision to actively aid Greece and Turkey. In 1946, four setbacks, in particular, had served to effectively torpedo any chance of achieving a durable post-war rapprochement with the Soviet Union: the Soviets' failure to withdraw their troops from northern Iran in early 1946 (as per the terms of the Tehran Declaration of 1943); Soviet attempts to pressure the Iranian Government into granting them oil concessions while supposedly fomenting irredentism by Azerbaijani separatists in northern Iran; Soviet efforts to force the Turkish Government into granting them base and transit rights through the Turkish Straits; and, the Soviet Government's rejection of the Baruch plan for international control over nuclear energy and weapons in June 1946. In light of the deteriorating relationship with the Soviet Union and the appearance of Soviet meddling in Greek and Turkish affairs, the withdrawal of British assistance to Greece provided the necessary catalyst for the Truman Administration to reorient American foreign policy. Accordingly, in his speech, President Truman requested that Congress provide \$400,000,000 worth of aid to both the Greek and Turkish Governments and support the dispatch of American civilian and military personnel and equipment to the region.

Truman justified his request on two grounds. He argued that a Communist victory in the Greek Civil War would endanger the political stability of Turkey, which would undermine the political stability of the Middle East. This could not be allowed in light of the region's immense strategic importance to U.S. national security. Truman also argued that the United States was compelled to assist "free peoples" in their struggles against "totalitarian regimes," because the spread of authoritarianism would "undermine the foundations of international peace and hence the security of the United States." In the

words of the Truman Doctrine, it became “the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.”

Truman argued that the United States could no longer stand by and allow the forcible expansion of Soviet totalitarianism into free, independent nations, because American national security now depended upon more than just the physical security of American territory. Rather, in a sharp break with its traditional avoidance of extensive foreign commitments beyond the Western Hemisphere during peacetime, the Truman Doctrine committed the United States to actively offering assistance to preserve the political integrity of democratic nations when such an offer was deemed to be in the best interest of the United States.

Eisenhower

Good evening, my fellow Americans: First, I should like to express my gratitude to the radio and television networks for the opportunity they have given me over the years to bring reports and messages to our nation. My special thanks go to them for the opportunity of addressing you this evening.

Three days from now, after a half century of service of our country, I shall lay down the responsibilities of office as, in traditional and solemn ceremony, the authority of the Presidency is vested in my successor.

This evening I come to you with a message of leave-taking and farewell, and to share a few final thoughts with you, my countrymen.

Like every other citizen, I wish the new President, and all who will labor with him, Godspeed. I pray that the coming years will be blessed with peace and prosperity for all.

Our people expect their President and the Congress to find essential agreement on questions of great moment, the wise resolution of which will better shape the future of the nation.

My own relations with Congress, which began on a remote and tenuous basis when, long ago, a member of the Senate appointed me to West Point, have since ranged to the intimate during the war and immediate post-war period, and finally to the mutually interdependent during these past eight years.

In this final relationship, the Congress and the Administration have, on most vital issues, cooperated well, to serve the nation well rather than mere partisanship, and so have assured that the business of the nation should go forward. So my official relationship with Congress ends in a feeling on my part, of gratitude that we have been able to do so much together.

We now stand ten years past the midpoint of a century that has witnessed four major wars among great nations. Three of these involved our own country. Despite these holocausts America is today the strongest, the most influential and most productive nation in the world. Understandably proud of this pre-eminence, we yet realize that America's leadership and prestige depend, not merely upon our unmatched material progress, riches and military strength, but on how we use our power in the interests of world peace and human betterment.

Throughout America's adventure in free government, such basic purposes have been to keep the peace; to foster progress in human achievement, and to enhance liberty, dignity and integrity among peoples and among nations.

To strive for less would be unworthy of a free and religious people.

Any failure traceable to arrogance or our lack of comprehension or readiness to sacrifice would inflict upon us a grievous hurt, both at home and abroad.

Progress toward these noble goals is persistently threatened by the conflict now engulfing the world. It commands our whole attention, absorbs our very beings. We face a hostile ideology global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose, and insidious in method. Unhappily the danger it poses promises to be of indefinite duration. To meet it successfully, there is called for, not so much the emotional and transitory sacrifices of crisis, but rather those which enable us to carry forward steadily, surely, and without complaint the burdens of a prolonged and complex struggle – with liberty the stake. Only thus shall we remain, despite every provocation, on our charted course toward permanent peace and human betterment.

Crises there will continue to be. In meeting them, whether foreign or domestic, great or small, there is a recurring temptation to feel that some spectacular and costly action could become the miraculous solution to all current difficulties. A huge increase in the newer elements of our defenses; development of unrealistic programs to cure every ill

in agriculture; a dramatic expansion in basic and applied research – these and many other possibilities, each possibly promising in itself, may be suggested as the only way to the road we wish to travel.

But each proposal must be weighed in light of a broader consideration; the need to maintain balance in and among national programs – balance between the private and the public economy, balance between the cost and hoped for advantages – balance between the clearly necessary and the comfortably desirable; balance between our essential requirements as a nation and the duties imposed by the nation upon the individual; balance between the actions of the moment and the national welfare of the future. Good judgment seeks balance and progress; lack of it eventually finds imbalance and frustration.

The record of many decades stands as proof that our people and their Government have, in the main, understood these truths and have responded to them well in the face of threat and stress.

But threats, new in kind or degree, constantly arise.

Of these, I mention two only.

A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction.

Our military organization today bears little relation to that known by any of my predecessors in peacetime, or indeed by the fighting men of World War II or Korea.

Until the latest of our world conflicts, the United States had no armaments industry. American makers of plowshares could, with time and as required, make swords as well. But now we can no longer risk emergency improvisation of national defense; we have been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions. Added to this, three and a half million men and women are directly engaged in the defense establishment. We annually spend on military security more than the net income of all United States corporations.

This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence – economic, political, even spiritual – is felt in every city, every Statehouse, every office of the Federal government.

We recognize the imperative need for this development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society.

In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together.

Akin to, and largely responsible for the sweeping changes in our industrial-military posture, has been the technological revolution during recent decades.

In this revolution, research has become central, it also becomes more formalized, complex, and costly. A steadily increasing share is conducted for, by, or at the direction of, the Federal government.

Today, the solitary inventor, tinkering in his shop, has been overshadowed by task forces of scientists in laboratories and testing fields. In the same fashion, the free university, historically the fountainhead of free ideas and scientific discovery, has experienced a revolution in the conduct of research. Partly because of the huge costs involved, a government contract becomes virtually a substitute for intellectual curiosity. For every old blackboard there are now hundreds of new electronic computers.

The prospect of domination of the nation's scholars by Federal employment, project allocations, and the power of money is ever present – and is gravely to be regarded.

Yet, in holding scientific research and discovery in respect, as we should, we must also be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite.

It is the task of statesmanship to mold, to balance, and to integrate these and other forces, new and old, within the principles of our democratic system – ever aiming toward the supreme goals of our free society.

Another factor in maintaining balance involves the element of time. As we peer into society's future, we – you and I, and our government – must avoid the impulse to live only for today, plundering for, for our own ease and convenience, the precious resources of tomorrow. We cannot mortgage the material assets of our grandchildren without asking the loss also of their political and spiritual heritage. We want democracy to survive for all generations to come, not to become the insolvent phantom of tomorrow.

Down the long lane of the history yet to be written America knows that this world of ours, ever growing smaller, must avoid becoming a community of dreadful fear and hate, and be, instead, a proud confederation of mutual trust and respect.

Such a confederation must be one of equals. The weakest must come to the conference table with the same confidence as do we, protected as we are by our moral, economic, and military strength. That table, though scarred by many past frustrations, cannot be abandoned for the certain agony of the battlefield.

Disarmament, with mutual honor and confidence, is a continuing imperative. Together we must learn how to compose differences, not with arms, but with intellect and decent purpose. Because this need is so sharp and apparent I confess that I lay down my official responsibilities in this field with a definite sense of disappointment. As one who has witnessed the horror and the lingering sadness of war – as one who knows that another war could utterly destroy this civilization which has been so slowly and painfully built over thousands of years – I wish I could say tonight that a lasting peace is in sight.

Happily, I can say that war has been avoided. Steady progress toward our ultimate goal has been made. But, so much remains to be done. As a private citizen, I shall never cease to do what little I can to help the world advance along that road.

So – in this my last good night to you as your President – I thank you for the many opportunities you have given me for public service in war and peace. I trust that in that service you find some things worthy; as for the rest of it, I know you will find ways to improve performance in the future

You and I – my fellow citizens – need to be strong in our faith that all nations, under God, will reach the goal of peace with justice. May we be ever unswerving in devotion to principle, confident but humble with power, diligent in pursuit of the Nations' great goals.

To all the peoples of the world, I once more give expression to America's prayerful and continuing aspiration:

We pray that peoples of all faiths, all races, all nations, may have their great human needs satisfied; that those now denied opportunity shall come to enjoy it to the full; that all who yearn for freedom may experience its spiritual blessings; that those who have freedom will understand, also, its heavy responsibilities; that all who are insensitive to the needs of others will learn charity; that the scourges of poverty, disease and ignorance will be made to disappear from the earth, and that, in the goodness of time, all peoples will come to live together in a peace guaranteed by the binding force of mutual respect and love.

Now, on Friday noon, I am to become a private citizen. I am proud to do so. I look forward to it.

John F. Kennedy's Birthplace

John F. Kennedy was born in a modest home in Brookline, Massachusetts, where his father, Joseph Kennedy, sought to create a family environment that reflected their growing success as Irish Americans. The neighborhood was filled with families seeking upward mobility and was close to public transportation, churches, and schools.

Joseph and Rose Kennedy's Aspirations

Joseph and Rose Kennedy purchased their home amidst aspirations shaped by the trends of the early 20th century. The area, once filled with wealth, had seen its construction stop due to economic downturns, but still attracted families like the Kennedys looking to improve their social status.

Irish Immigration and Struggles

Patrick Kennedy, John F. Kennedy's ancestor, left Ireland during the Great Famine to seek a better life in America. The famine devastated the Irish population, and Patrick, one of many who emigrated, arrived in Boston to face numerous challenges. The harsh conditions that Irish immigrants encountered, including poverty, disease, and prejudice, underscored their struggles as they adapted to life in a new country.

Life in Boston: Hardships and Triumphs

The experience of the Irish in Boston was fraught with hardship, illustrated by high mortality rates among Irish men due to harsh living conditions and demanding work

hours. Patrick Kennedy's early death left a legacy of resilience among the surviving family members, particularly his wife, Bridget, who became a single mother managing the household.

Rise of P. J. Kennedy

P. J. Kennedy, Patrick's son, navigated his way through the challenges of immigrant life, building a saloon business that afforded him local prominence and political influence within the Irish community. His success signified a shift as Irish families began to carve out a niche in local politics and P. J. Kennedy married Mary Augusta Hickey, and together they established a family that thrived both socially and politically. Their son, Joseph Patrick Kennedy, became the focus of their ambitions. Mary Augusta intended for him to rise above the limitations faced by previous generations of Irish Americans.

Joseph Kennedy's Education and Early Life

Joseph Kennedy's educational journey led him to Boston Latin and Harvard University, where he confronted social barriers despite his family's growing stature. The early years saw him striving for acceptance among Boston's elite, marked by his charm and determination, albeit mixed academic success.

Love Story: Joseph and Rose Fitzgerald

Joseph Kennedy's longstanding affection for Rose Fitzgerald, daughter of Boston's charismatic mayor, showed the intertwining of two prominent Irish families. Their relationship blossomed despite opposition from Mayor Fitzgerald, leading to their marriage amidst political and societal changes, including the onset of World War I.

The Launch of a Legacy

With the marriage of Joseph and Rose, the foundations of a prominent Kennedy legacy were laid, with the birth of their first son, Joseph Patrick Kennedy Jr., soon followed by John Fitzgerald Kennedy, setting the stage for future generations that would significantly impact American history.

Overview of FDR's Death and World War II

Context

In April 1945, Jack Kennedy received news of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's death due to a cerebral hemorrhage. Despite Roosevelt's declining health, he had won a

fourth term underestimating his ailments' impact. By this time, the Allies had made significant military advances in Europe, including the successful D-Day invasion and subsequent push into Germany, though heavy casualties occurred during the Battle of the Bulge.

Yalta Conference Outcomes

At the Yalta Conference in February 1945, Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill met to discuss post-war arrangements, resulting in concessions to Stalin regarding Eastern Europe and the promise of Soviet support against Japan. Critics later derided this agreement as a betrayal of Eastern Europe, but it was rooted in the military realities of the time.

Reactions to FDR's Legacy

Following Roosevelt's death in April 1945, he was remembered as a transformative leader whose policies reshaped American life and foreign affairs. His New Deal established federal government roles in economic life. Though some criticized his wartime decisions and civil rights failures, he was seen as a steadfast leader through the Depression and the war.

Jack Kennedy's Journalism Start

Following the war, Joseph P. Kennedy hoped Jack would rise to prominence, prompting Jack's assignment to cover the UN conference in San Francisco. His reports demonstrated realism about global politics, emphasizing the divide between the Soviet Union and Western powers, foreshadowing future Cold War dynamics.

Social Interactions and Political Observations

During his time in San Francisco, Kennedy engaged socially with various influential figures and began developing his political persona. His articles reflected a deep interest in international relations and an awareness of the changing political landscape, especially regarding the growing socialist sentiments in post-war Europe.

International Engagements Post-UN Conference

After the UN gathering, Kennedy traveled to Europe to observe the British elections, predicting Labour's success due to widespread public dissatisfaction with the Conservatives. This journey increased his political understanding, shaping his view that

politics was the most honorable path for his future, distinguishing him from his father's more isolationist perspectives.

Personal Growth and Political Aspirations

In his diaries, Kennedy expressed an evolving disillusionment with war and a desire to contribute to global peace efforts. His trip to Europe, particularly experiences in war-torn Germany, highlighted the need for effective governance in a newly emerging world order. Following the end of WWII with the atomic bombings in August 1945, he recognized the profound impact of nuclear technology on international relations and the necessity for political action in navigating this new landscape.

The Political Context of JFK's

Rise - John F. Kennedy's political ascent coincided with the start of the Cold War and an unprecedented anti-Communist movement in the U.S., impacting political discourse and diminishing opposing views within the Democratic Party. - The 1946 midterm elections marked a crucial shift as Republicans accused Democrats of being "soft on Communism," resulting in government loyalty programs leading to job losses and resignations among federal employees.

Republican Strategy and the Cold War

Republicans became adept at exploiting anti-Communist sentiments, drawing a divide between internationalist and isolationist factions within their ranks. - The Republican response to overseas events, like the Soviet atomic bomb and China's fall to Communism, further fed the need to portray Democrats as weak in foreign policy.

The Hiss Case and McCarthyism

The Alger Hiss case became a catalyst for McCarthyism, as accusations of communism gained traction, particularly through the efforts of Senator Joe McCarthy. - McCarthy's infamous "205 Communists in the State Department" speech marked the peak of his influence, despite lacking evidence for his claims.

Kennedy's Relationship with McCarthy and Political Ambitions

JFK initially viewed McCarthy favorably and shared some concerns regarding the Democratic administration's foreign policy. - He began developing his political platform, criticizing Truman and Acheson while contemplating a run for higher office

Kennedy's Observations and the Shift in Foreign Policy Views

Kennedy's travels, including a significant tour in Europe and Asia, broadened his understanding of global politics and the necessity for the U.S. to engage more meaningfully with emerging nations. - His impressions from meetings with international leaders emphasized that military solutions alone would not suffice in combating Communism, advocating instead for addressing local aspirations and inequalities.

Navigating Political Dynamics

The growing tensions of the Cold War and McCarthyism created a complex political landscape for Kennedy as he prepared for potential statewide office. - Balancing his criticisms of the Truman administration while acknowledging the realities of McCarthy's popularity presented challenges for Kennedy's future political ambitions.

Navy service

An unpopular John F. Kennedy facts include his service at the naval forces. Shortly after graduating from Harvard, he joined the US Navy. During his term, he was assigned to command a patrol torpedo boat in the South Pacific. During this, he faced life-threatening attacks from Japanese troops; the boat under his command, PT-109, was attacked on August 2, 1943. This led to two casualties, and 2 injuries one of them was JFK. he led the survivors to a nearby island, where they were rescued six days later. He was awarded the Navy and Marine Corps Medal for "extremely heroic conduct" and a Purple Heart for the injuries he suffered. Upon discharge from the Navy, he worked briefly as a newspaper editor for Hearst newspaper.

Congressional career (1947 to 1960)

House of Representatives (1947–1953)

As stated in many John F. Kennedy biography books he served at both the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate. The congressional period was from 1947 to 1960. In 1946, Kennedy won the Democratic primary with 42 per cent of the vote, in the House of Representatives. The main agenda of his campaign included better housing for veterans, better health care for all, and support for organized labour's campaign for reasonable work hours, a healthy workplace, and the right to organize, bargain, and strike. He also campaigned for peace in the United Nations and was in strong opposition to the Soviet Union. Although Democrats lost the vote in the 1946 elections, JFK won his

seat by a majority of 72 per cent votes. He served the House of Representatives for six years, he was among the members of Education and Labor Committee and the Veterans' Affairs Committee. He was a supporter of the Truman Doctrine during the emergence of the cold war. He publicly supported the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, he opposed the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, which restricted the power of labour unions.

Senate (1953–1960)

He served the senate from 1953 to 1960. Kennedy defeated Lodge by 70,000 votes for the Senate seat in the elections of 1952. During his time at the senate, he published the book for which he won the Pulitzer Prize. The book was named Profiles in Courage and was published in 1956. The book mentioned the courageous but unpopular contribution of the senate members who risked their careers for their personal beliefs.

The main focus during his term as a senate member was on eradicating Massachusetts-specific issues by sponsoring bills to help the fishing, textile manufacturing, and watchmaking industries. Kennedy also played an important role in the Civil Rights Act of 1957. He was re-elected for his term at the senate for the second time. He completed his term in 1960.

Presidency

He was elected as the 35th president of the United Nations, he was a democratic candidate. He won the election on January 20, 1961. He was the second next youngest president in the history of presidents in the United States of America next to Theodore Roosevelt. The major issue that he faced during his short tenure of the presidency was foreign affairs. One of the major historical events in the presidency was the failure to overthrow the Cuban leftist government. The project was called Bay of Pigs Invasion. The Cuban missile crisis was also among the major international nuclear crises of the world.

The main achievement of the presidency was the establishment of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty with Great Britain and the Soviet Union, helping to ease Cold War tensions. One of the major reforms that Kennedy initiated was the approval of the Civil Rights for Black people of America Kennedy's bill eventually passed as the landmark Civil Rights Act in 1964. During his early years of presidency, he initiated the foundation

of the peace corps that was focused on education, farming, health care, and the construction of the country.

Marriage and Children

He married Jacqueline Bouvier, who was known as a famous photographer, editor and socialite of the country. The first lady was popular for her love of history. Jacqueline Bouvier met with Kennedy during his term as Senate member, they later got married in the year of 1953. They had three children, named Arabella, Caroline, and John Jr. Patrick. They were believed to be a happily married couple.

Assassination

The murder of JFK was considered a national tragedy. The first historian documented the incident as in the JFK biography. He was murdered by Lee Harvey Oswald, a former Marine with Soviet sympathies. He was shot by the former Marine twice while he was in his car with the governor of Texas and his wife on 22nd November 1963. He died in the hospital at Parkland Memorial Hospital shortly thereafter, at age 46. One of the historians named Arthur Schlesinger Jr. documented the tragedy and its impact "as if Lincoln had been killed six months after Gettysburg or Franklin Roosevelt at the end of 1935 or Truman before the Marshall Plan."

Lyndon B. Johnson

President Lyndon Johnson's voting rights speech of March 15, 1965, is considered a landmark of U.S. oratory. It is reprinted or excerpted in nearly every anthology that chronicles the "great moments" or "great issues" of American history. Leading scholars of American oratory have ranked Johnson's speech as one of the top ten American speeches of the twentieth century. Even so, it is not unreasonable to ask, "Is the speech really that outstanding?" Johnson hardly can be counted among the nation's great orators. And some consider the civil rights campaign in Selma, Alabama, to have done more to ensure the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 than Johnson's speech.

While it is true that Johnson was not a gifted public speaker in general and that the Selma protests elicited support for voting rights legislation, the voting rights speech is indeed an exceptional instance of political oratory. In an uncharacteristically eloquent way, the president interpreted the meaning of the Selma demonstrations for a nation awakened to the problem of voter discrimination: His interpretation focused on the very

meaning of the nation, what he called "the American Promise." Out of that interpretation, he crafted a compelling rationale for immediate passage of a strong federal voting rights law. His language effectively framed public and congressional deliberations. His appeals helped cement equal voting rights as a fundamental American principle. And at a moment marked by urgency and chaos, his message provided focus and clarity. In short, President Johnson's speech is remarkable because it made the principle of equal voting rights meaningful and compelling through a public vocabulary of shared interests, motives, and aspirations in order to secure quick passage of the country's most important civil rights law. Studying Johnson's address also yields insights beyond the speech itself. It calls attention to the fact that freedom and equality are rhetorical terms whose meanings change and are redefined throughout American history and to the challenges of building moral consensus through oratory.

Speaker

Born and raised in the Texas Hill Country during the early twentieth century, Lyndon Johnson's childhood experiences did not predispose him to become an advocate of racial justice. Rather, his upbringing included the forms of socialization that typically lead to racial prejudice: ethnocentrism, a lack of meaningful interracial contact, and racial stereotyping. Despite his assertions to the contrary, Johnson carried some of this prejudice with him into adulthood, and even as president he sometimes referred to African Americans with derogatory terminology when speaking behind closed doors. Yet Johnson also inherited sympathy for the downtrodden from his family, and a personal identification with the disadvantaged was a distinguishing element of his personality from an early age. Although these convictions shaped his attitudes toward civil rights issues, Johnson did not possess a keen appreciation of the uniquely racial dimensions of African Americans' oppression.

Johnson's lack of racial consciousness, as such, during his early political career hardly was inconsistent with the outlook of many white liberals. In his formative political experiences during the 1930s and 1940s, Johnson demonstrated a commitment to equal opportunity and fairness that earned him a reputation as a friend of the poor—white or black. As Texas director of the National Youth Administration, Johnson lobbied for equal access to education and vocational training, and as U.S. congressman from the tenth

district of Texas, he fought for equal treatment for racial minorities in federal housing and agricultural programs. Yet Johnson also voted against every civil rights bill brought to the floor during his terms in the U.S. House of Representatives, including anti-lynching, anti-poll tax, and Fair Employment Practices Committee (FEPC) measures. He voted against these same measures during his early career in the U.S. Senate, to which he was elected in 1948. Johnson may have opposed the proposals—as he claimed—because they stood no chance of passage, while voting for them would have cost him his political career. He also emphasized that federal legislation to end lynching and the poll tax would violate the "states' rights," though it is unclear to what extent Johnson believed this commonplace of Southern rhetoric. However, his stated opposition to an anti-lynching bill also revealed his insensitivity to uniquely racial forms of oppression, as Johnson implied that lynching was no different than any other type of murder. And he also claimed that anti-lynching, anti-poll tax, and FEPC legislation was not germane to the issue of civil rights, which he stated should be advanced through measures that would provide for better housing, better education, better health care, and better wages.

The first civil rights bills Johnson supported were ones he helped usher in through the U.S. Congress as Senate majority leader. As he fixed his sights on the presidency, Johnson believed he needed to guide a civil rights bill to passage in order to demonstrate to Washington powerbrokers and the American people that he was not just a parochial politician beholden to Southern interests. While he had not become an all-out civil rights advocate, Johnson's basic commitment to equal opportunity and access aligned with his personal ambition to help produce the first piece of federal civil rights legislation in ninety years. In 1957, Johnson brokered a political compromise when it seemed that powerful Southern senators and their liberal adversaries would lock horns over a comprehensive civil rights bill written by President Dwight Eisenhower's attorney general—and thus fail to accomplish anything. Although the resulting legislative compromise, the Civil Rights Act of 1957, was a relatively toothless law that focused exclusively on the right to vote, Johnson emphasized that at least Congress had passed something and suggested that breaking the logjam had cleared the way for more meaningful legislation in the near future. Indeed, Johnson did try to maneuver a more meaningful bill through Congress in 1960 but had to broker another compromise due to

Southern legislators' influence in the Senate. Some liberal critics were skeptical and assailed Johnson for watering down both civil rights bills, but Johnson received widespread national praise for his legislative miracles and for shedding his parochialism. He accrued political capital for these accomplishments that furthered his presidential ambitions and even convinced some civil rights leaders that he was sincere in his desire to help pass meaningful civil rights legislation.

Johnson's presidential hopes were dashed during the 1960 campaign, but this personal setback ultimately led to a deepening of his commitment to civil rights. As vice president, he was appointed chairman of a committee that investigated and attempted to rectify cases of employment discrimination. Through this position, Johnson came into regular contact with blatant forms of racial discrimination and also learned that existing laws gave the federal government little power to make things right. As a result, he developed a stronger, more immediate understanding of bigotry that led him to become a firm supporter of civil rights. He began to speak out publicly against racial prejudice and was a strong advocate of President John F. Kennedy's comprehensive civil rights bill. By the time Johnson ultimately guided the bill to passage, following Kennedy's assassination in 1963, even those civil rights leaders who were formerly skeptical praised his deep understanding and conviction on civil rights. And the liberal critics who derided Johnson for weakening civil rights measures as Senate majority leader had to admit he kept his word: The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was a meaningful law that contained the provisions excised from the 1957 bill, including ones that prohibited discrimination in places of public accommodation and created a permanent FEPC.

Not content to wait for further action on civil rights, Johnson immediately turned to the issue of voting rights, on which he had developed a deep-seated commitment. He believed voting was the fundamental right in a democracy, one guaranteed to be free from racial discrimination by the U.S. Constitution. And he came to believe that the only way to help African Americans achieve genuine equality was through equal access to the ballot box. When voting rights demonstrations in Selma, Alabama, dramatized the problem of voter discrimination for the entire nation, Johnson seized the moment to help guide federal voting rights legislation—a law his Justice Department had been developing since 1964—to swift passage.

Like most politicians, Johnson's commitment to civil rights—including equal voting rights—was not unadulterated. Though often heralded as the greatest civil rights president in U.S. history, it is not freedom from prejudice or a life-long uncompromising commitment to racial justice that warrants such praise. Johnson's achievements on civil rights were the result of personal ambition, political calculations, duty, idealism, and personal conviction. Moreover, his ambition led him to wrangle with civil rights issues, an experience that deepened his understanding, which in turn shaped his principles. His political calculations led him to pursue realistic goals but were tempered by his sense of what his office required of him and by his idealism. His personal prejudices were moderated by his commitment to fairness and equal opportunity in public life. Johnson was a flawed but gifted politician who matured on the issue of civil rights and used his considerable political skills to help pass the first four civil rights laws since Reconstruction.

That Johnson used his legislative acumen to shape U.S. history is not surprising, whereas the fact that he motivated the nation through public speaking is remarkable. Johnson possessed considerable skill in his interpersonal communication (often referred to as "the Johnson treatment"), but he generally was a poor public speaker. In private conversations, he sought to understand his listeners—their aspirations, principles, passions, obligations, and weaknesses—and to use that understanding as a foundation for convincing, cajoling, and coercing them. In public discourse, however, he often seemed unable to connect with an audience so diverse in its makeup. And Johnson's efforts to ingratiate himself to people and, often, to dominate them interpersonally could not be transferred to public speech. Moreover, although he had taught public speaking and coached debate during his career as a schoolteacher in Texas, Johnson himself usually seemed affected and uncomfortable when speaking in public—expressing his ideas in a monotonous voice with awkward gestures and poor articulation, eyes glued to his speaking script. He appreciated eloquence but failed to study and practice the techniques of successful public orators, and he generally failed to find a speaking style that fit his nature.

Despite a general lack of skill, Johnson spoke a great deal as president, delivering more than sixteen-hundred speeches during his five years in the White House—very

nearly as many as delivered by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy combined during the previous twelve years. Many, perhaps most, of these speeches were stilted and forgettable, but Johnson was capable of delivering successful speeches. Indeed, he delivered one of the most significant presidential speeches in U.S. history when, in the spring of 1965, he urged Americans to fulfill their nation's promise by guaranteeing that all of its citizens have an equal right to vote and to share in the benefits of democracy. This speech, often referred to as the "We Shall Overcome" speech, was Johnson's greatest oratorical triumph.

Context

During the mid-nineteenth and twentieth centuries, African American leaders and their white allies expended significant political energy on attempting to secure equal access to the ballot box, especially following the ratification of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution (in 1868 and 1870, respectively). The amendments declared that African Americans were citizens and forbade depriving them of the vote on account of their "race, color, or previous condition of servitude." Southern states attempted to keep them from voting, however, through methods that were not racially discriminatory at face value but that clearly aimed to keep African Americans away from the polls. Civil rights advocates won significant victories against many of these methods in the U.S. Supreme Court, but success through litigation was slow, costly, and incomplete. There was significant African American political mobilization after an especially important legal victory against a persistent method of voter discrimination in *Smith v. Allwright*: Registration, education, and get-out-the vote campaigns were organized throughout the South. But their foes quickly developed new methods to prevent African Americans from voting, including gerrymandering, literacy and understanding tests, slow processing of voter registration applications, relocation of polling places, delay tactics, threats, and physical intimidation. Exhausted, frustrated, and a little demoralized, advocates of equal voting rights came to believe that a genuine victory would come only through federal legislation, and thus focused their crusade on the Congress and—especially—the president. By 1964, civil rights advocates had achieved significant victories against discrimination in education, places of public accommodation, and employment. Because of persistent prejudice and the shortcomings

of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1963, though, the ballot box remained inaccessible to many African Americans, especially in the South. Thus, civil rights leaders focused nearly all of their energies on one goal—the right to vote.

At nearly the same time that African American leaders were gearing up for an assault on voter discrimination, President Johnson was directing his Justice Department to draft a new law to ensure the guarantees of the Fifteenth Amendment. During the summer of 1964, a presidential task force on civil rights identified voter discrimination as the nation's chief civil rights problem and advised the administration to advance measures "to insure the speediest possible accession of Negroes to voting rolls, especially in the South."⁸ In the fall, partisan advisers suggested that in addition to upholding the promises of the Constitution, a new voting rights law that brought more African Americans to the polls might help compensate for the loss of support for Democrats in the South brought on by the administration's civil rights initiatives. Most of the president's advisers, however, counseled a cooling off period on civil rights legislation following the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and party politics were not a significant factor motivating the pursuit of a new voting rights law.

Rather, Johnson was motivated by his convictions, his desire to pass his own civil rights law, his vision of a "Great Society," and his aspiration to be a great presidential reformer. In mid-December 1964, he directed the attorney general to burn the midnight oil and develop a voting rights measure within a few days so that it would be ready for the 1965 legislative agenda. In his State of the Union address on January 4, 1965, President Johnson urged members of Congress to "eliminate every remaining obstacle to the right and opportunity to vote" and announced he would send them a detailed proposal on voting rights within six weeks. Aware that guiding a new voting rights law to passage would be a significant political challenge, Johnson aimed to rally public support in addition to persuading legislators. On January 15, he called Martin Luther King, Jr. and urged him to publicize the worst cases of voting prejudice to get Americans behind a federal voting rights act, a law Johnson said was a priority for his elected term as president. He told King that if citizens were to see a dramatic example of the voter discrimination and intimidation in the South, they would demand action to make things right, to make the electoral system fair.

Exhibiting the extreme opposition to African American voting Johnson believed would get the public's attention, Selma, Alabama, was the site of a nascent voting rights campaign that had begun with a mass meeting on January 2. Three days after talking with the president, King led the demonstrators in Selma in a mass march on the county courthouse to register to vote and to dramatize voter discrimination in Selma. Neither goal was achieved that day. But in the following days, local law enforcement officials assaulted the demonstrators in full view of journalists—who published and broadcast graphic reports and pictures of the violence across the nation. The Selma campaign became a political drama, as civil rights leaders and the president expected, but did not immediately succeed in creating an overwhelming public demand for immediate legislative action. Rather, many Americans' first reaction was that the government should provide protection for the demonstrators. And although the campaign did provide "fresh impetus" among members of Congress "to new legislation to assure Negroes the right to register and vote," legislators did not commit themselves passionately to the cause. In February, King penned a public letter that focused attention on the fact that in Selma "there are more Negroes in jail . . . than on the voting rolls," but the campaign still struggled to trigger an intense, urgent outcry among citizens or legislators. Late in the month, leaders of the Selma campaign planned for more confrontational demonstrations and acts of civil disobedience to help achieve the goal discussed by King and Johnson. Local law enforcement officials—led by Sheriff Jim Clark—indeed responded to the tactics with increased violence, killing one demonstrator and beating others brutally. But it was the plan for demonstrators to march fifty-four miles to the state capitol in Montgomery to petition for their rights on March 7 that aimed the confrontation in Selma toward a decisive, dramatic climax.

Had Alabama law enforcement officials turned the demonstrators around by blocking the highway to Montgomery, as many of the marchers anticipated, the Selma campaign well might have failed to galvanize support for a federal voting rights act. Instead, they acted the roles civil rights leaders reluctantly hoped they might. Soon after six hundred marchers set out from a local church around 4:00 p.m. on Sunday, March 8, they encountered an intimidating force of state troopers and the local sheriff's posse on the Edmund Pettus Bridge. A large crowd of local white citizens jeered the marchers

from the side of the road, while a cadre of journalists waited for the action. When the marchers came within fifty feet of the troopers, the officer in charge ordered them to stop and disperse within two minutes. March leaders John Lewis and Hosea Williams began spreading the word that demonstrators should kneel and pray before acting on the officer's orders. Only one minute after the order, while most of them still were kneeling to pray, the officer issued an astonishing order with furor: "Troopers, advance!" The marchers quickly were overrun. State troopers clubbed them, flailed them with bullwhips, and seared them with electric cattle prods. Horsemen from the sheriff's posse then charged into the panicked crowd of demonstrators and began to thrash them, too, as local bystanders cheered, "Get the niggers!" Troopers fired tear gas into the crowd, as the vicious beatings continued. Broken, bleeding, weeping, vomiting marchers lay strewn across the highway, while those still able to move tried feebly to escape. Some assailants pursued the escapees back into Selma's African American neighborhood for further battering, as others blocked ambulances from reaching the wounded on the bridge. Eventually, the bloodbath ended. Remarkably, no one was killed. But the severely routed marchers sustained broken ribs, arms, legs, and teeth, severe lacerations, skull fractures, concussions, and damage to their eyes and lungs.

