



History 1301.304CL
Fall 2022 League City 117
Mon/Wed 7:10am – 8:30am

Instructor: James Bailey

Email: jbailey2497@com.edu

(When emailing please indicate your name **and** class, ie – Mon/Wed)

Office hours: before and after class by appointment

Location: League City room 117

Course Information

Required Textbook: Joseph Locke & Ben Wright eds. *The American Yawp*, Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press, 2022 (Open Source & free, online – Just click on <http://www.americanyawp.com/>)

Course Description

This course is essentially a study of the history of the United States from the discovery through reconstruction and will emphasize political, economic and social events, trends, personalities and dynamic forces that have shaped the United States before 1877.

Course Requirements:

Students are expected to keep up with assigned readings, regularly attend class and be on time, take notes, participate in class discussions and activities, and exhibit appropriate behavior in the classroom. If a student misses a class, it is that student's responsibility to obtain class notes from another student. Students are also required to take all exams and quizzes and complete the Paper and Oral Presentation Assignment.

Determination of Grade

1. The final grade will be based on **five grades:** three regular tests, a Final Exam and a participation score counting 10%. Each exam will count 22.5% of the final grade. If the student misses a test for good reason a make-up should be done in the COM Testing Center. 20% of the final exam grade will include an oral presentation. If "extra credit" is done [see IV below] a sixth grade will be added

and averaged with the five above to attain a final grade.

2. All tests will be 80% multiple-choice with four subtle options. The basic rule of thumb is to choose the “**best**” answer. For each test a student **must** prepare and bring to class on the test day a **one page** internet research report which will count 20 points on the test taken that class period. [Relevance, coherency, grammar and spelling count on all reports.] Every student **must** prepare, use and turn-in one hand-written notesheet created for each exam.

3. All "note sheets" must be written on the back and front of 8 1/2 by 11 inch paper with **no Xerox or computer word processing**. These "notesheets" will be treated as an "alternative assessment" and bonus points will be added to the student's score based on the skill and knowledge exhibited on both multiple choice test and notes. [On the Final Exam students should use four “note sheets:” the three previously prepared plus one created especially for the final exam.]

Late Work and Make-Up Policy: a student who has a legitimate excuse for missing a test will be permitted to take a **make-up test** in the Testing Center on COM campus. Assigned work turned in late will get a reduced grade dependent on individual circumstances.

Extra Credit is available by emailed request and must be approved 10 days before the final. It is due 24 hours before the final exam.

All projects must:

1. **be based on internet research on a question about a “1301 Syllabus term,”** ie. “What are the best examples of the “Columbian Exchange?” or “Describe elements of the First Great Awakening.” or “To what degree was deism a common religious belief of our 18th century founding fathers?” “Did the Whigs evolve into Republican?”

2. be word-processed and titled with your “**approved**” question,

3. begin with your best five web citations listed in order of research value; each to be followed by a short paragraph indicating the website’s specific value,

4. end with a one page summary describing **two reasoned conclusions:**

First, an answer to your original question and **Second**, a statement of what you learned about internet research of a historical topic. For the conclusions section a caveat: The student will likely submit 2-3 pages but important

questions must be answered:

- What elements of a website makes it more trustworthy for historical research?
- What difficulties did the student encounter in separating trustworthy information from bias or propaganda?

Grade scale:

A=90-100, B=80-89, C=70-79, D=60-69, F=60-

Attendance and tardiness Policy:

Promptness, regular attendance are required. **Email me if you are absent.**

Excessive tardiness or absence (3 or more) without acceptable reason will result in loss of points on your final grade. Use my email address at the top of page one.

Communicating with your instructor: ALL electronic communication with the instructor must be through your COM email. Due to FERPA restrictions, faculty cannot share any information about performance in the class through other electronic means.

Mapping SLOs Core Objectives & Assignments

Student Learner Outcomes	Maps to Core Objective	Assessed via this Assignment
1. Create an argument through the use of historical evidence.	Critical Thinking Skills (CT)	Paper: Wikipedia Report
2. Analyze and interpret primary and secondary sources.	Critical Thinking Skills (CT)	Exams
3. Analyze the effects of historical, social, political, economic, cultural, and global forces on this period of United States history.	Critical Thinking Skills (CT)	Exams
4. Develop, interpret, and express ideas on a History 1301-related topic through written communication.	Commun- ication Skills (CS1)	Papers: Book TV Report & An art analysis report

5. Develop, interpret, and express ideas on a History 1301-related topic through oral communication.	Communication Skills (CS2)	Oral Presentation Assignment
6. Develop, interpret, and express ideas on a History 1301-related topic through visual communication.	Communication Skills (CS3)	Oral Presentation Assignment
7. Students will demonstrate intercultural competence, knowledge of civic responsibility, and the ability to engage effectively in regional, national, and global communities.	Social Responsibility (SR)	Exams
8. Evaluate choices and actions of others or one's own, and relate consequences to decision-making.	Personal Responsibility (PR)	Exams

Academic Dishonesty such as cheating on exams is an extremely serious offense and will result in a grade of zero on that exam and the student may be referred to the Dean of Students for appropriate action.

Plagiarism: Plagiarism is using someone else's words or ideas and claiming them as your own. Plagiarism is a very serious offense. Plagiarism includes paraphrasing someone else's words without giving proper citation, copying directly from a website and pasting it into your paper, using someone else's words without quotation marks. Any assignment containing any plagiarized material will receive a **grade of zero** and the student will be referred to the Office of Student Conduct for the appropriate discipline action.

Link(s) to resource(s) about avoiding plagiarism:

<https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/589/02/> <http://www.com.edu/on-site-services/speaking-reading-writing-center.php>

Concerns/Questions Statement: If you have any questions or concerns about any

aspect of this course, please contact me. My email address is at the top of page one. If, after discussing your concern with me, you continue to have questions, please contact Shinya Wakao at 409-933-8212.

Course Outline

1st class: August 22

- I. America and Europe before Columbus
- II. Voyagers and Conquistadors
- III. English Colonization
- IV. The Colonial Economy and Population
- V. English Relations with the Colonies
- VI. Colonial Culture and Mind
- VII. The Great War for Empire

☒ **Test One (Sept. 14):**

lecture thus far + Yawp 1-4

+ syllabus readings 1 - 4

+ *Book TV* assignment (see p. 5)

- VIII. Toward Revolution and Independence
- IX. The Articles of Confederation and the Constitution
- X. The Federalist Government
- XI. Jefferson as President
- XII. The War of 1812

☒ **Test Two (Oct. 12):**

lecture since the last test & Yawp 5 - 8

+ syllabus readings 5, 6 & 7,

+ Wikipedia project

- XIII. Toward a Sectional Economy and Culture
- XIV. The Age of Jackson
- XV. Manifest Destiny & Sectionalism

☒ **Test Three (Nov. 16):**

lecture since the last test & yawp 9 - 12

+ syllabus readings 8 & 9

+ a Handbook of Texas Online project

- XVI. A Gathering Tempest (1853-1861)
- XVII. The Civil War & Reconstruction

☒ **Final Exam (Dec. 5):**

lecture from the beginning
& Yawp 13 through 15
+ syllabus readings # 10 - 11 “Lincoln Quotations”& Lincoln

Institutional Policies and Guidelines

Grade Appeal Process: Concerns about the accuracy of grades should first be discussed with the instructor. A request for a change of grade is a formal request and must be made within six months of the grade assignment. Directions for filing an appeal can be found in the student handbook.

https://build.com.edu/uploads/sitecontent/files/student-services/Student_Handbook_2019-2020v5.pdf. *An appeal will not be considered because of general dissatisfaction with a grade, penalty, or outcome of a course. Disagreement with the instructor’s professional judgment of the quality of the student’s work and performance is also not an admissible basis for a grade appeal.*
https://build.com.edu/uploads/sitecontent/files/student-services/Student_Handbook_2019-2020v5.pdf

Academic Success & Support Services: College of the Mainland is committed to providing students the necessary support and tools for success in their college careers. Support is offered through our Tutoring Services, Library, Counseling, and through Student Services. Please discuss any concerns with your faculty or an advisor.

ADA Statement: Any student with a documented disability needing academic accommodations is requested to contact Michelle Brezina at 409-933-8124 or mvaldes1@com.edu. The Office of Services for Students with Disabilities is located in the Student Success Center.

Textbook Purchasing Statement: A student attending College of the Mainland is not under any obligation to purchase a textbook from the college-affiliated bookstore. The same textbook may also be available from an independent retailer, including an online retailer.

Withdrawal Policy: Students may withdraw from this course for any reason prior to the last eligible day for a “W” grade. Before withdrawing students should speak with the instructor and consult an advisor. Students are permitted to withdraw only six times during their college career by state law. The last date to withdraw from the 16-week session is November 18.

F_N Grading: The F_N grade is issued in cases of *failure due to a lack of attendance*, as determined by the instructor. The F_N grade may be issued for cases in which the student ceases or fails to attend class, submit assignments, or participate in required capacities, and for which the student has failed to withdraw. The issuing of the F_N grade is at the discretion of the instructor. The last date of attendance should be documented for submission of an F_N grade.

Early Alert Program: The Student Success Center at College of the Mainland has implemented an Early Alert Program because student success and retention are very important to us. I have been asked to refer students to the program throughout the semester if they are having difficulty completing assignments or have poor attendance. If you are referred to the Early Alert Program you will be contacted by someone in the Student Success Center who will schedule a meeting with you to see what assistance they can offer in order for you to meet your academic goals.

Resources to Help with Stress: If you are experiencing stress or anxiety about your daily living needs including food, housing or just feel you could benefit from free resources to help you through a difficult time, please click [here](#) <https://www.com.edu/community-resource-center/>. College of the Mainland has partnered with free community resources to help you stay on track with your schoolwork, by addressing life issues that get in the way of doing your best in school. All services are private and confidential. You may also contact the Dean of Students office at deanofstudents@com.edu or communityresources@com.edu.

QEP Oral Presentation Assignment: As part of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) this course has an oral communication assignment. The student will select a topic from the topics covered in the course and make a 3-5 minute oral presentation. A small percentage of classes will also be video recorded for institutional purposes.

A 20-Point Assignment for Your First Test:

The first 20 points of your first test will come from the internet activity described below.

Book TV is devoted to the presentation of interviews and public appearances of the authors of non-fiction books. Many of these programs offer a glimpse into the mind of a working historian. Take care to choose a program that fits with an American History course. Look at your syllabus and text at the topics covered. That should give you a good clue to the best topics. Feel free to talk to me if you have any anxiety about making a program choice.