Soon after the attack, journalists who were on the scene disseminated pictures and accounts of the brutality to a stunned nation. ABC TV even interrupted its evening movie with a special news bulletin that included fifteen minutes of video footage from the assault in Selma. The following day, the front pages of newspapers were filled with images and stories of the violence against those petitioning for equal voting rights. The confrontation, made especially salient by its vivid visual depiction, became a symbol of Southern efforts to maintain white supremacy at all costs. Writers called the day "Bloody Sunday," and the bloodshed made many Americans feel shame and disgrace. Overwhelming numbers of citizens expressed shock that such an outrage could happen in the United States: The violence stirred the nation's conscience and made a deeper impression than perhaps any demonstration during the civil rights movement. Members of Congress expressed "anger and disgust at Alabama's violent repression of the Negro marchers." Newspapers reported that the march had mobilized "formidable national sentiment behind new civil-rights legislation."

Although Johnson had endorsed the Selma campaign implicitly in his telephone conversation with King, the unexpected bloodshed there created a political climate more complicated than the president had anticipated. The process of drafting a bill was slower than anticipated, as Justice Department attorneys found it difficult to develop a straightforward method of ensuring the guarantees of the Fifteenth Amendment (that voting should be free from racial discrimination) without stating in affirmative terms who comprised the electorate—something not provided for by the Constitution and which would require a constitutional amendment. Yet the pressure on the White House to send legislation to Congress intensified as the situation in Selma escalated. The Justice Department completed a draft of a federal voting rights bill on March 5, and Johnson solicited input from members of Congress to strengthen the bill and pave the way for passage rather than introduce it immediately. Following "Bloody Sunday," pressure on the White House to send a bill to the legislature rose sharply and continued to increase as the president still pursued the prudent, deliberate—but slower—course of shoring up the bill and support for it among congressional leaders. Widely criticized for his perceived inaction, Johnson received at least some support for his strategy: During a special report on March 12, a CBS News commentator observed, "Legislation written in the heat of emotion usually is bad legislation." On March 13, the Justice Department finally completed its revisions to the bill, accepting mostly minor changes to its language made in the following days. And so in these exigent circumstances, Johnson planned to address the Congress and the nation on March 15 to provide them with the "information, details, explanation, and justifications" he believed they wanted to hear in regard to his voting rights measure.

After Johnson had declared in January his intention to submit a voting rights bill, the Washington Post reported that passing legislation "may require all the persuasion the President can muster." Clearly, the demonstrations in Selma had made the general case for voting rights legislation an easier one to argue. But Johnson had a specific case to make, and persuading the public to support his strong voting rights bill while convincing Congress to pass it quickly without watering it down still required considerable rhetorical skill. Moreover, although the primary purpose of Johnson's speech was instrumental, it also strove for eloquence—to inspire listeners by assigning deep meaning to events in the

world through compelling appeals that were both timely and timeless. When he stepped to the podium in the House chamber of the U.S. Capitol at 9:02 p.m. on March 15, President Johnson, his immediate audience, and his television audience of over seventy million, understood the significance of the words he was about to speak.

Interpretation

Initially, Johnson planned only to deliver a written message to Congress to accompany his legislative proposal but came to believe that such communication would be insufficient for advancing his legislative goal and for enacting his duties as chief spokesman for the nation. Presidents rarely deliver special messages to Congress in person to advocate for a specific bill, especially on domestic policy; Harry Truman had been the last president to do so. Such speeches are risky, as they put the president's credibility on the line and chance making members of Congress resentful, feeling they are being coerced into action and having their law-making duties usurped. Johnson did not decide for certain to make a public speech until nearly the last minute, following a meeting with members of his administration and congressional leaders on the evening of March 14. The meeting reinforced his belief that a public speech was needed to calm the public and assure them that the federal government was working to solve the problem of voter discrimination. Moreover, Johnson believed he needed to use "every ounce of moral persuasion the Presidency held" to ensure passage of the voting rights bill.

Unlike the bill, the address was prepared in haste by White House speechwriters, as they first received the assignment during the late hours of March 14. The final text was a synthesis of multiple speech drafts, previous press conference statements, and speeches Johnson had delivered as vice president. Presidential aides finalized and edited the address throughout the day on March 15, completing their task just moments before Johnson headed over to the capitol. As was usual practice, the president was not involved directly in the speechwriting process despite his later claim that he "penciled in changes and rewrote sections" of the address. Johnson took full credit for the speech, however, as his press secretary successfully coordinated a plan to communicate the following falsehood to the press: "The President wrote the speech. He talked out what he wanted to say—and as drafts were prepared in response to his dictation, the President personally edited and revised." In fact, Johnson's only direct contributions to the speech came during

its delivery, as he personalized some of the language and inserted a few phrases and short sentences. Given his detachment from the speechwriting process, there simply was no time to make changes before speaking; President Johnson received the reading copy just prior to delivering the message, and he was forced to speak from the manuscript for the first several minutes, as it had not yet been loaded onto the TelePrompter.

At some point during the speechwriting process, someone at the White House titled the speech "The American Promise." And although usually known by its most memorable line ("We shall overcome"), the official title better encapsulates Johnson's message. His speech used the word "promise" in both its meanings, referring to the nation's vow and its potential. Both senses of the word imply a story. Though making a vow is a stand-alone act, it beckons further action: The vow must be kept or broken. Having potential is a state of being but also signals future action: The potential must be fulfilled or neglected. Stories are an especially significant form of communication, as they can help us make sense of the world and often contain moral lessons that point to an appropriate course of action. They contain a logic, or narrative reasoning, that frames our decision-making in situations similar to those depicted in story. They reinforce our cultural values. In the political sphere, stories shape a people's collective sense of self, their national identity, by telling and retelling their past, present, and future. Such stories invite identification among citizens and between citizens and their government. Understanding the power of narrative, Lyndon Johnson attempted to persuade his listeners to act in order to guarantee equal voting rights—and more—by depicting contemporary exigencies and decisions as part of the story of the American Promise. That story is the central rhetorical feature of his speech.

Johnson began his address in a manner that suggested his message would transcend the current exigency facing the nation: He asserted that he spoke for "the destiny of democracy" (2).¹⁷ Indeed, the current crisis was critical, he claimed, because it constituted a "turning point in man's unending search for freedom" (4) and "equal rights" (6). It is an episode in the story of the American Promise, Johnson reasoned, which is a guarantee of freedom and equality—and the potential to be "the greatest nation on Earth" (7). Johnson suggested that denying equal rights to African Americans, exemplified by the violence in Selma, represented a threat to "the values and the purposes and the

meaning of our beloved nation" (9). He claimed that to keep African Americans from enjoying the freedom and equality assured by the Declaration of Independence and the battle cries of the Revolution would be to break our nation's promise and neglect our potential to "fail as a people and as a nation" (10). Of course, none of the dictums quoted by the president ("All men are created equal"; "Government by consent of the governed"; "Give me liberty or give me death") constituted a direct promise to African Americans regarding political freedom or equality. Yet Johnson interpreted them to have an expansive meaning that applied to the present problem. And since the story of the forward march of freedom and equality is perhaps the United States' "master narrative," his proposed political reform is made to seem a natural progression in American history. In short, he seized the rhetoric of democratic freedom and equality—transforming the meaning of the two principles in the process—to help guarantee equal voting rights to African Americans.

At the same moment President Johnson argued that the issue confronting the country was of historic significance, he also emphasized the importance of time. He suggested that although the United States long had kept African Americans from enjoying the benefits of freedom and equality, it had not broken its promise—yet. But since destiny had crossed our path at this particular time, he claimed, the decisive point in time had arrived. The president asserted that as such a moment came along "rarely in any time," (9) the nation must seize the opportunity. Articulating a similar theme about midway through the speech, he described the country's promise as "unkept," (51) not broken, and urged immediate action by stressing that the "time of justice has now come" (52). Johnson claimed, "This time, on this issue, there must be no delay or no hesitation or no compromise with our purpose," (42) adding that "the time for waiting has gone".

The themes of promise and urgency established in the beginning of Johnson's speech were central to the message's overall rhetorical power, as they transformed the political problem of voter discrimination into something even grander: a threat to America itself. And the effort to solve that problem took on a grand, almost religious imperative—as described by the president—since it implicated America's destiny, faith, and mission. He suggested the United States represented a chosen nation, "the first . . . in the history of the world to be founded with a purpose" (13). Invoking a passage from the

Bible, Luke 9:25, he claimed the nation would lose its very soul if it failed to achieve its purpose of upholding the democratic model of government, its promise to ensure freedom and equality. President Johnson took on the role of prophet in his speech, recalling the nation to its original task. As the gift of the prophet is vision, he suggested that by taking a penetrating look at current events to see their underlying meaning, one could truly understand what was at stake: the heart and soul of the nation.

By imbuing his narrative of the American Promise with a religious dimension, Johnson tapped into the cultural tradition scholars usually refer to as civil religion—the collection of symbols, beliefs, values, and rituals that give sacred meaning to political life; the transcendent sense of reality through which a people interpret their historical experiences. His message articulated three key myths in American civil religion: that the United States has a covenant that makes its citizens a chosen people, that it has a special purpose, and that its founding was a consecrated act that defined the meaning of the nation.¹⁹ In doing so, the president encouraged his audience to experience current events as part of a transcendent reality. As the nation's prophet, he called to mind its purpose, pointed out its sins and the wages of sin, and identified the path to redemption.

At the end of the first section of his speech, Johnson related the issue of voting rights to the American Promise directly. Whereas earlier he had described the issue confronting the nation in abstract terms of freedom and equal rights, he now made it clear that ensuring African Americans equal access to the franchise was central to the nation's promise and purpose. He claimed that the nation's Founding Fathers established "the right to choose your own leaders" as "the most basic right of all," and that the history of America, at its essence, was "the history of the expansion of that right to all of our people" (16). The president made the present course of action clear: "Every American citizen must have an equal right to vote. There is no reason which [sic] can excuse the denial of that right. There is no duty that weighs more heavily on us than the duty we have to ensure that right" (17). As the central idea of Johnson's speech, he returned to this theme in his conclusion, enacting the role of the prophet unequivocally and putting a point on the nation's sacred duty: "Above the pyramid on the great seal of the United States it says . . . 'God has favored our undertaking.' God will not favor everything that we do. It is rather our duty to divine His will. But I cannot help believing that He truly

understands and that He really favors the undertaking that we begin here tonight" (90). President Johnson intuited the will of God to be on the side of voting rights legislation and suggested that by enacting such legislation, the nation could keep its promise and confirm its covenant relationship with God.

To a great extent, Johnson's speech is persuasive to the extent it invested events with deep meaning for its listeners. His story of the American Promise aimed to help his audience make sense of a disturbing crisis in a particular way, to see it as part of a larger context of events. By emphasizing the idea of a promise, he provided a logic that framed his listeners' decision-making: They should act to keep their promise. His story reinforced the values to which the nation must recommit itself through action. It reaffirmed America's national identity and identified citizens with their government. When listeners found Johnson's speech compelling, it was likely because he induced them to want to guarantee voting rights in order to honor their status as a chosen people and to live out the nation's sacred purpose. He effectively appealed to their patriotic duty, infused with a religious imperative. Moreover, for those listeners who felt shame following Bloody Sunday, Johnson provided a way to purge their guilt. The violence in Selma was horrific, but the president suggested it may serve a significant purpose, since it has "summoned into convocation all the majesty of this great government" (7). The violence in Selma can be made meaningful, he implied, by enacting voting rights legislation

It is difficult to know whether President Johnson's speech converted many opponents of equal voting rights to his side, but this was not his only persuasive aim. Even so, as evidenced by his legislative strategies during his tenure as Senate majority leader, Johnson understood that voting was a weak spot in many Southerners' opposition to civil rights. He believed that although segregationists wanted to maintain white supremacy through voter discrimination, many still felt—in spite of themselves— their actions were wrong. The president may not have converted them to active supporters of voting rights legislation, but he likely persuaded some to accept it passively. His speech helped demoralize the Southern opposition to equal voting rights by making racial discrimination at the ballot box seem fundamentally un-American, at odds with what the nation was all about. It squarely put segregationists on the losing side of an issue of principle: None could argue convincingly that voter discrimination was consistent with

American values. Cultivating even passive acceptance was a significant rhetorical accomplishment for Johnson, as it had the potential to help Congress pass his voting rights bill more quickly and to encourage compliance with its provisions once it became law. In addition to weakening his opposition, the address encouraged the uncommitted to identify themselves with a hallowed cause. Moreover, it bolstered voting rights supporters. Johnson further justified their outrage over the violence in Selma by instilling it with a grander source of indignation. He made them feel as though the weight of American history was on their side, that equal voting rights was foreordained. His claim that the "time of justice has now come" (52) made their cause feel exceptionally urgent. His heady proclamation, "We shall overcome" (46) made progress seem unstoppable.

To appreciate the rhetorical ingenuity of the voting rights address, it is helpful to consider alternate persuasive strategies Johnson might have employed. The address is impressive precisely because he and his speechwriters made discerning choices among the available means of persuasion. For example, the president could have made a strong case for equal voting rights grounded in the U.S. Constitution. Indeed, an early draft of the speech, based on the written message sent to Congress with the legislation, focused on the mandate of the Constitution. After all, the Fifteenth Amendment prohibits racial discrimination at the ballot box and gives Congress the authority to pass legislation in order to secure that guarantee. Johnson simply could have demanded that the Congress do its constitutional duty (a claim he in fact made, albeit very briefly). However, making that the centerpiece of his speech would have entered him into a tedious legal argument with Southern opponents of voting rights, who in the past had demonstrated they were game for a protracted argument of exactly that sort. A plea for Congress to do its constitutional duty also would have put the American people on the margins of the decision-making process by focusing on the responsibilities of the federal government. And though possessed of a reasonable appeal, such a plea would have been less inspiring than his appeal to the American Promise: Johnson presented a stirring definition of the meaning of America rather than the meaning of the Constitution, a significant but arcane document to many citizens.

Rather than grounding his argument in the American promise, Johnson also could have made an explicitly moral argument decrying racial prejudice, including its

expression through voter discrimination. Indeed, in 1963 he had advised President Kennedy to deliver a civil rights speech that would make Southerners feel they were on the wrong side of an issue of conscience. Perhaps Johnson believed in 1965 that the violence in Selma already had accomplished that goal. Moreover, had he made a moral argument against racial prejudice, he would have risked alienating listeners who harbored personal prejudice against African Americans but still supported—or could be persuaded to support—equal voting rights. As demonstrated by the address, Johnson and his speechwriters found a way for him to speak with moral authority, as the nation's president and prophet, without preaching to his listeners about their personal transgressions

Above all, instead of focusing his rhetoric on constitutional or moralistic appeals, President Johnson simply assumed those issues to be resolved: "There is no constitutional issue. The command of the Constitution is plain. There is no moral issue. It is wrong—deadly wrong to deny any of your fellow Americans the right to vote" (37- 39). By focusing on what he described to be the unresolved issue of America's promise, he employed a rhetorical appeal that transcended issues of state and federal rights (which Southerners always raised in debates about constitutional questions of civil rights) and issues of personal morality.

Other rhetorical features of the president's speech were important. For instance, his claim that existing civil rights laws could not solve the problem of voter discrimination helped head off a counterargument by Southerner legislators who counseled delay following the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which contained worthless provisions on equal voting rights.

It was Johnson's transcendent appeal to the American Promise, however, that was most persuasive and that cultivated overwhelming support for the voting rights bill. In their coverage of his speech, many journalists lauded the president for invoking and affirming "the most sacred and deeply held convictions of a nation," which brought "the present chapter of the struggle for human rights into proper perspective."²⁰ Citizens echoed these sentiments in their letters and telegrams to the White House. And when editorialists urged swift passage of the president's bill, their appeals employed the language of Johnson's narrative: The New York Times even suggested passage was a foregone conclusion because a "people that has responded unflinchingly to every trial of

national purpose . . . will not fail this test."²¹ Moreover, following President Johnson's speech, members of Congress deliberated voting rights legislation using the language of America's destiny, promise, and purpose. Senators and congressmen claimed that the nation must "make good on its promise . . . [to] fulfill the revolutionary dream of freedom and equality for all Americans" by "passing a bill which [sic] fully insures that every American . . . has the right to vote"—which will represent a step "along this nation's honored march toward further fulfillment of our traditional goals of equal opportunity and equal treatment." Congress indeed passed the final voting rights bill less than five months after Johnson's speech. The president signed the Voting Rights Act of 1965 into law on August 6, emphasizing at the signing ceremony that America had righted a historical wrong, enacted its sacred principles, confirmed its promise, and now would endeavor to "fulfill the rights that we now secure."

Legacy

Political rhetoric that finds a way to transcend conflicts of belief and sentiment is uncommon, especially when it involves issues of right and wrong. Johnson's speech helped transcend those conflicts by focusing on civic virtue and civic duty. By appealing to and reinforcing a shared language of moral consensus—the narrative of the American Promise—Johnson made a lasting contribution to U.S. political and rhetorical history. As a statement of American principles that related to the issue of equal voting rights, his speech has enduring significance. Perhaps this also was part of his intent, as he wanted to be eloquent and wanted to go down in history as a great civil rights president.

Johnson's speech also has enduring significance on the issue of civil rights because it represented an effort to modify the meaning of two key ideas in American history while incorporating them into a more expansive vision of the nation's promise. His narrative of the American Promise was mainly a story of the nation's commitment to freedom and equality. The speech began by identifying these two ideas in a conventional way: Freedom is discussed in terms of political liberties, and equality is discussed in terms of equal rights or equal opportunity. The contemporary struggle for civil rights, he suggested, was about guaranteeing those principles. But as the president's speech continued, he emphasized how that struggle for civil rights was not just a struggle for freedom itself but rather for the "the fruits of freedom," (56) not just a struggle for equal

rights or equal opportunity but rather to help ensure equality as an actual characteristic of American life. Johnson emphasized the exercise of freedom and equality, which he claimed "takes much more than just legal right" (75). Rather than only guaranteeing equal rights and opportunities (opening the gates of equality), he suggested that to "make good on the promise of America" (63) also meant giving all citizens "the help that they need to walk through those gates" (77). He invited citizens to think not only about political rights but also about the circumstances under which freedom and equality flourish. Whereas freedom and equality can be thought of as the protections and privileges given to all citizens by law, as principles of nondiscrimination, Johnson also defined them as goals to be achieved. Perhaps most notably, the voting rights speech was one of the first messages in which President Johnson attempted to redefine the meaning of the idea of equal opportunity to include the concept of affirmative action, the help needed to achieve what he later called "equality as a fact and a result" not "just equality as a rights and a theory." This redefinition of equal opportunity attracted little attention at the time, perhaps because it was subsumed into the story of the American Promise—which, at some level, many citizens themselves felt to mean more than just a guarantee of basic legal protections. Indeed, as the word promise denoted potential as well as guarantee, Johnson's narrative emphasized the nation's potential to become a "Great Society" (a common theme in his rhetoric during this time): a nation in which citizens are educated, healthy, housed, and employed; a nation in which the experience of freedom and democracy flows from those principles.

Studying President Johnson's speech is significant as a reminder that the language of the American Promise has been a site of struggle throughout the nation's history. Though they are universal terms in American political rhetoric, freedom and equality are part of an ongoing process of definition and redefinition, of ongoing debates about their meaning. Neither freedom nor equality embodies a single idea; rather each symbolizes a mixture of values and meanings. For example, freedom has meant—at various times—the right to political self-determination, the right to make individual choices free from coercion, the capacity for ethical action, and more. The meanings of equality have included equal rights, equal treatment, and actual parity. Though their meanings change, freedom and equality remain authoritative terms in political discourse: To seize control of

them in a political debate is to acquire significant rhetorical power. One of the very terms Johnson sought to redefine to gain support for his civil rights program is in the process of being redefined. Participants in recent debates about affirmative action, including court cases about college and university admissions policies, seek to define and control the meaning of equality. Even the meaning of civil rights—a term whose meaning has been identified strongly with the civil rights movement—is now contested, as the advocates of state ballot proposals to outlaw affirmative action programs refer to them as "civil rights initiatives."

Since Johnson's speech helped establish the meaning of freedom and equality as employed during the congressional deliberations over the Voting Rights Act, his message may continue to have significant influence. The law requires that the Congress must periodically review and, if deemed appropriate, renew some of the provisions of the Voting Rights Act: The most recent renewal came in 2006. Federal legislators often look to the intent of former Congresses when renewing previously enacted laws, and in 1965 the 89th Congress described its intent in the president's terms of fulfilling the American Promise of freedom and equality. Despite some wrangling during the 2006 deliberations, members of Congress ultimately seemed to agree that "the liberties and freedom embedded in the right to vote must remain sacred."

Finally, studying Johnson's speech should encourage reflection on the nature of presidential rhetoric, especially on matters perceived to have a moral dimension. That presidents will use their office as a bully pulpit to serve as the nation's moral leader and spokesperson is a common assumption of the modern presidency. Like all orators, presidents are susceptible to misusing of the power of moral leadership: They may reduce complex problems to simple questions of right or wrong, demonize those who oppose them, assert moral consensus when none exists, appeal to listeners' base motives in the language of virtue, or enact the role of moral spokesperson with arrogance rather than humility. Even so, the nation sometimes needs its president to ascend to the bully pulpit to exhort it toward a public good that would not be realized without moving, inspiring oratory. But finding a shared moral language out of which a president can fashion a persuasive appeal is difficult. President Johnson effectively grounded his appeals in a potent narrative that focused on public morality—his listeners' civic duty to keep and

fulfill the sacred American Promise. But as the citizenry continues to become more religiously and culturally diverse, less schooled in the narratives of the nation's history, more aware of how such narratives can be used to justify depraved causes as well as honorable ones, and perhaps less influenced by the moral authority of the presidency, presidents may find it especially tricky to build moral consensus through oratory. Consider this problem from a perspective afforded by studying Johnson's speech. He used oratory to help secure the significant public good of equal voting rights, primarily by appealing to the American Promise—of which the Constitution is one expression—rather than the Constitution itself. But could Johnson have crafted such a stirring, persuasive appeal on the basis of constitutional guarantees alone? Would his listeners have found it as moving, meaningful, and motivational? Would we find it as eloquent today? Garth E. Pauley (Ph.D., The Pennsylvania State University) is associate professor of rhetoric in the Department of Communication Arts & Sciences at Calvin College in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Civil Rights Movement

We are going to talk about a social movement which happened in the 1960's in the United States and inspired similar movements all around the world. The result of the claim of the many social groups which were excluded of the America dream, the movement gave reason to blacks, women, gay people in every part of the planet, due to its amazing power of involvement, as well as its capacity of dealing with the symbolic appeal of the youth through different kinds of media – literature, music, movies, news media and cultural politics.

The civil rights movement, as we could see in the previous class, is also known as the African-American civil rights movement, American civil rights movement and some other terms). It was a decades-long movement with the goal of securing legal rights for African Americans, especially. With roots starting in the Reconstruction era during the late 19th century, the movement provoked a strong legislative impact after the direct actions and protests organized from the mid-1950s until 1968. Many groups and organized social movements fought and faced oppression and violence from the police, trying to promote the end of legalized racial segregation and discrimination in the United States.

Moderates in the movement were adept to non-violent manifestations and worked with Congress to negotiate the passage of significant pieces of federal legislation legitimating discriminatory practices. The Civil Rights Act of 1964, for example, banned discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex or national origin in employment practices, ended unequal application of voter registration requirements and prohibited racial segregation in schools, workplace and public accommodations, what gave reason to many fights and a daily struggle for the black community in order to have these rights guaranteed. The Voting Rights Act of 1965, in turn, restored and protected voting rights for minorities by authorizing federal oversight of registration and elections in areas with a historic prejudice against the blacks. The Fair Housing Act of 1968 banned discrimination in the sale or rental of housing. African Americans re-entered politics in the South and across the country young people were inspired to take action. But nothing was easy, as we can see in the many videos and movies available in the internet about such historical episodes.

From 1964 to 1970, a lot of riots in black communities took place. The emergence of the Black Power movement, which lasted from about 1965 to 1975, challenged the established black leadership for its practice of nonviolence and, instead, demanded that political and economic self-sufficiency could be built in the black community. Many popular representations of the movement are centered on the charismatic leadership and philosophy of Martin Luther King Jr., about whom we have already talked about in the previous class. He won the 1964 Nobel Peace Prize for his role in the movement.

Desenvolvimento

Before the American Civil War [1], in the United States there were almost four million blacks enslaved in the South, only white men of property could vote, and the Naturalization Act of 1790 limited U.S. citizenship to whites only. Following the Civil War, three constitutional amendments were passed, including the 13th Amendment (1865) that ended slavery. 13th, by the way, is the title of an amazing documentary film produced in 2016 and directed by Ava DuVernay. The film explores the “intersection of race, justice, and mass incarceration in the United States”, as The New York Times put it, and argues that slavery has been perpetuated in practices since the end of the American Civil War, through such actions as criminalizing behavior and enabling police to arrest

poor freedmen and force them to work for the state under convict leasing. It also denounces the suppression of African Americans by disenfranchisement, lynchings and Jim Crow [2], as well as the political failure of declaring war on which had as enemies the people from the ghettos, that is, the minority communities. By the late 20th century, it became a mass incarceration of people of color in the United States. The film also shows us the prison-industrial complex and the emerging detention-industrial complex, denouncing the great amount of money which is made by the big corporations interested in this field of investment. 13th was nominated for the Academy Award for Best Documentary Feature at the 89th Academy Awards and won the Primetime Emmy Award for Outstanding Documentary or Nonfiction Special at the 69th Primetime Emmy Awards.

Another Amendment was the 14th (1868), which gave African Americans citizenship, adding their total population of four million to the official population of southern states for Congressional apportionment, and the 15th Amendment (1870), which gave African-American males the right to vote, which was still very little, once women could not vote. From 1865 to 1877, the United States underwent the so called Reconstruction Era, during which there was an attempt to establish free labor and civil rights of freedmen in the South. Many whites, of course, resisted the social changes, leading to movements such as the Ku Klux Klan [3], whose members attacked black and white Republicans to maintain white supremacy. In 1871, the president Ulysses S. Grant, the U.S. Army and U.S. Attorney General Amos T. Akerman initiated a campaign to repress the KKK under the Enforcement Acts. Even so, some states were reluctant to enforce the federal measures of the act. By the early 1870s, other white supremacist and paramilitary groups arose against the African-American legal equality and suffrage.

From 1890 to 1908, southern states passed new constitutions and laws to disenfranchise African Americans and many poor whites. After the landmark court case of *Smith v. Allwright* [4], progress was made in increasing black political participation, especially in urban areas and in a few rural places where most blacks worked outside plantations. But the situation did not change much in the South, especially in North Louisiana, Mississippi and Alabama, until national civil rights legislation was passed in the mid-1960s. Thus, for more than sixty years, blacks in the South were not able to elect

anyone to represent their interests in Congress or local government. Furthermore, since they could not vote, they could not serve on local juries.

During this period, the white-dominated Democratic Party maintained political control over the South. The Republican Party, the “party of Lincoln”, as people used to say, was insignificant. Until 1965, the south was a one-party system under the Democrats. In 1901, President Theodore Roosevelt invited Booker T. Washington to dine at the White House, making him the first African American to attend an official dinner there.

While the African Americans were being disenfranchised, white southerners were imposing racial segregation by law. Violence against blacks increased, with numerous lynchings and hangings through the turn of the century. This system of racial discrimination and oppression that emerged from the post-Reconstruction South became known as the “Jim Crow” system. The United States Supreme Court, made up almost entirely of Northerners, upheld the constitution against those state laws that required racial segregation in its 1896 decision *Plessy v. Ferguson*, legitimizing them through the “separate but equal” doctrine. Segregation, which began with slavery, continued with Jim Crow laws, with signs used to show blacks where they could legally walk, talk, drink, rest or eat. But that was not enough. In those places where races could mix, non-whites had to wait until all white customers were attended. In 1912, president Woodrow Wilson ordered segregation throughout the federal government.

Segregation remained in the United States until the mid-1950s, when even the racist states began to integrate their schools, following, though reluctantly, the Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*, which overturned *Plessy v. Ferguson*. The early 20th century was the worst period for race relations in the United States. While the civil rights violations were most intense in the South, social discrimination affected African Americans in many other regions.

As we can see, the post-Reconstruction was full of tension and it was of central importance for the struggle against all kinds of prejudice. It can be illustrated by racial segregation; disenfranchisement; exploitation, because of the increase of economic oppression of blacks, Latinos and Asians, followed by the denial of economic

opportunities and employment discrimination; violence in all its senses: individual, institutional, and, in short. mob racial violence against non-white people.

From 1910 to 1970, African Americans sought better lives by migrating north and west out of the South, something which is narrated in many short stories and novels, like in *The invisible man* (1952), by Ralph Ellison. Nearly seven million blacks left the South in the so called Great Migration [7]. So many people migrated that the demographics of some previously black-majority states changed to white majority. As a consequence of this intense influx of blacks in Northern cities, hostility increased between both black and white Northerners.

Thus, African Americans experienced systemic discrimination also in Northern cities. Economic opportunities for blacks were routed to the lowest-status. The great migration also provoked a realignment among African American's from Republican to Democrat, what was sealed by the New Deal during the Great Depression in the 1930's. Under pressure from African American supporters who began the March on Washington Movement, president Franklin D. Roosevelt issued the first federal order banning discrimination, creating the Fair Employment Practice Committee. On the other hand, black veterans of the military after both World Wars pressed for full civil rights and often led activist movements, something which would happen some decades later, with the veterans from the Vietnam war. In 1948, they gained integration in the military under president Harry Truman, who issued Executive Order 9981 to accomplish it.

Housing segregation is also another central problem black communities have to face. The federal government did not reject the use of race-restrictive covenants until 1950. Suburbanization was already connected with white flight during this period, a situation perpetuated as time went by. From the 1930s to the 1960s, the National Association of Real Estate Boards (NAREB) issued guidelines that resulted in the creation of black ghettos in the country. In defiance, African-American activists began their action, and it was in the 1950's that the direct action began. Thus, the strategy of public education, legislative lobbying and litigation that had characterized the movement during the first half of the 20th century was transformed into a strategy that emphasized "direct action": boycotts, sit-ins, freedom rides, marches, walks and similar tactics that relied on mass mobilization, nonviolent resistance and civil disobedience.

In March 1964, Malcolm X (el-Hajj Malik el-Shabazz), national representative of the Nation of Islam, formally broke with that organization and made a public offer to collaborate with any civil rights organization that accepted the right to self-defense and the philosophy of black nationalism, which did not required Black separatism. On March 26, 1964, while the Civil Rights Act was facing a strong opposition in Congress, Malcolm had a public meeting with Martin Luther King Jr. at the Capitol building. Malcolm had attempted to begin a dialogue with Dr. King as early as 1957, but they could not agree in many points. In some interviews, he even called King an “Uncle Tom” who turned his back on black militancy in order to appease the white men. However, both of them were on good terms at their meeting.

Between 1963 and 1964, civil rights activists became increasingly combative. The repression of sit-ins in Jacksonville, Florida, provoked a riot that saw black youth throwing Molotov cocktails at police on March 24, 1964. Malcolm X gave many important speeches in this period. In his April 1964 speech, for example, which can easily be viewed on the internet, entitled “The Ballot or the Bullet”, he presented an ultimatum to white America: “There’s new strategy coming in. It’ll be Molotov cocktails this month, hand grenades next month, and something else next month. It’ll be ballots, or it’ll be bullets”.

During the Freedom Summer campaign of 1964, some crucial problems emerged. Many blacks in SNCC developed concerns that white activists from the North were taking over the movement. Their presence was not reducing the violence suffered by SNCC, but seemed to be increasing it. Additionally, people reacted negatively to Lyndon Johnson’s denial of voting status for the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. Meanwhile, during CORE’s work in Louisiana that summer, that group came to the conclusion that the federal government would not respond to their requests to (re)enforce the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and would not protect the lives of activists who challenged the racist society of the United States. For the Louisiana campaign to survive it had to count on a local African-American militia called the Deacons for Defense and Justice, who used arms to repel white supremacist violence and police repression.

On February 19, 1965, Malcolm X had told in an interview that the Nation of Islam was actively trying to kill him. On February 21, 1965, he was preparing to address the OAAU in Manhattan's Audubon Ballroom when someone in the 400-person audience yelled, "Nigger! Get your hand outta my pocket!". As Malcolm X and his bodyguards tried to quell the disturbance, a man rushed forward and shot him once in the chest with a sawed-off shotgun and two other men charged the stage firing semiautomatic handguns. Malcolm X was pronounced dead at 3:30 pm, shortly after arriving at Columbia Presbyterian Hospital. The autopsy identified 21 gunshot wounds to the chest, left shoulder, arms and legs, including ten buckshot wounds from the initial shotgun blast. There is a very interesting movie based on his biography and directed by Spike Lee, *Malcolm X*.