Instructions & Documentation for your work:

1. Comcast (**CSPAN 2**) offers *Book TV* from 7am Saturday to 7am Monday, however these programs are available online anytime. For the schedule go to www.booktv.org. Your assignment will be to prove to me that you watched a program with a degree of insight. To do that you must contrast the author's presentation with a published review of the presented book. To document your task, create a **500 word report**.
2. Go to www.booktv.org to discover numerous archived programs. Scroll to "Most Recent Book TV" and choose "View all Book TV videos" On the left, filter choices by clicking both "American History TV" and "Book TV" to find a program that interests you. You may have to click several times to find one you really like. Choose only a program of 40 minutes or more. If more than one book is presented in the video, select only one.
3. Take notes as you watch the program and as you read the published review of that book, then compose your report. Be sure you cite the published review.
4. **Questions to consider:** Just what three or four points did you think the author was trying to get across? What trouble did you have understanding the major points the author was trying to make? What historical question dealing with this video would you want for class discussion? Did the author say anything surprising to you? If you were in the audience what question would you have wanted to ask the author? But most of all: **How did the author's version and the published review version compare or contrast?**

Earn your first 20 points on Test Two:

1. **Begin by reading "Unethical Editing & Wikipedia's Credibility"** by Eric Haas [See p. 4-5] and then select an item from your textbook in the remainder of the book [for example "1912 election," "red scare" or "Mae West"]
2. **Critically read the narrative of your chosen item on Wikipedia.com.** Warning: As part of the grade you must include references from the "Talk" tab located at the top of the Wikipedia page. Also, check the index in your textbook as a basis of comparison.
3. **Condense your critical analysis** of this Wikipedia article into one page (1-2 paragraphs) indicating any problems with (1) "**point of view**," (2) "**white washing**" or (3) "**lack of contextual frame.**" Be sure to include points brought out in "Talk." I am looking for an expression of your opinion (**NOT a summary of the Wikipedia article.**) Be aware that some Wikipedia articles may have few critical comments in "Talk." In that case rely on your intuition using the three

Haas criteria listed above.

4. **Turn in your critical analysis page before Test Two.**

Unethical Editing & Wikipedia's Credibility

By Eric Haas, rockridgeinstitute.org, 10-26-07

Wikipedia is making a tremendous contribution to the democratization of information.... [There is] ...a joke about a man wanting to know what 2 + 2 equaled. Everyone told him four until he came upon an accountant who whispered, "What would you like it to be?" Nothing personal against accountants, it just seems that we have become so jaded by spin that we believe nothing is absolute. How then do we separate information that is truth from lies, damned lies, and statistics? Wikipedia has an opportunity to play an important role in answering this question in a way that reaches millions of people worldwide.

Wikipedia has been attempting to get to the truth by requiring the use of facts, not opinions, in its entries and relying on the integrity of open-source editors to adhere to its rules.... More transparency safeguards should be put in place. But more importantly for the long run, Wikipedia will need to resolve some kinks in its understanding of the links between facts, neutrality, and truth.

Wikipedia seeks entries that are written from a "neutral point of view" (NPOV). Every editor has a **point of view**, so Wikipedia has some basic guidelines for editing that include a prohibition on creating or editing an entry about one's self or organization and a requirement that editors present "facts" -- which Wikipedia defines as "piece[s] of information about which there is no serious dispute."

....The predominant violation is that people and institutions from politicians to the CIA... to ExxonMobil to the Democratic Headquarters have been anonymously changing their own entries or the entries of their opponents, to make them more positive or negative, respectively. These acts are clearly inappropriate, but, as a problem, they appear to have some ready solutions. Adding additional levels of editor identification will make Wikipedia more transparent and will likely make these rule violations more obvious and less likely....

But another editing practice... called "**white washing**" is more problematic, because it violates the logic, but likely not the letter, of Wikipedia's guidelines. In this way, it challenges Wikipedia's reliance on factual accuracy both as neutrality and as a means to truth. **White washing is where someone replaces negative or neutral adjectives -- words or phrases -- with more positive synonyms.** Here's

an example of the conundrum that white washing creates for the idea that one can achieve truth through neutrality derived from facts. In May 2005, someone at a Wal-Mart IP address changed a sentence in the Wal-Mart entry about employee wages. The original paragraph, with the key sentence in bold, read:

As with many US retailers, Wal-Mart experiences a high rate of employee turnover (approximately 50% of employees leave every year, according to the company). **Wages at Wal-Mart are about 20% less than at other retail stores.** Founder [Sam Walton] once argued that his company should be exempt from the [minimum wage]...

The new entry edited by Wal-Mart became this:

As with many US retailers, Wal-Mart experiences a high rate of employee turnover (approximately 50% of employees leave every year, according to the company). **The average wage at Wal-Mart is almost double the federal minimum wage** (Wal-Mart). However, founder [Sam Walton] once argued that his company should be exempt from the [minimum wage]...

There are two problems with these changes, and neither of them has to do with the facts. The facts are accurate, and that's actually part of the problem.

According to Wal-Mart documents, Wal-Mart paid its employees an average of \$9.68 per hour in 2005. According to a well-documented report by Arindrajit Dube and Steven Wertheim of the University of California, Berkeley, Wal-Mart's average wage of \$9.68 per hour was between 17% and 25% less than comparable general merchandise and large merchandise stores. So, the first statement is basically true. In 2005, the federal minimum wage was \$5.15 per hour. So, the second statement is also basically true.

Leaving aside Wal-Mart's violation of the self-editing guideline, both sentences pass the undisputed fact test. But they also violate the logic of Wikipedia's rule: undisputed facts equal neutrality which leads to truth. Both statements made \$9.68 per hour mean something different. The first made it a criticism of Wal-Mart as an exploitive corporation, while the second made it a positive attribute, portraying Wal-Mart as going way beyond its duties as an employer.

Both statements are accurate. They're also pretty meaningless, possibly misleading. Neither strikes a reader as really neutral, either. How could this happen? And, what does it mean about the future of Wikipedia as a democratic source of reliable information?

The first, and more obvious, problem is that both statements are incomplete.

Neither directly states the actual wage of \$9.68 per hour. That both statements presented the fact only indirectly through describing its relationship to something else -- as a percentage of other retailers' wages and as a multiple of the federal minimum wage -- should be a red flag for spin. The simple correction is to require the statistics themselves, in this case, the actual wage in dollars and cents. Combined with greater editor transparency, this problem is easily solved. This leaves a second, more difficult problem of incompleteness -- **the lack of contextual frame**. How do we understand what the hourly wage of Wal-Mart means? On its own, \$9.68 per hour means almost nothing. That is why, it appears, that the first and second entries framed the context surreptitiously. They compared the Wal-Mart wage to that of comparable employers and to the federal minimum wage, respectively. By implying a frame, both editors made the frame for understanding the Wal-Mart wage seem neutral. This meets the letter of the Wikipedia rules, but violates its logic.

But this appears to be the fault, so to speak, of Wikipedia's guidelines, rather than the editors (leaving aside Wal-Mart's self-editing violation). Facts by themselves aren't neutral because they don't have an intrinsic meaning that is universally understood. As the philosopher Thomas Nagel put it succinctly, you can't have a view from nowhere. **Facts require "frames" because they only make sense in context.** Current research in neuroscience and linguistics shows that we understand reality through frames composed of neural networks in our brains. These mental structures or frames, structure our ideas, shape our reasoning and impact how we act. They define common sense.

Frames operate through the words we use to discuss the world around us by linking together values, principles and ideal models of everyday things like fairness, a living wage and what a typical corporation does. Words and phrases trigger related frames deep in our unconscious minds that give them meaning. This is the mental process through which we understand what we hear and read.

This mental process is why the Wal-Mart edits are so enlightening. They show us that describing the Wal-Mart wage as being below that of comparable employers or above minimum wage can make Wal-Mart appear to be bad or good, without ever saying so. Depending on one's mental frames, one is already predisposed to understand the implied value connection. There is no factual neutrality because our brains are built to interpret. We assign value to information unconsciously. That is understanding. Without this ability, we would continually spend paragraphs explaining the context that is unconsciously obvious to most people in a few words.

For Wikipedia, reliance on facts alone to achieve neutrality that will lead to, or is itself, an understandable truth will result in a number of on-going problems:

- entries that are -- difficult to understand -- collections of dates and statistics.
- Indeterminate interpretations that vary widely from the editor's intent due to the prevailing political frames and those brought by each individual reader.
- the creatively implied contextual frames of white washing.

The idea that a collection of facts doesn't equal neutrality and doesn't lead to truth could be Wikipedia's undoing, discrediting open-source information as a reliable democratic force. This problem, if explicitly addressed and debated, could also be another historical opportunity for Wikipedia. If the relationship between facts and frames is embraced correctly, then Wikipedia could bring a new understanding of information to millions of people. Here's hoping it does.

A 20-Point Assignment for Test Three:

A Handbook of Texas Report

To receive the first 20 points on test three you must show three summaries of different entries from the Handbook of Texas Online [tshaonline.org]. **Please avoid cut & paste.**

1. Choose any **two** of the items in the list below and write a short summary of each. Then explain how they are related.

Black Codes, Freedman's Bureau, Margaret Houston Secession, George T. Ruby, Francis R. Lubbock, Mexican Texans in the Civil War, Gun manufacturing during the Civil War, German attitude during toward the Civil War, Elisha M. Pease, Carpetbaggers, Republican Party to 1877, Reading W. Black, Texas vote in presidential elections ('48 to '76), American party, Mexican War, Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, Unionism, Compromise of 1850, S.M. Swenson, Melinda Rakin

2. Research & summarize what you find about a Texas city or village you checked out while surfing the Handbook of Texas Online. Just about all, past & present, are covered in the Handbook.

Adding more facts will not solve these problems. Wikipedia must re-think its reliance on the logic of its guidelines that link facts to neutrality to truth. In other words, Wikipedia's verifiability policy -- previous publication by a reliable source - - is no longer enough.

Wikipedia can address blatant rule violations by dishonest editors through more transparency and greater administrator oversight. These changes are straightforward and some are already being implemented. White washing, however, will require a more thoughtful examination of Wikipedia's process for arriving at truth. That examination should include a **discussion**, best on Wikipedia itself, of recent research developments in neuroscience and linguistics. These developments demonstrate the **importance and necessity of frames in understanding facts....**

Information About Your Instructor

I grew up in Van Zandt County, Texas and by working as a movie projectionist was able to graduate from Van HS and Tyler Junior College by 1961. With a National Defense Education Loan I got my BA at East Texas State University (now Texas A&M at Commerce) two years later with a major in History and a minor in Government. Teaching freshmen as a Graduate Assistant in the History Department I completed 24 graduate hours in History and Government and began working on a Master's thesis.

In 1964 I moved to Galveston County and began teaching at Dickinson HS and within three years began teaching as an adjunct History/Government instructor for Alvin and Mainland Community Colleges which I continue to this day. After retiring from Dickinson ISD in 2002 I have remained active in professional and civic pursuits. Spending the summer of 1970 in Puebla, Mexico I took courses in Mexican history and pre-Columbian art. In 1977, after twelve years of research involving hundreds of interviews, countless trips to archives and 33 more graduate hours in History and Sociology at the University of Houston at Clear Lake I received my MA degree. My thesis dealt with the development of the Dickinson Italian colony.

In 1980, I received a "Practicum" grant from the University of Texas to create activities for economics classes. For this project I worked for several weeks with executives and employees at Phillips Petroleum in Houston and Bartlesville, Oklahoma. In 1986-87, I completed three more graduate political science courses at the University of Houston: *British Government* where I interviewed municipal workers in central England, *Political Parties* with Dr. Richard Murray and *International Relations* where I produced a paper with the hypothesis that the Soviet Union would morph into European socialism without a revolution. In 1991, I completed a course under Columbia's University's 90- year old W. Edward Deming in "*Quality Management*" which profoundly influenced the way I see

students and my role as teacher. After retiring from Dickinson ISD in 2002 I remain active in professional and civic pursuits.

Questions While Reading *Am. Yawp*.

Some Direction: Every student will be preparing a “note sheet.” That “note sheet” should show evidence that you took the following questions seriously as you read each text assignment. Some students may want to consider using **one segment** of your paper for lecture notes and the other for text.

Chapters 1 - 4

1. To what degree did native Americans see themselves as unified but owning land individually?
2. What was unique about Columbus and in what ways was he wrong about his discovery? How was he finally rewarded?
3. In Spanish colonial America how did the demographic and power relationships evolve?
4. How did Dutch colonial life influence American culture?
5. How did indentured servants live and survive in 17th century America?
6. Contrast the life style, occupations and politics of New England and the Chesapeake.
7. What was the economic and political effect of Bacon’s Rebellion?
8. What were Puritan attitudes toward acceptable behavior?
9. How did colonial politics compare with British politics?
10. How did Pontiac’s War affect colonial politics?
11. How did mercantilism actually work in colonial America?
12. How was slavery different in America from slavery in Africa?
13. What was like to live in colonial Philadelphia?
14. Among slaves in colonial America what was the most significant bonding factor?
15. What was the Enlightenment and Great Awakening?

Chapters 5 - 8

16. What was “Republican motherhood” and what influence did it have on American development?
17. What was the difference between the Stamp Act, the Townshend Acts and the Declaratory Act ?
18. What was the difference between the Intolerable Acts and the Quebec Act? Did the U.S. Bill of Rights react to this?
19. Why did most Americans take up arms in 1776?
20. What were the most important legacies of the Declaration of Independence?

21. What were the most significant concessions the United States gained in the Treaty of Paris in 1783?
22. What changes did the 13 states make in their new state constitutions after the Revolutionary War?
23. Advocates of free trade received a big boost with publication of what book in 1776?
24. How does the Articles of Confederation compare and contrast with the Constitution?
25. What happened to the free black population after the Revolution?
26. How does *The American Yawp* describe the men who attended the Constitutional Convention?
27. In the long run was it Jefferson or Hamilton that most influenced today's economic policies?
28. How does the concept of "slavery" enter the language of the Constitution? Why is there obfuscation?
29. What were the chief differences between Hamilton and Jefferson?
30. By the 1790s what had the phrase "we the people" come to mean? What attitude did most of the founding fathers have about democracy?
31. To what level of government did Jefferson and Madison take their protest of the Alien and Sedition Acts?
32. What points of logic did Jefferson use to criticize the passage of the Alien and Sedition Acts?
33. After becoming president, how did Thomas Jefferson deal with the Federalists? How does *Marbury v. Madison* fit into this story and why is it so important?
34. What factors that drove the United States toward War in 1812? Why did "peaceable coercion" not work?
35. Which technological changes most increased the speed and lowered the cost of commerce in the first half of the 19th century?
36. Which region was most positively affected by the Erie Canal?
37. How did the market revolution change the nature of the American family?

Chapters 9 - 12

38. What political and diplomatic problems were created when General Andrew Jackson led an army into Florida before we purchased it?
39. What were important insights made by Alexis de Tocqueville in the 1830s?
40. Explain the diplomacy behind the Monroe Doctrine?
41. What were the regional politics behind the nullification crisis?
42. What popular conspiracy theory in the 1830s benefitted the political fortunes of the Whig party?

43. What events most influenced Southern attitudes of paternalism and class?
44. What region was most affected the revivals of the Second Great Awakening?
45. What were examples of “silent sabotage” in the slave south?
46. How influential were the Transcendentalists and what did they believe?
47. Was there a antebellum Southern middle class and just where could it be found?
48. How did the Polk administration try to induce Mexico to sell California and New Mexico and how did Polk deal with the dilemma?
49. What were the provisions of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo of 1848? How and why did California become so important afterward?

Chapters 13 -15

50. Why was the extension of slavery significant politically?
51. What attracted voters to the Know-Nothing Party?
52. During the 1850s what were Abraham Lincoln’s views on race and the extension of slavery? How did that play into his nomination by the Republicans in 1860?
53. What makes Gettysburg significant?
54. What were the advantages and disadvantages of each side as the Civil War began? Why did Union soldiers feel that it was so important to defend the Union?
55. What was the most important piece of technology during the Civil War?
56. Compare and contrast Lincoln and Davis as presidents?
57. What provided a boost to Lincoln’s 1864 reelection?
58. How did the Fourteenth Amendment change American governance?
59. What was the ultimate results of the Civil War?
60. After emancipation how did ex-slaves travel, family and religious life change?
61. What were the major accomplishments of reconstruction Black politicians? What was least successful?
62. Describe how the share-crop and the crop-lien system affect poor farmers after the War.
63. What terrorist tactics did white southerners use to enforce racial hierarchies? To what degree was it stopped?

Readings for History 1301

An intriguing book by Gavin Menzies called *1421 was published in 2003* and details Admiral He’s world voyage. **Caveat:** Some of the book is a trip into historical fantasy and ventures into historical speculation. However, Menzies speculations are still historically based.

#1 Can History become historical fantasy?

Shall we continue to explore?

By Peter Bishop, *Galveston Daily News*, 9-17-03

In 1405, Admiral Zheng He of the Chinese navy set sail with the largest armada ever assembled. The fleet consisted of 62 ships, some of which were 400 feet long. Compare that with Columbus' three little crafts, the largest of which was a mere 85 feet long. Over the next 28 years, Admiral He made seven voyages to the "western seas," visiting Southeast Asia, India, and the east coast of Africa. Some of this crew even made the pilgrimage to Mecca, and all this decades before Vasco de Gama rounded Cape Horn in one ship! But 28 years later, this magnificent fleet lay in ruins. What happened?

It was not that Admiral He had not fulfilled his mission. He brought back priceless treasures, expressions of friendship from societies eager to trade with the Chinese, and new knowledge of engineering and medicine. So why did the Chinese destroy his ships? Quite simply, they judged that everything he had discovered and brought back was inferior to their own culture and technology. So why spend the money and risk the lives to explore when all they would find had no benefit or utility for Chinese society?

They were right about the first point. Chinese society at that time was far superior to the peoples the Admiral had discovered. In fact, it was superior to all societies on the planet at that time, including those in Europe. The Chinese had technologies that Europe and the rest of the world would have to invent or import later: paper making, printing, gunpowder, the mariner's compass, decimal mathematics, paper money, umbrellas, wheelbarrows and multi-stage rockets. They had built an administrative structure that governed 100 million people, more than 25% of the world's population at that time. They developed a high culture of art and literature upon the Confucian values of personal responsibility and hard work. In their minds, they had achieved perfection. What were they to learn or gain from interacting with other societies?

As we know from history, however, they were wrong about exploration, its purposes and benefits. They measured the value of exploration against tangible, near-term outcomes. If you can't see the return, why engage in the enterprise? The Europeans, on the other hand, explored largely for its own sake. They were a restless and curious lot. Of course, they were looking for returns--trade routes, gold, whatever. But when they did not find them, they did not give up exploring. We know now that Europe, driven by that curiosity and the desire for something

better, developed while China stagnated. And when they finally met, the Europeans, who came to them, had drawn even in technology, art and culture. And driving ever forward, they would come to lead and dominate the world while China has been catching up ever since.

So we are faced with the same question now, in light of the Columbia accident and the report of the Investigation Board--are we to continue to explore or have we had enough? The answer is pretty obvious. No one that I have heard is advocating that we abandon the space program the way the Chinese abandoned their naval program. The question now is how shall we proceed.

NASA has suffered three devastating tragedies in its illustrious history--the Apollo fire, the Challenger and now the Columbia. The Board's report puts its finger on the root cause of them all--oversold expectations, underfunded programs, a rush to completion, and a can-do spirit that says, "Failure is not an option." That spirit launched Americans into space, landed them on the Moon, and brought the Apollo 13 astronauts home safely. That same spirit, however, cuts corners, works around problems, compromises design in order to meet the schedule and achieve the goal. Gene Kranz said it way back in 1967, "No one stood up and said, 'Dammit, stop!'" If we are to continue to explore, then we must do it right. We owe it to the 17 who have lost their lives in U.S. spacecraft that there not be a fourth tragedy for the same reason. Rather than returning to flight armed only with good intentions, we must design a system that 20 years later is still as dedicated to safety as it was the day after the Columbia broke apart in the atmosphere. That will be difficult, and it will be expensive. But who knows what we will find as we continue to explore?

[Dr Peter Bishop is an associate professor and chair for studies of the future at the University of Houston-Clear Lake]

2 Is History an Adult-Only Adventure?
Why Columbus Offers the Best History Lesson
October 11, 2004, Minneapolis Star-Tribune
by Warren Goldstein

Although I studied to be an American historian for a decade, it never occurred to me that one of the most important things I'd ever do in a classroom would be to teach about Christopher Columbus. For me, Columbus meant a three-day weekend. But the unorthodox text I'd assigned in an introductory U.S. history course some years ago, **Howard Zinn's "A People's History of the United States"** -- since made famous by Matt Damon in the movie "Good Will Hunting" -- starts with Columbus, so I gave it a whirl.

Here's how Zinn begins: **"Arawak men and women, naked, tawny, and full of wonder, emerged from their villages onto the island's beaches and swam out to get a closer look at the strange big boat."**

Aside from its literary quality, the hint of Eden, and guesswork about the natives' state of mind, the passage asks us to look at the "discovery" upside-down: from the point of view of the people being "discovered." Zinn tells the now familiar story of violence and mayhem and greed, how Columbus seized land and prisoners, embarked on a futile, relentless search for gold, finally, when that failed, took slaves.

According to the distinguished historian Samuel Eliot Morison, a Columbus admirer and biographer, "The cruel policy initiated by Columbus and pursued by his successors resulted in complete genocide." Year after year, students are as deeply affected by this story as by anything else they learn during the course. Why?

First, they're embarrassed. After all, 1492 is one of the very few dates burned into their memories. At the drop of a hat they can all recite, sing-song, "In fourteen hundred and ninety-two, Columbus sailed the ocean blue." No such litany accompanies "In 1776..." Most are shocked to learn that relations between Columbus and the Indians were anything but trusting and peaceful. "But I thought they all had a big Thanksgiving dinner," one protested, confusing 1492 and 1621. "Why weren't we told this?" they then want to know, initiating one of the most important discussions we have all semester. The answer, if simple, is far-reaching: because most history gets told from the vantage point of the victors, not the vanquished. Native Americans north and south lost their battles with Columbus, with Cortes and Pizarro and, later, with the United States of America. That's why our children learn that Columbus "discovered" rather than "invaded" America. (I once had a student raised in Puerto Rico, who told the class she'd learned that Columbus discovered America in 1492 but invaded Puerto Rico in 1493.)

Students go on: "What else weren't we told?" they demand to know. Another good question. The answer, of course, is plenty. Most important, their curiosity is engaged, and they begin seeing that history, like politics and the Constitution, has been a battleground, that much of what they've been taught is the result not of balanced analyses of the American past but of struggles over power and meaning that some groups won and others lost.