In 1965, SNCC organized a political party, the Lowndes County Freedom Organization (LCFO), in the Alabama Klan territory, and permitted its black leaders to promote the use of armed self-defense. Meanwhile, the Deacons for Defense and Justice expanded into Mississippi and assisted Charles Evers' NAACP chapter with a successful campaign in Natchez. The same year, the Watts Rebellion took place in Los Angeles, showing to American white society that many black youth were now committed to the use of violence to protest inequality and oppression.

Seven years later, the Wattstax took place. It was a benefit concert organized by Stax Records to celebrate the anniversary of the 1965 riots in the African-American community of Watts, Los Angeles. The concert took place at the Los Angeles Memorial Coliseum on August 20, 1972, and included all of Stax's prominent artists at the time of various genres: soul, gospel, R&B, blues, funk and jazz. Months after the festival, Stax released a double LP of the concert titled *Wattstax: The Living Word*. The concert was filmed by David L. Wolper's crew, being transformed into a film documentary in 1973, with the title *Wattstax*, directed by Mel Stuart and featuring the famous comedian Richard Pryor (1940-2005). It was nominated for a Golden Globe the next year.

During the March Against Fear in 1966, SNCC and CORE fully embraced the slogan of "black power" to describe these trends towards militancy and self-reliance. Several people engaging in the Black Power movement started to gain a more strong sense of black pride and identity. Several blacks, then, demanded that whites no longer

refer to them as “Negroes”, but as “Afro-Americans”. Until the mid-1960s, blacks had dressed similarly to whites and straightened their hair, but from this time on they began to wear loosely fit dashikis and had started to grow their hair out as a natural afro. The afro, sometimes called the “’fro,” remained a popular black hairstyle until the late 1970s. Very recently, it came back, and many men and women are using it around the world.

But the Black Power movement became famous with the Black Panther Party (BPP), which was founded by Huey Newton and Bobby Seale in Oakland, California, in 1966. The group began following the revolutionary pan-Africanism of propagated by Malcolm X, and sought to rid African American neighborhoods from police brutality, establishing socialist community control in the ghettos. Between 1968 and 1971, the BPP was one of the most important black organizations in the country and had support from the NAACP and groups. The Black Power movement was taken to another level inside prison walls. In 1966, George Jackson formed The Black Guerrilla Family in the California San Quentin State Prison. The goal of this group was to overthrow the white-run government in America and the prison system. After a white prison guard was found not guilty of shooting and killing three black prisoners from the prison tower, in 1970, the group y retaliated by killing a white prison guard.

Many popular cultural expressions associated with black power appeared during this time. Released in August 1968, the number one Rhythm & Blues single for the Billboard Year-End list was James Brown’s “Say It Loud – I’m Black and I’m Proud”. In October 1968, Tommie Smith and John Carlos, while being awarded the gold and bronze medals, respectively, at the 1968 Summer Olympics, donned human rights badges and each raised a black-gloved Black Power salute during their podium ceremony, in an image which became iconic.

Dr. King was not comfortable with the “Black Power” slogan, which sounded too much like black nationalism to him. King was fatally shot by James Earl Ray at 6:01 p.m., April 4, 1968, as he stood on the Lorraine Motel’s second-floor balcony. The bullet entered through his right cheek, smashing his jaw, then traveled down his spinal cord before lodging in his shoulder. Abernathy heard the shot from inside the motel room and ran to the balcony to find King on the floor. The assassination of Dr. King provoked a wave of race riots in Washington, D.C., Chicago, Baltimore, Louisville, Kansas City and

many other cities. President Lyndon B. Johnson declared April 7 a national day of mourning for the beloved civil rights leader.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Born on January 15, 1929, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was the third generation of men in his family to graduate from Morehouse College with honors. He stood out for his academic excellence and went on to earn his doctorate from Boston University. He met and married Coretta Scott in Boston, and they raised two daughters and two sons together. King became pastor of a Baptist church in Montgomery, Alabama in 1954.

Upset by the unfair ways that African Americans were treated, King decided to become actively involved in fighting for their civil rights. He was a member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, often known today by the initials: NAACP. In 1955, when Rosa Parks was arrested because she would not give up her bus seat to a white passenger, King led a non-violent bus boycott that lasted 382 days. Despite dangerous attacks on his church, his home, and his family, King never lost faith or determination. Though his home was bombed and he was arrested, he fearlessly led the movement. The boycott was a success, ending the separation of races on public transport, and making the nation aware of the need for civil rights reform.

Elected as the president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, King used the peaceful methods of another important human rights activist, Mahatma Gandhi, which he combined with his own Christian faith, to promote equal rights for all races of people. He traveled around the country, giving speeches and writing articles and books. He organized opportunities for African Americans to register to vote.

Dr. King's most famous speech was in front of over 250,000 people who gathered at the March on Washington. In his speech, King spoke about his dream. He dreamed that his descendants would one day live in a world where they would be judged by their accomplishments, not by the color of their skin. His inspirational words are still some of the most quoted today. He met with Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson. His mission caused him to be arrested by some, and honored by others.

When King was a young 35 years old, he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. He donated the money earned from the prize back into the fight for civil rights. Had Dr. King been able to live out his full life, there is no doubt he would have continued to be a

positive force for change during the Civil Rights Movement. Unfortunately, his life was cut short by an assassin's bullet. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. died on April 4, 1968 in Memphis, Tennessee, where he was preparing to lead another protest march for the rights of workers who were being unfairly treated. Each January, we celebrate his birthday to honor his dream, and remember all that he did to protect the rights of all of the people of the United States.

President Oxnam, members of the faculty, and members of the student body of this great institution of learning, ladies and gentlemen. I need not pause to say how very delighted and honored I am to be with you tonight and to be a part of your lecture series. It is always a very rich and rewarding experience when I can take a brief break from the day-to-day demands of our struggle in the South and discuss the issues involved in that struggle with college and university students. And so I can assure you that it is an honor and a privilege to be here and I want to thank you for extending the invitation. It's good to renew old friendships; I'm very happy to be here with my teacher, Dr. George Kelsey and his lovely wife and other friends that I have in this area of New Jersey and in this area of our country.

I would like to use as a subject from which to speak tonight, the American Dream. And I use this subject because America is essentially a dream, a dream yet unfulfilled. The substance of the dream is expressed in some very familiar words found in the Declaration of Independence. "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." This is a dream.

Now one of the first things we notice about this dream is an amazing universalism. It does not say some men, it says all men. It does not say all white men, but it says all men which includes black men. It doesn't say all Protestants, but it says all men which includes Catholics. It doesn't say all Gentiles, it says all men which includes Jews. And that is something else at the center of the American Dream which is one of the distinguishing points, one of the things that distinguishes it from other forms of government, particularly totalitarian systems. It says that each individual has certain basic rights that are neither derived from nor conferred by the state. They are gifts from the hands of the Almighty God. Very seldom if ever in the history of the world has a socio-

political document expressed in such profound eloquent and unequivocal language the dignity and the worth of human personality.

But ever since the Founding Fathers of our nation dreamed this dream, America has been something of a schizophrenic personality, tragically divided against herself. On the one hand we have proudly professed the great principles of democracy. On the other hand we have sadly practiced the very antithesis of those principles. Indeed, slavery and racial segregation are strange paradoxes in the nation founded on the principle that all men are created equal.

But now, more than ever before, our nation is challenged to realize this dream. For the shape of the world today does not afford us the luxury of an anemic democracy, and the price that America must pay for the continued oppression of the Negro and other minority groups is the price of its own destruction. The hour is late and the clock of destiny is ticking out, and we must act now before it is too late.

Now I must hasten to say that we must not seek to solve this problem in America merely to meet the Communist challenge. We must not seek to solve this problem in America merely to appeal to Asian and African peoples. In the final analysis racial discrimination must be uprooted from American society because it is morally wrong. In the final analysis we must get rid of segregation because it is sinful. In a real sense it is a new form of slavery covered up with certain niceties of complexity. It is wrong, to use the words of the great Jewish philosopher Martin Buber, because it substitutes an I-It relationship for the I-Thou relationship and relegates persons to the status of things. And so this problem must be solved not merely because it is diplomatically expedient but because it is morally compelling.

And so I would like to suggest some of the things that must be done in our nation if this American Dream is to be realized, some of the challenges that we face at this hour; and in facing the challenges we will be able to bring this dream into full realization.

I would like to start on the world scale, so to speak, by saying if the American Dream is to be a reality we must develop a world perspective. It goes without saying that the world in which we live is geographically one, and now more than ever before we are challenged to make it one in terms of brotherhood. Now it is true that the geographical oneness of this age has come into being to a large extent through man's scientific

ingenuity. Man through his scientific genius has been able to dwarf distance and place time in chains. And our jet planes have compressed into minutes distances that once took weeks and even months. I think Bob Hope has adequately described this new jet age in which we live. He said it is an age in which it is possible to take a nonstop flight from Los Angeles, California to New York City, a distance of some 3,000 miles...and if on taking off in Los Angeles you develop hiccups, you will “hic” in Los Angeles and “cup” in New York City.. . (laughter) ...You know, it is possible because of the time difference to take a jet flight from Tokyo, Japan on Sunday morning and arrive in Seattle, Washington on the preceding Saturday night; and when your friends meet you at the airport and ask you when you left Tokyo, you would have to say I left tomorrow...(laughter)...This is the kind of world in which we live. Now this is a bit humorous, but I’m trying to laugh a basic fact into all of us, and it is simply this: through our scientific genius we have made of this world a neighborhood, and now through our moral and ethical commitment, we must make of it a brotherhood. We must all learn to live together as brothers or we will all perish together as fools. This is the challenge of the hour. No individual can live alone, no nation can live alone. Somehow we are interdependent.

I remember an experience that I had just a few years ago. Mrs. King and I had the privilege to journey to that great country known as India. I never will forget the experience of meeting and talking with the great leaders of India, meeting and talking with thousands and thousands of people in the cities and villages all over that vast country. These experiences will remain meaningful and dear to me as long as the chords of memory shall let them. But I must say to you that there were those depressing moments. How can one avoid being depressed when he sees with his own eyes evidences of people by the millions going to bed hungry at night? How can one avoid being depressed when he sees with his own eyes thousands of people sleeping on the sidewalks at night, no houses to go in, no beds to sleep in? How can one avoid being depressed when he discovers that out of India’s population of more than 400 million people, some 375 million make an annual income of less than \$80 a year? And most of these people have never seen a doctor or a dentist. As I noticed these conditions, something within me cried out, “Can we in America stand idly by and not be concerned?” And an answer

came, "Oh, no, because the destiny of the United States is tied up with the destiny of India and every other nation. And I started thinking about the fact that we spend millions of dollars a day in America to store surplus food. I said to myself, "I know where we can store that food free of charge, in the wrinkled stomachs of the millions of God's children in Asia and Africa and in South America, and even our own country, who go to bed hungry at night. And it may well be that we spend far too much of our national budget establishing military bases around the world rather than bases of genuine concern and understanding.

All I'm saying is simply this, that all life is interrelated. And we are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny -- whatever affects one directly, affects all indirectly. For some strange reason I can never be what I ought to be until you are what you ought to be, and you can never be what you ought to be until I am what I ought to be. This is the interrelated structure of reality. John Donne caught it years ago and placed it in graphic terms, "No man is an island entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main." And he goes on toward the end to say, "Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind. Therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for thee." I think this is the first challenge and it is necessary to meet it in order to move on toward the realization of the American Dream, the dream of men of all races, creeds, national backgrounds, living together as brothers.

If the American Dream is to be a reality, secondly we must get rid of the notion once and for all that there are superior and inferior races. This idea still lingers around in some situations and in some circles. Certainly the intellectual disciplines, the anthropological sciences, have made it very clear that there is no truth in this. Great anthropologists like Ruth Benedict, Margaret Mead, the late Melvin Herskovitz and others have made it clear that as a result of their long years of study in these various areas, there is no truth in the idea of superior and inferior races. There may be superior and inferior individuals academically within all races. But there are no superior and inferior races. But in spite of this, the notion still lingers around. There was a time when people tried to justify this or tried to give some validity to this argument by turning to the Bible. And there again, it is a strange thing to see how individuals will use or misuse the

Bible and religion to justify their prejudices and crystallize the status quo. And so from some pulpits around the nation it was argued that the Negro was inferior by nature because of Noah's curse upon the children of Ham. The apostle Paul's dictum became a watchword, "Servants, be obedient to your master." Then one other brother had probably read the logic of the great philosopher Aristotle, and you know Aristotle did a great deal to bring into being what we now know in philosophy as formal logic. And in formal logic you have the syllogism with its major premise and minor premise and conclusion. And this brother decided to put his argument of the inferiority of the Negro in the framework of an Aristotelian syllogism. He could say as his major premise, all men are made in the image of God. Then came the minor premise: God, as everybody knows, is not a Negro. Therefore, the Negro is not a man. This was the type of reasoning that prevailed.

Now on the whole I think people have gotten away from that; not altogether though because I heard the other day where someone in Mississippi said that God was a charter member of the White Citizen's Council...(laughter)...But on the whole we've moved away from these arguments. Now it's done on subtle sociological grounds. "The Negro is not culturally ready for integration, and if you integrate schools and public facilities, you will pull the white race back a generation." And then other arguments come out. You see, the Negro is a criminal. And these arguments go on ad infinitum. And the individuals who come forth with these arguments never go on to say that if there are lagging standards in the Negro community, they lag because of segregation and discrimination. And criminal responses are not racial, they are environmental. Poverty, ignorance, social isolation, economic deprivation breed crime whatever the racial group may be. And it is a tortuous logic for you to use the tragic results of segregation as an argument for the continuation of it. It is necessary to get to the causal basis.

And I think that we have enough evidence in practical experiences and practical accomplishments of individuals in the Negro community and individuals in other minority groups to demonstrate that there is no truth in the idea of the inferiority of the Negro race, of the superiority of any other race. From an old slave cabin in Virginia's hills, Booker T. Washington rose to the position of one of America's great leaders. He lit a torch in Alabama and darkness fled. From the red hills of Gordon County, Georgia, in the arms of a mother who could neither read nor write, Roland Hayes rose to the point of

being one of the world's great singers and carried his melodious voice into the palaces and mansions of kings and queens. From crippling poverty-stricken circumstances in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, there came a Marian Anderson to be the world's greatest contralto so that a Toscanini had to say, "A voice like this comes only once in a century." And Sibelius of Finland cried out, "My roof is too low for such a voice." From difficult, crippling, oppressive circumstances, George Washington Carver rose up and carved for himself an imperishable niche in the annals of science. There was a star in the sky of female leadership and then came a Mary McCleod Bathune, grabbed it and allowed it to shine in her life with all of its radiant beauty. There was a star in the diplomatic sky and then came a Ralph Bunche, a grandson of a slave preacher and allowed it to shine in his life.

These are just few examples, inspiring examples to refute the idea of the biological inferiority of the Negro. And they justify the conviction of the poet, "Fleecy locks and black complexion cannot forfeit nature's claim; skin may differ but affection dwells in black and white the same. Were I so tall as to reach the pole or to grasp the ocean at a span, I must be measured by my soul and the mind is the standard of the man."

A third thing that must be done in order to make the American Dream a reality is a very practical thing, but very important. It is necessary to develop an action program to get rid of the vestiges of segregation and discrimination. Now in order to get rid, I mean in order to develop an action program, it is necessary to get rid of one or two false ideas that are disseminated. They are myths and they are disseminated over and over again. One is the myth of time, and I'm sure that everybody assembled here has heard this idea, that only time can solve the problem of racial injustice. And so the individuals who believe this say to the Negro and to his allies in the white community, "Just be patient, don't push things too fast. Be nice and the problem will work itself out in a hundred or two hundred years." They say wait on time. The only answer that we can give to this myth is that time is neutral. It can be used either constructively or destructively. And points, I think, the people of ill will in our country have used time much more effectively than the people of good will. And it may well be that we will have to repent in this generation, not merely for the bitter words and violent actions of the bad people who will bomb a church in Birmingham, Alabama, but for the appalling silence of the good people

who sit around and say, "Wait on time." Somewhere along the way of life, we must come to see that human progress never rolls in on the wheels of inevitability. It comes through the tireless efforts and the persistent work of dedicated individuals who are willing to be coworkers with God, and without this hard work, time itself becomes an ally of the primitive forces of social stagnation. And so it is necessary for us to help time and forever realize that the time is always right to do right.

Now the other myth that is disseminated is the idea that legislation and judicial decrees and executive orders from the President cannot really solve the problem of racial injustice, only education and religion can do that. Now certainly a half-truth is involved here: if the problem is to be solved ultimately, hearts must be changed and religion and education must play a great role at this point. But it is merely a half-truth, for it may be true that morality cannot be legislated, but behavior can be regulated. It may be true that the law cannot change the heart but it can restrain the heartless. It may be true that the law cannot make a man love me but it can keep him from lynching me, and I think that's pretty important also...(laughter)...In other words, through legislation we control the external effects of bad internal attitudes; and so it is necessary in society to have legislation, and this is why it is urgent for the Civil Rights bill that is now in the House of Representatives of our nation to be passed. This is a need and it is a need at this hour and I feel that people of good will all over this nation should write in to congressmen, should write in to senators letting them know in no uncertain terms that this is a moral issue and that this bill is needed in order to help the nation rise to its full moral and political maturity. Now it seems that the bill will get through the House, but then it goes to the Senate. And there is a real danger that the filibuster will be used and in the midst of the filibuster, behind closed doors, compromises will be made, particularly on the public accommodation section of the bill and FEPC. And I am convinced that if these two sections of the bill are deleted, the bill will be so watered down that it will have no meaning. And this already ugly sore of racial injustice on the body politic of our nation may suddenly turn malignant, and we may be inflicted with an incurable cancer that will totally destroy our political and moral health. And so it is urgent for men of good will and women of good will all over the nation to work with determination to see that this bill is passed and that the coalition in Congress made up of right-wing northern Republicans

and southern Dixiecrats will not again serve as the legislative incinerator that will burn to ashes this meaningful Civil Rights bill.

Several months ago, a great, intelligent, vigorous young man stood before the nation and he said, "The issue of Civil Rights is not merely a political issue, it is not merely an economic issue; it is at bottom a moral issue. It is as old as the scriptures and as modern as the Constitution. It is a question of whether you will treat your neighbors as you would like to be treated." And on the heels of that great speech, he presented to the Congress of our nation, this comprehensive package of Civil Rights legislation, the most comprehensive and the strongest Civil Rights bill ever presented by any President. Since that time, a dark moment has come to our nation - - that young man has been assassinated. Now he belongs to the ages. But it is tragic indeed that the question of Civil Rights is still being debated. And it will be debated in the Senate to the point of a filibuster probably. This is tragic indeed, for I am convinced that one of the greatest tributes that a nation can pay to the late President Kennedy is to see that this bill, that he recommended to the Congress, will pass and pass without being watered down at any point.

Also...(applause)...and I would also like to say that there is need for legislation not only on the Federal level but also on the local level or within cities and states. The problem of housing discrimination is a glaring reality all over this country, north and south; and as long as we have this problem, there will be some form of de facto segregation in the public schools and in all other areas of life. And so there is a need for every state to work vigorously for fair housing bills so that we can move out of the long night of housing discrimination. The real test of one's commitment to the brotherhood of man may well be in this housing area, where the men and women can live together as brothers and sisters and not confine the Negro to a ghetto after a ghetto, a ghetto after a ghetto. And so this is a need in every state.

There is also a need to grapple with the serious problem of economic or rather employment discrimination. The Negro is still at the bottom of the economic ladder. The Negro is still somehow caught and smothering in an airtight cage of poverty in the midst of an affluent society. 42% of the Negro families of our nation still earn less than \$2000 a year, while just 17% of the white families earn less than \$2000 a year. 21% of the Negro

families of our nation still earn less than a \$1000 a year, while just 5% of the white families earn less than a \$1000 a year. 88% of the Negro families of America still earn less than \$5000 a year, while just 58% of the white families earn less than \$5000 a year. Now we can see the social problems created by this. If one does not make an adequate income, he cannot have adequate housing, he cannot have adequate health facilities, he cannot educate his children. And so the problems of juvenile delinquency, and the welfare problems, and all of the other social problems that develop are only compounded by the failure to grapple with this problem of employment discrimination. And the problem is even more difficult now because of a force known as automation. The Negro has been confined to semiskilled and unskilled labor, mainly because of a lack of educational opportunities and because of discrimination in apprenticeship training. And now these unskilled and semiskilled jobs are the ones that are passing away. And so the Negro wakes up and discovers that he's 28% of the population in a city like Detroit, Michigan, and 74% of the unemployed.

These problems are growing all over the nation. And the only way that these problems can be dealt with will be through strong concerted action on the part of people of good will. Labor, industry, the federal government, and individuals of good will must come to see that this is one of the most serious problems of our nation, and a program must be developed at every point to rid our nation of this system, along with action programs in the legislative area, and certainly there are other things that must be done. Many of the civil rights organizations are working with these other things, such as increasing the number of Negro registered voters. We are still working through the courts; this is necessary. But even after working through the courts and even after these other areas, we must see that a court order can only declare rights, it can never totally deliver them. And only when the people themselves begin to act, are these rights which are written on paper given life blood. And so this is why nonviolent direct action is necessary to supplement what can be done through these other areas.

Now I would like to take a few minutes to say something about this method or this philosophy of nonviolence, because it has played such a prominent role in our struggle over the last few years, both north and south. First I should say that I am still convinced that the most potent weapon available to oppressed people in their struggle for

freedom and human dignity is nonviolent resistance. I am convinced that this is a powerful method. It disarms the opponent, it exposes his moral defenses, it weakens his morale and at the same time it works on his conscience, and he just doesn't know how to deal with it. If he doesn't beat you, wonderful. If he beats you, you develop the courage of accepting blows without retaliating. If he doesn't put you in jail, wonderful; nobody with any sense loves to go to jail. But if he puts you in jail, you go in that jail and transform it from a dungeon of shame to a haven of freedom and human dignity. Even if he tries to kill you, you develop the inner conviction that there are some things so precious, some things so dear, some things so eternally true that they are worth dying for. And in a sense, if an individual has not discovered something that he will die for, he isn't fit to live. This is what the nonviolent discipline says. And there is something about this that disarms the opponent and he doesn't know how to deal with it.

Another thing about this method is that it makes it possible for individuals to struggle to secure moral ends through moral means. One of the great debates of history has been over this whole question of ends and means. There have been those individuals who have argued that the end justifies the means. Sometimes the whole systems of government have gone down this path. I think this is one of the great weaknesses and tragedies of Communism; it is right here, that often the attitude that any method, any means can be used to bring about the goal of the classless society. This is where the nonviolent philosophy would break from Communism or any other system that argues that the end justifies the means, because in a real sense the end is pre-existent in the means. And the means represent the ideal in the making and the end in process. And somehow in the long run of history, immoral means cannot bring about moral ends. And so the nonviolent philosophy makes it possible for individuals to work to secure moral ends through moral means.

Now, there is another thing about this philosophy -- I guess it's one of the most misunderstood aspects. It says that it is possible to struggle passionately and unrelentingly against an unjust system and yet not stoop to hatred in the process. The love ethic can stand at the center of a nonviolent movement. And people always ask me, "What in the world do you mean by this? How can you love people who are bombing your home, and people who are threatening your children, and people who are using

violence against your every move?" I guess they have a point. I'm not talking about emotional bosh at this point. It is nonsense to urge oppressed people to love their oppressor in an affectionate sense. This isn't what we are talking about.

Fortunately the Greek language comes to our aid in trying to discover the meaning of love in this context. There are three words in the Greek language for love. One is the word "eros." Eros is a sort of aesthetic love. Plato used to talk about it a great deal in his dialogues, a yearning of the soul for the realm of the divine. It has come to us to be a sort of romantic love, and so in this sense we have all read about eros in the beauties of literature. In a sense Edgar Allen Poe was talking about eros when he talked about his beautiful Annabelle Lee with a love surrounded by the halo of eternity. In a sense Shakespeare was talking about eros when he said, "Love is not love which alters when it alteration finds, or bends with the remover to remove. It is an ever-fixed mark that looks on tempest and is never shaken. It is a star to every wandering barque." You know, I can remember that because I used to quote it to my wife when we were courting. That's eros...(laughter)...Then there is "philia." The Greek language talks about this kind of reciprocal love, a sort of...a love that develops out of the fact that you, you like the person. You love because you are loved. This is friendship.

There is another word in the Greek language. It is the word "agape." Agape is more than friendship, agape is more than aesthetic or romantic love. Agape is understanding, creative, redemptive good will for all men. It is an overflowing love that seeks nothing in return. Theologians would say that it is the love of God operating in the human heart. And when one rises to love on this level, he loves every man, not because he likes him but because God loves him. And he rises to the level of loving the person who does the evil deed while hating the deed that the person does.

And I think that this is the kind of love that can guide us through the days and weeks and years ahead. This is the kind of love that can help us achieve and create the beloved community. I think this is what Jesus meant when he said, "Love your enemies," and I'm so happy he didn't say, "Like your enemies," it's pretty difficult to like some people. Like is an affection. It has sentimental qualities and, frankly, it is difficult to like, I find it very difficult to like Senator Thurmond and Senator Eastland and the things that they are doing on this Civil Rights issue and the way they are voting, I really don't like it.

But Jesus says, “Love them” and love is greater than like. Love is understanding, creative, redemptive good will for all men. And I seriously say that I think this can stand at the center of the nonviolent movement and help bring about the new America, the great America.

And so, as Dr. Oxnam said earlier, we can stand before our violent, most violent opponents and say in substance, we will match your capacity to inflict suffering by our capacity to endure suffering. We will meet your physical force with soul force. Do to us what you will, and we will still love you. We cannot in all good conscience obey your unjust laws because noncooperation with evil is as much a moral obligation as is cooperation with good. And so throw us in jail and we will still love you. Burn our homes and threaten our children, and as difficult as it is, we will still love you. Send your hooded perpetrators of violence into our communities at the midnight hours and beat us and drag us out on some wayside road and leave us half dead and, as difficult as it is, we will still love you. But be ye assured that we will wear you down by our capacity to suffer, and one day we will win our freedom. We will so appeal to your heart and your conscience that we will win you in the process. And our victory will be a double victory.

The Vietnam War (1955 to 1975)

World War Two had dealt a blow to the prestige and honor of Europe’s colonial powers, despite the fact that they were on the winning side at the war’s end. Feeling like junior players when compared to the USSR and the USA, the British, the French, and the Dutch, all resolved to restore their status as major powers and to reclaim valuable interests by retaking the East Asian colonies that they had been dislodged from by the Japanese in the 1942 to 1945 period. Despite this, at the war end in September 1945, the European powers remained committed to retaking their colonial possessions in areas such as French Indochina (including Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos), the Dutch East Indies (Indonesia), and British Malaya (the Malay Peninsula and Singapore – a large part of modern Malaysia). For the French, a major consideration was the restoration of French honor and imperial glory after a humiliating defeat and then occupation by Nazi Germany during World War Two. They were also pressured into action by powerful French elites with interests in Indochina. Consideration for the negative domino effect of an independent Indochina on the French Empire in Africa, particularly North Africa, was

another key element in Paris' determination to retake Indochina. The task of regaining these territories however would be much more difficult than expected and would soon become entangled in the wider struggle between communist and non-communist forces. Much had changed since the 1930s, and recently liberated countries such as Vietnam were unwilling to give up their hard-won freedom without a fight. In Indonesia (led by Sukarno who had collaborated with the Japanese) and in Vietnam (led by Ho Chi Minh who had fought against the Japanese) for example, nationalists and communists who had played a central role in the liberation of their countries declared their independence from their former colonial masters.

In southern Vietnam, the French ignored Viet Minh officials (members of a popularly supported communist and pro-independence organization) and put French government officials in their place. As Cohen contends, 'the determination of the Europeans to restore the status quo ante underestimated the determination of the nationalist leaders to maintain their independence' (Cohen, 2001: 363).

French intransigence over Indochina (including Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos) resulted in a much more brutal and protracted conflict with tragic results for the people of the region. Even before the Second World War had ended, the French wartime leader Charles de Gaulle had stated that (in January 1944) that Indochina would not be permitted to become independent. He did suggest however that the colony would be able to enjoy a higher level of political autonomy within the French Empire. The French, though weakened by the world war, had considerably more resources and personnel than the Dutch and were determined to keep their global empire together at all costs. From the US perspective, despite earlier positive relations between the communist Vietnamese forces and Washington, there was a strong belief, particularly within the US military, that French control of Vietnam would be better for American strategic interests than communist control of the country. The Vietnamese leader Ho Chi Minh had also been educated in Moscow, and the US feared the allegiances that he might make and the strategies that he could adopt for possible communist expansion in South-east Asia. An initial American commitment to end imperialism after the Second World War thus gradually became less important than the greater perceived threat posed by communism. Ho and his forces thus could not count on American assistance. As Cohen observes, 'In

Indochina, where the leading nationalist was also the leading communist [Ho Chi Minh], the Americans first muted their criticism of French imperialism, then supported it, and ultimately replaced it' (Cohen, 2001: 368). The nationalist-led KMT Chinese government, who were at that time engaged in the final stage of a bitter civil war with Mao's communists (1946-1950), also viewed Ho and his forces as a threat and an ideological enemy. Chiang Kai-shek also signed a treaty with Paris, and agreed to the French re-occupation of Vietnam after World War Two. The situation therefore appeared at first favorable to the French as they planned their return to ruling French Indochina. Major French forces gradually began to reoccupy Vietnam in the months after World War Two. By March 1946, they had formally commenced their re-taking of the country. By the end of 1946, the French had ousted the Viet Minh communists from their positions of power, and had re-occupied and controlled most of the country. In the other former Indochina territories, Cambodia and Laos, the French negotiated an agreement with the rulers of those countries whereby the Cambodians and the Laotians would receive greater autonomy in return for the agreed presence and supervision of a French governor in their respective countries. Diplomatically and politically isolated, Ho Chi Minh had accepted an agreement in March 1946 in which France seemed to recognize Vietnam as a sovereign state in return for Vietnam becoming a member nation of an Indochinese federation that would remain a part of the French Empire. Following this vague understanding, the Viet Minh permitted French soldiers to be stationed in Hanoi in northern Vietnam. Under an agreement drafted by the major Allied powers, nationalist KMT Chinese troops had temporarily occupied the area immediately after the war to fill the power vacuum left by Japan's defeat. The British army had held control of southern Vietnam in preparation for France's later return.

Within a matter of months after March 1946 however, the Vietnamese realized that the French were planning to try and completely re-control the country as colonial masters. This was unacceptable to the recently liberated Vietnamese. By the end of 1946, the French and the Vietnamese were engaged in a full-scale colonial conflict (see the First Indochina War from December 1946 to August 1954). One of the tragedies of Vietnam's legitimate call for independence was that it was caught up in the worsening global struggle between communist and non-communist forces. As the war against

France waged on, the French installed a puppet regime in the southern city of Saigon (Vietnam's largest city) under the former Vietnamese emperor Bao Dai, in 1949 (see the State of Vietnam (centered in South Vietnam) from 1949 to 1955). In geopolitical terms, by this stage, Chiang Kai-shek's nationalists had been defeated in the Chinese civil war, and Mao Zedong had declared the establishment of the People's Republic of China (the PRC) in 1949. The Chinese communists could now dedicate more time to send aid and assistance to the Vietnamese communists fighting the French south of China's border.

Escalation over Vietnam

Two key developments in the early 1950s contributed to making South-east Asia and countries such as Vietnam a more important component in the Cold War. In the first place, the Korean War and the victory of Mao Zedong's communist forces in the Chinese Civil War resulted in the new People's Republic of China (PRC) sending arms, advisors, and financial assistance to Ho Chi Minh's forces in Vietnam. Secondly, while Moscow was eager to see communism spread throughout the world, South-east Asia was far away from the nearest Soviet territory and as such, in the second half of the 1940s, it was not regarded as a major security issue by the Soviet Union. The distance between South-east Asia and the USSR also made it difficult for Moscow to supply their fellow communists in Vietnam (and elsewhere in the region) with military hardware and equipment. The death of Joseph Stalin in March 1953 however, four months before the Korean War ended, witnessed a change in leadership within the Soviet Union. Stalin's successors were committed to the idea of the Soviet Union more actively assisting communist movements in poor 'Third World' states throughout the world. This renewed ideological commitment in both the PRC and the USSR played a crucial role in helping Ho Chi Minh's communist forces to continue their long war against the United States from 1955 to 1975. This was particularly true in terms of Chinese aid, personnel, and materiel, which were sent across the border to Vietnam. For example, in the years from 1950 to 1970, the PRC provided the Vietnamese communists with over 20 billion US dollars worth of aid and materiel. The Chinese were responsible for about seventy-five per cent of all the foreign aid given to Ho Chi Minh's regime. The Soviet Union provided most of the rest.

In the weeks and months after Mao Zedong declared the establishment of the People's Republic of China (PRC) in October 1949, the Viet Minh escalated their war against the French. By the early 1950s, France was desperately struggling to maintain the fight against Ho's forces. Essential American aid and assistance to the French after the late 1940s was the only thing that stood between continuing the war and defeat by the Vietnamese communists. Before the Korean War (1950 – 1953), US aid to France was cunningly siphoned from congressional funding earmarked for Chiang Kaishek and his nationalist Kuomintang (KMT) forces in their war against the communists in China. Beijing's involvement in the Korean War in late 1950 and its recognition of Ho Chi Minh's 'Democratic Republic of Vietnam' as the only legitimate government in Vietnam in January 1950 convinced Washington of the importance of Vietnam in the fight against communism. The USSR also recognized Ho's regime in the same month.

After 1950 therefore, the Americans wholeheartedly sent materiel, money, and advisors to the French in their war against the communists. This amounted to some eighty per cent of all the money and materiel used by France in their colonial and anti-communist war. Despite this, by the early 1950s, Paris knew that their situation was hopeless and sought a way out of the conflict. The Americans however were not eager to see Vietnam fall to communist rule and urged the French to keep fighting.

When the Korean War ended in July 1953, there was a fear in China and the Soviet Union that the Americans would concentrate their efforts on Indochina and replace the French military and administrative presence in Vietnam, and thus deny Ho Chi Minh a complete victory, and total control over the country. To prevent this, Beijing and Moscow proposed an international peace conference through which France and the Vietnamese communists could reach a peaceful end to the conflict and allow the French an honorable exit from Vietnam, without the need for US military intervention. The issue of post-colonial Indochina dominated discussions at the Geneva Conference in Switzerland in May 1954. Post-conflict Korea was also discussed. A key development prior to the conference had been the Battle of Dien Bien Phu (March 13th to May 7th 1954). Seeking to improve their negotiation position before the upcoming Geneva talks, both the French and the Viet Minh tried to make military gains by inflicting losses upon the communists (in the case of the French) or taking control of as much territory as

possible (in the case of the Viet Minh). French military planners chose the area of Dien Bien Phu for two reasons. Firstly, the French believed that due to its strategic location west of Hanoi and deep in the mountains of northwestern Vietnam, the French army could draw the Viet Minh into a direct confrontation in which the communists could be dealt a crushing defeat. Secondly, a strong French military presence in Dien Bien Phu would also serve to cut off vital supply routes between Hanoi in northern Vietnam, the center of communist power, and neighboring Laos. In pursuit of these objectives, the French amassed their forces around a collection of major French military bases in Dien Bien Phu, and waited for the Vietnamese communists to fight them in a direct confrontation. The Viet Minh however took the French by complete surprise. In a major feat of ingenuity and determination, Ho's forces succeeded in hauling tons of artillery and other equipment through deep jungle and up the steep hills that surrounded the French military bases in the area. Now under siege by the communists, the French army was bombarded day and night for months by Viet Minh artillery fire and devastating attacks upon their bases. On May 7th 1954, the French military bases at Dien Bien Phu were finally over-run by the Viet Minh. It was a crushing defeat for France. The battle marked the end of France's one hundred and fifty year involvement in Vietnamese affairs. The Geneva Conference represented France's final exit.

Washington was very concerned about the implications of Dien Bien Phu for its containment of communism in East Asia. The Americans refused to sign the final accord of the conference, which promised Ho Chi Minh and his communist government immediate control of Vietnam north of the 17th parallel in central Vietnam. It also declared that nationwide elections would be held in 1956 through which all the people of Vietnam north and south could vote on and agree on a new national government (see the Geneva Accords of 1954). Ho had accepted this arrangement even though it was not ideal in terms of his desired to completely control all of Vietnam, north and south. The Soviets and the Chinese however convinced him to wait until 1956. The Viet Minh also feared American intervention in Vietnam, and were weary and bloodied after eight years of war against France. Ho therefore decided to wait and to accept the accords.

Washington however had no intention of providing the communists with an opportunity to democratically take control of all of Vietnam after 1956. Instead, the

American strategy was to make the 17th parallel a type of de-facto border between the communist North Vietnam and a non-communist South Vietnam (similar to what had happened on the Korean peninsula). In the south, Washington implemented measures to create a viable nationalist government in the south with Saigon as the capital. This regime, the US hoped, would be a bulwark against the spread of communism in the country. In the 1950s, with the Second World War still fresh in their memory, the American self-perception was very idealistic. To many Americans, the USA was the home and the defender of freedom, and the world's greatest democracy. Communism, they believed, represented everything that the United States was against. As with Japan, Washington believed that it could make South Vietnam a model of freedom, democracy, and prosperity in South-east Asia. After the Korean War ended in July 1953, the focus quickly shifted to Vietnam. The country was, by the mid-1950s, the main battleground of the Cold War in East Asia. In September 1954, the US used its power and influence to help establish the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), a security alliance dedicated to halting the spread of communism in the region. Oddly, SEATO only actually had just two South-east Asia states as members, the Philippines and Thailand. The other members were the US, the UK, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Australia, France, and New Zealand.

Washington favored the well-known Catholic nationalist Ngo Dinh Diem as a suitable candidate to lead an anti-communist and pro-American regime in southern Vietnam. To this end, Washington provided hundreds of political and military advisers and millions of dollars to help set up a new government with its capital in Saigon. The USA also refused to permit a nationwide election in 1956 as agreed by the participants at the Geneva Conference in 1954. Instead they choose to ignore it after American intelligence sources estimated that if elections were held, Ho Chi Minh and the communists would win at least eighty per cent of the national vote. As Cohen observes, 'the principle of free elections lost its attractiveness in Washington when the likely victor was communist.' (Cohen, 2000: 392). In October 1955, the 'Republic of Vietnam' (also known as 'South Vietnam') was established after a rigged election in southern Vietnam. Diem and his supporters had supervised the election. After initial successes in bringing stability to South Vietnam, the Americansponsored Diem government increasingly

became more and more unpopular, and isolated from Vietnam's intelligentsia, Buddhists, and its rural population. Buddhists made up about 70% of the population, and Buddhist religious leaders were often active in political protests and agitation. Vietnamese Catholics, made up about 10% of the population, and were often perceived as a mostly urban elite who had being closely linked to and privileged by the French during the colonial era. As a consequence of their privilege, Vietnamese Catholics tended to make up the wealthiest class in Vietnam, particularly in the area of landownership. They also held a disproportionate number of powerful positions in Vietnamese society. Poor southern Vietnamese peasants were more attracted to the land reforms promised by Ho Chi Minh and the communists in the north. Diem, a devout urban Catholic with close ties to Vietnam's rich rather than its poor was viewed as a distant figure, and as a ruler who favored the wealthy landowners over the poor peasantry. Buddhists also looked upon Diem as a leader who gave preference to his fellow Catholics, particularly in his choice of government officials. Diem also refused to remove antiBuddhist legislation, which had remained from the French colonial era, from South Vietnam's legal system.

In the countryside, the Saigon regime implemented a disastrous 'strategic-hamlet program' program in 1961 aimed at preventing the spread of communism in areas outside the cities and the urban centers. Washington and Saigon hoped to isolate the Vietnamese peasantry from the rising influence of the southern communist Viet Cong (VC) (the National Liberation Front), which had succeeded the earlier Viet Minh. The program forced millions of rural Vietnamese peasants and villagers to leave their ancestral homes and family burial grounds and into fortified 'strategic hamlets'. The campaign was a near complete failure. It was deeply unpopular amongst Vietnam's rural population and only increased support for the Viet Cong and Ho Chi Minh's government in Hanoi. Money earmarked for the program was also often siphoned into the pockets of corrupt Saigon regime administrators. As a result, many of the strategic hamlets lacked essential resources and were in fact poorly protected. The program became an easy target for the Viet Cong, who tried to undermine it militarily and politically. The Vietnamese intelligentsia also came to despise Diem and his government. This was due to his use of force and his secret police to eliminate free speech and any protests critical of his rule. By the early 1960s, it was apparent that the deeply unpopular Diem regime was in trouble,

and that it only had the support of the urban Catholic Vietnamese minority. Violent communist-led and non-communist rebellions against his government had begun. When Buddhist activists participated in street demonstrations against the Diem regime, the Saigon regime responded in ruthless fashion. International public opinion was outraged by media coverage of the demonstrations (see the self-immolation of the Buddhist monk, Thich Quang Due, in June 1963). In this environment, the Viet Cong increased its popularity in southern Vietnam. It also benefitted from a constant supply of financial, political, and military assistance from communist-controlled North Vietnam. Washington decided that Diem needed to be replaced before the government of 'South Vietnam' collapsed.

In November 1963, Diem was assassinated in a military coup that Washington secretly supported. The American Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), who originally had protected the unpopular ruler, provided a group of South Vietnamese generals with money with which to overthrow Diem and his family. The coup leaders had agreed to allow Diem to leave Vietnam but then broke their promise during the coup and killed Diem and his brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, another leading figure in the regime. The head of the military coup, General Nguyen Van Thieu, became the new leader of the Saigon-based government (from 1963 to 1975). The 1960s were years that saw a ruthless and dogged determination by the United States and the Saigon government to do whatever was necessary to defeat the communist threat in South Vietnam and to keep the northern communists behind the 17th parallel.

One major mistake made by the Americans was their belief that they could win an unconventional guerrilla war by adopting the methods and strategies of a conventional war. Growing increasingly frustrated by the slow progress of the war, the US military and the South Vietnamese army (the Army of the Republic of Viet Nam, referred to as ARVN), engaged in a ruthless counter-insurgency campaign aimed at neutralizing and killing as many suspected communists as possible (see Operation Phoenix or the Phoenix Program). The Viet Cong irregular guerilla army and the regular North Vietnamese army (the Vietnamese People's Army (VPA)) however seemed capable of suffering massive casualties in comparison to the US Army who increasingly were getting bogged down in an unwinnable war. The US suffered about 58,000 deaths during the war but the

Vietnamese communists suffered over one million deaths, about twenty dead Vietnamese combatants for every American soldier. These figures do not include all the innocent Vietnamese civilians who died in the war, estimated to be at least another one to two million people.

The US army and ARVN forces used napalm bombs (slow burning petroleum jelly which sticks to the skin), and chemical defoliants (see Agent Orange) to destroy vegetation and the dense jungle forests, which the Vietnamese communists used to hide themselves from US and ARVN aircraft and their ground forces. The devastating effects of 'Agent Orange' are still apparent in Vietnam today. The Viet Cong's vast and complex tunnel system as well as their ability to cross the border into Cambodia, Laos, and northern Vietnam however made comprehensively defeating the communists an extremely difficult task. From a figure of 12,000 US 'military advisers' in 1962, the American military presence had risen to 500,000 in 1967 after the Gulf of Tonkin Incident in 1964 (which saw a major escalation in direct US intervention in Vietnam). As a consequence, the US death toll in the war also rose dramatically. The war was extensively covered by the American and international media who aired TV pictures and newspapers of the true unsanitized story of war, and of the suffering of the Vietnamese people in particular (see the photo of 'General Nguyen Ngoc Loan executing a Viet Cong prisoner in Saigon' in February 1968, the My Lai massacre of March 1968, the napalm bombing photo of a young girl, Phan Thi Kim Phuc in June 1972). This contributed greatly to the Vietnam War's growing unpopularity back home in the United States and around the world. Alongside the Viet Cong, the US and the ARVN had to fight against regular North Vietnamese army soldiers who increased their presence and military capabilities in southern Vietnam via the so-called 'Ho Chi Minh Trail' (a network of roads and trails that connected North Vietnam to South Vietnam via Laos and Cambodia). The communists were also greatly helped by aid, finance, and advisors from China and the Soviet Union. USSR-made surface to air missiles and Chinese and Soviet anti-aircraft personnel shot down dozens of American planes that flew on highly destructive bombing raids over North Vietnam. By the mid to late 1960s, it was becoming clear to Washington that Vietnam was not Korea and that the war could continue indefinitely.

One event in particular clearly illustrated this dilemma for the US government, and for the US public who watched the war progress via television and newspapers back home in America. On the morning of January 30th 1968, the Vietnamese communists took the US army and the southern Vietnamese regime by complete surprise when they launched major attacks upon American and Saigon regime military bases, buildings, and symbols of power across all of South Vietnam. Four of its five major cities were attacked alongside numerous other rural and provincial centers. The US had expected the communists to honor a cease-fire during the Tet or the lunar New Year celebrations in Vietnam. During the so-called Tet Offensive, the Viet Cong scored a major psychological blow against the US when they succeeded in entering the grounds of the US embassy in Saigon and placing it under siege for up to six hours before the communist attackers were all killed. While the Tet Offensive was ultimately a military defeat for the Viet Cong, it was a psychological success for the communists because it highlighted to the American public that the Vietnam War was going nowhere for Washington. It also publicly displayed the brave determination of the communists to keep fighting and to strike hard despite a massive US effort to destroy them on the ground and via devastating bombing raids. The Tet Offensive provided stark evidence that the war in Vietnam was a war without end and that the communist enemy was more resilient and committed than the Americans appreciated.

Following January 1968, the will of the American people in particular to continue the war decreased dramatically. Anti-war protests in the US (and internationally), which had started in 1964 after the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, erupted on university campuses and city centers throughout the United States. Popular anti-war sentiment was also apparent within political circles, and amongst American celebrities (see Robert Kennedy, Muhammad Ali, Martin Luther King, and the Kent State shootings of May 1970 for example). The US government also began to realize that the war was unwinnable. Washington however persisted in conducting the war for another five years in the hope that they could win concessions from the Vietnamese communists in exchange for an American withdrawal from South Vietnam (the last US troops left Vietnam in March 1973). As a result, thousands of young American soldiers and hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese fighters and civilians died in the war before it finally ended in April 1975.

Negotiations between the USA and North Vietnam to end the war had begun in May 1968, five months after the Tet Offensive. In October 1968, Washington and Hanoi negotiated an agreement (with Soviet assistance) to end the war but this was turned down by the Saigon regime. Before he became President, Richard Nixon and his supporters gained politically by assuring the anti-communist regime that they would receive a better deal if they waited until after the US Presidential elections in late 1968. The war was therefore prolonged.

By the late 1960s, the Americans gradually began to decrease the number of US troops in southern Vietnam and to slowly withdraw their forces from an unpopular war. In order to reduce the number of US deaths in the war and thus lessen anti-war sentiment at home in the United States, Washington focused more and more on air power and aerial bombardment to pressure the North Vietnamese government in Hanoi. Under President Richard Nixon (from 1969 to 1974), the US government adopted a policy known as 'Vietnamization' aimed at preventing further American casualties. This policy involved US ground forces gradually being decreased, Saigon regime forces being strengthened, and the US air force resuming its earlier bombing campaigns against North Vietnam (see Operation Rolling Thunder from 1965 to 1968). Controversially, the American aerial bombardment of communist forces and supply lines was extended in support of South Vietnamese anti-communist forces into Laos and Cambodia. Hundreds of thousands of innocent Laotians and Cambodians died as a result of massive American bombing of large areas of their country (see Operation Menu and Operation Freedom Deal). The bombing also did terrible damage to the landscape and infrastructure of these countries. Incredibly, the United States dropped more bombs on Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos than they had throughout the Second World War. There was 1000 pounds (453kg) of bombs for every man, woman, and child in Vietnam.

In March 1970, the neutralist Cambodian government in Phnom Penh was overthrown in a coup d'état carried by military officers, led by the anti-communist Lon Nol, who were pro-American. In May 1970, US forces began to secretly penetrate into Cambodia (officially a neutral state) for the purpose of wiping out and destroying Vietnamese communist bases there. The military coup d'état and the US incursions into parts of Cambodia resulted in the deaths of hundreds of thousands of innocent

Cambodians and a serious destabilization of their political system. The American military's presence in Cambodia (and Laos) resulted in a rise in support for local communist movements in those countries (see the Cambodian Civil War from October 1970 to April 1975). In the chaos caused by the knock-on effects of the Vietnam War, the radical communist Khmer Rouge rose to power in Cambodia. Under the leadership of the notorious Pol Pot, the Khmer Rouge regime in Cambodia (from 1975 to 1979) murdered up to two million of their own countrymen and countrywomen in their goal of creating a utopian communist state. In February 1971, the Americans and their South Vietnamese allies also made a disastrous attempt to destroy Vietnamese communist bases in Laos, actions that later benefitted the Pathet Lao communists in terms of their support from the Laotian people. By the early 1970s, it was even more apparent to Washington that the war against communism in Indochina was making no progress and that the USA needed to withdraw its forces as soon as it possibly could.

After rounds of secret talks since the late 1960s, President Richard Nixon negotiated an agreement that was acceptable to China, the Soviet Union, and the Saigon regime. When a North Vietnamese attempt to invade South Vietnam failed in March 1972, the Vietnamese communists finally relented to pressure from Moscow and Beijing to end the conflict with the United States. One should note that at this stage in the war, China was desperate to improve relations with Washington following the Sino-Soviet split (from 1960 to 1989) and the Cultural Revolution (from 1966 to 1976) both of which left China domestically unstable and isolated on the world stage. By the late 1960s and the early 1970s therefore, the Chinese were eager to mend relations with Washington by persuading the North Vietnamese communists to accept offers to end the Vietnam War. We will discuss the Sino-Soviet split in more detail later. In October 1972, the Vietnamese communists therefore accepted a deal that was not a complete victory for them but would at least see the Americans leaving Vietnam (see the Paris Peace Accords of January 1973). In the remaining months of 1972 however, the war and a massive aerial bombardment of North Vietnam continued as President Nixon sought to pressure Hanoi into accepting a favorable peace deal and also to convince the Saigon regime that Washington would not abandon them after US withdrawal (see Operations Linebacker I and II). The Operation Linebacker II campaign (also known as the Christmas bombings)

witnessed the heaviest bombardment of North Vietnam by the Americans since the war began in 1955, and since full-scale US involvement in 1964.

After the Paris Peace Accords were signed in January 1973, nearly twenty years of US military involvement in Vietnam came to an end. By March 1973, the last American troops had left the country. After the US withdrawal from Vietnam, the emboldened Vietnamese communists and the dejected anti-communist Saigon regime continued to fight one another for control of 'South Vietnam'. Saigon still received support from Washington but the Watergate scandal (June 1972 to August 1974) and President Nixon's subsequent resignation from office in August 1974 witnessed a major fall in the United States' commitment and assistance to the Saigon government. By the middle of 1974, Saigon's military forces could no longer successfully defend South Vietnam against increasing numbers of communist attacks. The drop in American aid and support resulted in a weakening in Saigon's ability to remain supplied of arms and weaponry. The morale of the ARVN also dropped dramatically. Thousands of anti-communists soldiers deserted from the army. In March 1975, the Vietnamese communists launched a major attack on South Vietnam. Hanoi expected that it would take at least two years to topple the Saigon regime. In the face of a renewed communist attack however, the demoralized ARVN panicked and disintegrated. On this occasion, Washington refused to directly intervene and prevent South Vietnam from falling into communist hands. On April 30th 1975, Saigon fell and all of Vietnam was under communist control. The Vietnam War was over. In honor of their leader who died in 1969, the communists renamed Saigon 'Ho Chi Minh City.' As the Americans feared, the communist victory in Vietnam was followed shortly afterwards by the communist Khmer Rouge taking power in Cambodia and the communist Pathet Lao taking control of Laos. Communism however did not expand beyond these countries. As Cohen observes, 'After a war of thirty years, the Vietnamese revolution had triumphed over the French, the Americans, and all internal opposition. Where once the French tricolor had flown, three independent states now stood, united by their leaders' shared allegiance to the doctrines of Marx and Lenin'

By the mid-1970s and the end of the Vietnam War, the Cold War in East Asia was virtually over. After decades of conflict, war-torn countries such as South Korea and

the states of South-east Asia focused on reconstruction and rebuilding their societies. Cambodia was to suffer terribly until 1979 under the ruthless Khmer Rouge regime, and then due to the Cambodian-Vietnamese War (1977 to 1989). Former allies, Vietnam (now regarded as a Soviet proxy state in the region) and the Chinese (who fell out with the Soviets in the 1960s) went to war with each other in 1979 (see the Sino–Vietnamese War). China and the United States had become friends after 1972 (see President Nixon’s visit to China in 1972). With the exception of the still tense Korean Peninsula, there was no major communist expansion after the mid-1970s or no major threat to US strategic interests in the region. In the waters of East Asia and in countries such as South Korea, Japan, Taiwan, and the Philippines, Washington was still regarded as the predominant power in the region. Under the protection of the US giant, East Asian non-communist governments largely depended on the American military to maintain peace and stability in the region, while they concentrated on economic growth and prosperity..

Self-Assessment Questions

1. Explain the Interwar Years and the Great Depression.
2. Assess Franklin D. Roosevelt’s New Deal and its impact.
3. Analyze the causes and effects of World War II.
4. Explain how the USA became a world power after World War II.
5. Discuss the origins and policies of the Cold War.
6. Explain the Truman Doctrine and its significance.
7. Evaluate the leadership of Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson.
8. Assess the Civil Rights Movement and Martin Luther King’s role.
9. Discuss Nixon’s presidency and domestic policies.
10. Analyze the causes, course, and impact of the Vietnam War.

Unit- V

Contemporary USA - Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan – George Herbert Walker Bush . – Bill Clinton – George Walker Bush – War on terrorism - Barrack Obama – Multiculturalism - Popular culture - The Afro- Americans Experience - Hispanics and Asians.

Objectives

- To study the leadership of Carter, Reagan, Bush, Clinton, and Obama.
- To analyze U.S. policies and the War on Terror.
- To examine multiculturalism, popular culture, and minorities.
- To assess contributions of African Americans, Hispanics, and Asians.

Jimmy Carter

When Jimmy Carter is mentioned in American politics, he is used as an example of what not to be. Jimmy Carter has become the punching bag of the political right, exemplifying a failed liberal presidency. In a pre-election interview on NBC's Nightly News, Republican presidential candidate John McCain had the following to say about his opponent:

Obama says that I'm running for a Bush's third terms. It seems to me he's running for Jimmy Carter's second. (LAUGHTER)

The Democrats' instinct wasn't to reject the comparison's fundamental premise that Carter's second term would have been bad—it was to reject the comparison. This interpretation of Carter's presidency has become commonplace within modern political discourse. Instead, the Obama campaign team, with the Democratic Party behind it, responded by pointing out the differences between Carter and Obama. Indeed, Carter's very own political party has accepted that the insult to modern politicians is more easily deflected than the insult to the good peanut farmer

A mere three decades since Carter's presidential farewell, U.S. cultural memory has it that he was a failed president. Politically conservative historian Steven F. Hayward, F.K. Weyerhaeuser Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute and Senior Fellow at the Pacific Research Institute, has praised conservative leaders. In his examination of the Carter years, *The Real Jimmy Carter: How Our Worst Ex-President Undermines*

American Foreign Policy, Coddles Dictators, and Created the Party of Clinton and Kerry, Hayward accused the former president of quixotic idealism. He argued that Carter wasn't enough of a realist to be president, and that Carter's moral compass too often pointed him in the wrong direction. On the other end of the political spectrum, politically liberal and revisionist writers Frye Gaillard and Douglas Brinkley assert that the former president had only good intentions, and should be given credit for that. Brinkley, history professor and director of the Eisenhower Center at the University of New Orleans, wrote an entire book about Carter's post-presidential successes titled *The Unfinished Presidency: Jimmy Carter's Journey beyond the White House*. Brinkley used Carter's post-presidential successes to rectify the former president's reputation. Frye Gaillard, writer-in-residence for the History department at the University of South Alabama and winner of the Lillian Smith Book Award, wrote his own account titled *Prophet from Plains*. Gaillard asserted that Carter's "greatest asset [was also] his greatest flaw: his stubborn, faith-driven integrity", which put Carter in a more positive light. Carter himself admits to his steadfast commitment to his faith in his own account of his morals, *Our Endangered Values: America's Moral Crisis*.

Some cite Carter as an idealist, whose quixotic aims led his presidency to ruin. Others argue that he was a man with good-intentions in the wrong place at the wrong time. Instead of relying only on the history of Carter's four years as president or his years of philanthropy that followed, this essay seeks to examine the challenges of the Carter presidency through the lens of Carter's pre-presidential experiences.

Investigation

Farming in Archery, Georgia, the Carter family lived in a rustic environment. The young James Earl Carter Jr. grew up with all of the boyhood responsibilities of a smalltown farm. Earl Carter, the father of the would-be president, demanded much from his three children, not abstaining from physical discipline on occasion.⁸ As a result, Carter spent his childhood motivated to gain his father's approval.

Carter's childhood work ethic was refined by his experiences on the farm and—no doubt—by his relationship with his father. Earl Carter relied on tough love to catapult his son into manhood, which only intensified the young Jimmy's desire to please his father. Further, the young Carter learned to mask his anger toward his father by hiding

behind his smile. Rather than birthing a Georgian, arm-twisting, Lyndon Johnsesque politician, the atmosphere of Carter's childhood home created a man who was often unwilling to expose his inner feelings to advisers and legislators. Not necessarily creating a man with a permanent poker face, Earl's influence on the young Jimmy likely gave the president a constant reminder that he can never really succeed unless he performs perfectly.

Carter's rustic childhood didn't only frame his political challenges as opportunities for perfection, but also developed him into a fiercely independent problem-solver. Steven Hochman, a three-decade-long research assistant to the former president, explained in an interview that "[Carter] is very independent. If you grow up on a farm, you have to do things for yourself. When some problem comes up, he's used to solving it". This independence made Carter unlike many of his political peers. In his many political posts, it has been argued that Mr. Carter was less interested in listening to others than he was in trusting his own discretion. Indeed, Carter's maverick politics—the politics of self-induced isolation—were born from his time on the farm. To the young Jimmy—and to the 39th president—independent problem-solving was more of a way of life than a way out of teamwork.

Before entering the political ring, Carter spent a few years as a nuclear engineer. Leaving Georgia to study at the U.S. Naval Academy in Annapolis, Carter's competitive edge quickly surfaced. Francis Hertzog, one of his closest friends at Annapolis, recalled that "Jimmy just hated to lose...He wanted to be the best at whatever he did". Enlisting in the Navy following his studies at Annapolis, Carter would go on to work under the then and still legendary Admiral Hyman Rickover as an engineer on a new nuclear submarine program. Zelizer posits that "all of these years as an engineer helped to shape Carter's approach to tackling issues. He developed a technical and managerial...mindset to problem solving that would inform him throughout his career". This prepolitical career path sets him apart from most career politicians, who have traditionally been lawyers and business owners and managers. Carter's problem-solving methods isolated him from many of Washington insiders during his presidency. He didn't seem to understand the game of politics. His time as an engineer was in part responsible for his reputation as a political klutz.

Following Carter's promising naval career came his decisive time as a full-time peanut farmer in a segregationist community. After his father's death, Carter left the Navy to fill in the void left by his father. The family farm now became Carter's livelihood. Following the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision in 1954, the segregationist White Citizen's Council attempted to enlist as many local white men as possible. When the local White Citizen's Council demanded that Carter join them, even threatening to boycott his farm's goods and consequently his livelihood, Carter stood his ground and refused. He rejected the status quo and was a maverick among prominent local white men. He accepted that he was one of the only nonmembers in all of Sumter County. To Carter, dissension was more of a rule than it was an exception.

With decades' hindsight, Carter reflected that his "commitment to human rights came, [he guesses], from [his] personal knowledge of the devastating effect of racial segregation in [his] region of the country". This admission is made even more poignant when one considers the obstinacy with which Carter approaches infractions of human rights. Incidents like the encounter with the White Citizen's Council display Carter's steadfast confidence in his morals and willingness to stand by them even when it jeopardized his very livelihood. Throughout his time in Plains, Carter consistently found himself on the moral high ground, even if that meant being in the moral minority. This, very likely, was an attitude toward morality that Carter carried with him throughout his life.

Jimmy Carter: A Moral Hero

Carter's political acumen was very much developed by his early years in Georgia politics. The Georgian political system was riddled with corruption. Coming to prominence under such circumstances was the first hurdle over which Carter jumped, running into the Georgia political machine along the way. Carter dove into "the belly of the beast" and ran for a seat in the Georgia State Senate in 1962. Carter's opponent, a well-known local businessman, was an incumbent with the support of Joe Hurst, "one of the state's most powerful bosses". Carter narrowly lost the election because of Mr. Hurst's overt vote manipulation: "[d]ead men voted, 126 people voted in alphabetical order, and more votes were cast than there were registered voters on the rolls". Carter, an ever-tenacious man, challenged the incumbent's underhanded victory and demanded a

recount. Miraculously, he marshaled enough media attention to shed enough light on the corruption to secure a seat in the senate. Carter's battle scars from this episode never healed, serving as a reminder that fellow politicians cannot always be trusted.

Carter entered the senate lacking not only a comfortable legislative alignment with the party system, but also lacking a comfortable alignment with the legislators themselves. During his first year as a state senator, Carter was unusually hardworking, even among his peers. Unusual for a Georgian senator, he "did not enjoy the horse trading and socializing that also constituted part of legislative life". Such activities were proper for a senator to fulfill his duties fully. Unfortunately for him, he would maintain this asocial temperament through his political career. Hamilton Jordon, a lifetime political adviser and presidential chief of staff, noted that Carter didn't "understand the personal element in politics". Perhaps stemming from his tenure as a nuclear engineer, Carter was more interested in getting the job done today than he was in building relationships for tomorrow. Immersed in a political system that he presciently regarded as corrupt, Mr. Carter's belief that his way was the right way was galvanized during his senatorial stint. This, for better and for worse, was an attitude that he would long retain after he left the senate.

From the inception of his political career, Carter needed to work against, and not with, the political system to gain power. In his 1970 bid for governor of Georgia, "Carter's campaign focused on his promise to help the average Georgians, to make government more efficient, and to be responsive to citizen concerns". To the average Georgian voter, corruption was nearly synonymous with politics. Carter's appeal in this race was that he was antigovernment. He was an outsider. When he won the gubernatorial race, he further refined his image as an outsider. To combat the inefficiencies of Georgian government, one of Carters goals was to "streamline the state government by eliminating unnecessary agencies and centralizing control under the governor". Carter built a career on beating the system, redesigning the system, but not working with the system.

Governor Carter's initiatives were noteworthy for another reason: they were difficult to label. This wasn't unusual throughout Carter's political career, as he often "refused to be pinned down by preconceptions of what a liberal or conservative should do". Since Mr. Carter spent much of his pre-Washington political career fighting against

a corrupted political system, he developed his own set of beliefs that occasionally deviated from party platforms. He never felt the need to conform to the Democratic Party both within his state and within the nation. A political maverick from day one, Carter would have a particularly difficult time garnering support for his many legislative proposals from the people who had ultimate authority over them: the legislators. Because he never comfortably aligned with his own party, Governor—and President—Carter often hobbled across the chamber pigeon-toed.

This exploration would be incomplete without a discussion of Carter's faith. In his 2005 book, *Our Endangered Values: America's Moral Crisis*, Carter sheds light on his Christian faith and how it affected his presidency. In the introduction of the book, he admitted that "[his] own religious beliefs have been inextricably entwined with the political principles [he has] adopted". While religious beliefs often underpin many of the morals that politicians have, Carter's religious underpinnings ran much deeper than most presidents'. Carter submitted that he "was born into a Christian family, nurtured as a southern Baptist, and [had] been involved in weekly Bible lesson all [his] life, first as a student and then, from early manhood, as a teacher". This level of intimacy with the church is nearly unparalleled in presidential history, as Mr. Carter even maintained his Bible lessons through his presidency. For Carter, religion wasn't merely a part of life—it was a way of life. Carter himself contends that one of his "most fervent commitments was to the complete separation of church and state", but his religion no doubt found its way into many of his ethical dilemmas while in office in ways few presidents had before experienced. In response to concerns about his private, religious beliefs conflicting with his political, secular duties, Carter submits the following:

There were a few inconsistencies, but I always honored my oath to "preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States." For instance, I have never believed that Jesus Christ would approve of either abortions or the death penalty, but I obeyed such Supreme Court Decisions to the best of my ability, at the same time attempting to minimize what I considered to be their adverse impact.

Carter's faith was the lens through which he examined the world. This isn't a bias from which an actively practicing Christian can separate. To the researcher's advantage, Carter wrote this analysis of his morality more than two decades after leaving office. His

retrospection produced an honest self-assessment. For Carter, faith-based considerations were much less the expectation than they were the rule.

It might be said that Carter's faith-based perceptions might have been compatible with those of the conservative right. Though Carter was indeed religious, he belonged to the religious Left—"a very different beast". Carter supported many of the positions around which the Left rallied, such as environmental legislation, healthcare, and a dovish aversion to military intervention. Even so, Carter examined certain issues, such as abortion, through the same religious lens that the right would. These political incongruities made for a slightly awkward leader of the Democratic Party. Indeed, Carter's religious identity made him more of an outsider once in Washington, standing between even him and his party.

One of the most heavily-criticized episodes of the Carter administration was the energy crisis of 1979. In the wake of the Iranian Revolution, Iran cut the world's oil supply by two million barrels per day in December 1978. The Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) took the opportunity to hike oil prices. OPEC quickly moved to 50% increases by the summer of 1979. As a result, gas station lines spread and caused panic across the nation. This sudden scarcity may not have been the fault of the president, but required him to soften the blow to the nation's morale. As was, and still is, customary of an American crisis, nearly all matters of national concern fell on the president's shoulders. Carter's public response to the price hikes and station lines was to deliver what was to be known as the "malaise" speech. Within the address, Carter's moralistic underpinnings did more than shine through and in between each line. A few notable excerpts from the address are more than adequate to display this point:

It's clear that the true problems of our nation are much deeper—deeper than gasoline lines or energy shortages, deeper even than inflation or recessions.

After listening to the American people I have been reminded again that all the legislation in the world can't fix what's wrong with America.

The threat is nearly invisible in ordinary ways. It is a crisis of confidence. It is a crisis that strikes at the very heart and soul of our national will. We can see this crisis in the growing doubt about the meaning of our own lives and in the loss of a unity of purpose for the nation.

Our people are losing that faith, not only in government itself but in the ability as citizens to serve as the ultimate rulers and shapers of our democracy.

The symptoms of this crisis of the American spirit are all around us.

Within these excerpts from the speech, Carter projected his own spiritual perception of the issue onto the nation. Instead of focusing on the nation's crisis of oil, Carter focused on the nation's crisis of confidence. He didn't look to the typical explanations for the oil crisis, but instead relied more on faith and principles. What followed the address invited trouble: the purge of the presidential cabinet

Following the "malaise" speech, the president ordered the pro forma resignation of his entire cabinet, with an additional twenty-three senior White House staff. Though Carter would only accept five of the resignations, the purge was supposed to be an extension of the spirit of his recent address. The peanut farmer's intentions fell on infertile soil. Time described it as "the most thoroughgoing, and puzzling, purge in the history of the U.S. presidency". It wasn't only puzzling to the public, as Washington legislators also had doubts about the purge. Time also judged that "the house cleaning...provoked new doubts about Carter's understanding of the federal government and about his own leadership ability". To Carter, an antigovernment change was a gesture of democratic faith, almost inviting the public into the White House to clean up the government personally. Similar to his time in Georgia, Carter regarded government officials as corrupt and inept. However, the same political machine that functioned in Georgia didn't function in Washington. Carter's purge suggested to the public not that he was tending to the government's inadequacies, but that he was tending to his government's inadequacies. He was responsible for appointing the officials from whom he requested resignations. Carter's position as the appointer of these officials made the culpability mutual, and the public responded as such: "by end of the week, his approval rating had fallen back to the pre-malaise speech 25 percent". This episode illustrates that though Carter's moral rectitude may have been well-meant, its extremity was not well-taken.