The Columbus story enables them to wonder why they learned the significance of the date 1620 (the landing of the Mayflower) but not the equally momentous 1619 - the date African captives were first sold to North American colonists -- at Jamestown. The point is not to make students feel guilty, but rather to help them think about their history -- and their present -- in a different light. They ask about other heroes. They realize that the history they've learned might not be adequate for an adult (or a child, for that matter). Those training to be teachers vow not to let Columbus become simply an occasion for cut-out hats and pretty pictures of the Niña, Pinta and Santa Maria.

Others worry about how to broach the subject in their families. "My father's from Italy," said one young man, "and there's no way I can tell him this. Just no way." To get this point across, and many want to, they have to think like teachers, which is never a bad exercise. Months later I ask students to write down the most significant things they've learned in the course. Most come back to Columbus. It's rare that a teacher happens onto a single story that teaches so much, and engages students so thoroughly. I suspect the Knights of Columbus wouldn't approve, but I love Columbus Day.

Warren Goldstein, a former fellow of the University of Minnesota Humanities Institute, teaches American history and chairs the history department at the University of Hartford.

#3 Do we need Revisionist History?

HISPANOPHOBIA

by Tony Horwitz, Chron.com, 7-21-11

Coursing through the immigration debate is the unexamined faith that American history rests on English bedrock, or Plymouth Rock to be specific. Jamestown also gets a nod, particularly in the run-up to its 400th birthday, but John Smith was English, too (he even coined the name New England).

So amid the din over border control, the Senate affirms the self-evident truth that English is our national language; "It is part of our blood," Lamar Alexander, R-Tenn., says. Border vigilantes call themselves Minutemen, summoning colonial Massachusetts as they apprehend Hispanics in the desert Southwest. Even undocumented immigrants invoke our Anglo founders, waving placards that read, "The Pilgrims didn't have papers."

These newcomers are well-indoctrinated; four of the sample questions on our naturalization test ask about Pilgrims. Nothing in the sample exam suggests that

prospective citizens need know anything that occurred on this continent before the Mayflower landed in 1620. Few Americans do, after all. This national amnesia isn't new, but it's glaring and supremely paradoxical at a moment when politicians warn of the threat posed to our culture and identity by an invasion of immigrants from across the Mexican border. If Americans hit the books, they'd find what Al Gore would call an inconvenient truth. The early history of what is now the United States was Spanish, not English, and our denial of this heritage is rooted in age-old stereotypes that still entangle today's immigration debate. Forget for a moment the millions of Indians who occupied this continent for 13,000 or more years before anyone else arrived, and start the clock with Europeans' presence on present-day U.S. soil. The first confirmed landing wasn't by Vikings, who reached Canada in about 1000, or by Columbus, who reached the Bahamas in 1492. It was by a Spaniard, **Juan Ponce de Leon**, who landed in **1513** at a lush shore he christened La Florida. Most Americans associate the early Spanish in this hemisphere with **Hernando Cortes** in Mexico and Francisco Pizarro in Peru. But Spaniards pioneered the present-day United States, too. Within three decades of Ponce de Leon's landing, the Spanish became the first Europeans to reach the Appalachians, the Mississippi, the Grand Canyon and the Great Plains. Spanish ships sailed along the East Coast, penetrating to present-day Bangor, Maine, and up the Pacific Coast as far as Oregon.

Predating Plymouth Rock - From 1528 to 1536, four castaways from a Spanish expedition, including a "black" Moor, journeyed all the way from Florida to the Gulf of California — 267 years before Lewis and Clark embarked on their much more renowned and far less arduous trek. In 1540, **Francisco Vazquez de Coronado** led 2,000 Spaniards and Mexican Indians across today's Arizona-Mexico border ...and traveled as far as central Kansas, close to the exact **geographic center** of what is now the continental United States. In all, Spaniards probed half of today's lower 48 states before the first English tried to colonize, at Roanoke Island, N.C.

The Spanish didn't just explore, they settled, creating the first permanent European settlement in the continental United States at St. Augustine, Fla., in 1565. Santa Fe, N.M., also predates Plymouth: Later came Spanish settlements in San Antonio, San Diego, San Francisco and Tucson, Ariz. The Spanish even established a Jesuit mission in Chesapeake Bay 37 years before the founding of Jamestown in 1607. Two iconic American stories have Spanish antecedents, too. Almost 80 years before John Smith's alleged rescue by Pocahontas, a man by the name of **Juan Ortiz** told of his remarkably similar rescue from execution by an Indian girl. Spaniards also held a thanksgiving, 56 years before the Pilgrims, when they feasted

near St. Augustine with Florida Indians, probably on stewed pork and garbanzo beans.

Why do we cling to myth? - The early history of Spanish North America is well documented, as is the extensive exploration by the 16th-century French and Portuguese. So why do Americans cling to a creation myth centered on one band of late-arriving English — Pilgrims who weren't even the first English to settle New England or the first Europeans to reach Plymouth Harbor? (There was a short-lived colony in Maine, and the French reached Plymouth earlier.)

The easy answer is that winners write the history, and the Spanish, like the French, were ultimately losers in the contest for this continent. Also, many leading American writers and historians of the early 19th century were New Englanders who elevated the Pilgrims to mythic status (the North's victory in the Civil War provided an added excuse to diminish the Virginia story). Well into the 20th century, standard histories and school texts barely mentioned the early Spanish in North America.

While it's true that our language and laws reflect English heritage, it's also true that the Spanish role was crucial. Spanish discoveries spurred the English to try settling America and paved the way for the latecomers' eventual success. Many key aspects of American history, like African slavery and the cultivation of tobacco, are rooted in the forgotten Spanish century that preceded the English arrival.

Legacy was handy weapon - There's another, less-known legacy of this early period that explains why we've written the Spanish out of our national narrative. As late as 1783, at the end of the Revolutionary War, Spain held claim to roughly half of today's continental United States (in 1775, Spanish ships even reached Alaska). As American settlers pushed out from the 13 colonies, the new nation craved Spanish land. And to justify seizing it, Americans found a handy weapon in a set of centuries-old beliefs known as the "**black legend.**"

The legend first arose amid the religious strife and imperial rivalries of 16th-century Europe. Northern Europeans, who loathed Catholic Spain and envied its American empire, published books and gory engravings that depicted Spanish colonization as uniquely barbarous: an orgy of greed, slaughter and papist depravity, the Inquisition writ large.

Though simplistic and embellished, the legend contained elements of truth. **Juan de Onate**, the conquistador who colonized New Mexico, punished Pueblo Indians

by cutting off their hands and feet and then enslaving them. Hernando de Soto bound Indians in chains and neck collars and forced them to haul his army's gear across the South. Natives were thrown to attack dogs and burned alive.

No erasing enduring stain - But there were Spaniards of conscience in the New World, too: most notably the Dominican priest **Bartolome de Las Casas**, whose defense of Indians impelled the Spanish crown to pass laws protecting natives. Also, Spanish brutality wasn't unique; English colonists committed similar atrocities. The Puritans were arguably more intolerant of natives than the Spanish and the Virginia colonists as greedy for gold as any conquistador. But none of this erased the black legend's enduring stain, not only in Europe but also in the newly formed United States.

"Anglo Americans," writes **David J. Weber**, the pre-eminent historian of Spanish North America, "inherited the view that Spaniards were unusually cruel, avaricious, treacherous, fanatical, superstitious, cowardly, corrupt, decadent, indolent and authoritarian." When **19th-century jingoists** revived this caricature to justify invading Spanish (and later, Mexican) territory, they added a new slur: the mixing of Spanish, African and Indian blood had created a degenerate race. To **Stephen Austin**, Texas' fight with Mexico was "a war of barbarism and of despotic principles, waged by the mongrel Spanish-Indian and Negro race, against civilization and the Anglo-American race." It was the manifest destiny of white Americans to seize and civilize these benighted lands, just as it was to take the territory of Indian savages.

The first American citizens - From 1819 to 1848, the United States and its army increased the nation's area by roughly a third at Spanish and Mexican expense, including three of today's four most populous states: California, Texas and Florida. Hispanics became the first American citizens in the newly acquired Southwest territory and remained a majority in several states until the 20th century. By then, the black legend had begun to fade. But it seems to have found new life among immigration's staunchest foes, whose rhetoric carries traces of both ancient Hispanophobia and the chauvinism of 19th-century expansionists.

Rep. J.D. Hayworth of Arizona, who calls for deporting illegal immigrants and changing the Constitution so that children born to them in the United States cannot claim citizenship, denounces "defeatist wimps unwilling to stand up for our culture" against alien "invasion." Those who oppose making English the official language, he adds, "reject the very notion that there is a uniquely American identity, or that, if there is one, that it is superior to any other."

Rep. Tom Tancredo of Colorado, chairman of the House Immigration Reform Caucus, depicts illegal immigration as "a scourge" abetted by "a cult of multiculturalism" that has "a death grip" on this nation. "We are committing cultural suicide," Tancredo claims. "The barbarians at the gate will only need to give us a slight push, and the emaciated body of Western civilization will collapse in a heap."

Racism at the fringes - On talk radio and the Internet, foes of immigration echo the black legend more explicitly, typecasting Hispanics as indolent, a burden on the American taxpayer, greedy for benefits and jobs, prone to criminality and alien to our values — much like those degenerate Spaniards of the old Southwest and those gold-mad conquistadors who sought easy riches rather than honest toil. At the fringes, the vilification is baldly racist. In fact, cruelty to Indians seems to be the only transgression absent from the familiar package of Latin sins.

Also missing, of course, is a full awareness of the history of the 500-year Spanish presence in the Americas and its seesawing fortunes in the face of Anglo encroachment. "The Hispanic world did not come to the United States," **Carlos Fuentes** observes. "The United States came to the Hispanic world. It is perhaps an act of poetic justice that now the Hispanic world should return."

America has always been a diverse and fast-changing land, home to overlapping cultures and languages. It's an homage to our history, not a betrayal of it, to welcome the latest arrivals, just as the Indians did those tardy and uninvited Pilgrims who arrived in Plymouth not so long ago.

Tony Horwitz, the author of "Confederates in the Attic" and "Blue Latitudes," is writing a book on the early exploration of North America.

4 Are historical myths valuable?

Pious Pilgrims: part of our national myth

By Karen Ordahl Kupperman, *Washington Post*, 5-14-07

The colonists landed, short of food and supplies, after a long and harrowing transatlantic voyage. The initial exploring party stole a large quantity of corn that the Indians had carefully stored away for the hard winter. They then dug up some graves, looted items that had been buried with the dead and ransacked Indian houses. Furious fighting with the natives soon ensued. Once they had selected a site for their settlement, the migrants endured a winter of death in which they lost more than half their number.

Ah, of course, you're thinking — Jamestown. All that looting and fighting and stealing and death. It's the creation story from hell. But think again. That description is not of the troubled Virginia colony settled by a group of men popularly derided, then and now, as the scum of the Earth. Rather, it depicts the arduous first days of Massachusetts's Plymouth colony, our favorite myth of the nation's founding.

These aren't the kinds of events we remember the Pilgrims by, even though the description is drawn from their own words. Instead, our national mythmakers have accentuated the positive to carve the story of the pious Pilgrims and the first Thanksgiving out of Plymouth's more complicated, less pure beginnings. In contrast, the earlier Jamestown colony, whose 400th anniversary we now commemorate, is depicted as a saga of unrelieved degradation, relegated to second-tier status in history books. But it shouldn't be. American history today begins with the Pilgrims because their experience in Plymouth has been molded to offer a more acceptable foundation story than the dog-eat-dog world of the early Chesapeake. The Puritans' arrival in Boston, where they built John Winthrop's "city on a hill," clinched it for Massachusetts.

The Pilgrim story took over as our founding fiction after the Revolutionary War, when New England and the South began to pull in different directions. The Massachusetts colonists were labeled the Pilgrim Fathers in the 1790s, and the agreement they signed on arrival became the Mayflower Compact about the same time. Because Puritanism had come to be seen as repressive (think of Nathaniel Hawthorne's *Scarlet Letter*), early American leaders such as Daniel Webster brought the Plymouth colonists forward as the kinder, gentler Puritans.

This is the origins story we prefer and the one we promote. We prefer it because we like to think that we are descended from a humble and saintly band, religiously motivated and communal in organization, who wanted nothing more than the freedom to worship God. The individualistic, grasping capitalists of Virginia offer much less appealing antecedents.

Encasing our national founding in a myth of immaculate conception feeds the assumption that the United States is unlike other nations, that it acts in the world only to serve the greater good. Sometimes it even makes the connection directly. Two days before Thanksgiving 2004, U.S., Iraqi and British troops began a major offensive south of Baghdad. The name chosen for the campaign? Operation Plymouth Rock.

But America's true founding story is much more interesting and much more real. All early colonies had tremendous difficulties becoming established. The reports sent home from Jamestown were overwhelmingly dismal; it was all harder than anyone had expected, and everyone had different ideas about how to proceed. Dismayed by the high death rate and the disorder of Jamestown's first couple of years, the colony's London sponsor, the Virginia Co. — a kind of early venture-capital outfit — decided to compel the settlers to be virtuous. It imposed severe martial law, regulating every aspect of life to force the men to work for the collective interest. The death penalty was ordered for almost any infraction. If civic virtue could be achieved by force, the Virginia Co. was going to do it.

In fact, martial law did stabilize the colony (although many ran away to take up life with the Chesapeake Algonquins). But it couldn't foster true community development or create a thriving economy. Yet over the next several years, some colonists and backers came up with a different approach — and laid the foundations for what America is today. They substituted incentives for iron control. The land was divvied up among the colonists; a representative assembly gave landowners control of taxation; women were recruited as wives for planters; and the professional soldiers were removed. And voila. The colony began to grow. To get a stake in this new society, young men and women were willing to take on the burden of working as indentured servants for a number of years.

The new design was in place by 1619, 12 years after the first colonists arrived. Life was still hard and major conflict with the Indians soon came, but the essential elements of success were in place. Every colony from that point forward followed the Jamestown pattern. The Pilgrims, who came in 1620, began as a communal experiment, but within four years, they, too, demanded division of the land and began to disperse into family groups. Americans ever since have moved across the country in pursuit of the dream of land ownership, the innovation inaugurated on the James River. And they have prided themselves on the ingenuity that also surfaced first in Jamestown, where John Rolfe defied the odds by learning how to produce a marketable tobacco crop that became the colony's gold.

Of course, there was a tragic downside, as there is to many success stories. As colonists north and south hacked their farms out of the wilderness, they ruined the Indians' agricultural and hunting economy and forced the natives off their land. And ownership of property soon extended to ownership of labor, as Native Americans and imported Africans were enslaved in both New England and the South. The truth of our history is that it produced winners and losers. Our founding

is not a storybook Pilgrim fable. It's hardier and more complicated. And it's reflected in Jamestown's great accomplishment: that it was the place where English men and women worked through the messiness of real life in dire circumstances and found the secret to success in building a society — giving everyone a stake in the outcome.

Kupperman is a professor of history at New York University and the author of "The Jamestown Project." This article originally appeared in The Washington Post.

#5 Was the Revolution Gallant?

The Revolution was not what mythmakers say

By Froma Harrop, *Houston Chronicle*, 7-3-07

In the popular mind, the American Revolution was mostly about liberty and the pursuit of happiness — and the war that followed the Declaration of Independence wasn't much of a war. We imagine toy soldiers in red coats chasing picturesque rebels. Actually, the War of Independence was horrific, according to **John Ferling**, a leading historian of early America. It was a grinding conflict that rivaled, and in some ways exceeded, the Civil War in its toll on American fighters when looked at on a per-capita basis. Ferling chronicles the suffering in his new book, *Almost a Miracle: The American Victory in the War of Independence* (Oxford University Press).

"There's a sense that there was a great deal of gallantry," Ferling told me, "and the Revolution was a war unlike modern wars." Not so. **Ferling offers a gritty, boots-on-the-ground account of a war that subsequent generations had melted into a patriotic story suitable for children.** The reality was that combatants on all sides committed atrocities and the body count turned ghastly. One in four men who served in the Continental Army lost his life, a higher percentage death toll than in the Civil War, where one regular in five perished. In World War II, one in 40 American servicemen died.

Almost half the American rebels taken prisoner died, mainly from disease and malnutrition. The mortality rate among Union soldiers held at the infamous Andersonville POW camp in Georgia was a far lower 37 percent. Ferling challenges other misconceptions about the period. One is that the War of Independence came upon a previously peaceful land. By 1754, Virginia had already fought five wars against the Indians. In the North, the Puritans and their descendants had fought six wars. (Some of them involved European powers vying

for the control of America.) Before sailing for America, settlers would hear sermons warning them to prepare for war.

In these earlier hostilities, Ferling writes, the colonists "not infrequently adopted terror tactics that included torture; killing women, children, and the elderly; the destruction of Indian villages and food supplies; and summary executions of prisoners or their sale into slavery in faraway lands." English soldiers would refer to such methods as the "American way of war."

Another flawed impression is that the War of Independence was an overwhelmingly Northern phenomenon. (Before World War II, most of the historians writing about the Revolution came from the Northeast.) **Ferling, who grew up in Texas City, devotes about half the book to the war in the South, where the rivalries were perhaps the most brutal.**

"The only real instances of guerilla warfare are in the South," Ferling notes. After the British took Charleston in 1780, the Carolina back country erupted into a civil war. At King's Mountain, rebels massacred loyalists — and the carnage was such that a shocked Virginia colonel asked his officers "to restrain the disorderly manner of slaughtering ... the prisoners." In trying to find a winning strategy, British officers and American loyalists entered familiar debates on whether they should terrify the rebels or try to win their hearts and minds.

A Pennsylvania Tory named Joseph Galloway urged Britain to drop its "romantic sentiments" in dealing with Washington's army and to turn the redcoat into a "soldier-executioner." But others worried that excessive cruelty would hurt efforts to bring colonists back into the fold after Britain's expected victory. British Gen. Henry Clinton, for example, said it was necessary "to gain the hearts and subdue the minds of America."

Almost a Miracle provides a needed corrective to the idea that the fighting unleashed by the fine words of July 4, 1776, was mild by modern standards. The War of Independence, it turns out, was no cakewalk.

Harrop is a syndicated columnist based in Providence, R.I.

#6 Just how Complex can History Get?

The following was written by **JAMES D. FAIRBANKS** (University of Houston) who reviewed David Holmes' book, *The Faiths of the Founding Fathers* (Oxford U. Press) 2006. [*Houston Chronicle*, 5-14-06]

Our Founder's faith was anything but simple

Describing the Founding Fathers' religion poses the same challenge as trying to describe the religious beliefs of today's political leaders. Then, as now, beliefs varied from individual to individual.... Historian David Holmes from **William and Mary University** criticizes both sides of today's **cultural wars** for their sweeping generalizations about the Founders' views on religion.

His point is not just that the Founders represented a wide range of religious belief but that the 18th century was a very different world from ours.... He begins by surveying the state of religion in the Colonies right before they declared independence. The **established churches** were the **Congregationalists** in New England and the **Episcopalians** in the South. While acknowledging that evangelical strains of Christianity grew rapidly in the late 1700s, Holmes finds little evidence that any of the Founders were a part of these movements. Benjamin Franklin did give support to the evangelist **George Whitefield**, but Holmes speculates that what appealed to the freethinking Franklin was the "discomforting effect" Whitefield's preaching had on Philadelphia's stodgy Anglican elites.

Having the most influence on the Founders' religious thinking were not frontier evangelists like Whitefield but **Enlightenment** thinkers like Voltaire and Diderot in France and Bacon and [John] **Locke** in England. They emphasized searching for truth through reason and empirical inquiry rather than relying on religious dogma and supernatural explanations.

From the Enlightenment emerged a new school of religious thought: **deism**. While they never developed formal creeds, most deists understood God as the "first cause," the being who was responsible for making the laws of nature but who would not then act to contravene those laws once set in motion.

Three general groups

Holmes acknowledges that "an examination of history cannot capture the inner faith of any man" but argues that it's possible to use external criteria to place the Founders into one of **three general religious groupings: Non-Christian deists, Christian deists and orthodox Christians**. ...Holmes outlines four criteria for determining in which category an individual should go: church attendance, approach to sacraments or ordinances, level of religious activity and religious language.

Applying these criteria to the leading figures of the founding period, he finds that some, like **John Jay and Samuel Adams**, were orthodox Christians. Adams, who was sometimes referred to as the last of the Puritans, helped write the Massachusetts state constitution of 1780 that continued Congregationalism as the established, tax-supported church and declared it the duty of every citizen to worship "the Supreme Being."

Others, like Ethan Allen and **Thomas Paine**, were hostile to all organized religions, especially Christianity. Paine's *The Age of Reason* termed Christianity "a fable, which for absurdity and extravagance is not exceeded by anything that is found in the mythology of the ancients." Holmes finds that most of the nation's early leaders, including its first five presidents, fall **somewhere between Adams and Paine** and can best be thought of as Christian deists.

In his chapter on **George Washington**, for example, Holmes notes that Washington attended church, provided Christian chaplains for his army and believed that religion was the basis of all morality. There is no record, however, of Washington ever expressing his personal belief in the central tenets of the Christian faith. He did not take Communion or undergo confirmation, and his favored term for God was "**Providence**," though, as Holmes notes, "he sometimes appeared to have difficulty differentiating Providence from destiny."

For historians, there is little that is new or controversial in Holmes' accounts of Franklin, Washington, John Adams, Jefferson, Madison and Monroe.... Holmes is undoubtedly correct in concluding that the men he profiles would not be comfortable on either side of this debate. While often skeptical of what they saw as the supernatural elements of Christianity, they shared a belief in a guiding Providence and in life after death. They studied the Bible more thoroughly than do the vast majority of today's Christians and understood religion to be integrally linked to virtue and morality.

"The Past Is a Foreign Country," Holmes' final chapter, warns against judging the religion of people living in a different historical era. The nation's early leaders were products of "Enlightenment" thinking with its rejection of all that could not be comprehended by human reason. Judging them by their rejection of some of the church's traditional creeds, Holmes suggests, makes them "appear less devout than they were...."

7 Using Hamilton & Jefferson

Hamilton perceives an 'unruly Tyrant'

Dana Milbank *Washington Post*, 12-31-16

Amid the cultural sensation of Lin-Manuel Miranda's "Hamilton" on Broadway, the protagonist's arch-rival, Thomas Jefferson, has momentarily lost his place of honor in the founding narrative. If Alexander Hamilton is the hero, the Sage of Monticello, though not the villain (that's Aaron Burr) is an impediment. In truth, Jefferson and Hamilton were indispensable, the yin and yang of American democracy: Jefferson's love of liberty and Hamilton's taste for centralized power created the balance that built the world's economic and military superpower. And they had common cause in defending their creation.