Very likely the most nightmarish episode within Carter's foreign policy was the Iranian hostage crisis. This incident tested Carter's political acumen with both the public and his advisers. On November 4, 1979, "as many as three thousand militants who hated

America for its support of the Shah poured across the [U.S.] embassy walls and took control of the compound”. Fifty-two American hostages became mere puppets in the theatre of an Iranian revolution, forcing the Commander-in-Chief to undertake a series of negotiations for their release. This crisis would indelibly stain the Carter administration in its last year by undermining Carter’s legitimacy as Commander-in-Chief. Carter, a dovish head of the U.S. Military, refrained from the use of military force through each of the 444 agonizing days of the hostage crisis. This, Carter admits in a 2011 interview for The Guardian, “was not a popular thing among the public, and it was not even popular among [his] own advisers inside the White House. Including [his] wife”. Instead of military intervention, Carter maintained a personal moral high ground through Operation Eagle Claw. Intended to be a peaceful alternative to hawkish force, the operation only made matters worse by ending in a “terrible confluence of extreme circumstances involving a sandstorm in the desert and a helicopter crash, [in which] eight US servicemen were killed”. Ironically, Carter’s attempt to preserve lives resulted in lives lost. To the public, this was an unacceptable failure. Indeed, it was accident from which his presidency would never recover.⁴⁶ Gaillard even held that without this accident, “[Carter may have been reelected] if [he] had been lucky—if, for example, a navy helicopter and C130 transport plane hadn’t collided in a swirl of Iranian dust”. Even so, Carter would never regret his dovishness. The following excerpt from a 2011 interview with The Guardian illuminates how inextricably entwined the president’s morals were, and still are, with his leadership:

Rosalynn has been quoted as saying that, had her husband bombed Tehran, he would have been re-elected. [The interviewer] put this to Carter. "That's probably true. A lot of people thought that. But it would probably have resulted in the death of maybe tens of thousands of Iranians who were innocent, and in the deaths of the hostages as well. In retrospect I don't have any doubt that I did the right thing. But it was not a popular thing among the public, and it was not even popular among my own advisers inside the White House. Including my wife".

Carter’s current cost-benefit analysis perfectly illustrates the relationship between his morals and his politics: he regarded human life as infinitely more valuable than a

political victory, making his failed rescue plan a small cost for the benefit of preserving tens of thousands of innocent human lives.

Also inconveniently occurring within Carter's nightmarish final year in office was the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Carter's predictably diplomatic response was in the form of "a grain embargo, an Olympic boycott, and a backing away from the SALT II treaty". Despite all of these dovish and sincere efforts to halt the Soviet occupation, the Soviets continued with their mission anyway. Carter once again affirmed the notion that he was willing to put his morals well above what was clearly more viable. Carter was by almost no accounts an unintelligent man. Indeed, it is conceivable that he consciously neglected the viable to uphold his principles. He led this nation as Commander-in-Chief with a set of bulletproof morals, even at the gunpoint of politics.

With his presidency three decades behind him, Carter proudly submitted that "we kept our country at peace. We never went to war. We never dropped a bomb. We never fired a bullet. But we still achieved our international goals". Carter's present perception of his single term suggests no pangs of regret for his moral obstinacy. Though he may not have been the president for the political system, he remained content with his decisions. It should come as no surprise that Carter holds his moral underpinnings in high regard. Carter didn't just massage the conventions of presidential moral fidelity – he rejected them. To his demise, his moral fidelity was incompatible with the jungle of Washington. It was incompatible with the jungle of American politics, but it wasn't incompatible with the farmland of Plains, a fact which Carter may have overzealously applied throughout the rest of his political career.

Ronald Reagan

Many well-known phrases in the political world are associated with Ronald Reagan, the fortieth president of the United States. Many have called him the "Great Communicator." Others refer to his era as the "Reagan Revolution." Still others reflect on "Morning in America," one of the most memorable campaign themes in American history.

Ronald Wilson Reagan was born in the small northwest Illinois town of Tampico on February 6, 1911. After attending high school in Dixon, he studied economics and sociology at Eureka College, where he was elected president of the student body. After

his graduation from college, he moved to Iowa, where he began a career in radio as a sports broadcaster.

While on assignment in California, Ronald Reagan took a screen test and began working as an actor. He spent four years in the U.S. Army Air Corps during World War II. After completing his commitment to the army, he returned to acting in motion pictures and began working in television. Ronald Reagan appeared in a total of fiftythree films between 1937 and 1964.

While working in Hollywood, Ronald Reagan became involved in the Screen Actors Guild, a labor union for actors, and became its president in 1947. He served as its president at a time when fears about the spread of communism led Congress and the FBI to investigate members of the entertainment industry for their political views. His experiences during this period of his life deeply rooted his commitment to fighting communism both at home and abroad.

In 1954, Ronald Reagan began hosting General Electric Theater, a weekly television series. He became General Electric's spokesman, traveling to the company's numerous plants across the country, speaking out against big government, excessive taxation, and communism. During his General Electric years, Ronald Reagan honed his message and polished his speaking skills.

Although Ronald Reagan was a supporter of Democratic president Franklin D. Roosevelt and maintained his membership in the Democratic Party for many years, his political beliefs became increasingly more conservative. Part of Ronald Reagan's decision to join the Republican Party was its alignment with his anticommunist views. In 1963, he became involved in the campaign of Barry Goldwater, the Republican nominee for president. In October 1964, Ronald Reagan delivered a speech that became known as "A Time for Choosing," in which he attacked the expansion of government and appeasement of communism, themes that would resonate throughout his career. The speech thrust him into the national political spotlight.

Ronald Reagan was elected governor of California in 1966 and served two terms in office. While governor, he became prominent in national Republican politics as well. In 1976 he challenged incumbent president Gerald Ford for the Republican nomination for president. Although he did not win the nomination, he established his position as a

leader within the Republican Party, emphasizing the conservative ideals of less government regulation and taxation, vigorous opposition to communism, and support for a strong national defense

Ronald Reagan won the Republican nomination for president in 1980 and went on to defeat the incumbent Democratic president Jimmy Carter in the election. He was sworn in as the fortieth president of the United States on January 20, 1981, at the age of sixty-nine.

Some historians and political scientists have used the phrase “The Age of Reagan” to describe his importance in American politics. Ronald Reagan’s administration would be defined by its efforts to reduce the size and scope of government powers, reduce taxes, fight communism around the world, and renew American patriotism. The pursuit of these themes during Ronald Reagan’s presidency influenced the course of both domestic and foreign policy

Presidential Powers

The Framers of the Constitution were somewhat uncertain about creating the office of the presidency. They had fought the Revolutionary War against the excesses of executive tyranny and knew from history the dangers of concentrating power in the hands of one person. But they had also experienced problems due to the lack of a strong executive under the Articles of Confederation. In creating the presidency, they were inventing an executive unlike any that had ever existed in a democratic republic—one strong enough to be effective, but not so strong as to become oppressive. The result of their deliberations and attempts to strike this balance is found in Article II of the U.S. Constitution, which provides the basic structure of this office and a fairly brief list of its designated powers.

The Framers of the Constitution were aware that the office and function of the executive would need to adapt to the times and situations that the country would face and would be shaped in part by those who occupied the office. Although each president puts a unique stamp on the presidency, he or she must act according to the constitutional definition and limits of the executive and the precedents of those who had previously served.

Upon reading Article II of the Constitution, one is struck by how brief the article is, considering how important the office it creates has become. The Constitution provides only minimal guidance as to what the president is expected to do or exactly how the president may exercise his or her powers. For example, the president is directed to “from time to time give to the Congress Information on the State of the Union, and recommend to their Consideration [certain] Measures.” It is unclear exactly what the president’s involvement with the legislative process should be, and this involvement has changed over time.

Each president must abide by the Constitution as both the source of presidential authority and a limitation of that authority. In Article II, the president is given some specific powers. Some of these powers are fairly clear and easy to apply. The president, for example, is given the power to veto legislation passed by Congress. But some of the president’s powers are less clear and more subject to diverse interpretations. The president is “vested” with the executive power and is charged with the responsibility to “take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed.” In the context of the pressing issues of the day, presidents have sometimes differed in their interpretation and application of these phrases.

The Constitution states that “the President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.” Throughout history, this power of the president has been especially subject to interpretation. The extent of the president’s authority over the military is unclear. Article I of the Constitution gives Congress the power to declare war, to raise and support military forces, and to raise and appropriate funds for those forces. As James Wilson stated at the Pennsylvania Ratifying Convention, the Constitution was designed to “prevent one man from hurrying us into war.”

In Federalist 69, Alexander Hamilton drew a distinction between the powers of the president under the Constitution and the powers of the King of England:

The President is to be commander-in-chief of the army and navy of the United States. In this respect his authority would be nominally the same with that of the king of Great Britain, but in substance much inferior to it. It would amount to nothing more than the supreme command and direction of the military and naval forces, as first General and admiral of the Confederacy; while that of the British king extends to the declaring of war

and to the raising and regulating of fleets and armies—all which, by the Constitution under consideration, would appertain to the legislature.

Of course, presidents and congresses have debated the distribution of powers when applied to actual situations. The relative powers and responsibilities of the two branches are particularly difficult to judge when Congress has not declared war. Most of the military engagements of the United States have never been formally declared by Congress. Presidents have on many occasions committed troops to battle without a declaration of war from Congress.

After the Vietnam War, many members of Congress felt that it was time to clear up some of the ambiguities in the Constitution about the commitment of U.S. troops. In the War Powers Resolution of 1973, Congress sought a balance of congressional and presidential powers in making decisions about sending troops to war. The War Powers Resolution stated that without authorization or a declaration of war by Congress, “the President in every possible instance shall consult with Congress before introducing United States Armed Forces into hostilities.” But the resolution recognizes that serious and immediate threats may require swift action, and consultations may cause too much delay. In such cases, after dispatching troops, the president is required to report to Congress, and Congress determines whether the troops should remain or be removed from the situation.

Presidents since Richard Nixon have maintained that the War Powers Resolution is unconstitutional because they claim it conflicts with the president’s authority as commander in chief. On the other hand, some scholars have claimed that the War Powers Resolution is an unconstitutional delegation of congressional power to the president.

Executive Power and the Contemporary Presidency

Every presidency begins against the backdrop of current events. In the decades prior to Ronald Reagan’s inauguration, the country had experienced the expansion of presidential powers during the administrations of Lyndon Johnson (1963–1969) and Richard Nixon (1969–1974), and then the contraction of presidential influence under the presidencies of Gerald Ford (1974–1977) and Jimmy Carter (1977–1981).

During the 1960s and 1970s, policymaking centered in the executive branch resulted in concerns that the power of the presidency had grown too large and that certain

actions of the presidents were unconstitutional. A prime example of presidential strength was the direction of the war in Vietnam, which has been described as a “presidential war,” over which Congress had little influence. The term imperial presidency has been used to describe an office that some felt had expanded or grown too powerful. The Watergate scandal of Richard Nixon’s presidency reaffirmed this belief.

Upon the resignation of President Nixon, his vice president, Gerald Ford, assumed the office of president. Congress, in reaction to recent events, was committed to asserting its constitutional power in relationship to the powers of the president. When Jimmy Carter was elected president in 1976, Congress asserted itself further. Some scholars have referred to the administrations of Presidents Ford and Carter as the imperiled presidency. The Constitution’s lack of a detailed explication of the formal powers of the presidency had enabled Presidents Johnson and Nixon to expand their powers. That same lack of specificity enabled Congress to attempt to restrict the powers of the presidency during administrations of Presidents Ford and Carter.

In his first inaugural address, President Reagan expressed his optimistic view that the problems of the nation could be overcome with conservative policies. At the heart of his economic plan was the concept that “government is not the solution to our problem; government is the problem.” He explained this by saying,

We are a nation that has a government—not the other way around. And this makes us special among the nations of the Earth. Our government has no power except that granted it by the people. It is time to check and reverse the growth of government, which shows signs of having grown beyond the consent of the governed. It is my intention to curb the size and influence of the Federal establishment and to demand recognition of the distinction between the powers granted to the Federal Government and those reserved to the States or to the people

Although it is difficult to select a few isolated actions to be representative, presidential dealings can be divided into war powers, domestic politics, and foreign relations. We will examine Ronald Reagan’s use of presidential power during his administration as it relates to each of these categories.

President Reagan as Commander In Chief

One short military engagement illustrates Ronald Reagan as commander in chief. President Reagan's administration was concerned about Soviet and Cuban influence in Central America and the Caribbean. On the small Caribbean island nation of Grenada, a pro-Soviet communist government with close ties to communist Cuba seized power in 1979 and was proceeding with construction of a large airfield. President Reagan believed it would be used by the Soviets and Cuba to supply communist groups in Central America.

In October 1983, the government of Grenada was overthrown and the island's military assumed control. In response, President Reagan ordered American troops to invade. Several other Caribbean nations also sent troops. The invasion, conducted as a rescue mission, ensured the safety of about a thousand Americans on the island.

The mission achieved success quickly. The Americans on the island were evacuated to the United States, procommunist forces—largely Cuban troops—were defeated, and a new civilian government was formed. Even so, the invasion raised some of the same questions regarding executive authority that had been raised during the Vietnam War a decade earlier with previous presidents.

The constitutional division of war powers between the president and Congress has been debated since the Constitutional Convention. History provides us with many examples of presidents committing troops without either a declaration of war or prior congressional approval. But the War Powers Resolution of 1973 required presidents to consult with Congress before committing troops, except in cases of serious and immediate threats. In the case of Grenada, Ronald Reagan's administration informed some congressional leaders but did not seek actual consultation or advice before the invasion.

President Reagan's position was that as commander in chief he had an obligation to ensure national security and protect the interests of the country and its citizens. As for the War Powers Resolution, President Reagan reported to Congress, but only consistent with, not under the War Powers Resolution. He stated that he was acting under his constitutional authority to swiftly commit troops. Subsequent presidents have also used

this distinction when reporting to Congress concerning troop deployment and have not sought formal consultation with Congress before committing troops.

The invasion of Grenada is often cited as an example of President Reagan's decisiveness and action against the expansion of communism. Although there was some controversy over this exercise of presidential power, the invasion denied communism another foothold in the Caribbean and restored Grenada's parliamentary government, which continues to hold free elections. The Grenada invasion is also regarded as a return to presidential domination of war powers.

Domestic Policy: the Air-Traffic Controllers' Strike

A president can clearly point to the commander in chief clause of the Constitution as a basis for his or her authority to deploy troops. However, many other actions that presidents take consist of a combination of powers derived from various constitutional clauses and an interpretation and application of these powers to particular situations. Actions taken in domestic policy are often a mix of powers.

The president is charged with the general responsibility to "take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed." The Constitution notes that "the executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America." Of course, the legislature is given specific powers of its own, such as the power to create laws and appropriate money. However, the Framers were vague on how domestic policy would be administered by the president.

Early in President Reagan's administration, the nation's air-traffic controllers went on strike, seeking higher salaries and fewer working hours. The controllers were employees of the federal government and their strike violated federal law, which prohibited federal workers from striking. Although the controllers' union and several other unions had called similar strikes under previous presidents, no action had been taken against them. With the controllers on strike, the nation's air travel was briefly crippled and millions of Americans were adversely affected. President Reagan announced that the striking controllers must return to their jobs within 48 hours or they would be fired. When most of the workers did not return to work, he kept his promise and fired more than eleven thousand air-traffic controllers, replacing them with military controllers, supervisors, and nonstriking workers. President Reagan banned the striking

workers from being rehired. The Justice Department pursued fines against the union. Within months, the union was decertified and was effectively broken.

President Reagan's action in firing the striking workers was controversial. The strike and subsequent firing of these workers resulted in cutting roughly half the scheduled commercial flights on the first day of the strike, and the airline industry lost substantial revenue. Firing the workers went against the precedents of the four previous presidents, who did not fire government workers in similar situations. The Federal Aviation Administration faced the need to immediately hire and train new controllers. Commercial flights recovered quickly, however. The air traffic control system continued to function. Most Americans supported President Reagan's actions. The Soviets paid close attention to this incident and were struck by President Reagan's resolve and decisiveness.

Some critics claimed that the firing seemed to contradict President Reagan's campaign promises to the air-traffic controllers' union, the only union to have supported his election campaign. His decision to fire the striking workers showed that President Reagan did not intend his view of limited government to mean that he favored a weakened presidency.

The President and Foreign Policy

One important role of any president is that of "chief diplomat." Although these specific words do not appear in the Constitution, the president is given the authority to receive foreign diplomats. The president also acts as the director of foreign policy by appointing the secretary of state and ambassadors to foreign countries. These powers are shared with the Senate, which has the authority to confirm presidential appointments to these offices and to advise on and consent to treaties made by the president. In practice, the presidency has gained many informal foreign policy powers not written directly into the Constitution. The ability of the president to react swiftly, to speak as a single voice—in contrast to the many voices in Congress—and the central position of the president in American politics have created a dominant role for the president in foreign policy making. As international travel has become easier, presidents have capitalized on the opportunity to conduct diplomatic meetings with heads of state around the world.

Limiting the expansion of the Soviet Union's influence became one of the main goals of U.S. foreign policy after World War II. The struggle between liberal democracy, led by the United States, and totalitarian communism, represented by the Soviet Union, was called the Cold War. To challenge each other's influence, both the United States and the Soviet Union built up their militaries and arms stockpiles and extended them to their respective allies during this period.

Convinced that weakened U.S. military forces only invited Soviet expansionism around the globe, Ronald Reagan promoted strengthening the U.S. military through increased defense spending as one of the major themes of his 1980 presidential campaign. Military spending had been declining since the end of the Vietnam War—resulting in shortages of military parts and equipment—and had begun increasing at the end of President Carter's administration. Furthermore, President Reagan and his advisors believed that because the Soviets were outspending the United States in military weapons procurement, there would be a potentially dangerous imbalance of power.

President Reagan also aimed to reduce the influence of the Soviet Union and “roll back” or eliminate communist regimes around the globe by supporting anti-Soviet governments and groups. These included the mujahideen in Afghanistan, the Contras in Nicaragua, and the Solidarity Movement's struggle for freedom in Poland. This became known as the “Reagan Doctrine.”

President Reagan was very vocal in his opposition to communism. He predicted that communism would be left “on the ash heap of history” with other “tyrannies which stifle the freedom and muzzle the self-expression of the people.” He referred to the Soviet Union as an “evil empire.” This dramatic statement and President Reagan's policies toward the Soviet Union generated a great deal of controversy. Some saw his words as an important reassertion of American resolve. Others worried that they needlessly antagonized the Soviets and increased the risk of war. To alleviate these concerns, the president spoke of his program as “peace through strength.”

Early in President Reagan's second term, a reform-minded leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, assumed power in the Soviet Union. Like previous presidents, Ronald Reagan made plans to meet the new Soviet leader. During his presidency, President Reagan met with General Secretary Gorbachev on five occasions from 1985 to 1988. The

two leaders developed a personal relationship and worked together to reduce the tensions of the Cold War.

In June 1987, President Reagan stood before the famous Brandenburg Gate, which had been blocked by the Berlin Wall. The wall had been constructed in 1961 by communist East Germany to isolate West Berlin and to prevent East Germans from fleeing to the West. It had become a symbol of communist repression around the world. In what would become one of his most famous speeches, President Reagan challenged Secretary Gorbachev and said,

General Secretary Gorbachev, if you seek peace, if you seek prosperity for the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, if you seek liberalization, come here to this gate. Mr. Gorbachev, open this gate! Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall!

Also in this speech, President Reagan called for a lessening of the arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union. Just six months later, the two leaders signed a treaty to reduce nuclear weapons.

Mikhail Gorbachev introduced sweeping reforms to the Soviet Union that gave his people a greater measure of political and economic freedom. He hoped this would strengthen the weak Soviet economy and improve citizens' well-being. The reforms, however, unleashed a wave of protests. The protest movements led to the collapse of communism all over Central and Eastern Europe. In November 1989, the Berlin Wall was opened and eventually dismantled. The destruction of the wall became a symbol of this historic turning point. In 1991, the Soviet Union was dissolved and Mikhail Gorbachev resigned.

President Reagan's "peace through strength" strategy has often been credited as contributing to the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War. President Reagan himself believed that when given the choice, people will always choose freedom.

Ronald Reagan and the Presidency

President Reagan's reassertion of presidential power left a significant mark on events of the 1980s and reinvigorated the office of the presidency. It is generally acknowledged that President Reagan's policies were key factors leading to the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, liberating millions. President Reagan proved flexible in his dealings with the Soviet Union, reducing tensions and negotiating a

reduction in arms. However, opponents thought that President Reagan's policies of strengthening the American military and confronting the Soviet Union would increase the danger of armed conflict while adding to the budget deficit. In some instances, these policies led to claims that the United States had supported governments and outside groups that at times disregarded human rights. Nevertheless, during his eight years in office, Ronald Reagan's political instincts and determination to spread democracy and freedom raised American morale and promoted liberty around the world. Although scholars continue to debate the merits of his policies, popular esteem for Ronald Reagan has risen over time. Public opinion polls indicate that he remains one of the country's most popular and admired presidents.

George Herbert Walker Bush

The foreign policy of the United States toward Jordan has been shaped since the early years of the Cold War. On January 31, 1949, the United States established its diplomatic relations with the newly independent Kingdom. Since that time, the United States has appreciated the distinctive role of the Jordanian leadership in advancing peace and promoting democracy, as well as modernization in the Middle East region. Furthermore, the United States and Jordan share mutual visions, objectives, and interests toward achieving just, comprehensive, and lasting peace in the region. In April 1957, the White House declared "the independence and integrity of Jordan as vital," (Nyrop, 1980, p. 32) to the United States. Immediately, the Eisenhower administration provided Jordan with \$10 million of emergency financial aid, military assistance, and diplomatic support to ensure sustainability of Jordan and its regime.

The George H. W. Bush Presidency: 1989-1993

On January 20, 1989, George H. W. Bush was inaugurated as the forty-first President of the United States. The Republican President previously served as the United States House of Representative from Texas, United States Ambassador to the United Nations, Chairman of the Republican National Committee, Chief of the United States Liaison Office to China, Director of Central Intelligence, and Vice President from 1981-1989 under President Reagan. Following his inauguration, President Bush spent a large part of his efforts on foreign affairs ("George H. W. Bush: Foreign Affairs," n.d.). The years of Bush's presidency witnessed dramatic changes in world affairs. The most

prominent world events that took place during Bush's term in office included Panama, the ending of the Cold War, the fall of the Berlin Wall, the reunification of Germany with Eastern Europe, the break of the Gulf War, the formation of an unprecedented military coalition of 32 nations to liberate Kuwait, the reduction of the threat of nuclear war, the replacement of the Soviet Union with a democratic Russia, the Baltic states became free, US-Soviet relations changed, the New World Order was announced, the world system transformed from bipolar to unipolar, and the United States became the world's sole economic, military, and political superpower ("Biography: George Herbert Walker Bush," n.d.).

The Political Arena

Following the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait on August 2, 1990, King Hussein immediately placed a phone call to President Saddam Hussein of Iraq in an initial attempt to reach a settlement to resolve the Iraqi-Kuwaiti crisis. Saddam assured the King that if the Arab states were tolerant to the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, he would endeavor to begin a gradual recall of troops and complete his pullout of the emirate within weeks. After speaking with Saddam, the King met with the Egyptian President, Hosni Mubarak, to convene a mini-summit of the Egyptian, Iraqi, Jordanian, Kuwaiti, and Saudi leaders to resolve the Iraqi-Kuwaiti crisis. In the meantime, both the King and President Mubarak spoke by phone to American President Bush, who regarded the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait as totally unacceptable and voiced his opposition. They asked that he delay any American action and to allow the Arabs time to resolve the crisis within the Arab League. Further, they told Bush that it was just a matter of days that Saddam Hussein would withdraw his military troops from Kuwait.

On August 3, 1990, King Hussein met with Saddam Hussein in Baghdad. In that meeting the King ensured two objectives: first, he persuaded Saddam to participate in a mini-summit in Jeddah on August 5. Second, he convinced Saddam to withdraw his military troops from Kuwait within hours if the Arab League did not put down the Iraqi invasion. The last point was deemed important for Saddam because any direct censure of Saddam by the Arab League would create a sense of embarrassment for him. This condemnation could change the perception of withdrawal to that of a humiliating defeat. The King believed he had successfully advanced the goal of containing the crisis.

Unfortunately, although the King's diplomacy was to some extent successful, it was undermined when the Egyptian government first, and later the Arab League Foreign Ministers who met on August 3 in Cairo and unexpectedly condemned the Iraqi invasion. Marwan Al-Qassim, the Jordanian Foreign Minister and Representative to the Arab League meeting of Foreign Ministers in Cairo, abstained from voting due to his concern that this would be promoting intervention by outside parties. Jordanian officials were suspicious of the United States, convincing Egypt and Saudi Arabia to relinquish hope of a negotiating a permanent solution. Following the adoption of a resolution condemning the Iraqi invasion, Saddam abandoned any plans for withdrawal, whether real or otherwise, and refused to attend the Arab Summit in Jeddah.

The Egyptian President called an emergency Arab Summit, to be convened in Cairo on August 10th, to discuss the ongoing Iraqi-Kuwaiti crisis. The Jordanian King participated in the summit in an attempt to bring about a peaceful solution. As a result of this summit, the Arab League officially adopted a resolution (Resolution 195) condemning the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. It further called for immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the Iraqi forces from Kuwait, reasserted Kuwait's sovereignty, and additionally responded to Saudi Arabia and other Gulf states' requests to shift Arab forces to defend Saudi Arabia and the regional security of the Gulf states. Jordan and some other Arab states abstained from the vote (White Paper, 1991). The Jordanian neutral position was interpreted as an expression of sympathy for Saddam Hussein from both the Arab states, especially the Gulf states, and also the United States. The Arab League "Resolution 195" adopted at the Extraordinary Arab Summit in Cairo on August 10, 1990, decided the following:

To condemn Iraqi aggression against the brotherly state of Kuwait and not to recognize the Iraqi decision to annex Kuwait or any consequences arising from the invasion of Iraqi troops of Kuwait territory. (4) To call for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the Iraqi troops from Kuwait and the return to the state it was in before 1 August. (5) To reaffirm Kuwait sovereignty, its independence and regional security ... (6) To respond to Saudi Arabia's and other Gulf States' request to transfer Arab forces to support their armed forces to defend their territories and regional security against any outside invasion.

After the Arab League adopted a resolution condemning the Iraqi invasion, Jordan found itself isolated from the majority of the Arab states. Subsequently, on August 16, 1990, King Hussein met with President Bush in Kennebunkport, Maine to discuss the ongoing Iraqi-Kuwaiti crisis. The King tried to persuade Bush to keep the crisis within the Arab framework, find a diplomatic solution to the entire crisis, and avoid the military option. Ultimately, the King's attempt to convince Bush and his administration to reach a peaceful settlement was unsuccessful. Furthermore, American officials argued that the King was defending Saddam Hussein.

In his memoirs, Bush recorded that the King "pressed for some middle ground that could solve the problem, and I kept saying, there isn't any – it's got to be withdrawal and restoration of the Kuwaiti regime." (Ashton, 2008, p. 271). The meeting damaged relations between the two nations and displayed how far apart the United States and Jordan's policies were from each other at that time. The Bush administration was disappointed with the King's position and tension between the two countries grew. In the months following the crisis, the Jordanian King continued to persuade all the parties involved in the Iraqi-Kuwaiti crisis to find a diplomatic resolution to the crisis within the Arab framework instead of war. While King Hussein played a significant role in the Iraq-Iran War of 1980-1988 as a mediator between the Iraqi government and the United States, the King's efforts to resolve the Iraqi-Kuwait crisis reached a dead end. His prior efforts were completely forgotten and crucially undermined during the Iraqi invasion. Jordanian efforts to stop the war were effectively rejected by both Arabs and Americans

As the internationally-led airstrike campaign against Iraq started, the Jordanian government expressed more sympathy for the Iraqi people. On February 6, 1991, King Hussein delivered a firm speech to his nation that was brought about by the death of Jordanian truck drivers by an American airstrike while on the Baghdad-Amman highway. In his speech, the King sharply denounced the United States and its allies' war against Iraq, declaring that the allied war effort was "against all Arabs and all Muslims and not against Iraq alone." (Cowell, 1991). Further, he indicated that the allied forces were seeking to exercise a foreign hegemony in the Middle East, stating that the Western alliance intention was to "destroy Iraq and reorganize the area in a manner far more dangerous to our people than the Sykes-Picot agreement." (Cowell, 1991). Disappointed,

the United States responded to this speech by suspending aid to Jordan and promising to review plans for future aid (Garfinkle, 1993). In addition, Secretary of State, James A. Baker III told The Washington Post, “Although the United States ‘fundamentally disagrees’ with King Hussein of Jordan’s harsh criticism of the war against Iraq, alternatives to Hussein are not ‘particularly pretty’ and it is important to keep communications with the king open.

Three days later, President Bush swiftly sent a personal, harsh letter to King Hussein articulating his dissatisfaction:

I am not going to hide my deep disappointment with your speech of February 6. I had not expected ... to read such a vitriolic attack on the intentions and actions of the multinational coalition that is liberating Kuwait ... your words exculpate Saddam Hussein for the most serious and most brazen crime against the Arab nation by another Arab in modern times ... If we do not agree on these matters, so be it. But we must understand that a public, political posture that takes Jordan so far from the international and Arab consensus has damaged very seriously the prospects for eliciting international help for Jordan. If I am circumspect in my own public views on your accusations, it is only because I continue to place value, however unrequited, in your nation’s well-being and stability.

The Economic

Around The Gulf crisis of 1990-1991 negatively impacted the Jordanian economy, perhaps the most of any country outside of Iraq and Kuwait. By the time the crisis broke out, Jordan was hosting more than a million refugees. Approximately 300,000 of these returnees from the Gulf states became permanent residents in the Kingdom. The tremendous influx of returnees placed a significant strain on the already limited Jordanian sectors such as education, health care, housing, and transportation. In addition, the influx of returnees increased the demand on the country’s limited water supplies and infrastructure, causing an increase in the cost of living. These factors led to an increase in poverty and around 30% unemployment (“History: Seeking Peace: Jordan’s Stand in the Gulf Crisis,” n.d.), compared to United States unemployment 25% during the great depression 1929-1941. The Gulf crisis and its subsequent United Nations’ economic trade sanctions against Iraq created serious trade difficulty for the Jordanian state. Jordan’s

political position on the crisis, and later its hesitation to implement the United Nations trade embargo sanctions on Iraq, paved the way for the United States to threaten to close the Gulf of Aqaba, Jordan's only port outlet to the external world.

Two weeks after the Gulf crisis of 1990-1991, President Bush told the Los Angeles Times that he would block Jordan's only seaport if they did not join in the embargo (Lauter, 1990). This seriously damaged Jordan's trade relations with the world community, and Jordan was most especially concerned as "nearly 40 percent of Jordan's economy depended on Iraq." (Abu Jaber, 1994, p. 370). Undoubtedly, the first six months of the Gulf crisis was a very difficult period in the modern history of Jordan, damaging its relations with traditional Arab and Western allies as well as creating severe economic difficulties. In fact, the crisis may have cost Jordan as much as three billion dollars considering the impact on trade and declining revenues. Despite the negative impact on Jordanian relations and economy through the interruption of commerce, Jordan ultimately adhered to the mandated United Nations' sanctions against Iraq ("History: Seeking Peace: Jordan's Stand in the Gulf Crisis," n.d.). In addition to the economic difficulties that Jordan faced as a result of the Gulf crisis, the United States suspended foreign aid to Jordan as a response to King Hussein's speech on February 6, 1991. In this regard, James A. Baker III told CBS's Face the Nation that the United States may cut its foreign aid to Jordan, stating, "[We] must allocate our foreign aid in a way that makes the most sense from the national interest standpoint." ("Feb. '91 WSJ Article on Jordan King Hussein and Saddam," 2003). The United States Senate also expressed its deep resentment of the King for supporting the Iraqi regime during the Gulf crisis. On March 20, 1991, the Senate voted to rescind \$55 million in economic and military assistance to Jordan. Moreover, Senator Don Nickles of Oklahoma said the following regarding Jordan: "After billions of dollars of aid from the United States, Jordan actively opposed the United States and the United Nations by giving political and moral support to Saddam Hussein."

In a letter to the Senate, President Bush warned of the impact of the recession on the Jordanian government stating "Jordanian stability remains important to the region and to U.S. interests -- and indeed to Israel's interests -- and Jordan could play a significant role in postwar diplomacy, especially in the Arab-Israel peace process." (Tolchin, 1991). In response to Bush's letter, the Senate approved resuming aid to Jordan on a conditional

basis as long as the President agreed to certify and report to congressional committees on Jordan's progress in advancing the peace process in the Middle East. Alternatively, if it could be shown that the aid would contribute to the peace process then the aid would be restarted. The President signed a waiver allowing Jordan to receive eventually all of the FY 1991 and FY 1992 aid funds after the signing of the Jordanian-Israeli agreement to a bilateral agenda on September 17, 1993

Impact of the Peace Process in the Middle East

As the Gulf crisis came to an end, the Bush administration quickly transitioned toward sponsoring peace diplomacy to mend the Arab-Israeli conflict. On March 6, 1991, President Bush informed Congress that he intended to bring an end to the Arab-Israeli dispute ("The Madrid Conference, 1991," n.d.). Consequently, Bush's speech was followed by an intensified diplomatic campaign by James A. Baker III, culminating in the convening of the Madrid conference for Peace in the Middle East in October 1991.