Their system was under threat in 1800, when a quirk in the electoral college left the federalist-controlled House of Representatives to award the presidency to one of two republicans, Jefferson and Burr. Miranda portrayed Hamilton as reluctantly drawn out of retirement to endorse Jefferson, but Hamilton's letters show he was zealous in persuading fellow federalists to choose Jefferson — a man with whom he had more ideological differences than with Burr. The danger to the new country, Hamilton argued, wasn't ideological disputes, but the possibility that an unprincipled man would exploit public passions. He called Burr a latter-day Catiline, the ancient Roman senator who attempted a populist uprising against the Republic.

Hamilton's letters from 216 winters ago, which I re-read this week, provide much relevance to this moment, as our 45th president assumes office. Hamilton was no apologist for Jefferson, whose politics were "tinctured with fanaticism," and who was "a contemptible hypocrite." But, Hamilton wrote to Federalist James Bayard of Delaware, Jefferson is not "zealot enough to do anything in pursuance of his principles which will contravene his popularity, or his interest. He is as likely as any man I know to temporize — to calculate what will be likely to promote his own reputation and advantage; and the probable result of such a temper is the preservation of systems, though originally opposed, which being once established, could not be overturned without danger to the person who did it. Add to this that there is no fair reason to suppose him capable of being corrupted, which is a security that he will not go beyond certain limits." But how do you really feel?

Regardless of party affiliation, gender and income level, most people are more optimistic than they think. Some Federalists thought the non-ideological Burr would be more malleable.

But, Hamilton countered, a man without theory cannot be "a systematic or able

statesman.” Burr is “more cunning than wise . . . inferior in real ability to Jefferson,” Hamilton wrote. “Great Ambition unchecked by principle is an unruly Tyrant.” The former Treasury secretary warned that Burr’s trafficking in “the floating passions of the multitude” would lead him to “endeavour to disorganize both parties & to form out of them a third composed of men fitted by their characters to be conspirators.”

Hamilton recounted that when Burr was told something wasn’t permissible under the American system, Burr replied “les grands ames se soucient peu des petits morceaux” — great souls care little about small things. This led Hamilton to conclude that “Burr would consider a scheme of usurpation as visionary.” Hamilton issued similar warnings in the winter of 1800-1801 to James Ross of Pennsylvania, John Rutledge Jr. of South Carolina, Oliver Wolcott Jr. of Connecticut and Gouverneur Morris of New York. To restrain Burr, Hamilton wrote Morris, would be “to bind a Giant by a cobweb.”

Certainly there was personal enmity between Hamilton and the bankrupt “voluptuary” he called Burr. But underlying Hamilton’s aggressive campaign for Jefferson was a fear that America’s democracy was too fragile to survive Burr’s ambition. “He is of a temper to undertake the most hazardous enterprises because he is sanguine enough to think nothing impracticable, and of an ambition which will be content with nothing less than permanent power in his own hands,” he wrote Bayard. “The maintenance of the existing institutions will not suit him, because under them his power will be too narrow & too precarious; yet the innovations he may attempt will not offer the substitute of a system durable & safe, calculated to give lasting prosperity, & to unite liberty with strength. It will be the system of the day, sufficient to serve his own turn, & not looking beyond himself.” “The truth,” Hamilton wrote, “is that under forms of Government like ours, too much is practicable to men who will without scruple avail themselves of the bad passions of human nature.”

Hamilton’s view of Burr would later become universal. Jefferson would come to see his former running mate as “one of the most flagitious [villainous] of which history will ever furnish an example.” Hamilton’s intervention gave the country the triumphant presidency of Jefferson, sparing the young nation an unscrupulous man exploiting public passion to usurp power.

#8 Should a recent President be compared to Andy Jackson?

The New Old Hickory

Linda J. Killian, *New York Times*, 2-13-17

Donald Trump has hung a portrait of Andrew Jackson, the nation's seventh president, next to his desk in the Oval Office and members of his staff are touting the idea that the two men have a lot in common. Vice President Mike Pence has boasted of Trump's victory, "There hasn't been anything like this since Andrew Jackson." That may actually be true. There are already signs of similarities between the two men and it's a cause for significant concern.

Like Trump, Jackson was brash, abrasive, defensive and quick-tempered and both were described as vulgar and unfit to govern. Jackson was also thin-skinned and felt the world was against him and that the ruling elites looked down on him. Both expressed extreme loyalty to controversial advisers and elevated them to powerful positions in their administrations with disastrous effect. Both were called tyrants and bullies and like Trump, Jackson professed to always put American interests first and inveighed against "alien enemies."

Trump addresses his critics and enemies in media appearances, speeches and tweets, while Jackson engaged in duels, even killing one of his opponents. Trump has the least amount of government or military experience – which is to say none – of any president in history, but Jackson served as a judge, represented Tennessee in the House and Senate, was the first governor of Florida and was a hero in the War of 1812. Both are considered populists, although it can be argued Trump's is a faux populism ginned up to win support from people with which he has nothing in common. Jackson truly did come from humble origins and was a self-made man, although his fortune was made largely through the ownership of slaves and by speculating on Indian lands which he later seized for himself and the United States. Like Trump, Jackson reportedly spoke to the people using vivid, accessible language. Jackson was fervently devoted to the idea of majority rule and in his two successful presidential elections won the popular vote and suggested the Electoral College be abolished. This was no doubt due to his experience in 1824 when he won the most votes in a crowded field but not a majority. The election was thrown into the House of Representatives and thanks to what he labeled the "corrupt bargain," Henry Clay threw his support behind John Quincy Adams, who won the presidency and subsequently named Clay his secretary of state.

Jackson seethed over this and began working immediately to win the next presidential election, and like Trump railed against the corruption of the Washington elites. But both men after taking office installed their own supporters, wealthy friends and family members as advisers and cabinet members, which for Jackson often proved disastrous.

Jackson, the first president from the Democratic Party, viewed political equality for all (white men) as central to the nation's founding principles. In Trump's slogan to "Make America Great Again," there is a hint of Jackson's frequent harkening back to the founding principles. Both men took office at a time of social and economic upheaval. In Jackson's case, the United States was at the beginning of the Industrial Revolution when a manufacturing sector, commercial agriculture and a market economy were being created along with changes in transportation and communication. Just as there are today, there were big economic winners in Jackson's age who were able to take advantage of these changes and many others who were left behind. Jackson's policies, like those of Trump, were designed to appeal to those who felt threatened by economic change.

Historian H. W. Brands, who refers to Trump's "penthouse populism," dismisses the idea that there are meaningful similarities between the two men. But the most striking commonality between Donald Trump and Andrew Jackson is their use of race to divide the nation and unite their supporters and their seeming disdain for the rule of law. The concept of *Herrenvolk* (master race) democracy is the idea of oppressing one or more racial groups while promoting the idea of equality among the white oppressors. For Trump, this involves Muslims and Mexicans who have become scapegoats for our national security threats and manufacturing job losses. In Jackson's case, the most egregious example was his removal of Native Americans from Georgia, Mississippi and Alabama to Oklahoma in the Trail of Tears in which 4,000 Indians died on the journey. Jackson was unapologetic in asserting that he was recovering the land for white American settlement. Jackson ignored law and the Constitution when he considered the nation to be threatened, defied a Supreme Court decision in his removal of the Indians and asserted that his authority to determine what was constitutional was equal to the court. In the Trump administration's temporary ban on refugees and the subsequent court decisions to block parts of the order, we may be headed for a similar showdown over perceived security threats versus the Constitution.

In Jackson's biggest fight against the Bank of the United States and his veto of its congressionally approved charter, he asserted that his overwhelming re-election in 1832 gave him a mandate to challenge Congress and to express the will of the people. His "bank war" was also a proxy for the battles Jackson was waging against wealthy elites, foreigners and the economic changes that were happening in the country and is not dissimilar from the kind of misdirection Trump also practices. When Jackson was censured by the Senate for his actions involving the Bank of the United States, he asserted that he was "the direct representative of the people" and

attacking him was like attacking democracy. One can certainly imagine President Trump using a similar line of argument after his first major disagreement with Congress.

#9 Were the Know-Nothings Right?

A View from Two Conservatives

By Jeb Bush and Robert D. Putnam *Washington Post*, 7-3-10

...Americans should reflect on the lessons of our shared immigrant past. We must recall that the challenges facing our nation today were felt as far back as the Founders' time. Immigrant assimilation has always been slow and contentious, with progress measured not in years but in decades. Yet there are steps communities and government should take to form a more cohesive, successful union.

Consider what one leader wrote in 1753: **"Few of their children in the country learn English. The signs in our streets have inscriptions in both languages. Unless the stream of their importation could be turned they will soon so outnumber us that we will not preserve our language, and even our government will become precarious."** Thus Ben Franklin referred to German Americans, still the largest ethnic group in America. A century later, Midwestern cities such as Cincinnati and St. Louis were mostly German-speaking. So worried were their native-born neighbors that Iowa outlawed speaking German in public and even in private conversation.

Proponents and opponents of immigration agree on one thing: Learning English is crucial to success and assimilation. Yet learning a language as an adult is hard, so first-generation immigrants often use their native tongue. Historically, English has dominated by the second or third generation in all immigrant groups. Most recent immigrants recognize that they need to learn English, and about 90 percent of the second generation speak English, according to the Pew Hispanic Center. Research by sociologists Claude Fischer and Michael Hout published in 2008 suggests that English acquisition among immigrants today is faster than in previous waves.

Residential integration of immigrants is even more gradual. Half a century ago, sociologist Stanley Lieberson showed that most immigrants lived in segregated enclaves, "Little Italy" or "Chinatown," for several generations. This segregation reflected discrimination by natives and the natural desire of "strangers in a strange land" to live among familiar faces with familiar customs. Only with suburbanization, encouraged by government policy in the 1950s and 1960s, did the children and grandchildren of the immigrants of the 1890s and 1900s exit those

enclaves. That many of today's immigrants live in ethnic enclaves is thus entirely normal and reflects no ominous aim to separate themselves from the wider American community.

Immigrant intermarriage, then and now, also demonstrates steady progress over generations. In the 1960s, more than half a century after Italian immigration peaked, about 40 percent of second-generation Italians married non-Italians. This pattern characterizes today's immigrants: 39 percent of U.S.-born Latinos marry non-Latinos, according to the Pew Research Center. Intermarriage among second-generation Asian Americans is even more common. Today's immigrants are, on average, assimilating socially even more rapidly than earlier waves.

One important difference, however, that separates immigration then and now: We native-born Americans are doing less than our great-grandparents did to welcome immigrants. A century ago, religious, civic and business groups and government provided classes in English and citizenship. Historian Thomas P. Vadasz found that in Bethlehem, Pa., a thriving town of about 20,000, roughly two-thirds of whom were immigrants, the biggest employer, Bethlehem Steel, and the local YMCA offered free English instruction to thousands of immigrants in the early 20th century, even paying them to take classes. Today, immigrants face long waiting lists for English classes, even ones they pay for.

Why is this important? A legal immigration system is the not-so-secret edge in a competitive, interconnected world economy. Immigrants enhance our ability to grow and prosper in the dynamic global marketplace. We will need every possible advantage to expand our economy amid its fiscal challenges. Moreover, the aging of our population places a premium on young, productive workers, many of whom must come from immigration.

To improve their integration into our American community, we should:

- Provide low-cost English classes, in cooperation with local civic and religious groups, where immigrants build personal ties with co-ethnics and native-born Americans. These connections foster assimilation and help newcomers navigate our complex institutions.
- Invest in public education, including civics education and higher education. During the first half of the 20th century, schools were critical to preparing children of immigrants for success and fostering a shared national identity.
- Assist communities experiencing rapid increases in immigration, which is traumatic for those arriving here and for receiving communities. Schools and hospitals bear disproportionate costs of immigration, while the economic and fiscal

benefits from immigration accrue nationally.

Assimilation does not mean immigrants shed ethnic identities. Our national experience with hyphenated identities shows that good Americans can retain a strong sense of ethnic identity. **We've lived our national motto, "E Pluribus Unum" ("Out of Many, One"), better than any other country. But we ought not to airbrush our ancestors' difficulties in assimilation, nor fail to match our forebears' efforts to help integrate immigrants.** Government, churches, libraries, civic organizations and businesses must cooperate to address this challenge, as they did a century ago.

Jeb Bush was governor of Florida from 1999 to 2007. Robert D. Putnam is the Malkin professor of public policy at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government.

10 How do personal letters & public words shape history?

Lincoln Quotations

February 15, 1848 (in a letter to former law partner William Herndon who was supporting what Lincoln considered a pre-emptive and therefore unconstitutional War with Mexico) *Lincoln had consistently voted against the popular Mexican War and would shortly propose in Congress the "Spot Resolution" asserting that President Polk, two years before, had irritated a pre-emptive attack in order to force Mexico to sell California to the United States. Lincoln chose to retire from Congress later that year after serving a single term.)*

“Allow the President to invade a neighboring nation whenever he shall deem it necessary to repel an invasion, and you allow him to do so, ...and you allow him to make war at pleasure. ...If to-day he should choose to say he thinks it necessary to invade Canada to prevent the British from invading us, how could you stop him? You may say to him, -- I see no probability of the British invading us"; but he will say to you, ‘Be silent: I see it, if you don't.’

The provision of the Constitution giving the war making power to Congress was dictated... by the following reasons: kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This our [Constitutional] convention understood to be the most oppressive of all kingly oppressions, and they resolved to so frame the Constitution that no one man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us.” But your view destroys the whole matter, and places our President where kings have always stood.”

August 24, 1855 (in a letter to Joshua Speed, an old friend)

"I am not a Know-Nothing. That is certain. How could I be? How can anyone who abhors the oppression of negroes, be in favor of degrading classes of white people? Our progress in degeneracy appears to me to be pretty rapid. As a nation, we began by declaring that "all men are created equal" We now practically read it "all men are created equal, except negroes." When the Know Nothings get control, it will read "all men are created equal, except negroes, and foreigners, and Catholics." When it comes to this I should prefer emigrating to some country where they make no pretence of loving liberty - to Russia, for instance, where despotism can be taken pure, and without the base alloy of hypocrisy".

June 16, 1858 *More than 1,000 Republican delegates met in the Springfield, Illinois, statehouse for the Republican State Convention. At 5 p.m. they chose Lincoln as their candidate for the U.S. Senate, running against Democrat Stephen A. Douglas. At 8 p.m., Lincoln delivered this address to his Republican colleagues.*

"A house divided against itself cannot stand.... I believe this government cannot endure, permanently **half slave** and **half free**. I do not expect the union to be dissolved--I do not expect the house to fall--but I do expect that it will cease to be divided. **It will become all one thing, or all the other.... Have we no tendency to the latter condition?**"

August 1, 1858 (three weeks before the Lincoln-Douglas debates)

"As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy. Whatever differs from this, to the extent of the difference, is not democracy"

September 18, 1858 (4th debate with Steven A. Douglas) "I will say then that I am not, nor ever have been in favor of bringing about in anyway the social and political equality of the white and black races - that I am not nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having

the superior position assigned to the white race. I say upon this occasion I do not perceive that because the white man is to have the superior position the negro should be denied everything."

February 11, 1859 (part of a lecture series called "Discoveries and Inventions" given at Illinois College in Jacksonville, Ill.) *The following segment is considered a satire designed to provoke his audience. Substitute "oil" for "land" and the statement seems eerily relevant in the early twenty-first century.*

"We have all heard of Young America. He is the most *current* youth of the age. Some think him conceited, and arrogant; but has he not reason to entertain a rather extensive opinion of himself? Is he not the inventor and owner of the *present*, and sole hope of the *future*?"

....Young America has ...a longing after territory. He has a great passion -- a perfect rage -- for the '*new*;' particularly new men for office, and the new earth mentioned in the revelations, in which, being no more sea, there must be about three times as much land as in the present.

He is very anxious to fight for the liberation of enslaved nations and colonies, provided, always, they *have* land, and have *not* any liking for his interference. As to those who have no land, and would be glad of help from any quarter, he considers *they* can afford to wait a few hundred years longer....

Young America... owns a large part of the world, by right of possessing it; and all the rest by right of wanting it, and intending to have it He is a great friend of humanity; and his desire for land is not selfish, but merely an impulse to extend the area of freedom. He is very anxious to fight for the liberation of enslaved nations and colonies, provided, always, they have land."

December 22, 1860 (letter to Alexander Stephens, soon to be vice-pres. of the Confederacy)

"You think slavery is right and should be extended; while we think slavery is wrong and ought to be restricted. That I suppose is the rub. It certainly is the only substantial difference between us."

February 14, 1861

"I am rather inclined to silence, and whether that be wise or not, it is at least more unusual nowadays to find a man who can hold his tongue than to find

one who cannot."

March 4, 1861 (Lincoln's 1st Inaugural Address)

"In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow-countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The Government will not assail you. You can have no conflict without being yourselves the aggressors. You have no oath registered in heaven to destroy the Government, while I shall have the most solemn one to 'preserve, protect, and defend it'."

August 22, 1862 "Letter to Horace Greeley"

"My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, and is not either to save or destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing any slave I would do it, and if I could save it by freeing all the slaves, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone I would also do that. I have here stated my purpose according to my view of *official* duty; and I intend no modification of my oft expressed *personal* wish that all men everywhere could be free."

January 26, 1863 "Major-General Hooker, I have placed you at the head of the Army of the Potomac. I have heard, in such a way as to believe it, of your recently saying that both the Army and the Government needed a Dictator. Of course it was not for this, but in spite of it, that I have given you the command. Only those generals who gain successes, can set up as dictators. What I now ask of you is military success, and I will risk the dictatorship. And now beware of rashness. Beware of rashness, but with energy, and sleepless vigilance, go forward, and give us victories." - A. Lincoln -

January, 1863

"The hen is the wisest of all the animal creation because she never cackles until after the egg has been laid."

November 10, 1864

"It has long been a grave question whether any government, not too strong for the liberties of its people, can be strong enough to maintain its own existence in great emergencies. On this point the present rebellion brought our republic to a severe test; and a presidential election occurring in regular course during the rebellion added not a little to the strain. If the loyal people, united, were put to the utmost of their strength by the rebellion, must they not fail when divided, and partially

paralyzed, by a political war among themselves? But the election was a necessity. We cannot have free government without elections; and if the rebellion could force us to forego, or postpone a national election, it might fairly claim to have already conquered and ruined us.”

March 4, 1865

Lincoln's 2nd Inaugural Address

“On the occasion corresponding to this four years ago, all thoughts were anxiously directed to an impending civil war. All dreaded it--all sought to avert it.... **Both parties deprecated war; but one of them would make war rather than let the nation survive; and the other would accept war rather than let it perish. And the war came....**

All knew that [slavery] was, somehow, the cause of the war. To strengthen, perpetuate, and extend this interest was the object for which the insurgents would rend the Union, even by war; while the government claimed no right to do more than to restrict the territorial enlargement of it.

Neither party expected for the war, the magnitude, or the duration, which it has already attained. Neither anticipated that the cause of the conflict might cease with, or even before, the conflict itself should cease. Each looked for an easier triumph, and a result less fundamental and astounding. Both read the same Bible, and pray to the same God; and each invokes His aid against the other. It may seem strange that any men should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces; but let us judge not that we be not judged. The prayers of both could not be answered;....

With malice towards none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan--to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace, among ourselves, and with all nations.”

Norton Garfinkle in his 2006 book, *The American Dream vs. the Gospel of Wealth* (Yale U. Press), said that Lincoln turned to large government expenditures for internal improvements (canals, bridges and railroads) and supported a strong national bank to stabilize the currency. “He provided the first major federal funding for education, with the creation of land grant colleges keeping close to his heart an abiding concern for the fate of ordinary people, especially the ordinary worker but also the widow and orphan. Our greatest President kept his eye on the

sparrow.” He believed government should be not just "of the people" and "by the people" but "for the people." **Can you pick up any of those beliefs in the above quotations?**

11 Civil War Professor Reviews the movie “Lincoln”

Allen Guelzo, The Daily Beast, 11-27-12

Guelzo is the director of the Civil War studies department at Gettysburg College and author of a history of the Civil War and Reconstruction as well as important studies of Abraham Lincoln's religious views and the emancipation proclamation.

I am walking out of the multiplex theater in my old home town of Springfield, and already the sold-out audience for the next showing of Steven Spielberg’s new Lincoln is queuing up. The sound of something very rare in my movie-going experience is still reverberating in my ears – the sound of an audience applauding. And, from the opening crack of thunder that introduces us to Daniel Day-Lewis’s stoop-shouldered Lincoln, there is much worth applauding, even to an empty screen.

Let me play Lincoln biographer first, since I am not, after all, a movie critic. **The pains that have been taken in the name of historical authenticity in this movie are worth hailing just on their own terms.** Lincoln’s White House office (now the Lincoln Bedroom) meticulously replicates the marble fire-place, Lincoln’s stand-up pigeonhole desk, the scattering on the cabinet table of the Congressional Globe and a printed speech by Lincoln’s postmaster-general Montgomery Blair, the portrait of Andrew Jackson on the wall and the half-tone lithograph of British parliamentarian John Bright on the mantel. The theatre box in which Abraham and Mary Lincoln are listening to Gounod’s Faust has the same pattern of wallpaper as the fatal box at Ford’s Theatre, and Tad Lincoln learns of his father’s shooting while attending a performance of Aladdin. All the familiar figures appear: the staffers Nicolay and Hay, the 13th Amendment’s abolitionist floor-manager James Ashley, Navy Secretary Gideon Welles (“Neptune”), Secretary of War Edwin Stanton – even the clerk of the House of Representatives, Edward McPherson, is correctly situated. Ulysses Grant really did have reddish-brown whiskers, and his military secretary really was a full-blooded Seneca sachem, Ely S. Parker. Even the glass-cased amputated leg of the scoundrel-general, Dan Sickles, makes a quick appearance.