King Hussein was similarly motivated to repair the strained relations with the United States. On February 28, 1991, the King wrote a letter in which he congratulated President Bush for liberating Kuwait. In his letter the King stated:

Well done my friend and you will find me more than ever determined to contribute my utmost to the healing of wounds and to the opening of a new and bright chapter in the history of this region for the benefit of its future generations. We shall commit ourselves to the renewal of the best Jordanian/American and Arab/American relations on sound, clear and solid foundations.

On April 20, 1991, James A. Baker III paid a visit to Aqaba to discuss the Middle East peace process with King Hussein. According to The Washington Post, "The meeting was the first high-level U.S. contact with Hussein since he visited President Bush in Kennebunkport, Maine, shortly after Iraq invaded Kuwait last August." (Goshko, 1991). In his meeting with the King, Baker indicated that Washington hoped that Amman would play a key role in the peace process. The Baker-Hussein meeting marked a new beginning in American-Jordanian relations.

According to Nigel Ashton's book, *King Hussein of Jordan: A Political Life*, the American peace process allowed King Hussein to show his commitment to the region:

The American-led peace process which followed the [Gulf] war, and which was to culminate in the convening of the Madrid peace conference at the end of October 1991, was soon to give [King] Hussein the opportunity to demonstrate his commitment to this new beginning.

In short, US-Jordan relations which were damaged during the first six months of the Gulf crisis of 1990-1991, contributed to Jordan's isolation because of its stand on the Gulf War. Subsequently, its relations with the Arab states that were against Saddam Hussein worsened and its ties with Washington were also negatively impacted. United Nations sanctions against Iraq significantly affected the fragile Jordanian economy. As the Gulf War came to a close, US-Jordan relations began to warm. Baker visited Aqaba in late April 1991, and his meeting with King Hussein to discuss the peace process in the Middle East was considered a turning point in American-Jordanian relations. The Bush administration, like the previous ones, asserted that the stability of the Jordanian state is in the best interest of the United States and its allies in the region. Furthermore, it recognized the importance of the King's role, specifically, in any peace initiative in the Arab-Israeli conflict. It is important to point out that King Hussein and President Bush had a strong personal friendship dating back to 1976 when Bush was the director of Central Intelligence. Since 1976, the relationship between the two grew significantly. However, during the Gulf crisis of 1990-1991, both leaders had a different view of the crisis and were both disillusioned by the course of events. After the Gulf crisis came to a close, the relationship between them was recharged and positively impacted their countries. In fact, after King Hussein's death, President George H. W. Bush accompanied Presidents Clinton, Carter, and Ford on a trip to Amman to pay tribute to the King.

Bill Clinton

Bill Clinton's Biography

William Jefferson Blythe was born on August 19, 1946 in Hope, Arkansas. His father, William Jefferson Blythe III, had died in an auto accident several months before his mother, Virginia Cassidy Blythe, gave birth to the future president.

Raised in the home of his grandmother, Edith Cassidy, Bill's early years were dominated by two strong women, who often competed for his attention. His mother, an attractive and fun-loving free spirit, was often away from home taking nursing classes in

New Orleans. It was during those periods that his grandmother, a temperamental and strong-willed disciplinarian, tried to shape her grandson's character. As little Billy Blythe grew from infancy to toddler, he became not simply the go-between but a sort of prize in the battle between Edith and Virginia.

Between these two poles, bright, little Billy Blythe tried his hardest to satisfy both sides. As his high school friend and daughter of a Baptist minister Carolyn Staley later remarked, Bill would be fated to "wear good on one shoulder and bad on the other" (Hamilton, 2003: 44). This is better illustrated in the fight between grandmother and mother as Edith enrolled Billy at the local Baptist church, even though she herself disliked organized religion. She simply left Billy at the church door to be indoctrinated in the "good" as opposed to the "bad" that Virginia personified.

In 1951, Virginia married Roger Clinton, a used car dealer and abusive alcoholic. The family moved to Hot Springs, an exciting resort town five miles away. Hot Springs in 1953 had a population of 36,807-four times that of Hope. More important, the town had an annual tourist population of half a million, which made it more cosmopolitan than any other town in the state, including the capital, Little Rock.

Little Billy Blythe was driven into town each day to the first private, parochial grade school he had attended in his life: St. John's School, next to St. Joseph's Church on West Grand Avenue. St. John's had been started in 1908 for white children and by the 1950s boasted 250 pupils, all still white. Classes were conducted by the Sisters of Mercy, and it was they who, in their spinsterly but dedicated way, were the first to recognize the ability of the little Baptist boy in their midst: attentive, bright, and competitive to the point of annoyance.

Roger Clinton Jr., born on July 25, 1956 certainly seemed a godsend: the answer to a prayer for Billy Blythe. He was no longer home alone and would no longer be the sole brickbat between fighting parents. There was another birth that summer, that of a new national political hero. Virginia had bought a television set the year before. Televising of the national conventions brought the drama of political selection to tens of millions of viewers, including ten-year-old Billy Blythe at 1011 Park Avenue.

Television thus provided the beginning of a lifetime love affair with politics, as Billy later acknowledged, "I think it sort of came home to me in a way on television that

it wouldn't have otherwise," he reflected. The grand television challenge left a lasting impression on him.

On April 9, 1962, Virginia divorce Roger Clinton. At that time, Bill was fifteen. For Virginia, divorce offered liberation without poverty. The days of Roger Clinton's tyranny and alcoholism seemed finally over. The new Virginia could start afresh with her two wonderful boys.

Virginia Clinton moved into her new home at 213 Scully Street on the other side of Hot Spring. Her divorce had been finalized on May 15. To mark this new family scenario, Billy, the next month went to see the chancery judge at the Garland Country Court with a view to changing his name into William Jefferson Clinton. Sometimes after years he would say, "I decided it was something I ought to do. I thought it would be a gesture of solidarity. And I thought it would be good for my brother, who was coming up."

At the age of sixteen, Bill Clinton had been a junior class president at Hot Springs High and had subsequently put his name forward for the annual training week in politics and government: "The Boys State is a program where the leaders or the people at various high schools will pick a number of boys who are finishing their junior year. You get sponsors, and certain boys are selected for leadership qualities, and they go to this summer school. You spend a week learning about the workings of government. You are divided into cities and counties and states. People run for office. You carry out elections. It is designed to foster knowledge about the American political system, the American governmental system and get you involved in government. So that, theoretically, you'll have men that will know about government and be very involved in the system" said Joe Purvis.

The Boys State took place at Camp Robinson, which is a military installation; it was a World War II military army camp. But Bill was not content with Boys State: he was running for Boys Nation. Election for Boys Nation, held at the end of the session at Camp Robinson, would take two winners to Washington D.C., to participate in a week of mock political meetings, sightseeing, meetings with real senators and a visit to the White House to meet the President of the United States.

Bill won his first significant election outside school at the end of the week. For several weeks later, in July 1963, Boys Nation senators Bill Clinton of Hot Springs and Larry Taunton of El Dorado, Arkansas flew to Washington D.C. There, the seventeen-year-old Bill Clinton was captured in a historic photograph shaking hands with his political idol, President John F. Kennedy, in the White House Rose Garden. That handshake later symbolized the continuity between the Kennedy 1960s and the Clinton 1990s.

Bill Clinton graduated from high school in 1964 and enrolled at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., where he majored in international affairs. He was elected president of his class during his freshman and second years. “Bill Clinton was not a normal 1960s undergraduate,” (Hamilton, 2003: 133) his *American Spectator* nemesis and Georgetown graduate contemporary Emmet Tyrrell would later reflect. At an “epochal moment in American history” Bill was a government “goody-goody”, in other words, “a sycophant”:

“Generally of prosaic mind, the student government goody-goody rushes through four years of college, living a delusory life usually in frequent and unwholesome proximity to precisely those professors judged by serious scholars and discerning students to be decidedly flaky. Always, the student government goody-goody imagines himself cast in the role of a famous leader”.

During his junior and senior years, Clinton worked as a clerk for the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which was chaired by Senator J. William Fulbright, an Arkansas Democrat. Clinton greatly admired Fulbright, who was a leading critic of United States involvement in the Vietnam War (1959-1975). Just prior to his graduation from Georgetown, he won a prized Rhodes scholarship to study at Oxford University in England for two years. However, he was faced with being drafted for the Vietnam War due to a change in federal policy that eliminated almost all college deferments..

Bill needs to serve his country, but not in Vietnam. In New York he set about pulling the necessary influence to get his draft induction withdrawn so that he could fulfill his military obligations in the National Guard, the army reserve, or ROTC.

Bill had been granted his wish. His draft induction was withdrawn on the contractual understanding that he fulfills his stated intent to go to the Law School of the

University of Arkansas from September 1969 and to serve in its army ROTC from the following spring, becoming a commissioned officer in three years' time. He would thus be saved from serving in Vietnam. Three years in the Law School of the University of Arkansas ROTC and another two years in uniform as an officer seemed a heavy price to pay for avoiding the draft. Back in England, he again placed his name in the draft pool after the Johnson administration imposed a three-month freeze in calling up new recruits. His birth date draw came up 311, a distant enough number to ensure that he would never be called.

In 1970 Clinton enrolled at Yale University Law School, where he studied for a law degree. He paid his way with a scholarship and by working two or three jobs at the same time. At Yale he met a fellow law student Hillary Diane Rodham, from Chicago. As a Republican Hillary Rodham was not quite as smart as a Democrat Bill Clinton, but she had an impressive degree of focused intellect, a strong ability to cut away the irrelevant and less relevant and cut to the core issue. In a conventional woman this was a most unattractive character, since it negated traditional society's ideal of maternal love; soft, securing, and cuddling. Hillary Diane Rodham was a new breed of woman.

Unlike Bill Clinton, Hillary had, for example, succeeded in becoming senior class president at her women's college. In the spring of 1970, toward the end of her first academic year at the school, Hillary had already become involved in the Black Panthers' cause. Whereas Bill Clinton had marshaled five hundred well-mannered student protesters in London, Hillary had helped marshal 15,000 Yalies on the university green in support of the Black Panthers, watched by gasmasked police, armed units of the 82nd Airborne and 2nd Marines, and National Guardsmen. As an unelected but prominent spokesman for law school students, Hillary had negotiated with the university administration, achieving high marks for her cool handling of the hotheads in an unstable situation. She also achieved high marks for her class work.

Thus romance between Hillary Rodham and Bill Clinton gathered pace in the early summer of 1971. What drew Hillary to Bill, then, was his very promiscuity with love; his very refusal to count out his love or be miserly in love. Compared with the cautious New England approach to money and affection, his was a generous, giving spirit. That he did not date her exclusively and wise saying, perhaps even had sex with,

other women only increased the challenge. Instinctively, she could sense his need for her; of the hard ambitious intellect within her little body. Bill and Hillary were married on October 11, 1975, in Bill's new house. They have a daughter named Chelsea Victoria Clinton, born on February 27, 1980.

Toward the end of Bill's studies at Yale, he managed the Texas campaign of the Democratic presidential nominee George McGovern and then worked briefly as a staff member of the House Judiciary Committee. After graduation, Clinton moved back to Arkansas with a job teaching constitutional law at the University of Arkansas in Fayetteville. Almost as soon as he arrived home, Clinton threw himself into politics, running for a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives against the incumbent Republican John Paul Hammerschmidt. Although Clinton lost this race, it was the closest election for Hammerschmidt in his twenty-six years in Congress

Having demonstrated a great amount of energy for politics and holding connections to the influential Arkansas Senator Fulbright, Clinton was quickly identified as a rising political star in his state. Two years later, Arkansas voters elected him state attorney general. Then in 1978, at age thirty-two, Clinton ran for governor, winning an easy victory and becoming one of the nation's youngest governors to date. However, his youth and inexperience left voters unimpressed. Governor Clinton had several missteps, including failing to handle rioting among 18,000 Cuban refugees temporarily interned at Fort Charles, Arkansas. He also raised gasoline taxes and auto license fees to pay for road construction, and cleverly talked about Arkansas as a stepping-stone to national politics. Consequently, the voters turned him out in favor of Frank White, a little known Republican savings and loan executive.

Shocked by his defeat, Clinton went to work for a Little Rock law firm but spent most of his time campaigning for re-election. In the 1982 race, Clinton admitted his mistakes and used his incredible charm and well-honed TV ads to convince the voters to give him another chance. He won in 1982 and again in 1984. Voters then supported him for two, four-year terms in 1986 and 1990, a spectacular rebound that earned him the name of the "Comeback Kid."

As governor, Clinton championed centrist issues that avoided conflict in place of mediation. He strongly advocated for educational reform, appointing Hilary Clinton to

lead a committee to draft higher standards for Arkansas schools. One of the committee's proposals adopted by Clinton's administration called for competence test for all teachers; this policy development stirred up a national debate. Governor Clinton's sweeping education reforms positively impacted Arkansas schools, which experienced a decrease in dropout rates and increase in college-entrance exam test scores under his watch, though the state remained at the bottom in national ranking of educational achievement

During Clinton's tenure as governor of Arkansas, he dropped his opposition to capital punishment. He promoted welfare reforms aimed at pushing welfare recipients into the workforce, and moved quickly to promote affirmative action-appointing more African Americans to state boards, commissions, and agency post than all of his predecessors combined. Additionally, he initiated a style of government that looked like a permanent election campaign. Using the talents of the political consultant Richard Morris, Clinton pushed legislative agenda based upon public opinion polls. The governor and his strategist then built support for their policies through well-orchestrated sales campaigns that used television, leaflets, and telephone banks to pressure state lawmakers.

Clinton's first major effort into national politics occurred when he was enlisted to speak at the Democratic Party convention in 1988, introducing candidate Michael Dukakis. Clinton's address, scheduled to last fifteen minutes, became a debacle as Clinton gave an incredibly dull speech that lasted over half an hour. Despite his setback, Bill Clinton prepared for a run in 1992 against incumbent President George H.W. Bush. In the circumstances of the Persian Gulf War, President Bush seemed undefeatable, and several potential Democratic candidates passed on what seemed to be a lost cause.

Clinton's opponents raised various "character" issues during the campaign, including Clinton's evasion of the draft during the Vietnam War, and his clever response to a question about past marijuana use. Allegations of womanizing and illegal business deals also were raised. While none of these unproved faults led Clinton's defeat, they did fuel unusually attack opposition to Clinton's policies among many conservatives from the very beginning of his presidency. Clinton was the first Democrat to serve two full terms as president since Franklin Delano Roosevelt. His election temporarily ended an era in which the Republican Party had controlled the presidency for twelve continuous years, and for twenty of the previous twenty-four years. That election also brought the

Democrats full control of the political branches of the federal government, including both houses of Congress as well as the presidency, for the first time since the administration of Jimmy Carter.

Immediately upon taking office, Clinton fulfilled a campaign promise by signing the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993, which required employers of a certain size to allow their employees to take unpaid leave because of a family or medical emergency. While this action was popular, Clinton's unwilling to fulfill another campaign promises relating to the acceptance of openly gay members of the military garnered criticism from both the left and the right. After much debate, Clinton and the Pentagon agreed to a "Don't Ask, Don't Tell Policy" (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/bill_clinton, downloaded June 15, 2005), which officially remains in effect.

As president, Clinton was characterized as being a much more "hands on" president than some of his Republican predecessors. While Bush and Reagan had operated under what some critics dubbed an Imperial Presidency of bureaucratic "courtiers," Clinton had much more unfaithful relationships with his aides, and did not delegate them significant powers. He went through four White House Chiefs of Staff, a record number of men in a position that had once been the epicenter of the Imperial Presidency. This is not to say that Clinton was without political confidants in the White House. The First Lady Hilary Clinton played an active role in helping the President form policy, and Clinton's two best friends and most loyal supporters, Paul Begala and James Carville could often be seen defending the President's policies in Washington and on the media.

In the 1996 election, Clinton won re-election over Republican Bob Dole, while the Republicans still control of the Congress but lost a few seats. In 1999, in conjunction with a Congress controlled by the Republican Party, Clinton balanced the U.S. budget for the first time since 1969.

William Clinton, or simply "Bill Clinton," narrowly defeated George H. W. Bush in 1992 with just 43 percent of the popular vote; the election was largely a result of public disillusionment with the first Bush administration's handling of the economy. Clinton was elected for two terms in office (8 years), something no Democrat had done since Franklin Roosevelt in the 1930s. The Democrats controlled both houses of

Congress when Clinton was first elected, but this abruptly changed with the mid-term elections of 1994. As illustrated by the party affiliation chart, in chapter 2, both houses of Congress were led by Republicans beginning in January 1995. After that, Clinton had to deal with an assertive Republican Congress led by the speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich, and the Senate majority leader, Bob Dole. In theory, a Congress controlled by the Republicans might be expected to inhibit a Democratic president's use of force, but this did not appear to happen in practice, as the following illustrates.

In addition, Bill Clinton became the only president impeached in the twentieth century; the only other president impeached was Andrew Johnson in 1868. While one might expect Clinton to be an exception to Koh's pattern of executive initiative, congressional acquiescence, and judicial tolerance, the evidence regarding his use of force against terrorism indicates that he followed the same pattern. Clinton's foreign policy could have been a radical change from his Republican predecessor, George H. W. Bush, but this was not the case. In general, the Clinton administration began with a commitment to a "foreign policy rooted in a clear set of principles," instead of the "ad hoc" foreign policy of the preceding Bush administration.

President Clinton's first secretary of state was Warren Christopher (1993–1997), often described as a low-key advisor. The second, more visible secretary of state was the first woman in this position, Madeleine Albright (1997–2001). There were three secretaries of defense during the Clinton administration: Les Aspin (1993–1994), William Perry (1994–1997), and William Cohen (1997–2001). Anthony Lake was Clinton's first national security advisor (1993–1997) and Sandy Berger was the second (1997–2001). Clinton's CIA directors were R. James Woolsey (1993–1995), John Deutch (1995–1996), and George Tenet (1997–2004). The FBI director during the Clinton administration was Louis Freeh, a man chosen and appointed by Clinton in 1993, but ultimately at odds with many members of the Clinton administration. Freeh served as FBI director until June 2001, leaving shortly before the 9/11 tragedy and two years before the end of his statutory term. In his book, *My FBI: Bringing down the MAFIA, Investigating Bill Clinton, and Fighting the War on Terror*, Freeh asserted that under his leadership, the FBI did all that it could to stop al Qaeda, an assertion disputed by many.

Clinton's Foreign Policy

Unlike his predecessor George H. W. Bush, Clinton, a governor from the state of Arkansas, was not deeply steeped in foreign policy expertise when he was elected. In fact, Clinton was mainly focused on his domestic agenda and the American economy when he arrived at the White House in 1993, as the campaign slogan "it's the economy, stupid" bluntly reflected the public's concerns. Eventually, foreign policy challenges forced his administration to devote more time and energy to the international community. The disintegration of Yugoslavia in the 1990s, for example, required the administration to develop a strategy, along with the Europeans, for dealing with the associated problems and violence in Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia. When Clinton took the oath of office, the Cold War was over and the "new world order" which the former president (George H. W. Bush) envisaged, seemed possible; the rivalry between the world's superpowers no longer influenced every regional problem. Clinton advocated promoting democracy as an alternative to the containment strategy that prevailed during the Cold War. In 1994, his national security paper titled *A Strategy for Engagement and Enlargement* listed three pillars of US strategy: American retention of global military predominance, the search for continued economic prosperity and expanded free markets abroad, and the promotion of democracy around the globe.

George Walker Bush

During his time in office, President George W. Bush demonstrated impressive leadership skills.¹ He was able to overcome the lack of a mandate in the 2000 election and convince Congress to pass a large tax cut. He continued to press his policy agenda when the terrorist attacks of 9-11 transformed his presidency and reoriented its focus. The war on terrorism in Afghanistan was prosecuted effectively, with the Taliban being overthrown and Al Qaeda driven out of the country. The broader success of the war was mixed, however; as of the summer of 2003 Osama Bin Laden was not captured, the terrorist threat of Al Qaeda was not eliminated, and Afghanistan remained unstable.

In an impressive display of political leadership in 2002 President Bush was able to overcome the skepticism of the professional military in the United States, the opposition of much of the world, and the lack of support from the UN Security Council and take the United States to war with Iraq in order to depose Saddam Hussein. The war

ended within three weeks, though the attempt to install a legitimate successor government was to take much longer. Over this period, President Bush has exhibited several patterns of behavior that provide some insight into his policy choices. He has shown a preference for moral certainty over strategic calculation; a tendency for visceral reaction rather than reflection; a preference for clarity rather than complexity; a bias toward action rather than deliberation; and a preference for the personal over the structural or procedural. Bush exuded confidence and moral certainty and exhibited no evidence of self doubt or ambivalence about major decisions.

Even though many presidential options are constrained by the established structure of the office and by environmental demands on the president, the Bush presidency illustrates the impact of personality on the major policies of a presidency. The first section of this paper will examine President Bush's bias for action and impatience with procedural delay. The second section will address his moral certainty and its implications. The third section will look at the consequences of his personal approach to politics and policy formation. The conclusion will note the positive and negative implications of each of the president's tendencies. It must be noted that few inside accounts of the Bush presidency have been made public so far, thus these observations are based on public documents and are therefore necessarily tentative.

The paper will not attempt to analyze President Bush from a psycho-biographical perspective such as that of James David Barber's framework of presidential character. And from evidence so far available, his advisory system does not seem to fit easily into the frameworks developed by Richard Tanner Johnson or Alexander George. Bush's White House does not even seem to fit either the strong chief of staff or the spokes-of-the-wheel models of White House staff organization. The purpose of this paper is merely to point out patterns of presidential behavior and relate these patterns or tendencies to important policies of the administration.

A Bias for Action

As president, George W. Bush demonstrated decisiveness and an impatience for unnecessary delay. In contrast to President Clinton, who wanted to analyze every issue thoroughly and ensure that all angles had been examined, often in long drawn out meetings, President Bush preferred to act decisively and intuitively. In his words, "I just

think it's instinctive. I'm not a textbook player. I'm a gut player."⁷ He felt that one part of his role as president was "to force decisions, and to make sure it's in everybody's mind where we're headed."

In the aftermath of the terrorist attacks on the United States of 9-11, President Bush often exhibited impatience in leading his administration and the military to develop and implement the U.S. response. Though he sometimes felt the military's response to his direction was too slow, he understood the instinctive conservatism of military leadership. "It's very important to realize how do you balance the military's desire to cover all contingencies at least once, maybe sometimes twice— they're relatively risk-adverse and they should be, after all they're dealing with people's lives—versus the need to, for whatever reason, to show action." Of course the president was also making decisions of life and death, but he also felt the political need to show the public that he was acting. As he told King Abdullah of Jordan in late September of 2001, "We're steady, clear-eyed and patient, but pretty soon we'll have to start displaying scalps."

In late September, during the planning stages for the war in Afghanistan when, National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice explained to the president that the military was not yet ready to insert troops into Afghanistan because the search and rescue (CSAR) capacity was not yet in place, Bush responded, "That's not acceptable." Rice explained the difficulty of establishing bases, getting equipment in place, and coordinating with foreign governments. At a meeting with the principals, Vice President Cheney expressed a different perspective. "The president wants to avoid putting any artificial constraints or timelines on our military action. Let's do it right. Let's not do something stupid for PR purposes." Later Bush reflected on his impatience and the role of Condoleezza Rice: "Sometimes that's the way I am—fiery. On the other hand [Rice's] job is to bear the brunt of some of the fire, so that it—takes the edge off a little bit. And she's good at that.

Bush's bias for action also reflected his perspective on political capital. He felt that his father had not fully used the tremendous political capital he enjoyed after the Gulf War in 1991 when his public approval was at historic highs; he was determined that he would not make the same mistake. Bush 43 wanted to use his political capital to achieve large goals. "I will seize the opportunity to achieve big goals. There is nothing bigger than to achieve world peace." If he did not use his time wisely, Bush felt that

history would not be kind to him. "History will be the judge, but it won't judge well somebody who doesn't act, somebody who just bides time here," he told Japanese Prime Minister Koizumi in the fall of 2001. Impatience and a bias for action do not necessarily mean a lack of determination or perseverance, which Bush demonstrated in pursuit of tax cuts and other administration priorities.

In January of 2003 when other members of the U.N. Security Council wanted to give the inspectors in Iraq more time to search for weapons of mass destruction, President Bush was convinced that inspections would not work and was impatient for U.S. military action to depose Saddam Hussein. "Time is running out on Saddam Hussein. He must disarm. I'm sick and tired of games and deception. And that's my view of timetables."¹⁵ At a news conference, Bush declared, "Any attempt to drag the process on for months will be resisted by the United States. . . . This just needs to be resolved quickly,

The positive side of a bias for action is that a president has a better chance to get things done in a city where new initiatives can often be delayed until enough opposition develops to stop them entirely. This was one of the problems with President Clinton's health care proposals in 1993 and 1994. The potential downside of a bias for action includes premature decisions, a failure to examine the full implications of decisions, and the use of information before it is fully vetted or examined. The following sections will illustrate some of the positive and negative aspects of a bias for action.

Early Decisions on War with Iraq

In an interview in the summer of 2002 Bush reflected on the nature of the coalition to fight the war on terrorism in Afghanistan, but his words also foreshadowed his impatience with the process of gaining international approval and the UN Security Council resolution for confronting Iraq.

According to State Department director of policy and planning, Richard Haas, in the summer of 2002 President Bush had already made up his mind that war with Iraq was inevitable (barring capitulation by Saddam Hussein). "The president made a decision in the summer of 2002. We all saluted at that point. That is the way it works." Haas said that he raised the issue of war with Iraq with Rice, ". . . I raised this issue about where we really sure that we wanted to put Iraq front and center at this point, given the war on terrorism and other issues. And she said, essentially, that that decision's been made, don't

waste your breath.” The president may have made up his mind even earlier. In March 2002 the president told Condoleezza Rice when she was in a meeting with several senators.

Though Secretary of State Colin Powell convinced Bush to go to the UN and orchestrated the unanimous UN Security Council passage of Resolution 1441, the president ordered troops to the Gulf region in December 2002, shortly after the resolution was passed.

A bias for action and impatience with large bureaucracies can be a useful trait in a president, as long as the president has an effective advisory system that fully lays out the consequences of immediate action. In the decision making process leading up to the war with Iraq, the president may not have fully considered the arguments against the war that were made by Secretary of State Colin Powell (or potentially others) because he had seemingly already made up his mind. As indicated by State Department official Richard Hass, administration officials did not feel free to present opposing arguments to the president or his immediate aides because they were convinced that the decision had already been made. One former Bush staffer said of the Bush White House, “No one’s allowed to second-guess, even when you should.” This does not mean that the decision to go to war with Iraq was wrong or that Bush would have made a different decision about war had his aides not perceived that he had already made up his mind; it merely means that he probably did not get the full range of frank advice from his advisers that he might have.

The Use of Forged Documents in the Arguments for War

Another example of President Bush’s tendency to act instinctively and his impatience with details was the use by the United States government of forged documents to bolster the argument for war with Iraq. On September 24, 2002 the government of Britain charged that Iraq had tried to buy significant amounts of nuclear material from Niger. That information was used in a closed hearing of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate to help convince Senators to vote for the resolution giving President Bush the authority to take the United States to war with Iraq. Several months later, in his State of the Union speech on January 28, 2003, President Bush said

“The British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa.

The problem was that the documents used as evidence were forged and not authentic. The letter-head of one letter was from the military government that had been replaced before the 1999 date on the letter, and the signature on the letter indicated the name of a foreign ministry official who had left the position in 1989. The forgery was made public on March 7, 2003 by Mohamed El Baradei who was director of the International Atomic Energy Agency who reported the findings to the U.N. Security Council

Why would President Bush use documents of such dubious provenance? The issue was not minor; it was a question of convincing Congress to approve a resolution to let the president make the final decision about going to war. The State of the Union address presented the country with the prospect of war with Iraq, and the assertion that Saddam Hussein was developing nuclear weapons was one of the strongest arguments the administration had that regime change in Baghdad was necessary. Even though there may have been other, more credible evidence that Saddam was developing weapons of mass destruction, the use of forged documents to make the public argument for war with Iraq, if exposed, would undercut U.S. credibility with foreign nations.

There were reports that top CIA officials had serious reservations about the authenticity of the documents that were the basis for Bush’s statements. What could explain the president’s willingness to use the dubious documents in a public argument for war with Iraq? The president could easily have demanded that the CIA carefully examine the documents before including an account of them in his State of the Union address, but seemingly he did not. Most likely the account fit well with the president’s judgments about Iraq, and he did not want to wait for the time it would take to subject the documents to careful scrutiny. It is also possible that the CIA felt pressure (justified or not) not to press arguments that might be interpreted as unfavorable to the administration’s arguments about Saddam Hussein.

The president’s willingness to use the documents as a basis for his public argument for regime change in Iraq without demanding that they be examined carefully

by U.S. intelligence experts illustrated his tendency to act instinctively and quickly rather than after careful deliberation and examination of the evidence.

Another example of the president's use of incorrect information in his arguments without careful examination occurred when President Bush was responding to reporters' questions about the conclusiveness of evidence that regime change in Iraq was necessary. On September 7, 2002, at Camp David Bush said, "... when the inspectors first went into Iraq and were denied, finally denied access, a report came out of the Atomic—the IAEA—that they were six months away from developing a weapon. I don't know what more evidence we need." The IAEA report, however, said that "... the IAEA has found no indication of Iraq having achieved its program goal of producing nuclear weapons or of Iraq having retained a physical capability for the production of weapon-usable nuclear material or having clandestinely obtained such material." The report did say that before the 1991 Gulf War Iraq had been 6 to 24 months away from creating a nuclear capacity.

The downside of President Bush's impatience and self-reported dependence on his instincts, rather than careful analysis, was that at times he might make public statements that later turn out to be not true. This can be damaging to the nation's credibility, especially in making decisions about going to war. Stephen Hess, former Eisenhower White House staffer, scholar, and expert on the Presidency, said, what worries me about some of these [statements in the fall of 2003] is they appear to be with foresight. This is about public policy in its grandest sense, about potential wars and who is our enemy, and a president has a special obligation to getting it right." A president's effectiveness can be compromised if a bias for action pushes out the need to ensure the accuracy of important statements.

President Bush's Religious Beliefs

Ever since his life-altering decision to stop drinking in 1986, George Bush's Christian convictions have played a major role in his life. He regularly participated in Bible study groups and spoke, sometimes publicly, about his faith. In contrast to some other presidents who expressed religious beliefs, Bush clearly was a person who took his faith very seriously in his personal and public life. In 1993, the year before running for governor, Bush said that only those who believed in Jesus could get into heaven. This

was in an interview with a Jewish reporter, not a private religious meeting; it thus was intended to have political significance.

According to a Bush friend, Bush told him when he was Governor of Texas, “I believe God wants me to run for president.” During his campaign for the presidency George W. Bush often mentioned his Christian religious values, and when asked in a Republican debate in Iowa (December 13, 2000) to name his most admired “political philosopher,” (emphasis added) he responded “Christ, because he changed my heart.” Bush’s faith led him to believe that human history (and presumably politics) are governed by the intentions of God. “Events aren’t moved by blind change and chance. Behind all of life and all of history, there’s a dedication and purpose, set by the hand of a just and faithful God.

The president’s approach to religion was evident in the White House where he opened cabinet meetings with a prayer. The pervasiveness of the president’s approach to his Christian faith was reflected when a new speech writer, David Frum (who happened to be Jewish), first entered the West Wing and heard the words, “Missed you at Bible study,” directed at his boss, Michael Gerson. Frum said that Bible study in the Bush White House, “. . . was, if not compulsory, not quite un compulsory, either” (emphasis in original) and was “disconcerting to a non-Christian like me.” Although this incident might be seen as minor, it illustrated the assumption that at least some White House staffers were expected to share not only the President’s religion, but also to conform to the prevailing White House staff religious practices, that is, attending regular prayer breakfasts.

President Bush’s religious convictions were consistent with his lack of ambivalence about war and his willingness to take actions unpopular in much of the world. His religious beliefs may also have led to his moral certainty, his disdain for hesitation, his avoidance of ambiguity, and his lack of self doubt. According to historian Richard Brookhiser, “Practically, Bush’s faith means that he does not tolerate, or even recognize, ambiguity: there is an all-knowing God who decrees certain behaviors, and leaders must obey.

Condoleezza Rice commenting on her advisory role, said of Bush “He least likes me to say, ‘This is complex.’ ” Bush’s impatience with complexity was accompanied by

the firm conviction that the United States was special in the world and that it had a mission to stand up for moral values and confront evil. Other states did not merely have different interests than the United States, some of them pursued evil goals and had to be confronted, militarily if necessary. Bush's faith that history is guided by God and conviction that the United States was fighting for God-given values may have made it easier for him to embrace war as one of the instruments of history.

National Security Strategy of the United States, the "Bush Doctrine"

Bush's moral convictions and belief in the special role of the United States was expressed most thoroughly and authoritatively in the 2002 document, "The National Security Strategy of the United States of America." The document articulated what Henry Kissinger called a "revolutionary" revision of U.S. policy away from the containment and deterrence strategy of the Cold War era and addressed a new emphasis on terrorism and rogue states.

The policy doctrine began with a declaration that the U.S. model of government is universal and has triumphed:

The document also declared that the United States would act preemptively or to prevent any challenge to it, ". . . America will act against such emerging threats before they are fully formed." (P. 1) And it issued a warning to rival military powers: "Our forces will be strong enough to dissuade potential adversaries from pursuing a military build-up in hopes of surpassing, or equaling, the power of the United States." (P. 22) Thus the declaration was aimed not just at rogue states but at any future "potential adversary" of the United States

It is one thing for a nation to argue in an ad hoc manner that, as a matter of national security or self interest, that it intends to attack another nation that it believes is threatening. But it is quite another thing to elevate preemptive war to a matter of high principle and formal national security doctrine. A war is considered preemptive when a state attacks another state that is poised to attack it, thus preempting the anticipated attack. But preemptive war easily slides into preventive war when the potential threat is in the future; it is just a matter of how imminent the threat is perceived to be. The warning in the U.S. statements that other nations should not use preemption as an excuse for aggression is not likely to be heeded by other nations and may encourage or

legitimate their use of preventive wars. As Brent Scowcroft, national security adviser for Presidents Ford and Bush.

War on terrorism

War on terrorism, term used to describe the American-led global counterterrorism campaign launched in response to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. In its scope, expenditure, and impact on international relations, the war on terrorism was comparable to the Cold War; it was intended to represent a new phase in global political relations and has had important consequences for security, human rights, international law, cooperation, and governance.

The war on terrorism was a multidimensional campaign of almost limitless scope. Its military dimension involved major wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, covert operations in Yemen and elsewhere, large-scale military-assistance programs for cooperative regimes, and major increases in military spending. Its intelligence dimension comprised institutional reorganization and considerable increases in the funding of America's intelligence-gathering capabilities, a global program of capturing terrorist suspects and interning them at Guantánamo Bay, expanded cooperation with foreign intelligence agencies, and the tracking and interception of terrorist financing. Its diplomatic dimension included continuing efforts to construct and maintain a global coalition of partner states and organizations and an extensive public diplomacy campaign to counter anti-Americanism in the Middle East. The domestic dimension of the U.S. war on terrorism entailed new antiterrorism legislation, such as the USA PATRIOT Act; new security institutions, such as the Department of Homeland Security; the preventive detainment of thousands of suspects; surveillance and intelligence-gathering programs by the National Security Agency (NSA), the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), and local authorities; the strengthening of emergency-response procedures; and increased security measures for airports, borders, and public events.

The successes of the first years of the war on terrorism included the arrest of hundreds of terrorist suspects around the world, the prevention of further large-scale terrorist attacks on the American mainland, the toppling of the Taliban regime and

subsequent closure of terrorist-training camps in Afghanistan, the capture or elimination of many of al-Qaeda's senior members, and increased levels of international cooperation in global counterterrorism efforts.

However, critics argued that the failures of America's counterterrorism campaign outweighed its successes. They contended that the war in Afghanistan had effectively scattered the al-Qaeda network, thereby making it even harder to counteract, and that the attacks in Afghanistan and Iraq had increased anti-Americanism among the world's Muslims, thereby amplifying the message of militant Islam and uniting disparate groups in a common cause. Other critics alleged that the war on terrorism was a contrived smokescreen for the pursuit of a larger U.S. geopolitical agenda that included controlling global oil reserves, increasing defense spending, expanding the country's international military presence, and countering the strategic challenge posed by various regional powers.

By the time of U.S. Pres. George W. Bush's reelection in 2004, the drawbacks of the war on terrorism were becoming apparent. In Iraq, U.S. forces had overthrown the government of Saddam Hussein in 2003, and U.S. war planners had underestimated the difficulties of building a functioning government from scratch and neglected to consider how this effort could be complicated by Iraq's sectarian tensions, which had been held in check by Saddam's repressive regime but were unleashed by his removal. By late 2004 it was clear that Iraq was sinking into chaos and civil war; estimates of the number of Iraqi civilians killed during the period of maximum violence—roughly 2004 to 2007—vary widely but generally exceed 200,000. U.S. casualties during this period far outnumbered those suffered during the initial 2003 invasion. Afghanistan, which for several years had seemed to be under control, soon followed a similar trajectory, and by 2006 the U.S. was facing a full-blown insurgency there led by a reconstituted Taliban.

The Bush administration faced domestic and international criticism for actions that it deemed necessary to fight terrorism but which critics considered to be immoral, illegal, or both. These included the detention of accused enemy combatants without trial at Guantánamo Bay and at several secret prisons outside the United States, the use of torture against these detainees in an effort to extract intelligence, and the use

of unmanned combat drones to kill suspected enemies in countries far beyond the battlefields of Iraq and Afghanistan.

By the last years of Bush's presidency, public opinion had turned strongly negative concerning his handling of the Iraq War and other national security matters. This discontent helped Barack Obama, an outspoken critic of Bush's foreign policy, win the presidency in 2008. Under the new administration, the expression war on terrorism—still closely associated with Bush policies—quickly disappeared from official communications. Obama made the rejection explicit in a 2013 speech in which he stated that the United States would eschew a boundless, vaguely defined “global war on terrorism” in favour of more focused actions against specific hostile groups. Under Obama, the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan were gradually wound down, although at the end of Obama's presidency in 2016 there were still U.S. troops in both countries.

It is worth noting that beneath Obama's rejection of the war on terrorism as a rhetorical device and as a conceptual framework for national security there were important continuities with the policies of his predecessor. The Obama administration, for example, greatly expanded the campaign of targeted killings carried out with drones, even eliminating several U.S. citizens abroad whom it deemed threatening. Special operations forces were greatly expanded and increasingly deployed to conduct low-profile military interventions in countries outside of acknowledged war zones. And U.S. security agencies continued to exercise the wide-ranging surveillance powers that they had accumulated during the Bush administration despite protests from civil liberties groups.

Barack Obama

Barack Obama campaigned for President in 2008 heralding a fundamental shift in the direction of American foreign policy. He promised to challenge, and change, the reflexive mindsets and outdated dogmas that had shaped the policies of recent administrations, from attempts to police the globe to ill-conceived attempts at ‘nation-building’ in societies America has never bothered to, or cared to, understand.

Obama wanted to restore strategic solvency to allow more effective American interventions in the arenas that he believed counted most. More broadly, Obama sought to turn US attention from almost three decades of intense involvement in the military

conflicts of the Middle East to refocus on the more economically dynamic Asia-Pacific region, which was playing an increasingly decisive role in US trade and investment. That refocus also implied a shift away from the high priority America had placed on European economic and security developments during the long Cold War decades.

Along with this new realism, Obama also offered the promise of renewed idealism in the form of turning away from ‘un-American’ practices like torture and returning to policies more in conformity with American values and the US constitution. But Obama’s version of constitutionalism contained one highly consequential omission.

While Obama talked about a return to the rule of law and the constitution, he did not seek the presidency to diminish its powers, even the relatively recent accretions his post World War II predecessors had amassed, first to fight the Cold War and then to wage a worldwide military campaign against radical Islamist terrorists and their allies. Obama had been a constitutional law professor, and many of these new powers had stretched traditional understandings of the Constitution almost beyond recognition.

But Obama had sought the powers of the modern presidency to use them, not diminish them. He imagined he could transform the content of American foreign policy without transforming its operating structures. From the perspective of 2016, it now seems that the unanticipated consequences of that understandable but flawed assumption have limited his foreign policy achievements and diminished his overall legacy.

The promise

The changes candidate Obama promised lay not so much in specific actions, especially when it came to immediate issues of war and peace. By the time Barack Obama took office in January 2009, the schedule for the US military withdrawal from Iraq had already been set by the Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) signed by President George W. Bush the month before. That required full withdrawal of American military forces by December 2011. ¹ Obama’s tripling of the US force levels in Afghanistan was a big change, though one that should not have come as that much of a surprise. On the campaign trail, Obama had repeatedly referred to this conflict (in contrast to Iraq), as central to America’s global struggle against terrorism and pledged to resource the fighting in Afghanistan more adequately than his Republican predecessor had done. ² The net effect of the simultaneous Iraq draw-down and Afghan build-up was to leave

combined US force levels in these two legacy wars nearer the unsustainably high levels he had inherited for longer than Obama and most Americans expected.

The boldness of Obama's promise of change lay rather in new ways of thinking about foreign policy. During a Democratic primary debate in January 2008, he declared, "I don't want to just end the war, but I want to end the mindset that got us into war in the first place."³ Some 15 months later, Obama, now president, proclaimed in Prague "America's commitment to seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons".⁴ Obama promised a more solvent approach to national security, better matching Washington's chronically overambitious policy goals to its stubbornly finite military and fiscal means. More importantly, Obama signalled that he would try to make more rational judgements about where core US security interests were truly involved and where they were not, and, based on these judgements, would more carefully decide where the US needed to intervene militarily and where it did not.

In these and other ways, Obama promised the first real rethinking of the global role the United States had assigned itself during the Cold War. Seventeen years after the break-up of the Soviet Union and at a time when America's military and fiscal overextension seemed self-evident, such rethinking seemed overdue. In keeping with this promised rethinking, Obama also promised to shift attention and resources away from what appeared to him stalemated contests for peripheral American interests in the Middle East toward fortifying and revitalizing America's presence in what he considered the far more important economic and geopolitical battleground of the AsiaPacific. By doing so, he hoped to give China second thoughts about its own expansionist designs in that region, while avoiding wasteful and potentially highly destructive military conflicts between Washington and Beijing.

Beyond this, Obama promised to give new priority to negotiating global nuclear arms control agreements. Limiting nuclear weapons had been a personal cause of Obama's since his student days. Candidate Obama also committed himself to leading the international community to combat climate change more robustly. Meaningful action on climate change had been one of the main issues differentiating Democrats from Republicans in the 2008 campaign and for many years before that.

Falling short

Now, as President Obama completes the final year of his second term, he has perhaps inevitably, yet still disappointingly, fallen far short of achieving any such wholesale transformation. That is not his fault alone. The strong, two-house majorities Obama enjoyed in Congress during his first two years, slipped away, first in the House (2010) and then the Senate (2014). US intelligence agencies misjudged the Arab Spring and, later, the staying power and global ambitions of the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS). Nor did anyone anticipate Bashar Assad's deadly five-year struggle to hold on to power in Damascus. New nationalist leaders came to power in China, India and Japan, determined to revise the post-Cold War balance of international power. Vladimir Putin proved more interested in reasserting Russian power than in resetting relations with the United States.

But Obama himself can be fairly blamed for some of the shortfall from his early promise of foreign policy transformation. Losing Congress was not some exogenous event, but a political failure for which the president, the highest elected Democratic Party official, must share blame. While Obama took office with a strong personal mandate, it is less clear whether he began with a political majority for transformational foreign policy change. Unfortunately, his otherwise impressive set of skills proved unsuited to creating one.

And who appointed and kept on those intelligence officials who kept getting the Middle East (and Afghanistan) wrong? Obama's innate caution, which served him and the cause of foreign policy solvency well in some key international decisions, served him poorly when it came to domestic political leadership. So did his commitment to institutional continuity, including his refusal to pursue professional accountability for the legal end runs of the George W. Bush administration and re-examine the new surveillance powers assumed by the NSA and other intelligence agencies. By refusing to look back, he refused to learn and digest lessons and deter any recurrence. With a good chance that his immediate and future successors will prove less constitutionally scrupulous on these issues, that could turn out to be a catastrophic misjudgment.

Despite Obama's oft-repeated desire to pivot US attention and resources away from the Middle East toward the Asia-Pacific, American troops are again fighting in

Iraq, Afghanistan, and now Syria, with Washington also conducting limited military operations in Libya, Yemen and perhaps elsewhere in the Middle East North Africa region. US naval forces are regularly challenging Chinese territorial claims in the South China Sea, while the Obama administration quietly encourages the anti-China military posturing of those new nationalist leaders in Japan and India. With Washington unwilling or unable to shed its old ambitions of regional hegemony in every region, there can be no return to solvency in America's national security policy and no overdue rebalancing of federal budget priorities.

Despite military spending of roughly USD 600 billion a year, not counting the Energy Department's nuclear weapons spending and the separate supplemental budgets that fund ongoing wars, the US armed forces are still chronically under-resourced for the global strategies they are expected to execute – essentially to be able to intervene with decisive force anywhere and everywhere at any time. That will always be, as it always has been, mission impossible. Without scaling down that mission to protecting America's truly vital interests, national security spending will continue to devour resources needed for economic and social revival and continue to undermine the ultimate basis of America's strength.

Passing on to his successor the debilitating burdens of American strategic and budgetary insolvency may be the most disappointing feature of Obama's foreign policy legacy. But it is far from the only area where he has fallen far short of his declared goals. After modest but real nuclear arms reductions negotiated with Russia in 2010, further progress has stalled, leaving Obama likely to leave office with smaller reductions in the nuclear warhead stockpile than any of his recent predecessors and a staggering new commitment to spend an estimated USD 1 trillion over the next 30 years needlessly “modernizing” the U.S. nuclear arsenal”.⁵ Meanwhile, tons of unsecured nuclear materials around the world remain vulnerable to theft by terrorists or state proliferators. And Obama's ability to lead the world toward more robust climate change targets has been thwarted by his inability to overcome fossil fuel dependence and corporate resistance at home, a fight in which he has seemed barely visible over most of the past eight years. As a result, internationally negotiated targets are conspicuously and

alarmingly failing to keep pace with global warming, rising sea levels and melting ice caps.

Important achievements

But these defeats, disappointments and episodes of weak leadership are only part of the story. The Obama's foreign policy legacy also includes some impressive successes.

Perhaps Obama's single greatest foreign policy achievement was not in the traditional foreign policy arena at all. In his first months in office, Obama helped stave off a looming financial Armageddon, which threatened to implode America's power and authority internationally, disrupt world trade and supply chains and produce more mass unemployment, for far longer than the United States actually endured. Although initial steps had already been taken by his predecessor to rescue too-big-to-fail banks and the auto industry had already been largely bailed out by the time Obama took office, credit markets were still largely frozen and unemployment rapidly climbing at the start of Obama's first term. Only Obama's steady-handed leadership and aggressive stimulus spending restored confidence and stopped the free-fall. It is far from clear that Obama's Republican rival, John McCain could have provided that in time. With hindsight, we can see that more aggressive fiscal stimulus and more direct federal relief to distressed mortgage holders and consumers would have been even more helpful, though it was not clear then, and is still not clear today whether even the Democratic majority congresses of 2009 would have approved such stronger and wider-reaching steps. But as a result of the financial rescue steps Obama did undertake, American foreign policy is far more solvent, and therefore more globally influential, than it would otherwise have been.

In areas more traditionally associated with foreign policy, Obama, working with European allies (and Russia) helped build a successful diplomatic drive, backed by multilateral sanctions, which persuaded Iran to freeze its enrichment of bomb grade uranium. That required a departure from the symbolic but ineffective unilateral maximalism of his predecessors on the Iran nuclear issue. The compromise deal Obama agreed to offers no regime-change, no long-term guarantees and no cost-free concessions from Iran. What it does offer is much-improved short- and medium-term prospects for halting, or at least slowing, Tehran's progress toward producing nuclear weapons. Obama

focused his efforts on achieving just this kind of deal from the day he took office, spent substantial political capital overcoming congressional resistance to it and deserves considerable credit for getting it done.

And despite failing to completely extricate the United States from the Iraq and Afghanistan military interventions that were so severely draining America's credibility, budget and appetite for international involvement in 2008, Obama did manage to reduce drastically the number of American boots on the ground and budget dollars spent. US troop numbers in Iraq peaked at around 166,000 during George W. Bush's 'surge' in late 2007. Now there are about 5,000 there to fight ISIS, whose rise was a result of the Sunni political/military vacuum left behind by Bush's benighted invasion and occupation policies, not Obama's carrying out of the previously agreed withdrawal timetable he inherited. The peak in Afghanistan was around 100,000 US troops, reached at the height of Obama's own flawed surge-and-withdraw strategy in 2010. Now there are only about 10,000.

Cost reductions are harder to measure given Washington's growing use of private contractors for tasks traditionally done by the uniformed military. Those reduced numbers are unlikely to achieve the ambitious security goals Obama has declared for both countries. But at least fewer American lives and resources are being squandered. US credibility and reputational costs are another matter. Unfortunately, when a country goes around proclaiming for a generation or more that its military can solve any global problem, any downscaling to match real vital interests and finite resources better will likely set off a diplomatic and political backlash. Going sober isn't easy.

Another positive legacy will be the significant steps Obama took in 2015-16 to extricate the United States from a half-century of failed Cuba policies. At a time when the mortality of the Castro brothers (and the collapse of Venezuelan oil revenues) portended a likely economic and diplomatic realignment just 90 miles from American shores, America was in danger of cutting itself off from influencing these changes and profiting from them. Unless Congress lifts the continuing embargo, that danger will persist. But by using his executive authority to restore diplomatic relations, and by visiting the island in March 2016, Obama added new flexibility to US policy.

Nuclear diplomacy with Iran

Obama's strategy for a nuclear deal with Iran built on the efforts of his predecessors to form a broad international coalition willing to use the pressure of tough economic sanctions to induce Tehran's ruling mullahs to slow their uranium enrichment programs, thereby delaying their achievement of nuclear weapons capability. Washington had long understood that without a good faith US effort to explore non-military options, it could not hope to sustain international support or strong sanctions – and perhaps later military action should diplomacy fail. But unlike its immediate predecessors, the Obama administration believed diplomacy might actually succeed, and that a compromise deal peacefully achieved with broad international support would be the best possible outcome for the United States.

This new approach, conceived before the Iranian presidential elections of June 2009, did not depend on more moderate Iranian leaders being elected. Obama's realist team planned on dealing with the hardline forces then in power. The apparent electoral success of relative moderates in that 2009 election came as an unexpected surprise to Washington, and the widespread violent repression subsequently used by Tehran to keep those moderates from taking power posed an unwelcome complication for Obama's planned strategy. Obama's Iran specialists worried that too much open US support for the embattled moderates would make it that much harder to draw Iran's hardline leaders to the nuclear negotiating.

This proved a damaging miscalculation. Realism gains support at home and succeed abroad through tough-minded calibrations of incentives and disincentives, not unsolicited gestures of deference to repression. Obama offered tepid support to the embattled democrats, only to see the hardline regime rebuff American diplomatic overtures anyway. And whatever long-term credibility Obama's aloofness toward the 'Green Revolution' may have won him with the Iranian regime, it left Washington badly out of step with one of the first of the grassroots democracy movements that would soon sweep the region. It also gave ammunition to future US critics of the eventual nuclear deal Washington and its partners did reach with Iran in 2015, making it more plausible for them to charge that he failed to understand the dangerous and duplicitous nature of the Iranian regime. Serious negotiations on the nuclear deal only began in 2012 after

multinational sanctions began to take their toll on the Iranian economy. They were successfully concluded only after another Iranian presidential election had been held (in 2013) and brought the more diplomatically inclined Hassan Rouhani to office.

Since real decision-making power in Iran lies with its hardline clerical leadership, not its elected presidents, Obama's realist negotiating strategy made some theoretical sense. But the real world of American politics does not run on abstract international relations theory alone, and the costs of Obama's soft realist strategy were significant. Changing the direction of American foreign policy requires leveling with and bringing along the American people, and the Obama administration has never embraced this dimension of foreign policy. For a president who came to office almost universally hailed for his rhetorical talents, this has been a surprising, and damaging, omission.

Europe, NATO and Putin

Obama inherited an option-limiting legacy in the form of two rounds of NATO expansion under Clinton and George W. Bush, with a third added shortly after he assumed office. NATO membership extended Article Five security guarantees to Central and Eastern European countries (including the three former Soviet Baltic republics) that had never before been treated as part of America's national security perimeter or vital interests.

That did not seem all that consequential under Clinton, when hopes still survived of a non-adversarial relationship between the United States and Russia. But things started to change when those relations turned more adversarial under Vladimir Putin and George W. Bush. The contested areas of that period mainly included separatist regions of Georgia and Russian-speaking areas of Ukraine – two countries that were not, despite the efforts of George W. Bush, formally invited to join the alliance.¹¹ But NATO member states like Estonia, Poland, Latvia and Lithuania, with their histories of past Russian aggression and domination, understandably worried about possible future Russian threats to their own security.

Then Obama had to navigate the popular overthrow of a pro-Russia government in Ukraine, followed by Russia's annexation of Crimea and its arming of anti-government rebels in eastern Ukraine. Obama's response so far has been to impose US economic sanctions (later joined by the European Union, Canada, Japan and others),

dispatch US military trainers to work with Ukraine's armed forces, provide increased military aid for defensive weapons and agree to a NATO deployment of 4,000 troops to Poland and the Baltic republics.

The underlying question, still being debated inside and outside the Obama administration, is how to evaluate the threat (if any) Russia's new regional aggressiveness poses to US security. NATO's eastward expansion adds a degree of immediacy to that question, since Article Five of the NATO Treaty commits Washington to defend all member states in the event of attack. All the same, the geopolitics of Eastern Europe has changed profoundly since the end of the Cold War. Back then, containing the Russians in Central Europe was, or was treated as, a vital US interest. It is no longer so clear that that is the case today in Eastern Europe and former Soviet republics like Ukraine, Georgia and the Baltic republics. Nor are US and NATO forces currently configured for fighting on that terrain, at least without taking resources away from other current military missions. How much domestic political support would a war in these former Soviet republics command in the United States? What role would Germany and the EU be prepared or willing to play in such conflicts? Finally, what choices remain open to the US and which are already determined by the realities of NATO expansion? Events have not yet forced the Obama administration, or for that matter, most other NATO member states, to come up with hard answers to these hard questions.

Continuing the emergency state

In his first inaugural address in January 2009, Barack Obama ringingly declared that "we reject as false the choice between our safety and our ideals", a point he had during the campaign frequently criticised the Bush administration for failing to understand. But during Obama's eight years in office, his administration has regularly put security programs undertaken in the wake of the 9/11 attacks ahead of the constitutionally protected liberties of American citizens.

Picking up where the Bush administration left off, the Obama administration has further narrowed Fourth Amendment privacy protections through mass surveillance of email and phone data of ordinary Americans not individually suspected of any crime. It has narrowed First Amendment rights and weakened governmental accountability through one of the most aggressive campaigns against whistleblowers and leakers in

American history, throwing the book against the alleged Wikileaks source Chelsea Manning and NSA whistleblower Thomas Drake. And it pursued a worldwide campaign to prevent other nations from granting asylum or even temporary sanctuary to NSA leaker Edward Snowden. Obama's former Attorney General, Eric Holder, has now acknowledged that Snowden "performed a public service" when his disclosures sparked a useful and necessary debate about surveillance programs. But that has not slowed the Obama administration's campaign to prosecute and jail Snowden. And the administration has surely violated the due process requirements of the Fifth Amendment through presidentially ordered drone assassinations of American citizens not tried or convicted by any US court and not present in any declared or designated war zone.

On another level, Obama has ignored constitutional requirements and the War Powers Resolution by waging presidential wars in Libya, and now Syria, without formal congressional approval. This has been facilitated by the maintenance of a giant and expensive permanent 'peacetime' military establishment, not Obama's creation but unprecedented in American history before the Cold War. This is, of course, part of the permanent military-industrial complex Dwight Eisenhower presciently warned about in 1961. Without it, presidents would have to go to Congress to mobilise and arm for war, the essential check on presidential war-making powers the Constitution's drafters had in mind. And, Obama, like all of his recent predecessors, has kept information essential to debating public policies unnecessarily secret from the voting public and even from Congress.

This 'emergency state' mentality, as I have called it elsewhere, is not Obama's legacy alone. It has taken root and expanded over the past seven decades and more. Listening to Obama's campaign speeches in 2007 and 2008, many Americans thought he meant to at least begin rolling back that often-destructive mindset. The fiasco of the Iraq invasion had brought a moment for reflection on how far astray from American ideals things had gone. But that moment passed, and Obama made a conscious decision not to look back and judge what had gone wrong.

Multiculturalism

Although the UK has never (unlike Canada and Australia) formally embraced multiculturalism as a basis for inter-communal relations, multiculturalism has been

accepted, particularly since the 1980s, as the prevailing ethos in much of British public life. This has been evident in developments as diverse as the advance of bilingualism in Wales, the emphasis on 'equality and diversity' in the public services, the spread of so-called 'faith schools' and the Lord Chief Justice's (Lord Phillips) willingness to accept Sharia courts as a legitimate means of settling certain disputes between British Muslims. Such developments have nevertheless not gone unchallenged. Indeed, it has become increasingly fashionable to declare that multiculturalism has 'gone too far', or has 'had its day', a view expressed not least by Trevor Phillips, the chair of the Equality and Human Rights Commission. But what exactly is multiculturalism? What assumptions and thinking lie behind multiculturalism, and what different forms does it take? Finally, what are the main objections to multiculturalism and the wider politics of culture?

What is multiculturalism?

Some continue to use the term 'multiculturalism' empirically; that is, simply to refer to the existence of diverse cultures, values and traditions within the same society. Multiculturalism, however, is not the same as cultural diversity. Rather, it is a particular approach to dealing with the challenges of cultural diversity and, in particular, to bringing about the advancement of marginalised or disadvantaged groups. However, multiculturalism adopts a novel approach to such matters, one that departs from conventional approaches to social advancement, especially as represented by republicanism and social reformism.

Republicanism (associated with classical liberalism) is primarily concerned with the problem of legal and political exclusion, the denial to certain groups of rights that are enjoyed by their fellow citizens. The key idea of republicanism is the principle of universal citizenship, the belief that all members of society should enjoy the same status and the same entitlements. Republican thinking was, for example, reflected in first-wave feminism, in that its campaign for female emancipation focused on the struggle for votes for women and on equal access to education, careers and public life in general. It is also evident in anti-discrimination legislation, such as the Race Relations Act (1976), which prohibits discrimination on the grounds of race, colour and ethnic or national origin. Republicanism can, in this sense, be said to be 'difference-blind': it views difference as 'the problem' (because it leads to discriminatory or unfair treatment), and proposes that

difference be banished or transcended in the name of equality. Republicans therefore believe that social advancement can be brought about through legal egalitarianism.

Social reformism (associated with modern liberalism or social democracy) arose out of the belief that universal citizenship and formal equality are not sufficient, in themselves, to tackle the problems of subordination and marginalisation. People are held back not merely by legal and political exclusion, but also, and more importantly, by social disadvantage - poverty, unemployment, poor housing, lack of education, and suchlike. The key idea of social reformism is the principle of equality of opportunity, the belief in a 'level playing-field' that allows people to rise or fall in society strictly on the basis of personal ability and their willingness to work. Such social egalitarianism can only be brought about through a system of social engineering that aims to alleviate poverty and overcome disadvantage, in part through the identification of difference. For instance, the stress in the Race Relations Act (2000) on the promotion of equal opportunities forces schools, colleges and universities formally to monitor issues such as staff recruitment and promotion and student performance on the basis of ethnic or racial origin. This, nevertheless, amounts to only a provisional or temporary acknowledgement of difference, in that different groups are identified only to expose (supposedly) unfair practices and eradicate them

Multiculturalism, for its part, developed out of the belief that group marginalisation often has yet deeper origins. It is not merely a legal, political or social phenomenon, but is, rather, a cultural phenomenon, one that operates through stereotypes and values that structure how people see themselves and are seen by others. Universal citizenship and equality of opportunity, in other words, do not go far enough. Egalitarianism, in both its legal and social forms, has limited value, and may even be part of the problem. Multiculturalism, by contrast, is distinguished by an emphasis on difference over equality. This is reflected in its central theme: a positive endorsement, even celebration, of cultural difference, allowing marginalised groups to assert themselves by reclaiming an authentic sense of cultural identity. Multicultural rights are therefore specific to the group concerned, as opposed to 'equal' or 'universal' rights. They include:

The right to (public) recognition and respect. Cultural groups, defined by characteristics such as religion, language, ethnicity or national origin, should somehow be accepted as legitimate actors in public life. Such rights may include the right not to be offended, protecting the sacred or core beliefs of a group from being attacked or insulted.

Minority, 'special' or 'polyethnic' rights. These are legal privileges or exclusions that enable particular cultural groups to maintain their identities and their distinctive ways of life. (Examples in the UK include the exclusion of Sikhs from the requirement to wear motor-cycle helmets, the exclusion of Jewish shopkeepers from Sunday trading legislation, and exemptions for Muslim and Jewish butchers from laws regulating the slaughter of animals and birds.)

The right, in certain circumstances, to some degree of self-determination. This enables groups to exert some control, or at least influence, over the rules by which they live. Liberal multiculturalists, such as Will Kymlicka (1995), tend to restrict the right to self determination to indigenous peoples and tribes (who have become minority groups through conquest or colonialism), excluding minority groups that have developed as a result of immigration (where some level of consent can be assumed).

The politics of cultural self-assertion

Multiculturalism has been shaped by a larger body of thought that holds that culture is basic to political and social identity. In that sense, multiculturalism is part of a wider politics of cultural self-assertion. The origins of this form of politics can be traced back to the counter Enlightenment and, in particular, the ideas of the German poet and philosopher, Herder (1744-1803), often portrayed as the 'father' of cultural nationalism. However, in its modern form, cultural politics has been shaped by two main forces: identity politics and communitarians.

Identity politics is a broad term that encompasses a wide range of political trends and ideological developments. What all forms of identity politics have in common is that they view liberal universalism as a source of oppression, even a form of cultural imperialism, which tends to marginalise and demoralise subordinate groups and peoples. It does this because, behind a façade of universalism, the culture of liberal societies is constructed in line with the interests of its dominant groups – men, whites, the wealthy and so forth. Subordinate groups and peoples are either consigned an inferior or

demeaning stereotype or they are encouraged to identify with the values and interests of dominant groups, their oppressors. Edward Said (2003) tried to expose this through the notion of 'orientalism', highlighting the extent to which European colonialism had been upheld through stereotypical fictions that belittled and demeaned non-western people and culture. However, identity politics also views culture as a source of liberation and empowerment. Social and political advancement can be achieved through a process of cultural self-assertion aimed at cultivating a 'pure' or 'authentic' sense of identity. Embracing such an identity is therefore a political act, a statement of intent, a form of defiance. This is what gives identity politics its typically combative character and imbues it with considerable psycho-emotional force. Identity politics fuses the personal and the political.

Communitarianism is the belief that the self or person is constituted through the community, in the sense that individuals are shaped by the communities to which they belong and thus owe them a debt of respect and consideration. Communitarianism arose as a philosophical revolt against liberal universalism, the belief that, as individuals, people in all societies and all cultures have essentially the same 'inner' identity. Communitarian philosophers such as Alisdair MacIntyre (1981) and Michael Sandel (1982) portrayed this idea of the abstract individual – the 'unencumbered self' – as a recipe for rootless atomism. Instead, individuals must be embedded in a particular social, institutional, moral or ideological context, as only 'external' factors are able to give people a genuine sense of moral identity and purpose. During the 1980s and 1990s a major debate raged in philosophy between liberals and communitarians, one of the consequences of which was a greater willingness amongst many liberal thinkers to acknowledge the importance of culture. This, in turn, made liberalism more open to the attractions of multiculturalism.

Varieties of multiculturalism

One of the myths of multiculturalism is that it is merely a political stance: the belief that cultural diversity should be recognised or even celebrated. Rather, it is an ideological space which encompasses a variety of approaches to the challenge of diversity. All forms of multiculturalism are characterized by a belief in 'diversity within unity', the idea that the public recognition of cultural difference can and should be

contained within a single political society. However, rival multiculturalists traditions are divided over the respective importance of diversity and unity. The most important of these traditions are:

Liberal multiculturalism

Pluralist multiculturalism

Cosmopolitan multiculturalism

Liberal multiculturalism is a complex ideological phenomenon. It amounts to an attempt by liberals to distance themselves from universalism and, as far as possible, embrace pluralism. This has largely been done by embracing the idea of moral neutrality, the notion that liberalism does not prescribe any particular set of values but allows individuals and groups to make their own moral decisions. Nevertheless, this diversity tends to be 'diversity within a liberal framework', as liberals find it difficult and perhaps impossible to endorse cultural practices that are in themselves illiberal and oppressive. Moreover, as liberals generally stress the importance of civic unity, they tend to argue that diversity should be confined to the 'private' sphere, leaving the 'public' sphere as a realm of integration. Finally, liberals believe that liberal democracy has the unique advantage that it protects personal autonomy and thus offers the only political system in which diversity can be protected.

Pluralist multiculturalists place a greater emphasis on diversity than on unity. Diversity is viewed as value in itself, based on an acceptance of value pluralism, the idea that different moral beliefs – and therefore different cultures – are equally legitimate. Nevertheless, as pluralist multiculturalism is the form of multiculturalism that most clearly embraces identity politics, it is usually associated with attempts to defend 'oppressed' cultures and minority groups and has, at best, an equivocal relationship with liberalism. At the very least, it refuses to 'absolutism' liberalism, rejecting the idea that liberal values or liberal-democratic structures have any priority over their rivals. Pluralist multiculturalists also argue that only a strong and public recognition of cultural belonging enables people to participate fully in their society, thus embracing the idea of differentiated citizenship.

Finally, multiculturalist's ideas have been generated by theorists sympathetic to cosmopolitanism. Cosmopolitan multiculturalists have been particularly keen to defend

the rights and cultures of indigenous peoples, often within the parameters of the wider global justice movement. One of the characteristic themes of cosmopolitan multiculturalism is an emphasis on hybridist or multiple identities, the recognition that personal identity is complex and multifaceted. This, in turn, can lead to an emphasis on the merits of cultural mixing (evident, for example, in the idea of 'world music'), seen as a way of broadening people's political horizons and ultimately providing the basis for global citizenship. Cosmopolitan multiculturalism has been portrayed as a kind of 'pick and mix' multiculturalism, or as multiculturalism lite', implying that cultural identity is more a lifestyle choice (or a series of lifestyle choices) than something that is deeply rooted in society and history.