It is on Lincoln himself that the most demanding historical exactness is fitted. And Day-Lewis wears it uncommonly well. His reedy-pitched voice reflects the numerous descriptions of Lincoln’s voice which described it as a tenor, with almost

squeaky accents. He walks flat-footedly, as Lincoln did, wraps himself in a shawl, features only a tuft of beard at his chin (the luxuriant chin-whiskers of his early presidency had been shaved-down by the time of the movie's events, in 1865), and quotes Shakespeare between off-color stories.

Day-Lewis captures Lincoln's canniness and his awkwardness, his external simplicity and his internal complexity, a man easy to underestimate but dangerous in the outcome when you do. Even odd snatches of Lincoln's words surface, and not just in the set-piece moments like the Second Inaugural – "flub-dubs" to describe Mary Lincoln's over-budget redecorating projects, the dream of a recurring dream of the ship navigating toward an unknown shore, the theorems of Euclid, the desire to see Jerusalem.

But this is, after all, a movie, a drama, an entertainment (if you will), not a documentary. For all of our wailing about the lack of historical knowledge, awareness, teaching and reading, historical and biographical movies increasingly feel compelled to pay a much heavier duty in period-correct appearances than the costume-dramas of our parents' generation, and it's satisfying to see that Spielberg pays his duty so lavishly. But a preoccupation with authenticity at the expense of story has capsized more than a few historical movies at their dock, and Lincoln has not entirely escaped that problem.

The fundamental concern of Lincoln is the passage of the 13th Amendment, and Lincoln's struggles to make that passage happen in the House of Representatives. This is, in other words, partly a courtroom drama and partly a re-incarnation of Mr. Smith Goes to Washington. And there is great drama to be found in the floor-fights and speeches which led to the 13th Amendment's adoption on January 31, 1865. David Strathairn, who unquestioningly deserves a Best Supporting Oscar for his depiction of William Seward, conducts the back-room log-rolling necessary to assemble the requisite two-thirds majority, seconded by Tommy Lee Jones as Thaddeus Stevens (whose rapid-fire verbal savagery still manages to remind me more of Agent K than the Old Commoner). The bad guys appear in the form of George Hunt Pendleton (the disappointed Democratic nominee for vice-president in 1864) and Fernando Wood, the sleazy New York Democrat. Happily, when the final vote is taken, the bad guys lose. Spielberg invents a clever cut-away moment for the amendment's roll-call vote: Speaker of the House Schuyler Colfax is in the process of announcing the amendment's passage when the camera blinks onto Lincoln, at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, hearing bells and artillery salutes beginning to go off.

But good as this story is, Spielberg cannot resist trying to make it better by heaping several layers of counter-point on top of it. There is, for one thing, the Confederate peace commissioners whom Francis Preston Blair (in a hefty performance by Hal Holbrook, himself one of the great screen Lincolns) begs Lincoln to meet with. Blair's genuinely eloquent plea for Lincoln to concentrate on negotiating peace and to stopping the killing sets up a conflict between Lincoln's desire to end the war, and the knowledge that an end to the war will pull all the wind out of the sails of the 13th Amendment, since the amendment is being sold in Congress as a measure which, however radical in racial terms, will force the war to a conclusion. If Lincoln can get peace without needing the amendment, why have the amendment at all? Straithern's Seward puts this dilemma very neatly when he asks Lincoln bluntly: do you want to end the war or get the amendment?

The Democrats in Congress, who denounce the amendment as the opened-gate to black equality (and even women's voting), would like nothing so much as to welcome the Confederate commissioners to Washington. But here is where Lincoln is profoundly torn. He really does want the amendment and peace. Yet another counterpoint emerges here in the person of Robert Todd Lincoln, his eldest son, who wants to join the Army. But Mary Lincoln will hear nothing of so monstrous a risk, and so both Robert and his mother become another argument in favor of peace.

On the recommendation of General Grant, Lincoln sets up a meeting with the peace commissioners. He hopes to keep this under wraps, so as not to feed the Democrats' campaign against the amendment, even to the point of concealing it from Seward. But – enter another line of counterpoint – the word leaks out all the same, and Lincoln escapes a debacle over the vote for the amendment only by issuing a written assurance that there are no Confederate commissioners in yet another sub-plot to Lincoln, about the necessity of Washington. (They were not, of course, in Washington, but cooling their heels at Hampton Roads, where Lincoln would shortly meet with them, but no one in the Democratic caucus seems to have caught-on to Lincoln's lawyer-like evasion). In the end, the righteous triumph. But the interweaving of these story lines, while intended to heighten the conflict between peace and justice, actually burden it down. Like Spielberg's *Amistad* (which Lincoln so often visually resembles, with its smoky interiors and heavy shadows), Lincoln is a tremendously long and talky movie – a good two-and-half hours – a full half-hour of which might have easily ended-up on the cutting-room floor without missing a beat. For instance: the Robert Todd Lincoln sequences merely highlight what has already been highlighted; the climactic vote on passage of the amendment could have cut at once to the Second Inaugural without costing

anything. Even the opening scene, with the quartet of soldiers reciting the Gettysburg Address, really does nothing to launch the overall trajectory of Lincoln, and the two brief battlefield moments are little more than contrived interjections of emotional commentary (which is all the more surprising, coming from the director of Saving Private Ryan).

Even so, the talkiness of Lincoln is high-quality talkiness. Spielberg's screenwriter, Tony Kushner, puts into Lincoln's mouth an explanation of the legal technicalities of the presidential war powers, the Emancipation Proclamation, and the need for a constitutional amendment to abolish slavery which is so clear that Lincoln himself could have admired it. Lincoln's rebuff to Thaddeus Stevens' radicalism, staged between the two in the basement kitchen of the White House, is built around the image of a compass. That compass has a needle which points only one way, Lincoln says, to a clear and unfailing north, and in just the uncompromising way Stevens wants to conduct politics. The hazard for the traveler is that the north-pointing needle fails to indicate the swamps in the way of getting there. Stevens and Lincoln both understand this, and how it will likely make them enemies in the conduct of Reconstruction. (As Lincoln tells Grant, he wants no hangings after the war, and if Jeff Davis wants to go in exile, Lincoln will let him, rather than remorselessly tracking the arch-traitor down). But for the moment, the Lincoln and Stevens will work together, because both of them have worked in the direction of this amendment all of their lives. Which, by the way, introduces unholy political means to obtain holy political ends. **In a very great way, this is not a movie about the** hold-your-nose unpleasantness of democracy; it's about how the unpleasantness is not nearly so unpleasant as it is portrayed by democracy's cultured despisers.

Cumbersome and over-complicated as it is, Lincoln is still filled with a certain robust joy in the rough-and-tumble of American politics. In an age when so many people puffingly complain about gridlock, lobbying, campaign money, and inefficiency, Lincoln embraces all of them, and good comes out of it. It is, despite its over-length, a movie of confidence – confidence in politics, confidence in a very skilled yet principled politician, confidence in the self-created mazes of our representative democracy. And Day-Lewis's Lincoln, haggard but smiling, tormented and yet fundamentally serene in his knowledge of doing right, carries even the slowest and most awkward moments toward a fundamental affirmation of truth and purpose.

The queue has grown longer even as I think about this. I want to tell them that Lincoln will be worth the wait, and worth the length. **They are about to see what**

we so often deplore as mere sausage-making, and they will love it. They will see, in politics, how law and justice embrace. I step out into the chilly autumn evening, rejoicing.

#12 And a final word from William Faulkner:
“The past is never dead. It’s not even past.”
- *Requiem for a Nun*, 1951

Quotations Defining History

1. Until lions have their historians, tales of the hunt shall always glorify the hunters.
~African Proverb
2. Professor Johnston often said that if you didn't know history, you didn't know anything. You were a leaf that didn't know it was part of a tree.
~Michael Crichton
3. The unrecorded past is none other than our old friend, the tree in the primeval forest which fell without being heard. ~Barbara Tuchman
4. History is a tool used by politicians to justify their intentions. ~Ted Koppel
5. History is a jangle of accidents, blunders, surprises and absurdities, and so is our knowledge of it, but if we are to report it at all we must impose some order upon it. ~Henry Steele Commanger
6. [T]he historian must serve two masters, the past and the present. ~Fritz Stern
7. If history were a photograph of the past it would be flat and uninspiring. Happily, it is a painting; and, like all works of art, it fails of the highest truth unless imagination and ideas are mixed with the paints. ~Allen Nevins
8. The very ink with which all history is written is merely fluid prejudice.
~Mark Twain
9. Too many historical writers are the votaries of cults, which, by definition are dedicated to whitewashing warts and hanging halos.
~Thomas A. Bailey
10. History is never antiquated, because humanity is always fundamentally the same. ~Walter Rauschenbusch
11. History, like a vast river, propels logs, vegetation, rafts, and debris; it is full of live and dead things, some destined for resurrection; it mingles many waters and holds in solution invisible substances stolen from distant soils. ~Jacques Barzun
12. The present is the past rolled up for action, and the past is the present unrolled for understanding.
~Will and Ariel Durant

Week of	Topics and Reading	Assignments
Aug. 22	America and Europe before Columbus Voyagers & Conquistadors	Read: The American Yawp, chapter 1 -2 & supplemental readings # 1 - 2
Aug. 29	English Colonization, economy & Population & relationship w/England	Read: The American Yawp, chapter 3 & supplemental readings # 3
Sept. 5 No class on Labor Day	Colonial Culture and Mind The Great War for Empire	Read: The American Yawp, chapter 4 & supplemental reading - #4 View and create: Book TV report & Prepare: a notesheet
Sept. 12	Test One: Wed. 14 th Toward independence	lecture thus far & chapters 1 thru 4 of The American Yawp plus supplemental readings # 1 - 4
Sept. 19	Independence & the Articles of Confederation	Read: The American Yawp, chapter 5-6 & supplemental readings # 5
Sept. 26	Constitution & a federal government	Read: The American Yawp, chapter 7 & supplemental readings # 6
Oct. 3	The Jeffersonian revolution & the War of 1812	Read: The American Yawp , chapter 8 supplemental reading # 7 Research & Write: The Wikipedia Assignment
Oct. 10	Test Two: Wed. 12 th	lecture since the last test & The American Yawp, chapters 5-8 + supplemental readings: 5 - 7 & the Wikipedia project + a notesheet
Oct. 17	Toward a Sectional Economy & Culture	Read: The American Yawp, chapter 9 & supplemental readings # 8
Oct. 24	The Age of Jackson	Read: The American Yawp, chapter 10 supplemental readings # 9
Oct. 31	Sectionalism & Manifest Destiny,	Read: The American Yawp , chapter 11 Read: supplemental reading # 10
Nov. 7	The Mexican War The Tempest begins	Read: The American Yawp, chapter 12 Think about: supplemental reading # 11 Research & Write: Handbook of Texas Project
Nov. 14	Test Three: Wed. 16 th The Gathering Tempest (1853-1861)	Read: The American Yawp, chapters 9 through 12 supplemental readings # 8 - 9 + a notesheet

Nov. 21	The Civil War begins <i>No Class on Thursday, Thanksgiving</i>	Time to catch up on your reading i.e. Chapter 13
Nov. 28	The Civil War Ends & Reconstruction	Read: The American Yawp, chapters 13, 14 & 15 Review and prepare: your Final Exam notesheets
Dec. 5	Final Exam	lecture from 1790 through 1877 & The American Yawp, chapters -13, 14 & 15 supplemental readings # 10 – 11 + your notesheets