Popular culture

The 'cultural turn' in politics has not been without its critics, however. Cultural politics has been criticized from a variety of perspectives which, in turn, have generated specific attacks on multiculturalism. The most significant of these criticisms include the following:

- Culture as reductionism

- Culture as captivity

- Culture as conflict

Sociologists and others have questioned whether cultural groups can ever be seen as meaningful political entities, since cultures themselves are never homogeneous but are always complex, differentiated and fluid. Cultural politics is therefore based on a reductionist view of culture, in that it defines cultural membership in terms of a supposedly dominant characteristic and implies that the people who share that characteristic belong to the same 'community'. Critics have therefore argued that there is not such thing as, say, the 'Muslim community' or the 'Somali community', any more than there is a 'gay community'. 'Communities', in this sense, are political inventions, imagined communities not organic or living communities.

Culture may also be viewed as a form of oppression or captivity. This is a view advanced by universalist liberals, who portray cultural politics as a personal and political dead-end. This applies because culture is very largely passed down from one generation to the next through a process of socialisation. Unless it is based on free and informed

choice (which is rarely the case), cultural identity amounts to an affront to individuality and personal autonomy; it reflects what J. S. Mill called the 'despotism of custom'. In the feminist version of a similar argument, multiculturalism is seen as little more than a concealed attempt to bolster male power, as the cultural beliefs it seeks to preserve or strengthen are all too often deeply patriarchal. The politics of cultural recognition may therefore be used to legitimise continued female subordination.

Finally, cultural politics has been associated with division and conflict. Such thinking has been expressed in two contrasting critiques of multiculturalism. First, nationalists, and particularly conservative nationalists, have taken issue with the core multiculturalist idea that increased cultural diversity does not threaten political unity. For nationalists, the unrivalled capacity of the nation to provide the basis for legitimate political rule stems precisely from the fact it ensures that cultural identity and political identity overlap. In this view, multiculturalism is a recipe for civic strife and political instability. The second version of this argument is advanced by socialists, who argue that the politics of cultural recognition undermines the idea of a common humanity, limiting people's sense of moral responsibility to members of their own cultural group. Such a tendency tends to undermine support for the politics of welfare and redistribution, which relies on a wider and 'difference-blind' sense of altruism across society.

The Afro

In a third class continental railway carriage, my neighbors at first stare at me—sometimes a bit impudently, sometimes with an inquisitive smile. I have grown so used to this that I can sit quietly for an hour or so with from three to six pairs of eyes focused on my brown face, my closely curled hair, my hat, my clothes, my hands and the visible part of my soul, without betraying any considerable impatience. After satisfying their eyes and becoming more or less assured that I am neither wild nor a member of a passing circus, one of the bolder ones usually seeks to open a conversation, through the weather, the speed of the train, the window, or some such railway topic. It depends of course on my mood as to whether the conversation is particularly successful. Sometimes when there are not many with us, and my neighbor is pleasant and gentlemanly, I let the talk run on, well knowing whither it will eventually drift. I agree that the weather is pleasant, that the open window is to my taste, et cetera.

In this manner it gradually dawns upon my inquisitive friend that he is face to face with a modern “problem.” He recollects the emancipation of several millions of slaves in the United States some years ago, and he has since heard more or less of the trouble which naturally followed with this horde of partially civilized freedmen. In common, however, with the rest of the European world he had always thought of these people in the third person, and had no more imagined himself discussing this race problem with one of them, than he had planned talking Egyptology with a pyramid. The curiosity of my neighbor, therefore increases. He hesitates at openly prying into my private affairs or into such public ones as may be painful to me. Yet he is interested, for here, says he is a young man whose very existence is a kind of social paradox: removed but a couple of generations from barbarism, he is yet no barbarian; and again though to all appearances the civilized member of a civilized state, he represents the 19th century problem of barbarism

I am not always unwilling to satisfy my friend’s curiosity. Yes, I tell him, I am one of those nine million human beings in the United States, who constitute the so-called “Negro Problem.” The majority of us are not of pure Negro blood, and therefore, as a people, cannot be described as Negroes; neither we nor our ancestors for generations were born in Africa and thus we are not African. We describe ourselves by the perhaps awkward, but certainly more accurate term of Afro-American. If, now, the interest of my neighbor still continues, I proceed to enlarge on a subject which naturally lies near my heart.

The European child is born into one of several superimposed worlds; he sees in the various social grades and walks of life, so many different and more or less completely separated spheres to only one of which he belongs, and from which he views the others as so many strange and unknown planets. With the white American child, the case is not so different as many democrats would have men believe. With the Afro-American the case is quite different; he is born into a universe which in addition to all horizontal boundaries is separated by a straight perpendicular fissure into a white and black hemisphere. These two halves both have their horizontal differences of educated and ignorant, rich and poor, law abiding and criminal. On the black side these grades are not, to be sure, so highly

differentiated, and the average of culture is far below that of the white side, still they are adjacent and not superimposed spheres.

This fissure between white and black is not every where of the same width. Naturally it is the widest in the former slave states and narrowest in the older and more cultivated East. It seldom, however, wholly closes up in New England, while its threatening width in the south is the “Negro Problem.” Thus Whittier’s “Black Boy of Atlanta” had a peculiar world in which to “rise.” Born to ex- slaves, he was reared of necessity, in a physically and morally unhealthy home,—a home such as two hundred and fifty years of ruthless serfdom had left in a legacy to the freedmen. For his education he had himself no means, and those furnished by the State were in inverse proportion to his needs, the State following the peculiarly American principle that the poorest and most ignorant of her citizens should have the worst and shortest schools, since, forsooth, they paid the least taxes. The natural expense of schools was, in the South, increased by the maintenance of two systems, a black and a white, the white schools were and are bad, but nothing deserving the name of a school system for the blacks has existed until within the last ten or fifteen years, and remains to- day glaringly inadequate. This is, of course, to be expected in a land lately devastated by war, and upheaved by a mighty social revolution. The unaided efforts of the South to recover, laudable though they have been in many instances, have naturally failed as yet adequately to cope with the vast problem of ignorance before it.

If our black boy is so fortunate as to secure a common school education— a thing desirable for the humblest citizen of a republic, and absolutely necessary for one with such antecedents as the Afro- American—the question of a life- calling is, for him, beset with peculiar difficulties. His ability has little chance to display itself, for the majority of Americans refuse his entrance into the various walks of life on any terms. What American would buy of a black merchant, even if he sold honest wares? What “Knight of Labor” would take a black apprentice? What white Trade- unionist would labor beside a black craftsman? What is the black boy’s chance of getting the use of capital for business on a large scale? The higher the black youth aspires the greater his peculiar difficulties. He is often barred from professional schools, he is discriminated against in salaries, and ostracised [sic] professionally by his white brothers

The easiest thing for him to do is to sink into the old menial positions, which are, in American eyes, his ideal condition, and give up the struggle to raise himself to the heights he so thoroughly believes himself capable of attaining. Of course, if he be of heroic build, he will surmount all obstacles and break a new path amid the thorn of prejudice, and underbrush of ignorance: thus in spite of the difficulties I have mentioned, we have no small number of successful skilled laborers, tradesmen, teachers and professional men. The Afro- American is, however, no exception to the rule that most human beings are not heroes and waymakers, and need a certain minimum amount of encouragement to make them put forth their best efforts.

His calling chosen, and settled in life, the young Colored man still finds his life- path strictly hedged in. He marries most generally only one of his own race; he has difficulty in hiring or buying a house except in certain quarters of the city; in the south he is generally debarred from public libraries, theatres (save perhaps in the “pit”), lecture courses, white churches, etc., and from hotels, cafés, restaurants, and the like. On the railway he is confined to separate and poor apartments, or to the smoking- car. His wife and daughters are especially liable to insult and outrage, both by law and custom, while if the slightest suspicion arise that he has in any way insulted a white woman, he is liable to be hanged or burned without judge, jury, or the vestige of a trial. At law, he is not tried by his peers but always by a jury wholly or nine- tenths white, and by a white judge. His right to vote is, to a large extent, throughout the south rendered null and void. These discriminations may, in some cases, be merely protective measures of society against its proletariat—of civilization against the vast underlying strata of black barbarism. They change this character however, when they force back rising talent and desert among blacks, and leave uncurbed ignorance and lawlessness among whites. Even the boy born, as I was, in Puritan New England, finds that nearly all the paths of advancement opened to his white brothers are, by strong custom, sternly shut in his face. The difference between north and south in this respect is indeed great, but rather one of degree than of kind, and in Boston as well as New Orleans, the Afro- American must in his own country, feel himself the unwelcome guest at the national meal.

Three schools of thought may be said to represent the attitude of the American State toward its citizens of African descent, which I may designate as the Ricardean, the

Philanthropic and the Radical. The school which has hitherto been dominant is the Ricardean, i.e., the school which seeks to apply the principles of the Rousseau- Smith- Ricardo school of social philosophy to the solving of the race problem. Its creed was simple—emancipate the slave, give him neither land, tools, nor money, and leave him to the mercy of his former masters to work out his own salvation by “free competition” with the American freemen. It is safe to say that this was the most extreme application of the Smith- Ricardo economics ever made in a civilized State. The situation violated every condition which the English school of social philosophy presupposed as necessary for the application of their laws. Instead of a stable state of society, an absence of great class differences and prejudices, and an approximate equality of opportunity for the competitors, there was a state of society only to be described as revolutionary, a maximum of class hatred and unreasoning prejudice, and the competing “equality” of master and slave. Scarce a single step was taken by the State to remedy this. The ballot was given to the ignorant and bewildered freedmen, and promptly rendered null and void by the Ex- Masters in sheer self- defense. Russia, to whom America has often thought it fit to read lectures on national morality, gave the emancipated serfs a part of the land on which they and their fathers had toiled: not an inch was given America’s freedmen; the builders of the monarchic Prussian state took care that the ignorant German bauer was in a condition to compete before he was left to “free competition”: the democratic American state did not give its freedmen so much as a spade.

These efforts of the philanthropists were in accordance with the second school of thought in America in regard to this problem. This, like the first, is a child of the 18th century—a development of those one- sided moral and social ideals which made man purely the result of his individual environment. These new- world philanthropists have indeed, behind their Browns, their Garrisons, and their Sumners, striven for the highest ideals of humanity; but at the same time they have seldom escaped narrow fanaticism or great- hearted blindness to facts. Seizing upon the Rousseau- Jefferson half- truth: “All men are created free and equal,” they sought to secure the rise of the Negro by a course at College, and the recognition of his rights by legal enactment, or executive dicta. Here naturally, they largely failed. Their laws remained dead- letters, their mandates were hooted down by the mob, while the vast system of private charity which they set on foot

to aid the helpless and forsaken freedmen was without general plan, expensively distributed and, [sic] shortsighted in its object. The whole philanthropic movement in regard to the Afro- American forgot the real weakness of his situation, i.e., his economic helplessness and dependence; that whatever "equality" he could be said to hold in the American state, was an equality in "poase" [sic] and not in "ease."³ It gave him churches before he had homes, theories of equality instead of personal property, theological bickerings instead of land and tools, and mushroom "colleges" instead of a good common school and industrial training system. In spite, however, of all mistakes and all narrowness this philanthropy did a mighty work; and has been the agency, which in the face of the indifference and neglect of the State, supplied the ex- slave that aid which was indispensable to his advance. Not indeed the sole agency, for the southern people themselves have of late years given thousands of dollars through their legislatures to common- school and industrial education, and in some instances to higher education among the freedmen. This has been done at times grudgingly and in an illiberal spirit but nevertheless the facts speak most for the broader spirit of the South. The Nation has wrongly laid on this part of the country the whole responsibility of removing ignorance and degradation caused by slavery. That under such an unfair and short- sighted policy, the south should have been able to rise above her prejudices against Negro blood, and to build and equip a dozen or more normal and industrial schools in addition to a common- school system, even though that be poor, certainly deserves commendation; this what we Afro- Americans would be the last to withhold. Nevertheless even now Northern charity does the larger part of this work. Time has broadened the aims of these philanthropists, systematized and made practical their plans: the movement however, still remains a huge work of highest importance built on the narrow vacillating and humiliating basis of personal charity. The better self of the American people has not yet realized that this situation is something more complicated than a case of pariah almsgiving; and for this reason there has shown itself in later years a certain dissatisfaction with the total results of this 20 years of spasmodic charity. The more short- sighted of its promoters, with the American impatience of anything but quick and big "returns," are perplexed because the half- hearted efforts of two decades have not settled a social problem of the 250 years growth. Quick, thorough, radical, methods of

“settling” the problem, have lately found increasing favor with such people, as well as with those who have ever honestly believed the Negro an inferior being, incapable of any considerable elevation.

The grand thought of this radical school of opinion lies on the oft- repeated phrase: “This is a white man’s country,” i.e., in all questions affecting the weal or woe of America, the only people whose interests are to be considered are the members of the Caucasian race. This 15th century phrase is stated baldly and bluntly by some classes; by others it is dressed in 19th century clothes; it is said: We are dealing with facts, not theories of morality; there is among us a vast horde of people, alien to us in looks, in blood, in morals and in culture; our people will not associate with them, and cannot live in peace beside them; they stand on a lower plane of humanity than we, and never have in the past evolved a civilization of their own, nor under a favorable trial today do they show any ability to assimilate or forward modern culture; therefore as a lazy, shiftless, and bestial folk, they must in accordance with the universal law of the survival of the fittest yield before the all- conquering Anglo- Saxon, and must be either transported, isolated or left to slow and certain extermination.

At all events, the very circumstance that at this late day, after decades of discussion, the main facts of the problem are so little known as even to allow the serious assertion of so important a doubt, is an eloquent commentary on the methods in which the American people are settling their social problems. Here lies, of course, the kernel [sic] of the whole problem: to ascertain by careful statistics, historical research and scientific inquiry, the actual facts of the case in order that out of the chaos of opinion, allegation, and prejudice, the real truth and the real problems may be laid bare.

The peculiarity of the rise of the Afro- American is that he has been compelled to advance by means of democracy toward ideals which American democracy has set before him. The invariable rule of advance among peoples is the gradual evolving of leading, ruling classes among them, who guide the masses, and incorporate strata after strata with themselves until a sufficient number of the whole race become raised to that average of culture which we call civilization. So to place a nation that this usual method of advance was hindered, did not mean the substitution of some new method—it did not result as 18th century social philosophers taught, in the lifting of the race bodily from the bottom

into one dead level of equality; it merely [sic] meant that the natural development should be slower, and the natural aristocracy longer deprived of their rightful places as leaders of their own people. Thus it has happened that the majority worship and deification of mob- rule, which has too often in America displaced the high ideals of true democracy, has within the ranks of the freedmen themselves, acted as a disintegrating force at a time when unity and subordination was most needed. They were, directly after emancipation, like sheep without a shepherd. The cleft of race prejudice forbade that the better classes of the whites should assume that legitimate leadership and beneficent guardianship which the cultured classes of all nations owe their proletariat [sic]. The ex- slave was compelled, out of the dead- level of his degradation to evolve his leaders and his ideals. It was indeed impossible that these ideals should not be in great degree influenced by the ideals of the American State: and these were such as bewildered and confused the freedmen. He shrank instinctively from that soul- blunting competition, that Sturm und Drang of the gigantic business life, as the great cause of all the disabilities and indignities he suffered. All this in turn increased the prejudice against him: for those busy, restless Americans who are apt to rate sharpness higher than honesty, brilliancy higher than faithfulness, and dollars higher than God—such Americans had only contempt for the true- heartedness of the slave to his master, for the trusting and simplicity that allows the sharper merchant and land owner to cheat at will the black farmer and tenant, and a general smile of pity for the ex- slaves light- hearted joyousness, his vein of peculiar melancholy, his religious mysticism and respect for authority in fine for all those characteristics which American “business” methods have never found “profitable.”

We claim to see under what is commonly called the Negro problem at least four different problems; We regard the Negro problem proper as nothing more nor less than a question of humanity and national morality. Is the American nation willing to judge, use, and protect its citizens with reference alone to their character and ability, and irrespective of their race and color? Is the conscience of the American Republic so far behind the social ideals of the 19th century, as to deny to a human being the right of “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness” solely because he has Negro blood? This is the kernel of the Negro problem, and the question which the American people have never boldly faced, but have persisted in veiling behind other and dependent problems. For instance, it is

often said: the Afro- American is ignorant and cannot therefore be treated as other citizens, but this is not the Negro problem, for every American knows that there are thousands of Negro descent in America, who are not ignorant, and the question is, how are they to be treated? True it is that a much larger per- cent of the Afro- Americans are illiterate than of the whites, and this is to be expected. None however, can read the reports of the commission of education, and of the great benevolent associations without being struck with their remarkable betterment in this respect, since emancipation; we claim that it can be proven that the problem of illiteracy among us is no peculiar one but part and parcel of the vaster problem of ignorance that faces this immigrant- loving nation. It raises the great question as to how much longer the United States can in deference to its Manchester economics, leave the great question of the education of its citizens entirely to local control, and thus increase and intensify present evils by giving the worst schools to the poorest and most ignorant communities.

This brings us to the second problem which so often cloaks and confuses the race question; it is the political problem. An involuntary murmur of approval goes through the civilized world when the South says: we will not allow ourselves to be ruled by a horde of ignorant voters — intelligence must assert its legitimate sway over barbarism. We Afro- Americans can too express hearty sympathy with this. The majority of colored voters in the south are not fit to have the ballot and the carrying out of the rule of “one man, one vote” south of the Mason and Dixon line today would merely mean the subversion of civilized government. But here we say again, this is no Negro question, for although the greater number of ignorant voters in the south are those of Negro blood, yet no small number of white voters are just as ignorant and just as unfit to rule. In other words it is ignorance and not blackness which menaces civilization in the south. This is shown in the badly governed parts of the north, where the ignorance and venality of white voters made government so often corrupt and ridiculous. Again, we claim that Afro- American citizens who are capable of performing the duties of citizenship, and they are no small number, should be listened to in the councils of the nation and as jealously guarded in their rights as white citizens. Although we have, in a way, more excuse for our condition than our brothers in white still we do not for a moment defend ignorance and immorality in politics: but we do vehemently protest, when the plea of

incapability is used to disfranchise a vast number of intelligent and law-abiding black voters, while, at the same time millions of ignorant white voters are allowed to make the name of democracy a stench in the nostrils of civilization and decency. This whole question is part of the great problem of the future of political life in America. Already the nation has gone so far in its blind worship of democracy, that it is today ruled more from its gutters than from its homes. Is it not about time to stop, turn about and limit the franchise which has been so inconsiderately distributed? This must be done soon unless the intelligence and morality of America really intend to abdicate to ignorance and mob-rule.

Americans Experience

From acclaimed filmmaker Ric Burns, *Death and the Civil War* explores an essential but largely overlooked aspect of the most pivotal event in American history: the transformation of the nation by the death of an estimated 750,000 people – nearly two and a half percent of the population – in four dark and searing years from 1861 to 1865.

With the coming of the Civil War, and the staggering and completely unprecedented casualties it ushered in, death entered the experience of the American people as it never had before – on a scale and in a manner no one had ever imagined possible, and under circumstances for which the nation would prove completely unprepared. The impact would permanently alter the character of the republic, the culture of the government and the psyche of the American people – down to this day

“Transpose the percentage of dead that mid-19th-century America faced into our own time – seven million dead, if we had the same percentage,” says author Drew Gilpin Faust, on whose groundbreaking book, *This Republic of Suffering*, the film is based. “What would we as a nation today be like if we faced the loss of seven million individuals?”

Death and the Civil War tracks the increasingly lethal arc of the war, from the bloodless opening in 1861, through the chaos of Shiloh, Antietam, Gettysburg, and the unspeakable carnage of 1864 – down through the struggle, in the aftermath of the war, to cope with an American landscape littered with the bodies of hundreds of thousands of soldiers, many unburied, most unidentified.

The work of contending with death on this scale would propel extraordinary changes in the inner and outer life of all Americans – posing challenges for which there were no ready answers when the war began – challenges that called forth remarkable and eventually heroic efforts on the part of individuals, groups and the government – as Americans worked to improvise new solutions, new institutions, new ways of coping with death on an unimaginable scale.

Before the Civil War, there were no national cemeteries in America. No provisions for identifying the dead, or for notifying next of kin, or for providing aid to the suffering families of dead veterans. No federal relief organizations, no effective ambulance corps, no adequate federal hospitals, no federal provisions for burying the dead. No Arlington Cemetery. No Memorial Day. Death and the Civil War will premiere on AMERICAN EXPERIENCE on Tuesday, September 18, 2012 from 8:00 p.m. – 10:00 p.m. ET on PBS in conjunction with the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Antietam – to this day, the single bloodiest day in American history.

On July 21, 1861, three months into the Civil War, more than 60,000 men blundered into each other on a field outside the Virginia town of Manassas Junction. Nine hundred men were killed and 2,700 wounded – in just twelve hours. On that fateful day, the terrible reality of the Civil War – universally predicted to be a brief and bloodless military adventure – came crashing down. As the war dragged on and casualties mounted, the cumulative impact of the war sank deeply into the psyche of the American people.

Woefully unprepared for the monumental work of burying and accounting for the dead, the northerners and southerners alike had to find a way to deal with thousands and thousands of bodies, many unidentified, and the grieving families seeking information about loved ones who in the end, would never be found. When the Civil War ended in April 1865, Americans struggled to come to terms with what they had done to each other and to themselves in four bloody years. But much of the work of death had only just begun. No official policy existed for locating, identifying, re-burying and honoring the hundreds of thousands of people who had died, or for comforting the even vaster army of widows and orphans left behind. Tens of thousands of soldiers lay unburied, their bones littering battlefields; still more had been hastily interred where they fell, and hundreds of thousands remained unidentified.

A reburial movement spread across the country and in February 1867, Congress passed formal legislation to establish and protect national cemeteries. What became the largest and most elaborate government program undertaken in the nearly 100 year history of the republic, when the re-interment program was completed in 1871, 303,536 Union soldiers had been buried in seventy-four national cemeteries; 140,000 of the Union bodies were interred in graves marked simply “unknown.” All 30,000 African American soldiers were buried in areas designated “colored.” Segregated in death, as in life, their treatment was an indication that the Civil War was but the first battle in a much longer struggle.

In the impoverished and embittered postwar white South, where virtually every household had lost a husband, father, brother or son, it did not pass unnoticed that the \$4 million in public funds allocated for the reburial process was used exclusively for Union dead. In order to take care of their own, women of the South banded together, lobbied Congress and raised the money to similarly honor their fallen sons.

The refusal of the victorious North to attend to the vanquished southern dead would have powerful consequences for generations to come. The deep feelings of grief, loss, rage and doubt white southerners carried within became focused on reclaiming the bodies of hundreds of thousands of their dead loved ones, abandoned by the federal government. These fallen warriors soon became an anchor and rallying cry for resurgent Confederate identity.

Decoration Day rituals – placing seasonal flowers on graves sites – sprang up in many locations around the South. Northerners, too, frequently chose a spring day for formal commemoration of the dead. In the spring of 1868, General John Logan officially designated May 30 “for the purpose of strewing with flowers or otherwise decorating the graves of comrades who died in defense of their country.” Memorial Day is still celebrated nationally on the day General Logan specified three years after the end of the Civil War. Many southern states recognize Confederate Memorial Day on a different date from the nationwide holiday, reflecting persistent sectional differences among both the living and the dead.

“After the Civil War, the United States thought constantly about the dead, this constituency that was no longer there, and yet was so powerful in the influence it has on

our nation, because the nation had to live up to the sacrifice that these individuals represented,” says Drew Gilpin Faust. The generation of Americans that survived the Civil War lived the rest of their lives with grief and loss. Some continued to search for information about their missing loved ones until they themselves died. Others were never able to get over the cruel deaths of sons or husbands or dear friends and lived in perpetual mourning. Their struggle to give meaning to the seemingly senseless deaths of so many still haunts us today.

About American Experience

Television’s most-watched history series, AMERICAN EXPERIENCE has been hailed as “peerless” (Wall Street Journal), “the most consistently enriching program on television” (Chicago Tribune), and “a beacon of intelligence and purpose” (Houston Chronicle). On air and online, the series brings to life the incredible characters and epic stories that have shaped America’s past and present. Acclaimed by viewers and critics alike, AMERICAN EXPERIENCE documentaries have been honored with every major broadcast award, including 14 George Foster Peabody Awards, four duPont-Columbia Awards, and 30 Emmy Awards, including, most recently, Exceptional Merit in Nonfiction Filmmaking for Freedom Riders.

Exclusive corporate funding for AMERICAN EXPERIENCE is provided by Liberty Mutual Insurance. Major funding provided by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation. Major funding for Death and the Civil War provided by the National Endowment for the Humanities: Exploring the Human Endeavor. Additional Funding provided by the Arthur Vining Davis Foundations, Dedicated to Strengthening America's Future Through Education; the Nordblom Family Foundation and the Gretchen Stone Cook Charitable Foundation, members of the Documentary Investment Group; and by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and Public Television Viewers. American Experience is produced for PBS by WGBH Boston.

Hispanics in the United States: A Brief History

As the British and other European groups settled on the eastern seaboard of what later became the United States, the Spanish colonized much of Central and South America, as well as a significant portion of the Caribbean. There were a few Spanish settlements and missions in Florida, but the Spanish government eventually turned this

territory over to the United States through the Adams-Onís Treaty in 1819. Mexico itself gained its independence from Spain after a protracted war from 1810 to 1821, and its population generally consisted of a mix of three groups: a Spanish-origin elite population; mestizos (those of mixed European and Indian ancestry), who were mostly landless but who occupied many middle-tier positions in society (working, for example, as craftsmen, soldiers, laborers, and traders); and, finally, Indians, who remained outside of Spanish-speaking society and who farmed land in a traditional manner.

The Mexican government had a weak hold on its outlying states to the north in what is now California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas. The size of the Mexican population in these states was likewise modest but made important contributions to the development of the Southwest, such as through cattle ranching and mining. As U.S. citizens from the East poured into Texas and eventually began to significantly outnumber the Mexican population there, conflict increased, especially as the aggressive newcomers began to assert more control. In 1836 Texas proclaimed its independence from Mexico and beat back a Mexican effort to reclaim the land. Then, at the request of the Texans, the United States annexed this territory in 1845, precipitating the Mexican-American War. After the Mexican army was defeated in 1848, Mexico ceded territory to the United States in what is now California, New Mexico, Nevada, Arizona, Utah, and Colorado as part of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. This treaty also gave U.S. citizenship to the fifty thousand or so Mexicans who remained.

Aside from frequent back-and-forth movement across border communities, the number of immigrants of Mexico in the United States was modest through much of the rest of the nineteenth century. Immigration increased considerably during the conflict and instability that accompanied the beginning of the Mexican Revolution in 1910. Immigrants from Mexico were also drawn to economic opportunities in railway construction, the expansion of commercial agriculture, and the development of manufacturing in the Southwest and other areas of the United States. Employers were also hungry for cheap labor. Mexican Americans were frequently treated as expendable, second-class citizens, often recruited during labor shortages but at other times encouraged to return to Mexico, sometimes by force. For example, during the early years of the Great

Depression, from 1929 to 1935, at least 415,000 Mexicans were compelled to leave the United States.

The next large period of large-scale immigration accompanied World War II, during a period of acute labor shortages in the United States, when many working-age men joined in the armed forces. The Bracero Program was implemented in 1942 to recruit Mexican workers to the agricultural industry, mainly in California, though some immigrants were brought in to work on railroad construction in other states as well. Conditions were generally poor for the workers, but the jobs often paid considerably more than they could earn back at home. The Bracero Program ended in 1964.5 Nevertheless, the number of Mexican immigrants to the United States continued to grow even after that time. In 2013 about 11.6 million Mexican immigrants lived in the United States, compared to 2.2 million in 1980.

The presence of other Hispanic groups is more recent. Spain ceded Puerto Rico to the United States in 1898 as a result of its defeat in the Spanish-American War. In 1952 it was established as a commonwealth, in which it was a self-governing community voluntarily associated with the United States, with its own governor and legislature. Reflecting its status, Puerto Ricans are U.S. citizens at birth (and have been since 1917). Puerto Rico underwent a period of industrialization and development in the post–World War II period. During this period of change and displacement, when, for example, the mechanization of the sugar industry reduced the number of jobs on farms, migration to the U.S. mainland increased rapidly. New York City became the main destination for these migrants; by 1970 New York had a population of 818,000 Puerto Ricans, compared to 463,000 in San Juan, the main municipality in Puerto Rico. While Puerto Ricans, compared to other Latino migrants, enjoy the benefit of U.S. citizenship at birth, the population is generally very racially mixed; many have some African ancestry, and darker skinned Puerto Ricans in particular have encountered significant racial barriers.

Many of these immigrants were highly educated professionals and business and political leaders who had been supporters of the deposed president and dictator, Fulgencio Batista, or who became disillusioned by the increasing repressiveness of the Castro regime as Fidel Castro consolidated political and economic power. By the 1970s the immigrant population from Cuba was becoming economically more diverse—with a

substantial number from the working class— and thus more representative of the Cuban population as a whole. Another wave of Cuban immigrants entered in 1980 as part of the Mariel Boatlift, and this group was both racially and socioeconomically very mixed. In that year 803,000 Cubans, or about 8 percent of Cuba's population, lived in the United States. Cubans overwhelmingly settled in Miami, and many found success as entrepreneurs and small-business owners.

Immigration from the Dominican Republic to the United States also increased since the 1960s. The country experienced considerable economic growth, but also population growth, urbanization, significant income inequality, and political turmoil—all which contributed to immigration over several decades. Some Dominicans went to Miami and other destinations, but New York was by far the principal destination. Since the 1980s there has been a growth in the United States in the number of Latinos from a variety of origins, including El Salvador and Guatemala—two countries that have experienced considerable political instability.

These patterns of migration have had a considerable impact on the demographic composition of the U.S. population. In 1970 just 5 percent of the U.S. population was Hispanic. By 2013 this had risen to 17 percent, and population projections suggest that perhaps 28 percent of the population might be Hispanic in 2050, though, as discussed in chapter 2, the actual percentage will depend on how data are collected in the future and changing patterns of self-identification, especially among people of mixed-ethnic origins. Provides greater detail about the composition of the Hispanic population, according to the 2010 census, and how this changed during the preceding decade. A significant majority of the Hispanic population is of Mexican origin (63.0 percent), with the next largest groups being Puerto Ricans (9.2 percent), Cubans (3.5), Salvadorans (3.3), and Dominicans (2.8). All countries of origin have seen demographic growth from 2000 to 2010, with particularly large increases, in percentage terms, for Uruguayans (from a very small population base), Hondurans, Guatemalans, and Salvadorans. Overall, the growth in the Hispanic population from 2000 to 2010 (43.0 percent) far exceeded the growth of the U.S. population as a whole.

While Hispanics are overrepresented in particular regions of the country, with different groups being concentrated in different specific areas due to historical

circumstances, the Hispanic population is gradually spreading to new areas across the United States. For example, 11 percent of the Mexican origin population lived in the Los Angeles metropolitan area in 2010, down from 19 percent in 1990. Similarly, while 38 percent of mainland Puerto Ricans lived in the New York City area in 1990, by 2010 this figure was down to 20 percent. Mexicans can now be found in significant numbers in states where they had little historical presence, such as North Carolina and Georgia. A majority of Cubans now live outside of the Miami metropolitan area as well.

Because of this spread, there are a growing number of communities across the United States with little recent experience with immigration now grappling with population growth and increasing diversity. Immigrants often bring economic vitality but can also strain resources, such as by increasing the need for more schools to meet the needs of immigrant children. Sometimes there is a wariness of the newcomers among the native population, a clash of cultures, or outright hostility. For example, in one study of people's attitudes toward immigrants in a rural Midwestern community that had a growing number of Hispanics working in a local food processing plant, one respondent reported, "We used to feel like we knew everybody. I mean, you used to walk around town and you could walk down [Main Street], and you knew everybody, you knew all of the faces. And now, you don't know all the faces and so, I think sometimes you feel a little isolated, or maybe vulnerable, just because you're not familiar with that person's background." Others looked down on the newcomers: "A friend in town had a house for sale for I think over three hundred thousand. And unfortunately next door was a rental property with a, uh, Spanish-Mexican family, and they had about three cars in the yard. It just looks bad. Three, two, cars all covered in junk."

Self-Assessment Questions

1. Discuss the leadership and policies of Jimmy Carter.
2. Analyze Ronald Reagan's domestic and foreign policies.
3. Evaluate George H. W. Bush's presidency and key initiatives.
4. Examine Bill Clinton's domestic reforms and economic policies.
5. Assess George W. Bush's leadership and the War on Terror.
6. Discuss Barack Obama's major policies and achievements.
7. Explain the concept of multiculturalism in contemporary USA.
8. Analyze the influence of popular culture on American society.
9. Assess the social, economic, and political experiences of African Americans.
10. Examine the contributions of Hispanic and Asian communities in the USA.

Recommended Books

1. Arnold S. Rice and John A Krout, *United States History From 1865*, Harper Collins College, New York, 1991.
2. Henry B. Parkes, *The United States of America*, Scientific Book Agency, Calcutta, 1968.
3. Jack Lane, Maurice O' Sullivan., *A Twentieth-Century American Reader*, USIA, Washington DC, 1999.
4. Howard Cincotta., (Ed.) *An Outline of American History*, USIS Publication, United States Information Agency, 1994.
5. Subramanian, N., *A History of the USA*, Ennes Publications, Udumalpet, 1995.
6. Thomas S. Kidd., *American History 1877 to Present - B&H Academic*, 2019.

References

1. Douglas K. Stevenson, *American life and Constitution*, USIA, Washington D.C. 1998.
2. George Brown Tindall with David E. Shi., *'America, A Narrative History, Vol. I & II*,
3. Howard Zinn., *A People's History of The United States*, Harper and Row, Harper Collins, U.S.A., 1990.
4. Thomas S.Kidd., *American History-Combined Edition: 1492 to Present—B&H Academic*, 2019.